

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a manuscript sent to us for publication and microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. Pages in any manuscript may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. Manuscripts may not always be complete. When it is not possible to obtain missing pages, a note appears to indicate this.
2. When copyrighted materials are removed from the manuscript, a note appears to indicate this.
3. Oversize materials (maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or in black and white paper format.*
4. Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, all photographs are available in black and white standard 35mm slide format.*

***For more information about black and white slides or enlarged paper reproductions, please contact the Dissertations Customer Services Department.**

U·M·I· University
Microfilms
International

8611380

Seliger, Michael

CRITICAL ELEMENTS IN THE "HEALTH" OF COMMUNITY ACTION
AGENCIES IN THE AGE OF "REAGONOMICS." (VOLUMES I AND II)

City University of New York

PH.D. 1986

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1986

by

Seliger, Michael

All Rights Reserved

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy.
Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received ✓
16. Other _____

University
Microfilms
International

CRITICAL ELEMENTS IN THE "HEALTH" OF COMMUNITY
ACTION AGENCIES IN THE AGE OF "REAGONOMICS"

By

MICHAEL SELIGER

- VOLUME ONE -

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty
in Sociology in partial fulfillment of the require-
ments for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

1986

COPYRIGHT BY

MICHAEL SELIGER

1986

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

1/15/86
date

Stanley Aronowitz
Chairman of Examining Committee

1/15/86
date

William Korman
Executive Officer

Professor Stanley Aronowitz

Professor Charles Winick

Professor Lindsay Churchill

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ABSTRACT

CRITICAL ELEMENTS IN THE "HEALTH" OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES IN THE AGE OF "REAGONOMICS"

by

Michael Seliger

Adviser: Professor Stanley Aronowitz

This study explores critical elements in the "health" of Community Action Agencies during a stressful period in their history - the first term of Ronald Reagan's presidency, with its emphasis on cuts in the federal funding of social programs. CAA's are a unique "class" of organizations, which came into existence during the early years of the "War on Poverty" in the mid sixties. They are clearly "Open Systems", in which their scope, focus, and even philosophy are closely effected by the external environment in which they operate, and which they in turn seek to effect on behalf of their constituency (or constituencies).

By observing ten moderate - sized New York State CAA's at the beginning and end of Reagan's first term, the study considers a group of operations in a social ecological context, applying ethnographic techniques to the consideration of practical aspects of organizational dynamics and especially Open Systems theory, in a "real world," non-laboratory setting.

In the process of studying these agencies, a general schema with specific prescribed diagnostic features - has been developed that relates different aspects of agency strategy, operating style, and other factors, to aspects of organizational health. These overall findings have relevance for organizations that seek to improve or sustain "agency health", by demonstrating that "agency health" is a multi-faceted concept, in which different approaches may contribute to different facets of the whole. As organizations prioritize the aspects of agency health they wish to enhance, the schema would suggest strategic and managerial strategies that appear to be linked to those aspects.

Findings indicate that director's Mode of Management, Approach to Communication with Staff, Commitment to Staff Development, and Allocation of Time were related to CAA Health as defined with regard to Staff Morale, at both points of analysis, with Democratic, open style being positively correlated with better staff morale. CAA Health, as measured in Fiscal terms, was closely correlated to CAA's relationship to local government and how the CAA is perceived by public officials. Other indicators were not consistently related to CAA Health at both rounds, and their presence and absence are subjected to speculative discussion which addressed the direct impact of Reagan's budget cuts on the strategies and organizational activity of the ten agencies.

PREFACE

The study reported on the pages that follow reflects on our times by considering the strategies and approaches used by Community Action Agencies - products of the sixties - in order to remain viable in the less supportive atmosphere of the Reagan eighties.

I have attempted to present a fairly full picture of those effects. Doing so has meant organizing the material in a manner that does not suit all readers equally. Accordingly, be advised that Chapters Six through Eight present findings in a thorough but unexciting manner. Since key aspects of these findings are summarized within Chapter 10 (Discussion), a reader may wish to skip or skim chapters six to eight. For those desiring more data and information on the agencies, please see the appendices.

I am, of course, grateful to the Community Action Agencies of New York State, Directors, Staff, and Board members, for their trust and cooperation. All have my admiration for perseverance and commitment during these times. I am also, of course, grateful to my employer, my wife, and my friends and faculty at CUNY, for their support of my pursuit of this effort. And of course, grateful thanks for the invention of word processors and an exceptionally talented friend who successfully translated my scrawl, through that machine, to what we have here.

As a subject area that is close to me, I welcome feedback and new information related to this field.

To reiterate my thanks, personally, to some very special people:

- My wife, Linda Dillman, and our son, Daniel Leon, born soon after this was completed, thanks for your help and patience!

- My employer, Arawak Consulting Corporation, Angelo Giordani, President, for giving me the space and support needed to complete this effort. My fellow employees, George K., Tom, Anna, George S., David, Gloria, Bill, Nathan, and more--for various supporting help.
- My committee--Drs. Stanley Aronowitz, Charles Winick, and Lindsay Churchill--for sticking with me with the guidance I needed.
- My colleagues and friends at CUNY, too numerous to mention, but special thanks to Mike Brown and Bogden Denitch, among others...
- My brother, Ed, for helpful assistance in the final stages of this project.
- Finally, thanks for a superb, caring job, to Debra A. Enriquez, Cynthia Z., and Carmen for their work on production of this document and kind support of my efforts throughout...

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	iv
Preface	vi
PART ONE - BACKGROUND	
<u>Chapter One: Introduction</u>	1
A. Overview; Statement of Purpose	1
B. Statement of the Problem	3
C. Assumptions	4
D. Conceptual Framework	5
E. Operational Definitions	8
F. General Hypotheses	15
<u>Chapter Two: Background</u>	17
A. Origins and Evolution of CAA's	17
B. Status of CAA's in 1981	20
C. A Modest Literature Review	23
<u>Chapter Three: Methodology</u>	56
A. Base Line Data	56
B. Predictions Based on Baseline Findings	56
C. Field Visits for Round Two	57
D. Study Sites	57
E. Data Analysis, Presentation of Findings	58
<u>Chapter Four: General Characteristics of the CAA's and Communities Included in the Study</u>	60
A. General Target Area Characteristics	60
B. CAA General Characteristics	62
<u>Chapter Five: Factors in CAA "Health"</u>	67
A. Fiscal Health	67
B. Morale	75
C. Constituent Perception of the CAA	76
D. CAA's and Political Officials and Community Leaders	79
E. Program Activity	81
F. Board Factors	83
PART TWO - FINDINGS	
<u>Chapter Six: Impact of Director, Board, Agency Activity and Strategies, on CAA Health (1981)</u>	86

	<u>Page</u>
A. Executive Director's Impact on Agency Health	86
1. Mode of Management	87
2. Communication with Staff	91
3. Parallels to the Communication Items	95
4. Public Image	96
5. Relationship to Board	98
6. Director's Allocation of Time	101
B. Board Chairperson's Impact on Agency Health	111
1. Areas & Levels of Activity	112
2. Relationship to Executive Director	113
C. Board Mode of Operations'	
Impact on Agency Health	113
1. Board Activeness	124
2. Board Committee System	115
3. Staff at Board Meetings	116
4. Areas of Board Involvement	117
D. CAA Strategy Mix, and its	
Relationship to CAA Health	120
1. Four Strategies	120
2. Strategy choices characterizing	
CAA Emphasis over the past twenty years	121
3. Strategy mix related to CAA Health	123
4. Level of Effort on each Strategy,	
related to CAA Health	129
- Service Delivery	130
- Community Organization	130
- Advocacy	131
- Resource Development	131
E. Relation to Local Government, and CAA Health	132
<u>Chapter Seven: Summary of CAA Activity Related to Each</u>	
<u>Aspect of CAA Health (1981)</u>	135
A. Morale	135
B. Program Activity	139
C. Community Leader Attitudes Towards CAA	142
D. Political Officials' Attitudes Towards CAA	146
E. Fiscal Health	148
F. Board CAA Health	152
<u>Chapter Eight: Revisits to CAA's in 1984:</u>	
<u>Summary of Findings Compared</u>	
<u>to 1981</u>	156
A. General Changes Between 1981 and 1984	156
B. Morale	159
C. Program Activity	164
D. Community Leaders' Attitudes Towards CAA	168
E. Political Officials Attitudes Towards CAA	172

	<u>Page</u>
F. Fiscal Health	174
G. Board CAA Health	180
<u>Chapter Nine: The Human Element:</u> <u>Intangible But Vital</u>	185
PART THREE - DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	
<u>Chapter Ten: Discussion</u>	199
A. Study Objectives	199
B. Instrument and Methodology	201
C. Limitations of the Study	204
D. Discussion of Findings:	
CAA Activity and ACC Health	207
1. Morale	207
2. Program Activity	221
3. External Perceptions & Attitudes of the CAA	236
-Beneficiaries	237
-Community Leaders	240
-Political Officials	245
4. Fiscal Well-Being	251
5. Board Health	261
E. Discussion of Findings: Impact of Reagan-Era Budget Custs on CAA Strategies, Approaches, Operations, and Overall Well-Being	271
<u>Chapter Eleven: Conclusions and Recommendations</u>	285
<u>Appendices: Case Summaries of Ten CAA's</u>	292
<u>Bibliography:</u>	419

Note: Appendices and Bibliography appear as Volume Two.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview; Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore critical elements in the "health" of Community Action Agencies¹ (CAA's) during a period of belt-tightening caused by the assault on the funding base of these agencies during the first year of "Reagonomics". By looking at agencies at a time when their "core" funding was being cut severely, inquiry can be made into factors which "make a difference" in the abilities of these agencies to sustain their efforts at a time when both they, and the people they are mandated to serve, are feeling a budgetary squeeze.

The study uses, as "baseline data", information gathered during a 13-month period which began on the week of Reagan's election, and ended just after the dismantling of the Community Services Administration. (CSA was the federal agency responsible for administering CAA funding, and was an early casualty of the Reagan budgetary ax.) During this time, I served as Project Director on twenty week-long evaluation visits to CAA's in New York State and New Jersey. Information gathered from these visits provides a "baseline" of "agency health", and each organization's style of operating. The extent to which various

¹ Community Action Agencies are local organizations which were designated as recipients of funding from the United States Community Service Administration and its predecessor--the US Office of Economic Opportunity--as appropriate conduits for conducting programs and or delivering services beneficial to the low-income residents of specific geographic areas of such as a City, County, or group of rural counties. Most recently, this funding has been administered through states, via the Community Services Block Grant.

elements correlate with measures of "agency health" provide a basis for the development of hypotheses on the relationship of "agency health" to specific elements characterizing CAA's modus operandae.

Ten agencies in New York State were revisited, specifically for this study, in September-October 1984. The revisits determine how well each agency fared, compared to the findings from the 1981 visits. Predictions, based on how well the agency's approach in 1981 correlated with factors that--at the time--appeared to contribute to "agency health", were tested by comparing 1981 and 1984 "health" and operational factors at each agency.

The study sought to provide the following:

- Documented assessment of how particular organizational strategies and modes of operation at staff and board levels contributed to "agency health" as measured in terms of fiscal well-being, program activity, staff morale, and how the agency is perceived in the community and among "community leaders".
- A means of measuring "agency health" was tested, as well as means of analyzing various factors which may contribute to it.
- Summary descriptions of ten CAA's--their strategies, organization approaches, program operations, and so on--were prepared for two distinct time periods, providing a sense of overall change as well as change in each agency.
- An overall summary places changes in "agency health," and related strategies and other factors, in the context of the time period in which this comparison is made.

B. Statement of the Problem

The "War on Poverty" is now twenty years old. Community Action Agencies have been a central vehicle in this "war" since the beginning. Few comprehensive studies have been conducted and broadly disseminated on CAA's during the past twelve or more years. This is unfortunate. CAA's represent a group of institutions of a common type, usually coming into existence at about the same time, with the same general mandate, with a commitment to impacting on the lives of the poor in their target areas. The agencies and their approaches have evolved differently in different communities, based on local conditions, and based on the approach developed by the agency under the guidance and vision of its Board and/or executive director. Much of the evolution of these agencies was influenced by changes in government policy and expectations, which were asserted through regulatory control of agency funding. (A more detailed discussion of the evolution of Community Action Agencies is found in Chapter II, Part A.)

At the time that Reagan took office, CAA's were being encouraged to develop long-range planning mechanisms, so they could put their approach into a measurable format. Some agencies had already done long range planning well before this was announced as a national priority. Others only began to participate in this effort because funding depended on it. In any case, the Reagan administration pulled the rug out from under this effort, and left CAA's with less clear requirements than at any time in recent years. In effect, CAA's had been thrown overboard and were given the opportunity to show how well they had learned to swim.

The different ways that agencies had evolved--their different

degrees of reliance on federal funding, their different internal organizational approaches, the leadership style of their executive director, the role and activeness of the board, etc.--would certainly effect the way they would survive without federal guidance and with far less federal money as part of their support.

Simply stated, this study seeks to determine whether elements in the organizational makeup of CAA's can be correlated (and used as predictors) to "agency health" over time.

The goal is to develop a conceptual model which describes the resultant trends that emerge from this study, and offer both information and a methodological approach which might enhance further study (possibly including some introspective self assessment by CAA's themselves.)

C. Assumptions

This study makes the following assumptions:

1. Community Action Agencies are similar enough, in stated purposes, bylaws, board structure, staffing, time of origin, process of development, and constituency for common parameters of "agency health", "success", and Modes of operation, to be derived from a review of evaluations of a number of agencies.
2. The status of CAA's in a single state will be affected more-or-less equally by the transfer of authority for administration of Federal "local initiative funds" to the State via block grant mechanism.

3. Agencies whose initial "status" (baseline) was reviewed between December 1980 and December 1981 can be treated as sufficiently similar, when compared to their "status" in September-October 1984, as long as the funding ratio used to discuss fiscal well being consistently uses FY 1981 program years² as its standard comparison point.
4. Operational definitions of "agency health" and various elements contributing to it can be derived from a review of the 1981 materials and used as the basis for predicting "relative health" to be found on the 1984 revisits.

D. Conceptual Framework

Much of the "conceptual framework" of the current study is derived from empirical experience, rather than based strictly on theoretical constructs which have served as the basis of previous research. Nonetheless, the body of literature which addresses Leadership Style and its relationship to organizational cohesiveness and productivity; studies of Compliance style in organizations; and Open System Theory with its emphasis on the relationship of organizations to their environmental context--certainly have relevance to the present study. The same is true of studies of the distribution of local community power; the role of community action, community control, and related struggles in shifting the focus and efforts of local leadership with

² CAA program years are staggered, with different agencies receiving funding for the next twelve month period on different start-dates within the fiscal year. 19 of the 20 agencies visited were seen during their FY 81 Program Years.

regard to changing class power relationships; and strategy decisions of local social change organizations. Of particular relevance are recent studies such as Marilyn Gittel's (1980) explorations of the primary operating strategy selected by various local organizations involved with public education issues at a time of decline for such organizations; organization dynamics literature on effective management style in industrial and institutional settings; and materials developed specifically for community action agencies, Head Start Programs, and the like, on the critical role of Boards in planning, evaluating, and supporting agencies with regard to goal pursuit. Also relevant is the recent literature on the impact of Reagan's budget cuts on community service agencies and their constituents.

The relevant literature written in these areas also includes a substantial amount written by myself (sometimes in collaboration with others.) Among the more relevant items in this category are the following:

- a 250-page Community Organization Training Manual
- Training Guides for Board Roles in community based organizations, including Board Role in fundraising, planning, evaluation, and resource development.
- A 100-page document for Boards and Agency Staffs on the conducting of Community Needs Assessments;
- Evaluation Reports on the Administrative and Programmatic strengths and weaknesses of over 200 community agencies;
- Numerous information-gathering instruments applied to these evaluations

- Administrative operations and procedures manuals for several community based health organizations and other nonprofit organizations.

A modest consideration of the extant literature appears in Chapter Two, Part C.

Stated succinctly, the theoretical framework, derived from both empirical and evaluative research studies, and from the extant literature, embodies these points:

1. CAA's are organizations. Their stated purpose includes impacting positively on the lives of the poor in their target area. These organizations have a history and--often modified--mandate from their initial (and often primary) source of funds (CSA.) This combines with local realities in the shaping of the agency's approach, staffing, goal articulation, and board size and composition.
2. CAA's employ various strategies and approaches in pursuit of their stated objectives.
3. An often unstated, but real, purpose for the CAA's efforts, is the strengthening/continuance of the CAA itself. (This is not judged negatively, especially as it is generally perceived as appropriate activity for continuing efforts to serve the target constituency.)
4. Various elements impact on how well the agency is doing. How well the agency is doing is measured in terms of fiscal well-being, staff morale, productivity of the agency, and recognition of the agency by constituents and community leaders). The elements that impact on the agency include

activities of the executive director and board, especially with regard to the means they employ to get the agency to conduct goal oriented activities. Similarly, the strategy-mix that defines the agency's choice of an approach to meeting its mandate is a key, relevant item.

5. The CAA's well-being--as measured by fiscal health, staff morale, productivity (measured in terms of effective services, interventions, or other impacts on clients directly or through advocacy), and recognition (including trust and respect as well as familiarity)-- is effected by the (internal organizational) elements mentioned above in #4. It is also effected by external factors such as availability of funding and presence or absence of local government support. Many of the external factors are, themselves complex products of the relationship of the CAA to these external factors, established over time, at least partly due to the nature of the CAA itself...

E. Operational Definitions

1. Community Action Agency is a non-profit organization designated as the recipient of federal funding under the Economic Opportunities Act, as amended, for the purpose of impacting on the lives and/or conditions of the poor, in a specific geographic target area. These agencies were funded through the United States Community Services Administration in 1981, until it was dismantled. By late 1982, all CSA funds were administered through Community Services Block

Grants to the states. (Legislation in New York State required that all agencies funded by CSA should share in the funds available to the Community Services Block Grant, and that many CSA guidelines remain as requirements for the agencies under state jurisdiction.) Of the twenty CAA's which provide the baseline data from 1981, 13 are in New York State, seven in New Jersey. Ten of the 13 New York State agencies are used for the follow up study. (Selection of the ten is based on their similar size, with regard to local initiative funding level. Two of the three not revisited are ten times as large--and the last was the only site not personally visited by me in the first round.)

2. "Agency health" is the level of agency well-being or active potential for the agency to carry on the tasks that meet its mandate while perpetuating and strengthening its reasons for existing. This is measured by the following:

- a. Fiscal well-being--defined by the ratio of all CAA funding from all sources, to funding provided specifically through CSA (and later through the block grant) as Local Initiative Funding.

Local Initiative Funding is money allocated by a formula from Congressionally approved Community Services funds, to all CAA's, to be used in whatever manner the local agency sees fit. These funds often serve as core administrative funds, for the agencies to administer a variety of programs funded by other means. Empirical experience with the first round data suggests that a

(1981) ratio in excess of 5.5 to 1 suggests a "Healthy" agency on this measure. A ratio of less than 3 to 1 is clearly indicative of an agency. "At Risk." (26% reductions in Local Initiative moneys should actually require an 8-1 ratio, in 1984, for a comparably healthy ratio, and anything less than 4-1 would be considered "at Risk.")

- b. Staff Morale - determined through interviews with staff, and by observation of programs in operation. An agency is "At Risk" if more than 10% of those interviewed (or observed) indicate that a problem exists or that they are looking for another job or demonstrate disinterest in the actual performance of their work.
- c. CAA Role Recognizability by Constituents - determined by the percentage of interviewees who describe the agency in terms of broad purposes of multiple activities, as opposed to a single function or service. If over 75% of clients interviewed know the agency as one that does many things, the Agency and its image in the community can be considered "highly recognizable" or Well Known. If over 50% of clients interviewed describe the CAA in terms of a single purpose, the agency is not WIDELY known. There are other measures to be looked at here, including the percentage of income eligible persons in the target area whose lives are somehow effected by the CAA. (Regrettably, Data on this variable could not be

deemed sufficiently representative of the Agency client populations, and much of this analysis was curtailed.)

- d. CAA Recognition Among Community Leaders and Public Officials - Measured through interview responses, in terms of familiarity with the CAA (as above--knowledge of the CAA for its breadth of activity, or for a single function); respect (acknowledgement that the CAA does its job well and serves a valid purpose on behalf of the targeted population); and co-operation (in which the community leader indicates that individually or organizationally there are direct current ties to the CAA in which support is provided in at least one direction.) The Agency's relationship to community leaders is "Well Connected" if the Agency's Board contains an appropriate mix of community leaders on its Board, including public officials, and representatives of social agencies, community or civic groups, labor, church, etc. The CAA is "Well Respected" if 90% of the community leaders express favorable opinions about the agency in the course of interviews. The Agency's relationship to community leadership is Weak if there are significant gaps on its Board and/or over 20% of leaders interviewed expressed negative opinions about the CAA. Analysis of "Community Leader" and "Public Official" data revealed that it would be appropriate to treat these as separate categories.

- e. Program Activity - In some ways this is a less directly comparable element to measure, because both level and type of activity is appropriately different at different agencies based on local conditions. Program Activity is deemed to be Appropriate if it is based on community needs assessment or other process that identifies needs and shapes programs in response to current realities, with mechanisms for updating the activity. Program activity is stagnant if the agency had not altered its programming, while interviews with staff, board, and community identified unmet needs that might be met by the CAA.

Quantity of program activity was to be measured by comparing 1981 and 1984 statistics on various program outcome measures.

Quality of program activity is considered satisfactory if over 80% of beneficiaries expressed satisfaction, unsatisfactory if 25% of beneficiaries had serious reservations. Other measures of Quality are based on direct observation of program activity, including consistency of effective performance by staff, and trust shown by beneficiaries in the staff.

3. Organization-operating characteristics are variables in the way organizations work. These are to be correlated with the above measures of "agency health."

- a. Leadership Style of Executive Director is defined in terms of openness of communications to staff and board;

extent to which responsibilities are delegated to others; degree of commitment to building skills and potential for decisionmaking of both staff and Board; and how the director defines his/her relationship with the agency in terms of personal philosophy and goal.

- b. Organizational Compliance System - closely related to leadership style, this inquires directly into how closely the organization fits the pattern of "coercive", "utilitarian", or "normative" types of system, with regard to expectations of staff compliance, as defined in the literature.
- c. Role of Board Chairperson - defined in terms of level of activity (measured in numbers of hours per month on the job), areas of activity (policy guidance, board development, resource development, and the like are Positive areas of participation; direct involvement in day to day administration of program is a Negative Role.)
- d. Relationship between Board Chairperson and Executive Director - This is probably the most important relationship at any CAA. It can range from Cooperative (in which each performs their prescribed role and supports the other, in their pursuit of common agency goals) to Competitive (in which the two actively struggle over the control of the agency's two main reasources--staff loyalty and activity, and boardmember support for policy and program direction). A Strong Director sometimes has a Dominating relationship to the

Board, using it as a rubber stamp of policies dictated by the director. A strong Board Chairperson can also exceed appropriate bounds and Usurp the administrative responsibilities of the director or limit the director's scope of activity...

- e. Activeness-Level of the Board - Measured by frequency of meetings and attendance of Board and subcommittees. An "Active Board" would always have a quorum at meetings during the past year. It is probably more efficient if it uses Subcommittees as the vehicle for doing work between meetings which could then be ratified at Board meetings. Also required for being an active Board is that the Board plays a role in at least two of these areas: planning, evaluation, resource development. A Board is at risk if less than 80% of its meetings achieve quorums; procedures for selecting new Board members are not consistent with agency bylaws; at least 20% of the board's seats are vacant; or interviewed Board members are unable to articulate their role and that of the agency in more than 10% of the cases.
- f. Agency Program Strategy Mix - The way the agency balances the following program strategy options with regard to the time and effort expended on each: Service Delivery (direct services to clients); Community Organization (efforts to mobilize groups in the target area to coalesce in the articulating and acting upon issues relevant to them); Advocacy (public posturing by

the CAA on behalf of needs of individuals or groups within the community, including pressing for changes in laws or administrative procedures of other agencies...); and Resource Development (the activity required to raise funds, mobilize volunteers, and otherwise gain community support for the activities of the agency.) This will be ascertained through interviews and document review.

F. General Hypotheses...

1. The relative level of "organizational health" on each of the five measures in 1981 will be positively correlated with each other.
2. The relative level of "organizational health" on each of the five measures in 1981 will be positively correlated with the same measures in 1984.
3. Agency operational measures which were found to correlate with measures of "organizational health" in 1981 will also correlate highly based on the 1984 assessment.
4. The Agency Operational Characteristics, as found in 1981, can serve as predictors of agency health in 1984.
5. External factors, including political/funding climate, may explain any discontinuities between 1981 and 1984 findings.

While the analyses will follow this set of testing of hypotheses, the reporting of findings on change (or lack of change) at each CAA, during the Reagan years, will also be

addressed through descriptive narrative. These comparisons over time lead to additional findings and generalizations which are worthy of note in their own right, but were not predicted in advance. (For example, the number of CAA directors who left between 1981 and 1984; ways that the Reagan climate has affected program strategies; and, variance between stated philosophy and actual practice.)

II. BACKGROUND

A. Origins and Evolution of Community Action Agencies

Community Action Agencies typically came into existence in the mid 1960's, as the primary local recipient of funding from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, in its efforts to combat/eradicate poverty throughout the nation. Many changes of focus have occurred in the twenty years since the "War on Poverty" was declared by President Johnson. These changes were sometimes the result of each CAA's unique development in response to unique local realities, plus the increased experience of the CAA. However, a number of key changes had an impact on all CAA's. These were externally induced as a result of changes in Federal government policy. The paragraphs which follow trace these changes in a summary fashion.

- o The Early Years (1964-66) - When the Economic Opportunity Act was first passed in 1964, it authorized close to \$1 billion to be spent on a broad range of programs which would be largely operated by Community Action Agencies, and funded through the United States Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). Operating under a mandate to achieve "maximum feasible participation of the poor," these early efforts included the creation and funding of new organizations whose board and agency structure empowered new constituencies. These were somewhat free-wheeling years in which successful program ideas could generally receive funding to match their potential. Innovation and community mobilization were common and welcome.

- o The Green Amendment (1967) - The first tightening of control over CAA's came with the passage of the Green Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act in 1967. This altered the composition of CAA Boards, requiring a balance of public officials, private sector representatives, and poverty community representatives on the Board, and requiring legislative approval over CAA's in each area. Local legislatures were given the alternative of designating "public" Community Action Programs--operated by the local government, but with board representation from the poverty community--if they were not satisfied with the independent CAA approach. Most CAA's remained officially separate from local government, although the influence of local officials--who now constituted 1/3 of the Board, by law--was greatly strengthened. The major impact of the Green Amendment was to slow or halt the development of constituencies capable of challenging existing political power holders. Nonetheless, emphasis on participation by the poor and a growing emphasis on programs leading to independence and "breaking the cycle of poverty" continued to challenge existing social agencies to be more responsive to the aroused constituency.

Nixon: Dismantling OEO, Categorical Funding

When Richard Nixon became president, he initiated executive decisions that weakened OEO and the CAA's, by transferring programs to other Federal agencies. Head Start was transferred to the Department

of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1969. VISTA was moved out of OEO into a new agency for volunteer programs (ACTION) the next year. A trend that had already started was intensified: CAA's were given less money for general purposes (where they could decide how the money would be spent) while more funds were earmarked for particular programs which tended to be more service-oriented and, thus, less threatening to traditional holders of power.

When his second term began, Nixon's "War on the War on Poverty" went into high gear. Thirteen programs were transferred out of OEO in 1973. In 1974, Legal Services was transferred out of OEO, to struggle along as an independent entity.

Community Services Administration

OEO was abolished and replaced by the Community Services Administration in 1974. As its name implies, CSA sought to increase the service orientation of the CAA's, by establishing "Standards of Effectiveness" and other procedures that required increased emphasis on administrative procedures and service statistics.

By the beginning of the Carter Administration (1977) the CAA's had begun to receive new program funding for the first time in years, and their future brightened.

For the most part, these new programs were categorically funded service activities that could best be handled by an existing network of locally based organizations. (These included new employment and training initiatives, Weatherization, Energy Crisis Intervention Program, teen pregnancy and rape crisis centers, and summer youth employment.) Thus, even though the agencies might grow, their ability

to mobilize as change agents had not been as well supported.

In 1980, evaluations of community action agencies were contracted for by the Carter Administration, to analyze their effectiveness and to determine the way that the strategies of Community Organization, Service Delivery, Advocacy, and Resource Development were employed by local agencies. It was under this contract that I came to evaluate 20 CAA's in New York and New Jersey.

Reagan

As part of a general assault on federally supported human services, the Reagan Administration closed the Community Services Administration in September 1981. After a year of transition, the reduced available funding for CAA's had been transferred to the States, under the Community Services Block Grant. (The Economic Opportunity Act was repealed soon after Reagan took office.)

For the past two years, the Administration has tried unsuccessfully to get Congress to merge the Community Services Block Grant with Social Services Block Grant, which would result in most CAA funding being buried in State Departments of Social Services (Welfare Departments). The current annual CSBG budget is approximately 1/3 of the first OEO budget--although funding now exists for programs originally created within OEO.

B. Status of CAA's in 1981 (after first round of visits, faced with major fund cutbacks)

The previous section did not include considerations of whether an agency had, or could attract, sufficient funding and/or other resources to sustain the program activity needed for its constituency. That is

assumed as a basic underpinning for agency operations, although since 1981 the adequacy of some funding has been seriously questioned.

Even before the budget cuts which went into effect in October, 1981, most CAA's had experienced little growth in their federal government support over the past several years. The impact of this had typically, been:

- Comparatively low salaries, especially for paraprofessionals and clerical personnel.
- Inability to expand programs into some new areas.
- Difficulty in attracting or holding some qualified staff persons.
- Difficulty in maintaining or improving agency facilities.
- Waiting lists for some services such as Weatherization.

In addition, cutbacks in CETA had reduced personnel at least on Weatherization crews, and in some cases throughout the agency.

CAA's were facing 45% cuts in Local Initiative funding, and total uncertainty with regard to Weatherization, ECIP, Nutrition, and other programs. (The actual CSBG funding has hovered at 74% of pre 1981 levels). Reduced monies for Manpower programs and support areas such as Day Care have resulted in increases in the numbers of people needing assistance at the same time that CAA ability to provide assistance has been reduced.

The extent to which this is a problem varies from agency to agency. Those agencies that have ownership of buildings are not as seriously endangered as those where rental would become a larger portion of the agency's core funding. Those agencies that already receive substantial local and county support and contracts to operate

programs for County government are somewhat more insulated than those agencies which do not have good relations with county government.

Agencies which kept their staffs apprised of the situation were found to have higher morale and support for plans to continue programs with the least impact from dollar cuts, while agencies where employees were not well informed were full of anxiety, low morale, and little loyalty.

Although badly shaken, it appears that most CAA's were responding to the cutbacks by asking how they can best continue their efforts, with reduced resources. Meanwhile, of course, they look for alternative resources. There did not appear to be any organized loud scream coming from all of the CAA's, at once. Instead, we seem to be hearing groans as individual agencies buckle down harder.

Those agencies with low funding ratios would be expected to have a harder time surviving with the budget squeeze. Ability to do so would depend on a significant improvement in agency resource development accomplishments.

The impact on program beneficiaries is harder to determine. Some outreach centers might close, thus decreasing the accessibility of services which CAA's had brought to the poor. This could be a serious blow, especially to rural and elderly poor.

The threat of major energy program cutbacks could have been devastating to poor people whose homes had not yet been winterized, who are unable to meet fuel costs even without increases in cost or harsh winter weather, etc. The more effective the educational and organizing efforts of the CAA in the past, the better off the local poor should be, thanks to the creation of fuel co-ops, etc., and increased

knowledge of how to conserve fuel. But the actual impact as of 1981 was quite varied, and another year or more of education activity would have yielded beneficial results in every community. Weatherization funding since 1981 has been sporadic, with much uncertainty for operating agencies and staffs, but the actual dollar levels have risen in the past few years.

The impact of transferring control of monies to states also caused some anxieties--especially in New York State--over the State's ability to process contracts and vouchers promptly enough to support CAA needs. There are also long range concerns that States might be tempted to press for a larger portion of limited resources to be administered by public agencies such as Departments of Social Services. This would be quite harmful, as there are segments of the population that do not deal well with impersonal bureaucracies, but have thrived and grown in working with CAA's.

Because of the way that the budget cuts were being handled, a gradual decrease in capabilities and performance of CAA's could be anticipated, unless alternative resources are found. This gradual decrease in capability to respond might go largely unnoticed until the over-all level of despair approaches critical levels.

C. (Modest) Literature Review

Introduction: The Literature's Conceptual Context

In developing the conceptual framework for this study of community action agencies in the 1980's, it has been necessary to draw on writings in several related fields, and combine and blend these writings with extensive empirical experience. The need for this

balanced approach comes from the nature of the study itself, and the fact that CAA's--which constitute a unique set of organizations that were formed at approximately the same time, under similar mandates and with similar limitations placed on their organizational (Board) Policymaking structure, which have evolved differently largely due to the unique characteristics of environment, personnel, and operating and programmatic strategy choices deriving from these--have not received systematic attention from social researchers. In this sense, we make a distinction between "researchers" and "evaluators". The growth of evaluation studies has rarely led to their being incorporated into the body of knowledge of systematic social research and its professional journals. Our study incorporates evaluation concepts and literature, with a historical grounding of the CAA's themselves and literature that seeks to develop a systematic sense of the operations of organizations in the context of their environment and in the planning and pursuit of organization objectives.

As a study of Community Action Agencies in the 1980's, it is appropriate to consider literature on community action programs and their evolution, and to consider literature on the impact and implications of federal budget policy during the 1980's on social programs and related strategies. There is remarkably little direct overlap between these two kinds of writings, as little social science or policy literature has focused on community action agencies in the past fifteen years. Nonetheless, it is from our efforts to clarify and define the CAA of the 1980's that its goals--and hence the measures of success used in this study--are derived.

As a study of organizations that exist as entities within social,

economic, political and informational environments or contexts, literature on organizational dynamics--internally and in relation to external entities--has been drawn on to focus some aspects of the study. This is especially true with regard to consideration of styles and approaches of leadership/administration and their relationship to measures of agency health, and the relationship between organizations and their environments suggested by Open Systems Theory. Some aspects of CAA-type organizations have been virtually ignored, or have not been routinely studied or reported on in social science organization research literature. This includes the role of boards in organizations, especially with regard to their impact and relevance to decisionmaking in nonprofit organizations such as CAA's, and the potential pitfalls when scope and limits of Board participation are unclear. Empirical experience and non-theoretical literature developed for the building of effective Boards has had to substitute for this void.

Since the study grows out of the field of program evaluation, it is also appropriate to discuss both contributory elements of this field which are incorporated into this study, and its limitations. This entails both discussion of literature about evaluations, and a brief review of a small number of studies that have at least minimal relevance to the current effort.

Much of the focusing that is required for the developing of this study does not come from these sources, but comes from government reports and communiques to the community agencies themselves, and through my own field evaluations and observation of the CAA's throughout their existence. These provide a level of reality-testing

to the (sometimes scanty) relevant literature discussed below.

In the section which follows, on CAA literature, the reader is cautioned that only those aspects of the literature that contribute to the study's overall conceptual framework are included. A history of community action appears as Section A of Chapter Two.

This same approach--of reporting only on literature whose consideration is relevant to the development of the conceptual basis of the present study applies to each of the areas addressed below.

Anti Poverty Programs: Born, 1964, Left for Dead, 1970... Rumors of Death Somewhat Exaggerated

From shortly after its "official" inception, with the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the "War on Poverty" was a phenomenon that drew substantial attention from academic social scientists and policy analysts. From analytical and historical essays by Yarmolinsky, Wofford, Sundquist et al., in On Fighting Poverty (edited by Sundquist, 1969), to Moynihan's apologetic treatise, Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding (1969), and right wing reactions such as Scheibba's Poverty is Where the Money Is (1968), we find common threads. These writers, and others--see Clark and Hawkins (1969), Morris and Rein (1967), Lens (1969), Weissman (1969), Zurcher (1970), Everett, ed., (1966), etc.--agree that the "war on poverty" was already "lost" by somewhere between 1967 and 1970. Moynihan stated that the "war on poverty" was "in full retreat by 1967," having been created "not because it was necessary, but because it was possible". (Moynihan, 1969, p. 29) The history documented by Moynihan, Yarmolinsky, and others arrives at largely the same conclusion as

Scheibla's, that the "scandals" and disappointments of the poverty program "are largely the result of a poorly prepared program, launched on a crash basis for political gain." (Scheibla, p. 8).

Another common thread of the abovementioned writers is that virtually none wrote further on CAA's or the War on Poverty, after 1970. One author who did write in this area after 1970, James Patterson, agrees that 1965 to 1970 were "OEO's peak years". Patterson's book, by title, addresses poverty "from 1900 to 1980" although the book's chapters address efforts to combat poverty only through 1973. Patterson criticizes OEO for having a "fuzzy" diagnosis of poverty, which resulted in wide variations in how the problem was attacked, nationally and locally. But he does not write the effort off, within six years of its birth, and neither do I.

Of particular interest in Patterson's book is his consideration of the difficulties involved in evaluating the war on poverty in general, and community action in particular. He notes that during the "peak years" of 1965 to 1970, the number of poor declined from 33 million to 25 million. He wisely points out that, in the middle of an economic "boom" period, with the Vietnam war providing jobs and a channel for reducing minority unemployment, "causation cannot be attributed to the War on Poverty" (for the decline in the number of "poor.") (Patterson, 148) He notes that the number designated as poor dropped further--to 23 million--by 1973, but that this official figure was based on "stringent and arbitrary" definitions of poverty. This difficulty in defining the limits of the "class" to be served by anti-poverty programs touches on both research methodological concerns, and on political strategy. The research issue is how to address the questions

of target constituency; how the CAA's define their target constituencies, and the implication of that decision. As we shall see, different CAA's made different choices--sometimes actively, sometimes accepting service category limitations inherent in legislation. These choices made by CAA's have their parallels in non-government-funded national movements, as well; thus presenting the political strategy consideration. George Wiley, head of the National Welfare Rights Organization, came to feel that poverty programs and welfare rights were "minority strategies for change" which could not win. Recognizing the need to take middle class discontent into account, Wiley pressed to organize the broader-based Movement for Economic Justice (see Boyte 1980, p. 53 ff.) Similar emphasis on broad-based, multi-class issue organizing is seen in the work of Alinsky and his followers. In the present study, interest in agency strategies leads to consideration of decisions to serve broader or narrower constituencies, and the outcomes of the decisions, rather than any arbitrary limitations on the service population to be addressed.

Patterson observed that it was "particularly hard to evaluate the community action programs" because their wide variation defied easy generalization. "Some, as in Syracuse, created conflict and controversy that led to counterattack by existing authorities. Others, as in Newark, paved the way for the rise of black political leaders and a shift in local leadership. The majority worked more or less harmoniously with existing institutions and concentrated on delivering educational, legal, and family planning services. In these places, Community Action personnel augmented existing social agencies and did not make dramatic changes in what had long been done." (Patterson,

149) Contained in this statement are both some important considerations for the present study--the wide variation in CAA's; their focus, activity, and observable immediate and longer range outcomes--and some questionable assumptions. Patterson's conclusion that, in most places, the presence of the CAA did little to change what had long been done is subject to debate. His conclusion is derived from discussion of evaluation studies, most of which were pre-1970. While it cannot be denied, as Patterson asserts, that poverty among disadvantaged sectors was not eradicated (and recent analyses suggest that--by some financial measures--much poverty remains as severe now as at the start of the War on Poverty), I find myself in agreement with analysts who find the continued existence and ongoing effects of CAA's to be noteworthy. For example, in Piven and Cloward's post-Reagan analysis, The New Class War (1982), they emphasize the theme that, "although the movements of the 1960's subsided, as had the movements of the 1930s before them... they left in their wake a profound transformation--economic rights through law," creating "pervasive new linkages between the state and democratic publics." (1982, p. 118) Although Piven and Cloward did not make reference to a CAA role in the linkages that they applaud in their 1982 work, their earlier writings (1971) credited the CAA's with making lasting changes in how blacks were treated by welfare and other institutions. Moynihan also saw a long-range impact, suggesting that "very probably the most important long run impact of the community action program of the 1960s will prove to have been the formation of an urban Negro leadership echelon at just the time when the Negro and other minorities were verging towards extensive commitments to urban politics." Recent electoral advances

for blacks at local levels suggest that Moynihan may have been correct, for some urban areas. However, the Piven and Cloward contention was not as clearly supported. Cloward and Piven themselves (1979) reported the decline in numbers defined and serviced as in the seventies as evidence of loss of ground for the Great Society programs, due to a decline in activism which reduced pressure on government to sustain or increase its efforts to ameliorate conditions for the poor. When pressure waned, the "programs that had provided resources and justification for black protest were stifled, their activities curbed, and funds curtailed or eliminated..." This assessment of antipoverty agencies in a general state of retreat, was a reverse of Cloward and Piven's earlier optimism with regard to the impact of the Great Society programs. They explain the reversal in their 1982 book, where they re-reviewed their position, as being reflective of a change in the times. Since the study presented here assumes that the CAA efforts are worthwhile at least in the context of articulating and addressing local needs, with broader implications dependent on local CAA strategy choices takes in the context of local realities, the Piven and Cloward 1982 analysis is welcomed. Community Action Agencies, in their multitude of forms and distortions, twisted and rechanged by the changes of federal outlook over the past twenty years, remain a major vehicle for the articulation of these changed relationships to government and private social agencies on behalf of its constituencies. CAA selection of strategic approaches to this role--as advocate, deliverer of service, mobilizer of resources, direct organizer of self help and empowerment organizations, link in development of issue-oriented coalitions, or what have you--varies from

place to place, as the current study shows. One aspect explored in this study is how those strategic choices affect the ability of the CAA's to withstand the counterattack on social programs instituted by the Reagan administration. That they have withstood assaults in the past--with some CAA's bending and changing focus, and others relying on the capabilities and support developed in earlier periods to withstand pressure to change--provides a basis for our understanding how (and how varied) CAA responses to the Reagan onslaught might be.

Piven and Cloward (1982) project an optimistic sense of the outcomes of the current conflict. They base their analysis of the rationale of the conservative attack on social programs in neo-Marxian analysis of the role of the service network as provider of needs which "have weakened capital's ability to depress wages by means of economic insecurity..." (1982, p. 13) With regard to these programs, Piven and Cloward suggest that the conservative attack will fail because the attack will serve to unite a wide range of interest groups--both poor and middle class, urban and rural, of all ages who are affected by the conservative attempt to reduce or eliminate services which are now perceived as basic entitlements, won over time. The battle lines described by Piven and Cloward are between funding withdrawal by the conservatives, and unifying electoral response by the affected groups and their natural allies (e.g. labor movements). These considerations also apply to the current study of CAA's, as it is appropriate to determine how the agencies respond to funding cuts, and how they retain their viability in the face of this situation. Reactions vary depending on agency philosophy, from seeking to achieve a dominant role in advocacy and service delivery for a community, to avoidance of overt

competition with other local groups for funds; from coalition-building, to waiting for a better day, from confrontation of governmental abuses to quiet cooperation in order to assure funding support. The range of responses raises questions about the narrow, primarily funding-oriented, analysis of many writers, including Piven and Cloward, Sugarman, et al. At least for some agencies, continuance and continued relevance seem to stem from sources in addition to (possibly even instead of) funding levels. In a way, this echoes Jack Newfield's comment on the demise of Mobilization for Youth, the program that served as a model for early Community Action Program development, but was itself an early casualty. "MFY did lose its battle... but it set a pattern for programs that were to spring up at the very moment its own came under fire." (See Moynihan 1969, p. 123).

It is interesting that two divergent opinions from the sixties foresaw community action as a phenomenon that would be heard from for a long time to come. Sargent Shriver, first director of OEO, was quoted at New York State's 1984 celebration of "Community Action... Twenty Years and More..." as having said, while addressing the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty (4/66): "We have started a movement. No one can stop it. OEO can't. The Citizen's Crusade can't, and you can't, even if you wanted to." Conservative writer Shirley Scheibber said much the same: "While it is too early, as this is being written, to determine the accomplishments of the various anti-poverty groups, it is apparent that Michael Harrington already has realized his dream of giving a political voice to the poor, a voice which congress would not be likely soon to mute. OEO has reached the point of no return." (Scheibber 241-242). To her horror, she also reports that "Many of the

militant groups organized under Community Action cannot now be "unorganized," and many are no longer dependent on federal funds for survival."

These two observations appear correct, in suggesting that--over time--CAA's take on a life and momentum of their own. Virtually all CAA's have survived and remain vital as a vehicle for maximizing the effective focusing of needs of low income residents throughout the nation, and--as such--they have an important role to play. This role includes the effect described in Piven and Cloward (1982) of "limiting profits by enlarging the bargaining power of workers with employers." It also has the potential as a trusted focal point for advocacy, organizing, educating, and economic development--not all of which are typically found in each CAA. They also can, as survivors, have symbolic value as reminders of the fruits of past struggle--providing the survivor's remains aren't so pitiful as to represent a negative example of the long range outcome of struggle.

Whether CAA's have evolved from being the motivation for local government to respond to citizen needs, to being partners with local government in efforts to deal with local problems (Agranoff, 1983, p. 7) or whether they are among the links for restoring a less restrictive government as suggested by Piven and Cloward (1982), it is clear that the conditions under which they operate today are different than in the past.

Various analyses have been undertaken, of the changes "wrought" by Reagan (e.g., Sugarmann, Agranoff, ed., Piven and Cloward 1982, and Rosenbaum.) Virtually all concentrate on the dollar impact and their implications for losses of these programs (37.1% according to

Rosenbaum, through FY 1984, for Community Services Block grant, of the 100% reduction sought by Reagan.) Yet none of the writings address the question of how should/could/do individual organizations respond to this assault, what weapons they have to use, how they can choose to adapt, what should influence their choices. It is in response to this void that the present study takes its form. Accordingly, the analytical scheme developed here acknowledges the variance in goals and approaches of CAAs, and inquires into the relationship of varied approaches to the accomplishment of varied goals. The outcomes of the study can then be seen, as prescriptive as well as descriptive, offering reflective guidance to theorists and practitioners, with regard to the relationship of approaches, efforts and strategies, to various aspects of CAA "health", including--but not limited to--agency fiscal well-being.

Inside, Outside, All Around... Discussion of Relevant Elements of Political and Organization Theory

In this section, we begin with the knowledge that virtually no studies have been reported in which CAA's have been subjected to a research methodology, for the purpose of determining the fit of CAA's to a model of political or organizational dynamics--either in relation to things outside itself (clients, competitors, allies, funding sources, political realities, laws, social political economic climate, etc.), or with regard to how the organization conducts its activities and maintains and manages its efforts. Nonetheless, it is clear--intuitively and from review of the literature--that

- o CAA's are organizations;

- o CAA's are strongly affected by forces outside themselves (i.e., their environment), both as the source of funds/energy/support necessary to sustain its efforts, and as the changing field in which its missions is performed;
- o CAA's exist primarily to have an impact on aspects of the external environment (clients, conditions, institutions, public attitudes, and the like), although other reasons--including sustaining their existence and providing income for its staff also exist;
- o The CAA's internal modes of operating--communications patterns, extent of sharing of responsibilities for leadership and decisionmaking, and so forth--play a role in how well the agency meets its goals, and how members feel about their role in the CAA (which, in turn, reflects on performance);
- o Decisions made by the CAA (Board or leadership) influence its effectiveness in various areas that it elects to pursue;
- o CAA effectiveness and choices, with regard to areas of concern and effort, are influenced by the interests and efforts of "outside forces", and, in turn, influence the "outside forces" perception of the CAA;
- o Each CAA can be seen as a political entity, engaged in goal-oriented activity based on the belief system of whatever leaders, board, or set of rules determines the nature and scope of the organizations efforts;
- o Viewed as political activity, the CAA's efforts have goals that effect relations among different parts of their

environment, and CAA activity is based on some level of analysis of that environment and a philosophy (articulated or directed by its leadership or whatever consensus which defines the agency's activity.)

Given these general truths, it appears that CAA's should be subject to analysis according to laws or theories applicable to organizational systems and political systems. The balance of this section presents some of the elements of organization system analysis and political science analysis, which appears to be useful in considering the present study from a social science focus.

Beam and Simpson have recently (1984) published a treatise which proposes that a third component be added to the study of political science. In addition to the study of political philosophy and political analysis, they propose "the study of political actions undertaken to attain goals" (1984, p. 17). These same three elements provide the appropriate balance for the study of community action agencies which can, indeed, be viewed as political entities operating within a context of local and broader economic and social realities which must be analyzed and acted upon in a manner consistent with the organization's articulated philosophy.

Beam and Simpson suggest that "proper political analysis depends on many kinds of knowledge: on empirical observation and experience aided by intuitive understanding and tempered by an assessment of how accurately abstract models fit the real world, the meaning of actions for those involved, and the influence of social position on the interpretation of observations." (p. 29) In the present study, a very similar approach is used. A background set of experience is applied to

as systematic a set of analysis as can be undertaken to understand the variables that influence CAA strategic choices, as well as the relationship of those choices--in practice-- to various measures of CAA wellness (clearly an agency goal.)

Beam and Simpson observe, "Whereas analysis gives us knowledge about conditions, political philosophy is needed for identifying proper goals." They suggest that effective political philosophy must use reason and common sense, plus analysis of factual information, and be based on a knowledge of human nature. Political understanding, they write, "is created by bringing together knowledge acquired through analysis, goals acquired through philosophy, and strategy acquired through the study of political action." (p. 41) The effectiveness of the approach of the CAA's can be considered with regard to how well they integrate these aspects. To a large extent, this integration is done through the process of strategy development and implementation, both externally and internally. Beam and Simpson wrote, "Strategists look at situations and redefine them, not from the viewpoint of traditional techniques and institutions, but in terms of the potential in the situation... it must be a strategy conceived from the point of the group." Strategy decisions at CAA's are made in various ways--by Directors, Boards, Program Managers, or groups of senior staff--and in response to various external factors. These factors include the wishes of funding sources and/or (other local officials; the needs and attitudes of the target constituency; the political and economic climate of the community (i.e., context); the range of opportunities open to the CAA to obtain funding, address needs, be recognized for its efforts, and so forth. The question of how CAA's arrive at strategy

decisions, and the consequences of those decisions are both addressed in the context of factors related to CAA "health."

Several aspects of organizational theory and group dynamics also serve as appropriate points of focus for this study of CAA's. Open system theory posits that social (organizational) behavior patterns are systemic and open to environmental inputs. Katz and Kahn have developed their thorough understanding of organizations, as presented in The Social Psychology of Organizations, second edition (1978), based on an open system approach. Community Action Agencies, as organizations, clearly must be studied in the context of their relationship to external elements on the environment. Open System Theory provides a basis for considering these factors.

Katz and Kahn present a "theoretical model" of an open system, as "an energetic input-output system in which the energetic return from the output reactivates the system." (1978, p. 20) The system transforms the energy input into some useful/consumable product (the output) whose social value results in the reinvestment of energy into the system, thus completing and repeating the cyclic nature of the open system. The entire process is one of "negative entropy," as it reverses that law of thermodynamics which says that--in the absence of new stimuli--an entity tends to run down, become totally disorganized, or die.

Applying open systems analysis to community action agencies provides us with a useful analytic tool for describing the elements of the CAA's "system." The CAA receives a number of kinds of "energetic input," including tangible resources such as grant funds, volunteer contributions of time, contracts from local government to perform a

service (and the funds to perform it). Other types of input include information from various sources, recognition and appreciation from their constituency, respect and cooperation of other organizations, and so forth. The "throughput" involves the conversion of grant funds, etc. into labor and facilities support in response to constituent need (or other organizational objectives) and in maintenance of the organization itself. The output is the various types of activity--direct services, communications, organizing efforts, outspoken advocacy statements, outreach and education efforts, resource mobilization, and so forth. This output is "measured" by funding sources, constituents, local officials, community leaders, and so forth, and the CAA is "reenergized" for the quality and/or quantity of their output. The "reenergizing" can be renewed grant funds or contracts, active or potential support from constituents or community leaders (translatable into Gamson's (1968) concepts of potential influence and immediate influence), positive feedback and encouragement from constituents or others, and so on. In some cases, the "reenergizing" is based on current or recent output, but at other times it can be based at least partially on perceived potential output (e.g., a decision whether or not to re-fund a training program may be based on the perceived potential influence that might be activated if the funds are not granted...)

The interactions between the CAA and its environment are numerous, and contribute to the shaping of the organization's goals, strategies and attitudes of its members (board and staff) towards the work being done by the organization. Katz and Kahn describe four ways of conceptualizing environmental forces: level of "turbulence or

stability", empirical measurable economic exchange factors (such as size of budget granted to the agency by a funding source), relationship to other organizations, and context. Each of these has relevance to CAA's in general, and more specifically in the past few years. "Turbulence and Stability" are, it seems, a particular aspect of the context in which the agencies operate. The doubts cast onto agencies by threatened and realized funding cuts are not only a measurable impact (once they occur), but also a less tangible force that may pervade the agency in anticipation of its occurrence. Morale can be affected, although our findings suggest that other factors can offset or negate such negatives. These other factors include intra-organizational incentives such as praise from respected leaders or others, and internalized motivation elements such as value expression and self-identification based on participation in the CAA, and affiliative expression. Katz and Kahn wrote that, in various studies, staff concern over pay was consistently found to be a high--but never the highest--factor relating to job satisfaction. The notion of mitigating factors, as mentioned above, is not addressed. This could be considered a gap in a generally thorough presentation.

Much of what has been discussed here has emphasized the interrelationship of environmental factors to the organization and, hence, to the behavior and attitudes of its members and performance of the organization itself. Katz and Kahn stressed the importance of recognizing that systems models should at least consider the effect of environment, thus enabling the analyst to determine the degree of openness that a given system has. As Koehler et al have noted, "Open and closed are relative terms as applied to organizational systems...

depending on the degree of interaction permitted across its boundaries within its environment." (Koehler, Anatol, Appelbaum, 1976) CAA's are certainly highly open systems. This does not, however, mean that we cannot or should not benefit from considering internal organizational elements of CAA's. In doing so, however, awareness that they are effected by, and probably effect, environmental factors should be maintained.

The systems model for the study of organizations ultimately led to Open Systems theory's coming into vogue. Etzioni (1961) had described the systems model as starting with "a working model of a social unit which is capable of achieving a goal... it is a model of a multifunctional unit. It is assumed a priori that some means have to be devoted to such nongoal functions as service and custodial activities, including means employed for the maintenance of the unit itself. From the viewpoint of the system model, such activities are functional and increase the organizational effectiveness." (1961, p. 218) In fact, as both Etzioni and Katz and Kahn stress, failure to tend to these internal matters will lead to disintegration of the system.

It is appropriate, here, to consider some of the intra-organizational phenomena which effect the organization's well-being, especially in the areas of staff morale and productivity or operating effectiveness. These include leadership and/or management style, nature of communications and other relationships among organization personnel; decision-making process; means of influence and integration of group members; and motivational activity. These are briefly discussed below.

While rarely found in "pure" form, organizational leadership is found to vary along a continuum, from highly autocratic or authoritarian (centralized control, centralized decisionmaking, communicating by direct order, personally aloof from group and its opinions) to laissez faire (where the leader allows full rein to individual and group initiative and does little to influence group behavior.) Democratic leadership, in which decisionmaking and information are shared, with leader and organization members arriving at policy decisions through informal group discussion is a more common alternative to the autocratic form. Various studies have been conducted over more than 30 years, assessing the relative effectiveness of these styles. Many of the earlier studies were laboratory experiments, which meant that the group was treated as a closed system with little or no environmental influence. These studies tended to find productivity higher in authoritarian groups, and quality, morale, and job satisfaction higher in groups with democratic leadership. (see Koehler et al, p. 144-150). More recent studies have found that the most effective form of leadership is that which is legitimated by the situation. Katz and Kahn conclude that the advantages of democratic (as compared to hierarchical) organization structures "reach a maximum... when the organization is maximally open to environmental demands and when the environment is changing in ways that pose complex and difficult problems of organizational adaptation... Democratic organization is particularly advantageous when the correctness and appropriateness of adaptations are more crucial than the speed with which the adapting decisions are made, and when the nature of individual roles involves creative efforts that require broad

understanding of organization functions and the motivation that comes from identification of one's goals with the aim of the organization." (1978, p. 330) Although other aspects of organizational management/leadership have been studied, this dimension was incorporated for the present study because of its relevance to both productivity and morale--both of which are key dimensions of agency health which are studied.

Closely related to the element of administrative or leadership style are elements of compliance theory. Etzioni (1961) proposes that organization members are influenced to perform the tasks needed by the organization, in one of three ways:

- o "Coercive control", in which compliance is demanded under threat of negative consequences if the tasks are not performed;
- o "Utilitarian" or "economic" control, in which control over resources (payment) gains compliance; while not as highly alienating as coercive control, this sustains only limited loyalty from the member;
- o "normative" control, in which the member comes to internalize the group's goals as their own, results in high commitment, high morale, and less clockwatching.

Democratic style of leadership, with its open information-sharing, is closely correlated with "normative" control, in the present study as well as in previous research.

Gamson (1968) applied Etzioni's compliance model to his analysis of "partisan groups" which may resemble some CAA's. He indicates that in most organizations one kind of control is dominant, as two kinds could

neutralize each other. He states that the selection of the dominant means is determined by current conditions which indicate which type will be most efficient and least "costly" to the organization. A second factor is the perceived impact of the chosen means on long-term future costs of influence. In groups where trust is high, moral persuasion is the preferred approach. In neutral groups, economic inducements play a larger role. In alienated groups, constraints are more necessary. Given the correlation noted between democratic leadership style and use of moral persuasion, Gamson's model could be interpreted to suggest that alienated groups are least democratic and require most constraint, while confident/trusting groups will be most likely democratically managed...

Communication in organizations is described by Katz and Kahn as "the very essence of a social system or organization". (1978, p. 428) Although various types of communication "systems" are discussed in Katz and Kahn, Koehler et al, and elsewhere, the essential elements of communications to be considered in organizations are their quantity, quality, focus, appropriateness and direction. Kahn and Katz note that communication is, by definition, a 2-way process. Yet, the extent that communication actually moves both from and to leadership varies between groups. Parallels exist between democratic leadership and full, 2-way, open, information-sharing communication systems; autocratic leadership tends to limit "downward" information flow to directives, while requiring task-relevant information as "upward" flow. Except for consideration of organizational climate, no effort is undertaken in the current study to analyze "horizontal" communication. This would be beyond the scope and abilities of the study.

One element of communication that is very important to the CAA study is not addressed in the literature. This is communication flow to and from Boards, and how these are processed. This would be an area worthy of study for analysts concerned about centralized versus more open general communication patterns. Since Board communication can directly influence organization policies and strategies, it is important to determine whether the Board should be treated as part of the organizational system, or an important environmental element. Discussion of Board roles (or even Board existence) is notably and regrettably absent from Katz and Kahn's chapter on policy formulation and decision-making, as well.

In the present study, it was appropriate to treat board health as an element of CAA health, while elements of board activity were also considered as independent variables that relate to other aspects of agency health. Of six CAA health variables, Board Health is the only one requiring attention as both part of the organization and the environment.

Who's Been Looking at Community Action Lately? Evaluation Literature and Related Approaches

As mentioned previously, little has been written in the social science literature, with regard to community action organizations since the early 1970's. This certainly has not meant that CAA's have not been subjected to some purposeful scrutiny. Since the beginning of the Great Society programs, the field of program evaluations has burgeoned into a major industry. Rossi and others use the term "Evaluation Research", but the field suffers from serious limitations with regard

to the rigor of its designs and methods. Although professionals in the field seek to strengthen the quality of work done in the name of evaluations, much of what is funded in this area is narrowly oriented and often poorly designed.

Even in the field of evaluation research, more work is done than is found in the literature. This is because most such evaluations are done for government funding sources, as a means of measuring or monitoring the activity and/or impact that the funding source has invested in. Approximately 15 to 20 percent of all CAA's were evaluated, annually, either by the Federal government (OEO or CSA) or under contract to it, until CSA expired in 1981. Except for narrow, infrequent reportage on individual pilot programs, these evaluations were not treated as material to be shared with the public or research communities. Instead, its major purpose was as a monitoring and managing tool for federal purposes, with identification of technical assistance needs a second level objective.

Katz and Kahn observe that "the need for evaluation research is especially salient for public agencies that have no feedback from the marketplace." (1978, p. 472) This certainly applies to programs such as CAA's, especially since, as Gurel wrote, "Given ever-present shortages of funds for human services, continued pressures for intensified evaluation of public services programs are almost a certainty." (Gurel, 1976, p. 11) Considering evaluation a tool only for assessing the relative justifiability of a program or organization is, however, too narrow, even though this was certainly a major impetus in the growth of evaluation activity since the 1960's.

From Katz and Kahn's vantage point, the major weaknesses of

evaluation research of public programs is that "Because they are scattered, piecemeal, and practical in character, they also do not contribute significantly to a cumulative body of social science knowledge." (1978, p. 466) Further, they are seen as "operational rather than systemic in character." A study by Schiller, in 1973, is cited: "after a review of empirical studies in the field of welfare dependency, Schiller concludes that their findings have done little to change policies or practices of welfare agencies and have been inadequately reported in scientific journals and have not been integrated into the social sciences." (1978, p. 466)

Various writers have proposed ways of considering organizational effectiveness which would be useful for evaluators to consider, thus somewhat bridging the gap between organization research and evaluation research. Etzioni writes "a measure of effectiveness establishes the degree to which an organization realizes its goals under a given set of conditions... the central question is... "Under the given conditions, how close does the organizational allocation of resources approach an optimum distribution?" (1961, p. 221) One problem with this line of reasoning is that "optimum" will vary depending on the viewpoint chosen. (Using the CAA as an example, optimal effectiveness for the funding source seeking cost-effective programmatic results, the CAA seeking organizational stability, and the CAA's clients seeking optimal services, may provide very different perspectives on what is optimal.) This concern is addressed by Katz and Kahn, who identified five attempts to define organizational effectiveness:

- o "Preferential ordering of constituencies"--in which the "dominant coalition" defines goals for the organization

(although Katz and Kahn are skeptical about whether the document coalition actually exists...)

- o "Linear programming" in which a single goal (e.g., profits) is the objective measure of effectiveness;
- o "Survival" (but even here, there are questions of short and long-term measurements);
- o "Throughput" itself, which provides the results of organizational effort; and
- o "Organization's contribution to the supra system."

Rossi and Beck (1981) suggest that "Evaluation Research" begins with policy questions in need of answers. The choice of evaluation method then derives from the questions posed. The activity takes place in one of the two contexts: while policy and/or programs are in formation, or with respect to existing policy and/or programs. Schema are developed for three types of evaluation, for three sets of purposes: Policy Function and Program Design; Accountability; and Program Assessment. None of these, however, are designed to address the question of whether--and how--different approaches lead to different outcomes for the organization itself, as well as its constituency.

Cronbach (1982) describes two kinds of evaluation: "summative", which asks "(1) Is the program achieving its goals? (2) Does the program have an effect? (3) How much larger... is the outcome under Plan A than under Plan B?" and "formative" evaluations which "regard the programs as fluid and seek ways to better it." (Cronbach, p. 12) For Cronbach, "evaluations are to be judged by the extent to which they help the political community achieve its ends." With regard to research design, he writes "Those who become investigators quickly

learn that the formal, preplanned design is no more than a framework within which imaginative, catch-as-catch-can improvisation does the productive work. Even in basic research, nature does not stick to the script." (1982, p. 12)

Abt (1979) and Wurzburg (1979) bemoan the limits on evaluation quality that result from federal constraints that begin with the procurement process--which constricts the evaluation process through cost considerations involved in bidding for the evaluation--and then locks in the minimal accepted design through federal contracting procedures. Wurzburg blames the lack of a research mentality on the part of federal personnel, who are mandated by legislation to include an evaluation of funded programs, for the current "state of the art of evaluations" being "primitive--neanderthal."

Datta and Perloff (1979) have compiled an excellent collection of writings addressing the problems of Evaluation Research, in attempting to earn respectability for its scientific approach. Some of its articles (Abt, Wurzburg, Rossi) are cited above. In general, the tone of the book calls for more rigorous evaluative research, ideally designed at the time that a project is conceived of, with evaluation design included in its development, instead of as an afterthought tacked on to comply with government funding requirements. Much of the volume is devoted to new approaches, more effective ways of selecting control groups, and the like. Only one of the articles suggests considering open systems in the evaluation process (Knapp), and this article primarily addressed organization theory as it effects the evaluation process, rather than evaluation considerations of how organizations function in the context of their environment. Knapp

attempts to address the impact of program evaluation itself on educational institutions evaluated. He posits the need for the evaluation community "to confront more directly that fact that imprecision and lack of systematization have important roles to play in organizations providing human services. Systematic program evaluation can tamper with subtle networks of authority, communication, and confidence which allow organizations to deliver their services in a complex environment." No comparable awareness and sensitivity to these organizational properties was found being applied to the study of these institutions, in search of understanding of how these elements contribute to the well-being or effectiveness of such organizations.

A small number of recent studies are reported here, because of some relevance to the present study.

A major study was undertaken, nationally, during the late seventies, to compile the approaches of various Regional Offices of the Community Services Administration and their Regional contractors, to arrive at an understanding of a comprehensive model for assessing CAA's across a series of programmatic and strategic dimensions. This study, undertaken by the Foundation for Human Service Studies was a casualty of the Reagan era. With data largely gathered and manuscript largely written, funds were withdrawn. The study reviewed the approaches employed by each of the ten CSA Regional Offices, to comply with requirements to conduct evaluations of approximately 15% of their grantees, each year. The evaluation typically involved review of all CAA program activity, inquiring as to the effects of program effort in terms of their adherence to a set of standards of effectiveness incorporated into the CSA--enabling legislation. These standards were

designed to be broad enough for CAA activity to be described as related to at least one of these objectives. (e.g., "increased participation of the poor", "improved targetting of services for the poor," "increased job opportunities...", "improved effectiveness of comprehensive community planning," "increased mobilization of resources," and "development of new and innovative programs...") A major focus was on ways that CAA's attempted to increase the self-sufficiency of the target constituency.

Had it been completed, this study would have provided a cataloging summation of the evaluative efforts of at least ten different entities, nationally. No direct field work by the Foundation staff was incorporated into this effort. As it is, this study was able to benefit from some of the analytic thought which had been done, although its purposes and focus were quite different. The current study looks at factors that contribute to agency health, while the Foundation's efforts sought to consistently measure outcomes of agency activity without correlating them to particular characteristics of the agencies. Where the two studies come closest is in the area of comparing agencies based on their strategy and program emphasis. Again, our comparison seeks to relate these choices to measures of agency health, while theirs intended to consider the relative impact of different strategies on outcome measures of the areas of effectiveness (e.g., self-sufficiency.)

Marilyn Gittel's (1980) study of community education organizations is rare, in that it is a relatively recent study which looks at a substantial number of organizations and their development (or decline) over time. Using a focused case-study approach, she inquires into the

factors that may differentiate groups that are able to sustain themselves from those that founder during hard times. Her conclusion suggests that advocacy-oriented organizations in which leadership responsibility has been rotated or otherwise widely shared are most likely to survive. This conclusion in support of democratic, rotating leadership may be appropriate for the mostly voluntary--school-oriented organizations that she was studying, especially since this approach reduces the volunteer organization's dependence on one or few "leaders" for information and sense of direction. Nonetheless, her over-all conclusion with regard to these types of organizations is that they are on the decline--a victim of the institutionalization of some of the demands that justified their coming into existence in the first place. "A shift in the character of citizen participation can be directly related to those federal, state and local policies which in recent years have mandated school organizations and provided funding to community organizations for the delivery of supplementary educational services. These policies have effectively diffused the energies of independently based and self-initiated citizen organizations. Advocacy organizations have been replaced by service-delivery and mandated advisory organizations... The creation of these officially sponsored advisory bodies has had a negative impact on the character of citizen participation. These new-style organizations have the most direct access to the system but the least influence on school policy." (Gittel, p. 242) She concludes that there is need and hope for broad community organization that include educational issues as an integral part of their community development effort. These advocacy or advocacy-plus-service organizations would, she feels, effectively

involve and sustain active low-income participation.

Although methodologically interesting and oriented towards issues of concern in the present study, the small, voluntary groups studied by Gittel are not comparable to broadly funded, multipurpose CAA's, whose mandate is partly defined by its funding sources, and partly by its volunteer board. The Board of a CAA, in some ways, more closely resembles Gittel's organization than does the CAA as a whole. Both are volunteer efforts, with a concern for the monitoring and influencing of an organization or institution that is supposed to be operating in the interest of its constituency. They differ in the extent that CAA Boards are mandated by agency bylaws, balanced among three diverse types of membership (representatives of the public sector, private sector, and the poor), and often dependent on CAA director or staff for much of its information and understanding of its role. Nonetheless, Gittel's use of a longitudinal study, lengthy interviews, and consideration of the relationship of the agency's structure and administrative style to its goals and ongoing viability, are as close a model for the current study as could be found in recent social research literature.

Other recent attempts have been made to document the activities of a range of organizations that operate on behalf of the poor. Typical of these are two books by Harry Boyte (1984, 1980). Both are based on Boyte's cross-country travels to document-through interviews with leaders and others--the existence of viable, community oriented groups that demonstrate, by their existence, the potential of such efforts at this time. Virtually none of the organizations catalogued by Boyte are CAA's, and none have attained the complex funding relationships

that characterize the CAA's. Some do, however, exert influence on local government, and some may have benefitted from support from CAA's either directly or indirectly (e.g., staff resources, space, co-sponsorship of events, printing assistance, etc.) Unfortunately, Boyte's presentation does not help us to identify the elements that would make these organization's efforts successful (both initially and over time.) We see examples of local leaders of grass roots organizations, who have earned the trust of their constituents, but we do not learn much about the way their organizations operate internally, how they sustain themselves, or how they relate to other local entities.

A less recent study deserves attention here, because of its methodology and content. Poverty Warriors, by Louis Zurcher (1970) applied "Action Research" (differentiated from "applied social research" which is more like evaluation studies of various kinds) to the study of community action in Topeka, Kansas. This was an 18-month study of regular observation and usually unstructured interviews, at three levels of this CAA: Topeka OEO--the grantee CAA; its Board; and twelve "Target Neighborhood Committees and their indigneous leaders." The research "departs from the usual technique of evaluating program productivity quantitatively. It focuses on qualitative analysis of the program process and its social psychological impact on participating community members."

The reportage in this study addresses many of the issues and concerns of the present study: the process by which agency leadership seeks to establish an effective internal working climate with clearly articulated goals that staff can internalize; the role of the board chairperson and problems that arise if he oversteps his prescribed

responsibility limits; scope and level of participation of the Board itself; relationships to public officials and the target constituency; and strategies developed to enhance community awareness, "stimulate local leadership", coordination of resources... In Topeka, Zurcher documents a strategy called the "Overlap Model" which was developed to assure the involvement of all community sectors in support of the antipoverty effort, without alienating the poor or their academic and institutional-based middle class supporters.

Zurcher concludes that the "overlap model" which occupies a middle ground "between City Hall and Alinsky" in its approach to poverty, appears appropriate--especially where poverty is "largely unseen" and "well behaved." Under these circumstances, CAA's such as Topeka OEO can serve as what Rein calls "potentially ideal redistribution mechanisms."

Without reflecting on Zurcher's conclusions--other than to note that they would undoubtedly benefit from a reassessment since fifteen years and three shifts of presidential administration have occurred since his study was completed--it is a pleasure to conclude this section by reporting on a methodology that is at least stylistically close to mine, with at least some investigative effort applied to questions about how things are done, and what difference these decisions and activities make to the organization itself.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Base Line Data

Base Line Data was be established by use of 20 CAA Evaluations conducted between 11/80 and 12/81. The Base Line data was gleaned from review of the 20 evaluation reports, and reference to all back-up data (over 80 interviews per site, statistical data on agency activity, and other CAA literature). All evaluations were in New York State or New Jersey.

The data is compiled to provide profiles of each agency, on the variables described in chapter I/E 2 and 3 (Agency "Health", and Operating Characteristics)..

Narrative Descriptive Summaries of ten New York State agencies have been prepared, with the particular elements for analysis being discussed in the same format for each summary. This facilitated analysis and comparison with Round Two findings.

B. Predictions Prepared Based on Baseline Findings

Subhypotheses were be developed based on correlations found in the Round One data between Agency Health and Organizational Elements. Predictions were related to the relative health of each agency, in 1984, over-all and on each of the five submeasures, based on the organization characteristics present in 1981. The predictions were formulated based on the assumption that the organization's approach remains consistent during this period. An additional prediction is made: that change in organizational leadership and/or strategies will result in a change in the predicted outcome for the agency, in the direction that would be predicted for the changed status.

C. Field Visits and Data Gathering for "Round Two"

The ten study sites in New York State were revisited in September-October, 1984. Interviews were conducted at each site, as well as observation and document review. The same information collection format was used at all sites. The format was modeled after the Round One data gathering approach, to assure that all information necessary for appropriate comparisons would be captured. In addition to using the same interview and document and site review formats, the follow-up visit used additional focusing tools on Staff Morale, Agency Fiscal Health, Executive Director's approach and time allocation, Agency Reputation, and Self-Perpetuation activities of the agency.

Less emphasis is placed, in the Round Two data gathering, on number of interviews, than on obtaining sufficient information to make a sound and defensible judgment with regard to each aspect of the study. Experience and knowledge of the agencies from Round One enabled the Round Two visits to be more precisely targeted.

Copies of the instruments used are included as appendixes.

D. Study Sites

This study reports on visits to ten New York State CAA's. The characteristics of these CAA's and their target areas are summarized in Chapter IV. In order to maintain a modicum of confidentiality, the names of the agencies have been altered, when they appear in the pages that follow. The agencies, as renamed, are listed below:

Hudson Valley:	Taconic County Community Action Agency (TCCAA)
	West Horse County Opportunities For Action (WHOA)

Bricktown Community Action Program (BCAP)
Upper Hudson Action for Progress (UHAP)
Pip County Community Action Committee (PCCAC)
Central New York: Lake County Community Action Agency (LCCAA)
Southern Tier Action Group (STAG)
Mowhawk County Community Action Program (MCCAP)
Community Action for Silver County (CASC)
Apply County Community Action Agency (ACCAA)

E. Data Analysis and Presentation of Findings

The study becomes an analysis, at two points in time, of the way ten agencies compare and change on five types of "agency health" measures, and the extent to which five elements of agency strategy or leadership style appear to be related to this.

In order to conduct this analysis, a system of coding, rating, and ranking agencies on each type of variable was developed, based on the various subelements in each area that were specified through an extensive analytic process.

Translation of the summaries, based on these subelements, of each agency on each element, will be done by two different readers, to assure that the information obtained can be translated by different persons in the same way (inter-rater reliability...)

Comparisons of 1981 data to 1984 data will be done both

- A. to test the specific hypotheses, and
- B. to maximize the analyses of available data.

Appropriate, often non-parametric, statistical techniques will be used to analyze the relationship of all variables.

Numeric and Narrative summaries of each agency have been prepared. Differences between 1981 and 1984 findings are discussed. These summaries appear as Appendices.

In addition to presenting an analysis of the specific hypotheses, a chapter describes local responses to the changes forced by budget cuts. This chapter includes narrative descriptions of both effective and ineffective adaptation attempts.

For purposes of discussion and description, most information is reported as aggregate findings. Where the individual agencies are described and contrasted over time, various masking mechanisms--including giving them different names for the report--are employed.

IV: GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CAA'S AND COMMUNITIES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

A. General Target Area Characteristics

Each of the 10 CAA's in this study applies its unique approach to its mission in the context of the demographic, political, and economic realities in which it is located. The section presented here indicates the general characteristics of the Target Areas served by the CAA's.

All of the agencies are located in New York State, outside of its largest cities. Five of the ten are located in the Hudson Valley, within 2 1/2 hours drive of New York City (the closest being within one hour). The other five are located in "Upstate" (Central) New York, within 2 1/2 hours drive of Syracuse (the closest being within one hour).

Seven of the agencies are the sole Community Action Agency serving their entire county. Three share CAA responsibility with one other CAA in their county, with each agency's geographic scope clearly specified.

Although most have some mixture of servicing both rural residents and town/village/small city residents, 4 are primarily rural; one primarily urban (small city); one largely suburban; and 4 truly mixed, offering approaches appropriate to both urban and rural poverty.

The populations of the CAA jurisdictions ranged from 46,000 to 245,000. The median and mean size was 146,000. The areas served include some of New York's poorest areas, and some well above the median on economic measures.

Nine of the ten areas are over 90% white, the tenth being 85% white. Urban industrial corridors in 5 of these have higher

proportions of minority residents--and usually higher rates of poverty which draw greater focused attention from the CAA. Blacks are between 0.1% and 10% of CAA target area populations, but are up to 35% of the population of the urban industrial corridors. Hispanics are present in substantial numbers in 7 of the 10 areas, representing 2% to 5% of the total population, but are more concentrated (up to 12%) in 3 urban or village areas and 2 rural areas.

Senior citizens, largely on fixed incomes, were a growing segment of the population for all CAA's. They represent, numerically, from 10% to over 20% of the areas' populations, a higher percentage of each area's households, and a higher percentage (up to at least 30%) of each area's poverty.

Major poverty factors identified by each agency showed a remarkable commonality. Transportation (and, related, access to needed services) was a major need identified by 9 of the 10 agencies. Unemployment in at least a major segment of the community was a major factor for 9 of these agencies, with plant closings and other erosion of industrial employment evident in 5 areas. Housing--deteriorated conditions, insufficient code enforcement, and/or lack of sufficient affordable decent abodes--was a major factor for 8 of the agencies. The plight of seniors on fixed incomes--needing to stretch dollars, obtain needed health and nutritional services, conserve resources, and find opportunities for meaningful social contact--were identified as concerns in eight of the ten areas. Only three CAA's had identified youth/teen problems as a major concern in 1981. This number doubled by 1984, as more CAA's sought and obtained funding for counseling of problem youths, teen pregnancy programs, and youth vocational

programs. Although most of these agencies operate Head Start and Weatherization programs, needs in these areas were not specifically identified as characterizing the poverty characteristics of these areas.

B. CAA General Characteristics

Facilities

CAA's operated out of a sizable number of sites, as they provided varied services to usually broad geographic areas. Four agencies operated at more than eight sites; three, 5-6 sites; three, four or fewer sites. The number of sites did not change greatly between 1981 and 1984, although there were some changes in characteristics of the sites. The mean number of sites in 1981 was 7.5; in 1984, 6.8.

Three CAA's owned property in 1981. Two owned their Headquarters building; the third owned two program buildings on one site. Three had headquarters located in County-owned office buildings, which had the mixed blessing of savings on rent and other services, at the cost of some agency identity as an independent entity. In most instances, coordination of services was done from a single, unified place, although three Head Start programs were administered from sites other than Agency Headquarters, and 3 agencies had three different sites from which programs were managed. Consolidation and improved coordination reduced this, by 1984, to the point that only two agencies had more than one site for all program management. One of these two Head Start programs was administered from the building next to CAA Headquarters.

While only 3 CAA's owned property in 1981, three more sought to become owners of their Headquarters by 1984. Only one had been successful, as of the time of my revisit.

Typically, Headquarters buildings housed Administrative staff, program coordinators, and--sometimes--specific program activity. Other sites were often Neighborhood Centers, Head Start classroom sites, Senior Nutrition sites, and the like.

Executive Directors

Six of the Executive Directors had been in their position less than one year, at the time of our initial visit. Two had been in that position for 15 or more years. (One of these two had tendered her resignation prior to our arrival, and left soon thereafter.) The other two had been Executive Director for 2 1/2 to 4 years.

Seven Directors were White, three Black, at the time of our initial visits. In 1984, five Directors were White, five Black. In 1981, six Directors were male, four female. In 1984, five were male, five female.

"New" Directors in 1984

Although only five of the ten directors were still at their post at the time of the revisits, all ten persons seen in 1984 were at the CAA in 1981. A summary of their prior relationship to the CAA appears below:

- One was Board Chairperson in 1981, and had previously been Acting Director. He resumed "Acting Director" status in 1983, after the 1981 director and one subsequent candidate had been unsuccessful in dealing with (primarily fiscal) crises.
- One had been a Program Director in 1981, and had already been

nominated by her predecessor to succeed her. (She is counted as a sixth director who served for the full period, with regard to strategy impacting on 1984 status. 1981 status is treated as due to her predecessor's approach.)

- One Director in 1981 has been on medical leave, on and off, for over one year. The fiscal officer serves as Acting Interim Director.
- One had been a Component Director in 1981, and watched two other staff persons fail to stem the agency's economic collapse, before he assumed that role in 1983.
- One had become Head Start Director on the same day as our 1981 visit, and assumed the Executive Director position in 1983, after two others had not been successful in that role.

Board Chairpersons

Only two persons who were Board Chairperson in 1981 remained in that position in 1984. In 1981, 4 were from the Low Income sector of the Board, three from the Public sector. Three were from the private sector. In 1984, 5 were from the private sector, 3 low income, 2 public.

With one exception, all of the Board Chairpersons in 1984 had been on the Board at the time of the 1981 visit, with three having been Vice Chairperson in 1981.

The one "new" arrival on the Board had been Head Start Policy Council chairperson prior to joining the Board.

In 1981, seven of the ten Board Chairpersons were White, with three Black. In 1984, nine of the ten were White.

Funding Levels

Local Initiative Funds

The minimum funding level from the Community Services Administration to CAA's, for "Local Initiative" (core) funding, was \$150,000 in 1981. Seven of the ten agencies in this study were funded at this level. The largest amount for local initiative funding for any CAA in this study was slightly less than twice this basic amount (\$287,100). These funding levels were based on a population/need formula adopted over a decade before, using 1970 census data.

When the state took over management of funds formerly allocated through CSA, it continued to use the same funding formula, and reserved 90% of its "Community Services Block Grant" (CSBG) funds for allocation to CAA's under the formula. Due to reductions in the federal funding available, all CAA's have received 25-26% less under CSBG than they did under CSA. Consequently, the agencies that received \$150,000 in 1981, now receive basic grant awards of \$112,725. The largest amount received is now \$215,756. (In 1983, awards were slightly higher, due to unexpended carryover balances, but the figure has returned to its past-1981 baseline.)

Analyses conducted by the Community Action Congress--a coalition of CAA grantees, primarily in upstate New York--have questioned the appropriateness of the 1970 allocation formula, and suggested that \$175,000 should be the minimum basic grant required by any CAA, to assure that its basic program operators can be sustained. Nine of the ten CAA's in this study currently receive less than the \$175,000 figure.

Total Funding

In 1981, the CAA's total funding level--exclusive of "in-kind" contributions of space and volunteered services--ranged from a low of \$625,000, to a high of \$1.8 million. In 1984, the range was from \$869,000 to \$2 million.

V. FACTORS IN CAA "HEALTH"

A. Fiscal Health

Ratio of Core Funding to Total Funding

In 1981, core funding was anywhere from 8% to 40% of grantees' total funding. Because of anticipated cuts, it was projected that any agency with less than a 3-1 ratio of total dollars to core dollars could be at risk, and any agency with less than a 6-1 ratio would be "borderline" at risk. One CAA, with a 2.5-1 ratio, was found to be "at risk." Three others, with ratios between 4 and 5 to one, were in the borderline category. The remaining six CAA's were considered "Sound" on this dimension, with ratios ranging from 6.6-1 to 12-1.

By 1984, the "At Risk" CAA had moved into the "Borderline" category, with a 4.8-1 ratio. One CAA had moved from Borderline to the lower end of "Sound", with an 8-1 ratio. (The borders of these categories were raised 25%, to compensate for the 25% reduction in core funding.) All other CAA's were in the same category in 1984 as they were in 1981. One CAA had gone through a severe funding crisis, but the agency had bounced back to resume its "Sound" status. Another CAA was seen to be weakening, as its funding slipped and the ratio declined from 10.5-1 to 9.7-1. This remains far from an "At Risk" situation.

Head Start and Weatherization Funding

Two human services programs largely escaped the budget cutting efforts of Reagan's first term. One is Head Start, the pre-school educational program which provides a mix of educational, health, nutritional and social services to children and their parent(s). Head Start's popularity resulted in its exemption from initial budget

cutting plans, as the Reagan Administration attempted to show that the budgetary ax they were wielding was selective. Head Start was blessed with a different type of torture--slow strangulation, rather than instant decapitation. Expansion moneys were made available so Head Start could move into additional sites or expand existing sites, but little was done to enable administrative and support services to expand to meet the increased program size. Also, expansion moneys were called separate funding from basic Head Start program allocations, and continued funding was not assured from year to year for the new sites. In addition to the uncertainty of continued funding of the new sites, funding did not allow for pay raises near the level of inflation, and Head Start staff remain comparatively underpaid--except when compared to the rest of CAA staffs. Head Start budgets included small cost of living adjustments, while CAA's were forced to try to stretch the same annualized amount while inflation cut into its purchasing power.

The second program that experienced growth during this period was Weatherization. Unlike Head Start, Weatherization--a program which provides a limited amount of improvements to the perimeters and heating/hot water systems of the poor and elderly, to reduce energy costs--was not initially welcomed by the Reagan team. This program, housed in the Department of Energy, was slated for cuts or abolition as part of the plan to eliminate DOE. However, local popularity of the program translated into Congressional support and eventual acceptance and expansion of the program.

Both Head Start and Weatherization were born in Community Action Agencies, as demonstration projects, and initially funded through CAA's. Although much has changed, most Head Start and Weatherization

programs are still operated by CAA's. They are the largest examples of how increased categorical funding can shape the focus of a CAA, while its ability to sustain its basic outreach, information, organization, advocacy and strategic development roles may be curtailed at the same time by reduced core funding.

Nine of the ten CAA's in this study operate Head Start programs. All ten operate Weatherization programs. At the time of our initial visit, Head Start provided an average of 32% of the funding at the 9 CAA's with Head Start funds. The tenth was the one agency considered "At Risk" because of the low ratio of overall funding to core funding. One agency--where Head Start accounted for 58% of its funds--engaged in a lengthy legal battle to prevent its Head Start program from severing its ties to the CAA. Having settled the issue by the time of my revisit, this CAA now receives 66% of its funding for Head Start.

The table, below, indicates the extent to which Head Start and Weatherization have grown as major portions of CAA funding. By 1984, all 9 of the CAA's with both Head Start and Weatherization programs received over 50% of total agency funding from these two sources. At three programs, the two programs provided over 70% of annual funding. Two Head Start programs were larger than the rest of the CAA.

While the actual dollar amounts received by 7 of the 10 CAA's had grown by more than \$100,000, only four of these would show any increase if Head Start funding increases were discounted.

Interestingly, the second greatest increase in agency funds, in 1984, was found at the one CAA without a Head Start program.

Head Start and Weatherization as Percentages of CAA Budgets

	1981			1984		
	<u>HS</u>	<u>Wx</u>	<u>Combined</u>	<u>HS</u>	<u>Wx</u>	<u>Combined</u>
BCAP	58%	14	72%	66%	18	84%
WHOA	24	39	63	39	27	66
CASC	28	24	52	34	17	51
STAG	42	24	66	34	27	61
TCCAA	-	11	11	--	30	30
LCCAA	15	17	32	43	30	73
UHAP	33	8	41	39	15	54
MCCAP	29	11	40	46	18	64
ACCAA	27	24	51	40	37	77
PCCAC	<u>28</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>64</u>
	28.4*	18.1	46.5	39.5*	22.9	62.4

* 31.6% of those operating HS

* 43.9% of those operating HS

LOCAL SUPPORT

County Cash

In 1981, 6 of the 10 CAA's received actual cash support from County government. The amount ranged from \$10,000 to \$93,831, with an average contribution of \$25,200. (The average for the six agencies receiving a contribution was \$42,000.)

By 1984, 8 grantees received some County cash, including three CAA's that received \$10,000 or less, as local cash match for specific projects, as the County's sole contribution. Other CAA's received up to \$125,000 in County cash grants, with a mean of \$28,700. (The average for the eight receiving County cash was \$35,875.)

Over half of the CAA's that received County money were able to apply some of the funds to extend their core funding (i.e., at least some funds were earmarked for a specific program.) This certainly enabled CAA's to take up some of the slack from cuts in core funding.

Two CAA's were further supported by County governments' advancing contract moneys or loans which improved CAA cash flow capabilities.

Local Cash

In 1981, one CAA received cash from a local township. Others did some local fundraising for special projects or local outreach centers. By 1984, five of the 10 CAA's had successfully approached local government to seek assistance in sharing the burden required to sustain CAA programs.

Facilities

Three of the ten CAA's had their Headquarters in contracted space

in county office buildings, in 1981. This typically had the advantage of saving the CAA money for space, and made other county resources--bulk purchasing, telephone lines, vehicle maintenance services, etc.--available. The possible disadvantage to the CAA's was the blurring of the distinction between CAA and County government.

By 1984, two of the three CAA's had moved headquarters from the County Office Buildings. In both cases, this was done to consolidate the agency's administrative operation more effectively, in larger quarters. Both agencies had been concerned about maintaining a clear, independent image, although both enjoy close working relationships with the County.

Local town or village governments, boards of education, churches, and the like provided free or reduced cost sites for neighborhood centers, outreach satellites, head start classrooms, senior nutrition sites, etc.--for at least 8 of the CAA's.

County Contracts

Nine of the ten CAA's had some type of contract from County government in 1981, and 1984. The one CAA which did not have a contract in 1981 had three small contracts in 1984; another CAA had lost its only contract by that time.

Five CAA's, in 1981, and seven in 1984, had contracts with County Social Services Departments to do intake and additional services for the HEAP program. HEAP provides financial subsidies to people who cannot afford their winter fuel bills.

Two CAA's had substantial contracts to operate transportation systems for the County, primarily in rural areas. One of these tended

to operate at a perennial deficit. Both were slightly smaller in 1984 than 1981, but remained a major source of funds for both agencies.

Two CAA's received substantial County funding for Senior Nutrition programs, and one for Senior Outreach. Similar programs operate in other locales, under County Departments for the Aging.

One CAA operated large subsidized employment and training contracts for the County at both points in time. A second CAA, which had lost close to \$1 million in CETA training contracts before 1981, had a Job Training Partnership Act contract from the County, in 1984, for less than \$10,000. No other CAA's had such funds.

Over half of the CAA's were tapped by County governments to serve in the bimonthly surplus food giveaways initiated during the Reagan administration. This activity, for which CAA's are paid a few cents per pound to obtain and distribute tons of warehoused surplus food (originally just cheese, now several commodities including honey, flour, cheese, etc.), is not profitable for the CAA's, and places a high short-term demand on its personnel. It definitely increases agency visibility. Different agencies have approached this task in different ways--and with different results. This is discussed more, later.

Volunteer Personnel

As funding is tightened, the need to maintain or supplement personnel levels requires attention. Head Start has been designed as a program which encourages volunteerism, especially among parents, as part of its overall program. Other CAA programs have no such mandate, but some CAA's extensively use volunteers, especially at neighborhood centers.

In 1981, 3 CAA's used volunteers who were student interns from local colleges; 2 CAA's benefitted from pooled resources that they shared with other organizations they had helped mobilize; 5 CAA's had regular volunteers participating at neighborhood centers, or senior sites.

In 1984, these efforts were further supplemented, as the number of agencies using part time help paid for by Office for the Aging increased from one to five, four agencies utilized persons assigned by County Welfare as "Workfare" persons, with one CAA regularly upgrading person from this status to CAA-supported workers. Three CAA's operate Foster Grandparent programs at present, and two others use Foster Grandparents in Head Start programs. Two CAA's enlisted Volunteer help from Industry.

All food distribution programs--both bimonthly surplus food, and "emergency food pantries" organized by at least half of the CAA's, attract extensive volunteer efforts.

Fiscal Management Problems

In 1981, only 2 of the 10 CAA's were free of fiscal problems. Two others were in generally good shape, but could improve by tightening their written procedures--according to recent audits. Two had problems related to low levels of funding impinging on management of the operation. Three agencies had experienced fiscal records management problems in the past, and were attempting to correct these past problems while sustaining their current effort.

Two agencies were clearly in fiscal difficulty because the fiscal director was not qualified or capable of functioning in that role.

By 1984, fiscal mangement had improved. Six agencies had no fiscal management problems. Two others operated satisfactorily, but still needed tighter written procedures. One had a recent resignation of Fiscal Director, and the new person was not yet fully comfortable with procedures for that position. The final agency had been through major cuts in funding, and had negotiated through very serious difficulties. It still had serious cash flow problems.

Fiscal Impact on Morale

The two ways that Fiscal situations impacted most seriously on morale were both related to staff confidence in agency funding. Where the future of the CAA was threatened by fiscal problems, staff showed anxiety for their jobs and/or the agency itself. The fiscal crisis also, in a few instances, lowered respect for the agency, which also lowered staff morale.

In 1981, 3 CAA's faced serious morale problems over fiscal situations; 3 faced "moderate" problems; and at 4 CAA's, fiscal did not contribute to morale problems.

By 1984, 2 CAA's which had no morale problems due to fiscal in 1981, now had serious morale problems. No other CAA's still faced serious morale problems: 2 moderate, 2 minimal, 4 none. In some cases, morale problems in 1984 had been minimized because the budget cuts had resulted in dismissal of those who were anxious.

B. Morale

A second element of agency health is staff morale. It can be affected by relationships with director and/or Board, by uncertainties

about funding, or by the physical conditions in which work is performed. Eleven areas that may contribute to Agency morale problems were considered in this analysis. The list of these areas is in Appendix 2.

Five of the ten CAA's were found to have serious staff morale problems, which put the agency "at risk" in this area. In 1984, all five had improved to the point that morale problems were usually moderate (in one case, minimal), but two other CAA's had serious morale problems in 1984. Neither had any morale problems in 1981.

In six of the seven instances of serious morale problems, relationship with executive director was identified as a serious morale problem area. Staff Trust (5), Relationship with Board (4), and Communications were the next most frequently mentioned items.

Only two CAA's in 1981, and one in 1984, appeared to have no visible morale problems.

Analyses conducted comparing morale ratings to fiscal measures of Agency Health found non-significant correlations, except for one comparison of CAA's with new directors since 1981. 1984 morale and a composite measure of fiscal health were found to bear a significant positive correlation, when their relative "rank orders" were compared (see appendix on statistical analyses).

C. Constituent Perception of the CAA

Time and sampling procedures did not provide the opportunity to interview a true cross section of CAA beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries. As a result, this discussion of constituent perceptions of the CAA's is admittedly the most "impressionistic" of this entire

study. This is not due to the inability of researchers to collect the needed information, but the limitations of the present effort. The information that frames the current section is based on interviews with staff and beneficiaries, review of agency records, observations of agency facilities, and the like. The reader is referred to Chapter 10 for a discussion of a more "ideal" research approach to this aspect of Agency Health.

The information presented here is presented with confidence that it represents the way CAA's are perceived by constituents with regard to three areas:

- Reputation for Trustworthiness
- Breadth of Reputation in the Target Communities;
- Clarity of the CAA's role and overall philosophy.

These are areas which can be gleaned within the limits of the current study. No claims are made as to the actual scope or quality of CAA efforts, which are too varied and subjective to include in a comparative study such as this.

The key to CAA "trustworthiness" appears to lie in the way constituents are made aware of the CAA's efforts, and the extent to which their expectations are consistently met. In 1981, only five of the ten CAA's commanded general trust from beneficiaries. Where doubts existed, they were caused by intra-agency friction and split loyalties at two agencies; unsatisfactory level or quality of service at two sites; lack of information clarifying agency role at one site; and negative press at at least two of these sites. Some of the "trusted" CAA's were treated as places to go to get a range of services or help in dealing with problems. One agency had earned trust as an advocate

on behalf of the low income population, and at least one other was attempting to emulate this.

Six CAA's appeared to have client trust in 1984. A seventh was seen as trustable within very narrow functional limits prescribed by the agency itself, but not as a place to go to seek support for matters beyond those limits. Two CAA's had declined in "trustability" as funding shifts had weakened their ability to reach out to local problem situations, or respond to "walk-ins" who previously knew of the agency as a place that could help. At least one agency did not present a clear sense of its purpose and role, to constituents. No "bad press" was noted at this time.

In 1981, 5 of the 10 agencies were "widely known" and recognized throughout their target areas. Three other agencies operated programs which enjoyed higher--and distinct--visibility, compared to the agency itself. Two were only known in a limited part of their target area, and even there maintained a low public profile. Of the five agencies which were "well known," three were fully trusted by their constituents, and two were embroiled in intra-agency squabbles that limited trust.

By 1984, one agency had succeeded in strengthening its agency image, and was now among those with wide agency reputations. Two CAA's slipped in this period, as their reputations declined even though almost as many people still knew of them.

While virtually all CAA's or their programs were at least somewhat known, only two CAA's had made their agency-wide role clear to constituents. A third agency joined these two by 1984, with a fourth having taken some strides in that direction. Most other agencies'

roles were equated by beneficiaries with specific program activity, rather than an agency-wide philosophy, outlook, or approach.

The three CAA's with clearly understood agency-wide roles were also highly trusted and widely known.

D. CAA's and Political Officials and Community Leaders

CAA Health was also considered with regard to the extent to which Community Leaders and Public Officials knew of the CAA, and respected and supported the agency's efforts. This was considered for four aspects of interrelationship with the CAA:

- o Appropriate Representation on CAA Board
 - Familiarity with CAA role
 - Respect for CAA Effort
 - Cooperation/support for CAA

In 1981, 4 of the 10 CAA's had good ratings, with regard to relationship with Community Leaders, in all four areas. In 1984, this was true of 3 CAA's, including two of the four from 1981.

In 1981, 3 CAA's had good ratings in all four areas, with regard to relationship with local political officials. (Three others were satisfactory in all four, but "good" in only one...) In 1984, only one of these retained as good a relationship with local public officials, although the other two retained "good" relationships in two areas, and satisfactory relations in the other two. (Two of the three other agencies with satisfactory relationships in three areas and "good" relationships in one, remained unchanged in this regard. The third declined.)

In 1984, one different agency had a generally unsatisfactory

relationship across the board, with community leaders, while the two in that position in 1981 improved to "Fair." The two CAA's with poor relationships with political officials in 1981 remained in this range in 1984.

In general, a majority of CAA's enjoyed satisfactory to good relations with both Community Leaders and Public Officials, on each of the four areas. A close parallel seems to exist between respect and cooperation with the CAA, and between these two items and adequacy of Board representation.

The area in which the most CAA's had "Good" relations with Public Officials was Board Representation (5 of the 10 CAA's were in the good category.) This was also the area with the most CAA's in the "Poor" category (3 in 1981, 2 in 1984.) Two of the three CAA's with Poor relations in this area in 1981 were the agencies that also were "Poor" in the areas of Respect and Cooperation. While Respect and Cooperation improved to Fair in 1984, these two agencies still suffered from Poor public official representation on their Boards in 1984.

A very high correlation was found between the CAA's 1981 relation to public officials, and the 1984 relation. ($r = .93$, significant at .01 level) The correlation between 1981 and 1984 relations with Community Leaders was not significant, primarily because one agency plummeted from top rank to bottom on this item. (A significant correlation was found for the other 9 agencies.)

As would be expected, a strong correlation also was found between perception of CAA's by public officials, and extent of local financial support of the CAA's. These two are not mutually exclusive categories. As will be discussed further, there are circumstances

where County financial support remains relatively substantial even when the Public Official respect of the CAA is lower.

E. Program Activity

Program Activity was considered with regard to 4 aspects which were expected to be comparable regardless of program size and strategy. These aspects were:

- o Operating Effectiveness (programs meeting specified objectives);
- o Scope of Programs (from Broad to Limited)
- o Program Development Level of Effort (from Growing to Declining);
- o Appropriateness (from programming based on planning around needs, to unplanned, stagnant programming.)

With regard to effective operation of their programs, 3 CAA's at each time were found to operate all programs effectively. All of the rest operated "most" programs effectively. Two of the three CAA's operating all programs effectively were the same at both times.

In 1984, seven of the ten CAA's were found to have suffered from fiscal cutbacks impacting on program "quantity" but not quality. CAA's remained effective in what they did, but often had to cutback the scope of outreach or neighborhood center activity due to cutbacks.

With regard to scope, 3 CAA's in 1981--and 4 in 1984--were found to operate a "Broad/Innovative" range of programs, well beyond the minimum which virtually all CAA's operate (Head Start, Weatherization, and core services). Most other agencies operated a "Modest, Appropriate" range of programs. One CAA's scope of programs was found

to be "Limited"--at the time of both visits. One other had been reduced to operating only "Basic" programs by 1984.

In 1981, 3 CAA's were seen to be growing, 5 sustaining, and 2 declining--with regard to program development. By 1984, 5 were growing--two quite modestly--; four were "sustaining"--2 actually partly growing while partly declining, and one sustaining at a low level of programming; and one declining (but giving some hints that its worst days might be behind it).

With regard to the appropriateness of CAA programs for their target areas, 3 CAA's clearly developed their program operations based on identified community needs, while most other CAA's programming was developed or maintained primarily in reaction to available funding. In some cases (3-4 in 1981, two in 1984), available funding appeared to provide a reasonable match with basic needs of the target community. One CAA was found, in 1981, to be stagnant with regard to agency programs--primarily operating programs because it had grants that continued from year to year. A second agency joined this one, in this status, by 1984. Both can be said to be stagnant but not necessarily stagnating, as the programs operated are mostly adequate and appropriate, although quite limited.

Overall agency health in the area of Program Activity (incorporating the four areas mentioned above) was found to be closely correlated with two other measures of agency health: staff morale and perception of community leaders. These correlations were significant at the .01 level (using Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients) for both 1981 and 1984 for Community Leaders; and .01 level in 1981 and .05 level in 1984, for agency morale. The 1984 Agency Health rating on

Program Activity was also significantly correlated (.05 level) with one sub-area of fiscal health: the amount of dollar change between 1981 and 1984, exclusive of Head Start).

F. Board Factors

The sixth element considered as a factor in Agency Health is the demonstrated ability of its Board to effectively exercise its role as a contributor to Agency well-being. Four Board factors have been considered as indicative of Agency Health.

- o Achievement of Quorums at Board Meetings, which is indicative of Board ability to conduct its business (i.e., function).
- o Number of Vacancies on the Board, which is indicative of the Board's ability to perpetuate itself and maintain appropriate representation from its major constituencies, colleagues, and local officials.
- o Boardmember Understanding of Board Role, which is necessary for the Board to carry on its appropriate functions.
- o Board Performance of Its Role, which includes many possible contributions to agency well-being, through monitoring program and fiscal activity, resource development, through both fundraising efforts and linkages to other community groups, and various planning roles. While decisions of where to place Board emphasis are strategy decisions, the effectiveness of the effort is a factor in CAA health.

As mentioned in Chapter II, Background, CAA Boards were required to be balanced, with 1/3 of its representation from the Public Sector, the Private Sector, and the Target Population representatives. Bylaws guidelines specified that Boards must contain at least 15, and not more than 51, members. In practice, all of the CAA's in this study have 21 to 30 Board members. Requirements that the 1/3 - 1/3 - 1/3 balance be maintained remain in effect for New York State CAA's, as the State Legislature adopted CSA requirements as standards for CAA's now

functioning under the State's Community Services Block Grant.

Most CAA's meet more-or-less monthly (typically 10 times per year), although some have reduced their schedule to six times per year.

Only one CAA, in 1981, and none in 1984, was found to be in good condition with regard to all four Board factors. Two other CAA's were in good condition on 3 of the four elements (both times), and were found less than satisfactory because over 10% of the seats on their Board were vacant. Two CAA's, in 1981, had no areas in which Boards were found to be satisfactory. One of these remained in that condition--with virtually no functioning Board-- in 1984. Most (8) CAA's were found to be in satisfactory condition on 2 or more of the four elements in 1981. In 1984, only 5 of the CAA's were found to be satisfactory in 2 or more areas.

With regard to achievement of quorums, 7 of 10 CAA's had 100% quorums at Board meetings in 1981. In 1984, this was true for only 4 of the ten. In both years, eight of the 10 CAA's had quorums at 75% or more of their meetings (which was considered adequate for this study). Two agencies had 0 to 50% quorums in each period. When quorums are lacking, business is often conducted by Board Executive Committees, as authorized in agency bylaws. While legally sufficient, regular use of this mechanism is not indicative of agency or Board health.

Board vacancies--which also reduce the number of persons required to achieve a quorum--are not uncommon at CAA's. Small numbers of vacancies can be considered "normal," as bylaws limit the term of any member except public officials (or their appointees) to five years; representatives of the poor are often elected to one or two year terms; and some attrition is natural. In 1981, six of the 10 CAA's had Board

vacancy rates in excess of 10%, and four of these exceeded 25%, the highest being 40%. Eight of the 10 CAA's had vacancy rates in excess of 10% in 1984. Four of these exceeded 20%, with two over 30%. Vacancies were twice as common in the public sector as in the private sector, with vacancies among the poor midway between. At three CAA's over half of the public sector seats were vacant. At one CAA, over half of the target area seats were vacant. These did not change between 1981 and 1984.

With regard to Board Role, 5 CAA's in 1981--and 6 in 1984, were found to perform their roles at least at a minimally satisfactory level. The number of CAA's where the Boards' Role was clear to all members was less (3 in 1981, 2 in 1984). Thus, there were cases where Board activity was satisfactorily sustained without all Board members able to contribute fully. In all cases where Board Role was clear to all members, Board performance was satisfactory to highly satisfactory.

Overall rankings of CAA's Board Health, based on cumulative scoring (at .05 level) between the two time periods (Board Health rankings were found to be closely correlated (significant at .05 level) with rankings of CAA's on Agency Health measures of Program Activity for 1981, and Community Leader Perception of CAA's for 1984.

_VI: IMPACT OF DIRECTOR, BOARD, AND AGENCY ACTIVITY
AND STRATEGIES, ON CAA HEALTH (1981)

A. Executive Directors' Impact on Agency Health (1981)

Without a doubt, Executive Directors play a vital role in the life, health, scope, and style of CAA's. While all Executive Directors operate with the responsibility for implementation of strategies and procedures for the accomplishment of agency objectives, there are wide variations in style and approach. In some ways, the Director's mode of operations may be shaped by factors not of their own choosing--the political climate of the agency's target area, the CAA's past history and present status, staffing, and Board; needs and expectations of the CAA's constituency; and the basic social, economic, and geographic realities of the CAA area. On the other hand, much of a Director's approach comes from personal philosophy and beliefs about the ways that agencies "should" be administered, the ways that problems "should" be approached, the "appropriate" relationship with Board and staff, and other matters.

A review of Executive Director "style" and approach, and their relationship to measures of "agency health" was conducted using the 1981 data. This data indicates that different aspects of agency health appear to be related to different aspects of executive director leadership style and approach. 36 different "elements" related to executive director "Style" were considered. These break down into the following general areas:

- o Mode of Management
- o Communications with Staff

- o Clarity of Sense of Purpose
- o Commitment to Staff Development
- o Attitude toward Public Image
- o Attitude toward Board
- o Areas which are allocated major amounts of time

Other elements--such as relationship to local government, and mix of agency strategies for program operations and development--are clearly influenced by the Executive Director. These are discussed separately because they involve policy decisions that are, at last nominally, influenced by Board, as well as Executive Director, policies and practices.

The findings presented, below, deal "only" with the elements mentioned above (see Appendix). They indicate that--even with only ten CAA's being analyzed--the elements considered do give a clear array of style options for Executive Directors, and indicate that different approaches correlate with different elements of CAA Health. What is not always clear is whether directors had made conscious decisions to pursue some elements of agency health at the (relative) expense of others.

1. Mode of Management

Four items were considered with regard to Executive Director "management style." These are:

- o Management Style: Tight/Centralized Control vs. Democratic/Open;
- o Responsibility: Highly Centralized vs. Broadly (Regularly) Delegated;

- o Leadership Mode: Autocratic vs. Democratic vs. Laissez Faire;
- o Staff Perception of Director: Strong/Controlling vs. Open/Supportive vs. Weak/Defensive.

Among the ten directors visited in 1981,

- o Three consistently fit a pattern of democratic, supportive/open management, on all four of these items;
- o Two consistently fit the pattern of autocratic, tight central control, centralized management;
- o One appeared weak and lacking in control; and
- o Four showed mixed patterns containing both centralized and democratic elements. (One of the four leaned more towards central control, three towards democratic openness).

Democratic/supportive management was found to be consistently correlated with good to excellent morale ratings, while the 3 CAA's with poor morale included both CAA's with the pattern of tight central control and the CAA which was lacking in control. (The 4 CAA's with good to excellent ratings on morale included the 3 consistently democratic CAA's, and one that leaned in that direction).

No such clear correlation was found between mode of management and attitudes towards the CAA of either Community Leader or local Political Figures. A correlation tendency was noted between one subscale--mode of leadership--and community leader attitudes, as the six CAA's with "Good" or "Satisfactory" ratings on Community Leader Attitude were found to utilize either Democratic or Mixed (Democratic/Authoritarian) modes of leadership. The other four--with fair to poor ratings on Community Leader attitude, included two "Autocratic" leaders, one "Laissez Faire", and one "Mixed." This tendency was found to be the

case for each of the four Community Leader subscales (Board representation by community leaders, familiarity, respect, and cooperation with the CAA.) Board representation also clearly differentiated Democratic/Open from Tight/Control CAA's, as all 3 Democratic/Open CAA's had good Board Representation from Community Leaders, while the four "Tight Control" CAA's--included one with "Satisfactory" Board representation, two "Fair," one "Poor".

Political Officials' attitudes towards CAA's were not found to be closely correlated to mode of management.

Program Activity was also not found to be a measure of CAA health that was closely correlated with Executive Director mode of management, but a tendency is noted. Two of the three "Democratic" CAA's ranked first and second on the composite Program activity rating measure, but the third was tied for sixth out of ten. "Tight/Central" CAA's ranked in the last two positions.

With regard to Program Activity subscales, there are some tendencies, but these could not be confirmed to be statistically significant due to small size. The tendencies suggest that "Democratically managed" CAA's appear more likely than "Centrally controlled" CAA's, to

- o operate a broad, innovative array of programs;
- o plan and develop programs based on identified community needs, rather than money available;
- o be growing, rather than declining, in terms of programming.

With regard to over-all Fiscal Health, "mode of management" items did not reveal significant trends. Of seven subscales, only two showed noteworthy tendencies. These are indicated below:

- o None of the three "Democratic" agencies own their own facility. Both of the highly autocratic CAA's owned property.
- o With regard to use of Volunteers, 2 of three "Democratic" CAA's (and one leaning in that direction) used Volunteers extensively, the third "Democratic" CAA had "moderate" volunteer use. Both "Centralized/ Authoritarian" CAA's had minimal use of volunteers.

With regard to Board Health, the 3 "Democratic" CAA's all have Boards with clear understanding of their roles, and satisfactory performance of those roles. Both "Autocratic" (centrally controlled) CAA's had Boards whose understanding was limited or lacking, with Board performance unsatisfactory because the Boards serve as "rubber stamps" for the directors. The CAA with weak to absent executive director management had one of the more effective operating Boards. (This weak director had only interim status after a stronger director had been fired.)

In summary, then,

- o A democratic/open mode of management appears to be correlated with positive agency health with regard to staff morale, and board health.
- o Some tendencies are noted linking democratic leadership style to Community Leader attitudes towards CAA's.
- o While most aspects of Program Activity were not significantly correlated to mode of management, democratic/open management appeared more likely than centrally controlled CAA's to operate a broad, innovative array of programs, and to base programming choices on identified community needs.

- o With regard to Fiscal Health, no significant correlations were found between mode of management and aggregate Fiscal Health and five of seven subscales. With regard to facility ownership, both autocratic, centrally controlled CAA's own facilities while none of the three democratic CAA's own facilities. With regard to Volunteers, CAA's with democratic, open styles were found to utilize volunteers extensively to moderately, while minimal use of volunteers was found among the most centralized CAA's.
- o No noteworthy relationship was found between mode of management and attitude of public officials towards the CAA.

2. Communication with Staff

Executive Director's Communications with Staff was addressed by several items included in the overall analytic instrument. The items are summarized below:

- o Openness: 4 CAA's - including the three with democratic management styles--are characterized by information being fully available to staff; 5 CAA's provided "partial information" to staff; one was not at all open.
- o Regular Staff Meetings: 4 CAA's - including 3 of the "Open" CAA's, but only two of the "democratic" ones--held at least one staff meeting per month. Six did not.
- o Sr. Staff Meetings: 5 CAA's held weekly senior staff meetings. This includes the three "open" CAA's that held at least one full staff meeting per month.
- o Monthly Reports: 5 CAA's required at least monthly reports

from staff (in some cases, departments). This includes two "democratic, open" CAA's, while two "open" CAA's did not require monthly reports.

- o Information Flow: Seven CAA's had 2-way information flow, although only the 4 abovementioned "open" CAA's were found to have balanced communications, while the others were more heavily weighted in the direction of information flowing to the director. (Of the other 3 CAA's one had one-way information flow towards the director, one had one-way flow away from the Director, and the third was--at least temporarily--characterized as 0-way communication.)
- o Open Door?: 4 CAA directors--including the three with democratic management styles--maintained "open-door" policies in which staff were enabled to feel that they could share their concerns with the director at almost any time.

Only one CAA was found to be on the positive side of communication with staff on all six items. Five were on the positive side in at least four cases. These included the three "democratic" CAA's and two "mixed" but leaning in that direction. Four of the other 5 CAA's were each "negative" on five of the six items, the sixth being "negative" on four of the six communication items. Thus, there is an overall comparison possible between (5) CAA's which were generally positive with regard to staff communication, and (5) CAA's which were generally negative. This overall comparison and the breakdown of individual items are analyzed with regard to the impact of communication with staff, on CAA Health, reported below.

Communication with Staff was found to be extremely closely

correlated to staff morale. The five CAA's with excellent (2), good (2), or marginally satisfactory staff morale were the five CAA's which were generally positive with regard to communication with staff; all five CAA's "negative" on staff communication had unsatisfactory to poor staff morale. A perfect correlation was also found for the "openness" variable: the 4 CAA's with full openness were ranked first through fourth (excellent to good) on staff morale; agencies with partial openness ranked fifth to ninth on staff morale; the one "closed" agency ranked last on morale. Information Flow was 2-way at all 5 CAA's with marginally satisfactory to excellent morale; 2 way information flow was found at only 2 of the 5 CAA's with unsatisfactory/poor morale. Four of the five CAA's with at least satisfactory morale maintained an open-door policy, while none of the five CAA's with unsatisfactory morale did so. Four of the five CAA's with at least satisfactory morale have weekly senior staff meetings, while only one of the five with unsatisfactory morale did so.. The only communication item that did not clearly differentiate between CAA's based on staff morale was whether monthly reports were required. Three of five CAA's with satisfactory morale required monthly reports; two of five with unsatisfactory morale required monthly reports. None of the 3 CAA's whose morale was rated "poor" required monthly reports.

Communication with staff was not significantly correlated with any item of the "Program Activity" measure of CAA health.

Two of the six communications items--information sharing openness, and (2-way) information flow show some positive correlation with attitudes of community leaders towards the CAA. However, these correlations were not significant, except with regard to Community

Leader Board representation. Four CAA's had "good" representation of Community Leaders on their Boards. These four were the agencies with balanced 2-way information-sharing, and were found to be fully open with regard to information-sharing.

Communication with staff was not significantly correlated with any item of "Political Officials' Attitudes" as a measure of CAA health.

With regard to fiscal health, communication with staff was found to have some interesting tendencies, but few statistically significant correlations. For example, the three CAA's ranked highest on overall (composite) fiscal health were 3 of 5 agencies on the "positive" side of overall communication and 3 of 4 CAA's credited with full, open communication and balanced 2-way information flow. However, the lower rankings of other CAA's in these categories resulted in these being not statistically significant. (They are mentioned here because the tendency is notable, and our numbers small...)

None of the three CAA's that own their own facility were found to share information fully or conduct regular staff meetings.

Fiscal management problems and consequent fiscal impact on morale were found to be serious in all 3 CAA's which did not have 2-way information flow. CAA's with serious fiscal problems and consequent morale problems were found to not have open door policies and to be lacking in openness of communication.

With regard to Board Health items, director's communications with staff tended to show some differentiation with regard to Boardmember understanding of roles, and Board performance. On these two subscales, full 2-way information sharing CAA's were more likely to be those with clear understanding of Board roles and satisfactory Board performance.

Overall communications ratings, and subscales related to monthly reports and senior staff meetings, were not significantly correlated with Board Health.

3. Parallels to the Communications Items

Staff understanding and accepting of the Director's role and stated sense of purpose were found to be exactly parallel to the alignment of CAA's on the communications item about Directors "Open Door" policy. The same four CAA's that had approachable, open directors enjoyed at least good understanding and full acceptance of the Director's sense of purpose. This was found to be significantly positively correlated to staff morale, but not to any of the other overall measures of CAA Health (Program Activity, Community leader and Political Leader attitudes, Fiscal Health, or Board Health.) Positive correlation tendencies were found on Community Leader Attitude subscales, and a clear correlation was noted with regard to two fiscal subscales: The 4 CAA's with a high degree of staff understanding and acceptance of director's role did not have serious fiscal management problems, while 4 of the six others did. On the other hand, none of the 4 owned their own facilities, while 3 of the other six do.

Executive Directors at 4 CAA's were seen as committed to staff development (primarily within the organization). These were the same four CAA's which ranked highest on openness of communication. This translates to the following relationships to CAA Health measures:

- o A perfect positive correlation with the staff morale measure;
- o Tendencies, with regard to overall measures of attitude of

community leaders, program activity, fiscal health, and board activity.

- o Significant or notable sub-items, including:
 - The 4 CAA's operated a Broader, more innovative range of programs than did the others.
 - The 4 CAA's committed to staff development all had good board representation from community leaders, while none of the other six had better than "adequate" representation.
 - The 4 CAA's were significantly better off than the other six, with regard to fiscal management problems.
 - The 4 CAA's used volunteers far more extensively than the other 6 CAA's.
 - The 4 CAA's were significantly "healthier" than the other 6 CAA's, with regard to Board Understanding of its role, and Board performance.

4. Director Attitude Toward Public Image

Three items inquired into the Executive Director's attitude towards the CAA's public image (and their own). These items are:

- o Unified Agency Image: Seven of the ten CAA Directors stated that they believed that it was important for the CAA to be perceived as a unified, coordinated entity rather than as a name for separate programs functioning largely autonomously. Three Directors indicated that they did not feel this was important. Among the seven CAA's, practice lagged behind belief at three agencies.

- o Preferred Level of Agency Visibility: Four CAA Directors felt that CAA's should have a high level of visibility. The others felt CAA visibility should be medium or mixed. None felt CAA's should maintain low visibility.
- o Preferred Level of Director's Visibility: Half of the ten CAA directors experienced a preference for low visibility for themselves (although this was sometimes qualified with "except when higher visibility is necessary.") Two Directors preferred high visibility, three medium.

The four CAA's whose directors support and practice the notion of a unified agency image are the same agencies that provided full information to staff on the "Openness" dimension of communication. These four were also the same agencies found to be committed to staff development. Accordingly, there is a strong correlation between Unified Agency Image (and Openness and Commitment to Staff Development) with Staff Morale, and some tendencies in a positive direction with regard to program activity (especially scope, program development, and appropriateness); community leader attitude (especially with regard to representation on the Board); overall fiscal health (especially with regard to absence of serious fiscal problems among the four CAA's, compared to others; and extensive use of volunteers by 3 of the four CAA's). This item was not found to be significantly correlated with political leader attitudes or board agency health.

Three of the four CAA directors who felt that CAA's should have high visibility were the same as those who effectively apply the unified agency concept. The shift of one agency results in a less

strong correlation with staff morale, but a much stronger correlation with Overall Program Activity (and three of its subscales--scope, program development, and appropriateness) and Attitude of Community Leaders (and all four of its subscales--especially familiarity, respect, and cooperation with the CAA). This item was not significantly correlated with Attitude of Political Officials, Fiscal Health, or Board Agency Health.

Executive Director preference for their own visibility was not found to be significantly correlated with any of the measures of CAA health. There was some tendency for Agency Board Health to be correlated with executive director preference for low visibility.

5. Relationship to Board

Three items considered Executive Directors' relationships to CAA Boards. The items were

- o Relationship with the Board (Qualitative: from Excellent to Poor, with no CAA's found to be worse than "Fair").
- o Role with Board (Support/Cooperation to Manipulation, with "Basic" reporting and responding as an intermediate alternative)
- o Role at Board Meetings (serving as a resource and reporter of information vs. being the meeting's "leader"/information manager.)

A very high correlation was found between the first two of these items. The same five agency directors with Good to Excellent relationships with their Boards were the five directors whose role with boards was supportive/cooperative. Three directors were found to have

fair to good relations with their boards--and all three exercised some degree of manipulateness towards the Board. Two directors with only fair relations with the Board performed only a basic, limited role with the Board.

Director's role at meetings was found to be similar, but not as closely correlated as the other two measures. At four of the five CAA's with good relations between Board and Director, and one with only fair relations (and limited basic role), the Director's role at Board meetings was to serve as a resource and reporter of information. At four other CAA's, including the three where directors were at least somewhat manipulative, plus one CAA with a supportive, good to excellent relationship, the Director's role at Board meetings was more controlling--leading the meeting (directly or indirectly) and managing the information available to the Board.

In the analyses reported below, director relationship to board and role with board have been combined.

With regard to (Positive) Staff Morale, Director's Relationship with Board and Role with Board were closely correlated. The five CAA's with at least satisfactory morale were the same as the five CAA's with good to excellent relations with boards, based on a supportive/cooperative role played by the director. These are the same five CAA's where directors had generally positive overall communications with staff. Thus, a parallel was found between Director's communication with staff, and role with Board.

Director's role at Board meetings did not reveal as close a correlation to staff morale.

With regard to overall Program Activity, Director relationship to

Board was not found to be closely related. A look at the subscales finds that all 3 CAA's with broad, innovative scope of programs have good to excellent, cooperative relationships between Director and Board. (3 Board/Innovative and two Modest/Appropriate versus 4 Modest, 1 Limited.) All three CAA's whose programs are developed based on needs analysis are CAA's where the Director's role at Board meetings is that of Resource/Information Reporter.

There was no significant correlation between Executive Director's relationship to the Board, and CAA's Relationship to Community Leaders or Political Officials. Role and Relationship to Board were closely related to Community Leader representation on the Board. All 4 CAA's, which had good board representation among community leaders, also had good to excellent relationships with the board--and a supportive/cooperative relationship with community leaders. No such parallel was found for political officials on the Board.

Executive Director relationship to Board was not significantly related to composite Fiscal Health, although 3 of the 5 CAA's whose directors had good relationships and cooperative roles with their Board ranked first to third on composite fiscal health (the other two ranked seventh and ninth out of ten.) The only subscale on which a notable correlation appears to exist is with regard to the absence of serious fiscal management problems among the 5 CAA's with supportive director-board relations, while fiscal management problems were serious at four of the other 5 CAA's. (This also impacted on fiscal's serious impact on the morale of 3 of these four agencies.)

Composite Board Health was--somewhat surprisingly--not significantly correlated with the relationship of directors to their

boards. However, a review of the sub-items found a close correlation relating Board Performance to good/supportive role and relationship. A higher percentage of quorums (95% to 70%) was also recorded at CAA's with good, cooperative director--board relations. These tendencies were less clearly accentuated when Director role at Board meetings was compared to Board Health.

6. Directors' Allocation of Time

A list of ten activity areas was developed. These activities encompass the scope of areas to which CAA executive directors devote time in the course of their "normal" work week. (Most directors swore that there was no such thing as a normal--or typical--work week, indicating that the job took far more time than most people expect to devote to a job.) Being presented with a list of activities and being asked to indicate the time allocated to it was found to be a useful revelatory self-assessment tool by several directors. ("Now I know why I never get home for dinner!" or "This shows how badly we need a deputy/planner.")

A list of the areas, and the number of CAA's directing major/prime attention to each area, is presented below. Discussion of how these time allocation decision related to Agency health follows the table.

Table : Executive Director Allocation of Time to Activity Areas (1981)

<u>Activity Area</u>	<u>Major/Prime</u>	<u>None-Moderate</u>	<u>(Prime)</u>
Resource Development	6	4	1
Networking Among CAA's	1	9	
Networking with Local Org's	5	5	1
Working/Dealing with Public Officials	5	5	1
Representing CAA at Public Functions, Media	0	10	
Program Operations	4	6	2*
Staff Development	4	6	2*
Agency Administration	8	2	5*
Board Development	3	7	1
Board Support	5	5	

* One Director indicated that primary activity combined Administration, Staff Development, and Program operations. Another indicated that it combined Administration and Staff Development.

Since zero or one director allocated major time to two areas, these areas are not discussed, below, in relation to CAA Health. (It should be noted that some directors considered these areas important, but not major demands on their time.)

Prime Area of Attention

Three CAA directors devoted primary attention to administration only. These CAA's were all in the lower half on staff morale ratings. On all other agency health measures, these CAA's ranks were spread out enough to conclude that primary concentration on program administration did not have a significant relation to any of the other overall measures of agency health. Adding the two CAA's that combined administration and other activities in their primary emphasis did not change this "mixed", non-significant picture.

The other "primary" choices are too varied to analyze.

Number of Areas of Major/Prime Attention and Agency Health

3 Directors indicated 3 or fewer areas received major portions of their time. Four CAA's identified exactly four areas. Three indicated five or more areas received major time attention. Comparison of these three groupings' ranks on overall measures of agency health found the following:

- o On all six overall measures of community health, the three CAA's whose directors devoted time to 3 or fewer areas had poorer mean rank scores than the other CAA's. On five of the six, the three CAA's whose directors devoted major time to the most areas (5 or more) had better mean rank scores than

the other CAA's. (On the sixth area, they were almost even with the four agencies with major attention devoted to exactly four agencies.)

- o The correlation was clearest with regard to attitudes of political officials towards the CAA's, as the top 3 agencies in this area all had directors who devoted major time to 5 or more areas, and three of the four lowest ranking CAA's (7, 9, 10) were the agencies with directors who put major time into 3 or fewer areas.
- o While there were no other areas where the "5+" directors' agencies were consistently the highest ranked, there were three additional areas where the CAA's whose directors put major time into 3 or fewer areas, were consistently ranked at or near the bottom (3 of the four lowest ranks): Overall Fiscal Health (x = 9), Community Leader Attitudes (x = 8.3), and overall program activity (x = 8.2).

Areas of Directors' Major Time/Attention, Related to CAA Health Areas

Resource Development:

Six CAA directors indicated that they devoted major time to resource development. Their agencies consistently included the agencies ranked highest on all measures of CAA Health, but also

included one or two poorer ranked agencies. These ranking's are indicated below:

Ranks on Overall CAA Health Measures, of
CAA's Whose Directors Devoted Major Time
to Resource Development

Morale: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10
Program Activity: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6T, 9
Community Leader Attitude: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9
Political Leader Attitude: 1, 2, 3, 4TT, 4TT, 8 (3 way tie for fourth)
Fiscal Health: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5T, 7
Board Health: 1, 2T, 4, 5, 6, 8

A number of findings worthy of note appear in analysis of the agency health sub-items:

- o All three CAA's whose programmatic activity is "Broad/Innovative" have directors who devote major time to resource development.
- o The four CAA's who consistently command community leader respect, cooperation, and so forth are all CAA's whose director devote major time to resource development.
- o All five CAA's with good representation by political officials on their Boards have directors who devote major time to resource development (as does a sixth CAA with poor representation from its public sector).
- o Although 2 of the 4 CAA's with serious fiscal management problems had directors who devoted major time to resource development, none of the three CAA's where fiscal problems seriously impacted on morale had directors committing major time to resource development.
- o All 3 CAA's that used volunteers extensively were among the

CAA's with directors devoting major time to resource development.

Networking With Local Organizations

Four of the 6 directors devoting time to resource development, and one other director, devoted major time to networking with local organizations.

Strong correlations between Directors devoting major time to this item were found for three of the six overall areas of community health, with some tendencies in the other three areas.

Perfect rank correlations (first to fifth vs. sixth to tenth) were found in two areas: overall program activity, and community leader attitude toward CAA. Strong correlations held on most subscales in these two areas.

The third area of strong tendency was staff morale, where the first 3 (and sixth and seventh) CAA's were agencies whose directors devoted major time to networking with local organizations, while the bottom three agencies did not. Overall fiscal health also found the bottom three agencies without directors who devoted major time to local agency networking, but the third and fourth ranked CAA's had the same characteristic.

All four CAA's which had minimal use of volunteers were among the five CAA's which did not have major time of director devoted to local agency networking.

Work With Public Officials

While five of ten CAA directors devoted major amounts of time to

working with public officials, this did not correlate favorably with any of the overall measures of CAA health.

With regard to morale, four of the five top rated CAA's had directors who did not devote major time to working with public officials.

A less strong tendency is noted in the same direction for overall program activity. The two top-ranked CAA's on this item did not have directors who devoted major time to working with public officials, while the two poorest ranked CAA's did.

Virtually no correlation (positive or negative) was found relating Community Leader or Political Official Attitude towards the CAA, based on time Directors spent working with public officials.

Correlation between directors spending major amounts of time with public officials and overall fiscal health was not significant, but tended slightly in a positive direction. All three of the CAA's that own their own facilities had directors who devoted major time to working with public officials.

Overall Board Health, and the subscale on Board Performance, showed a negative correlation comparable to that noted above for morale, when related to director time devoted to work with public officials.

Program Operations

Four of the ten executive directors indicated that they devoted major time to program operations. Some directors who indicated that they did not spend more time in this area indicated that this was largely delegated to others. In some cases, however, directors felt it

was important to be directly and personally involved in day to day program operations.

A clear tendency is noted for CAA's whose directors did not devote major time to program operations, to be better off on overall program activity and its subscales, as the first three-and five of the top six-CAA's did not have directors who devoted major time to program operations. (This finding raises a "which came first-chicken or egg?" situation. We are unable to say that directors' heavy involvement in program operations causes poorer overall program activity. It is possible that problems with program activity result in increased attention/participation by the Director in those areas.)

An even stronger tendency, in the same direction, shows a negative correlation between Director's spending major time on Program Operations, and overall Board Health. The top four CAA's ranked on overall Board Health (and 7th and 9th), had directors who did not devote major time in this area.

A less strong tendency, in the same direction, is found with regard to community leader attitudes towards the CAA.

No significant correlation was found with regard to CAA morale, political officials' attitudes, or overall fiscal health staff development.

Four CAA directors indicated that they devoted major time to staff development. Interestingly, only three of these were among the four CAA's whose directors had expressed a philosophic commitment to staff development.

Noteworthy tendencies were found relating director time spent on staff development, to CAA Health on all measures except Board Health.

On four of these measures, the four lowest ranked agencies were CAA's whose director did not devote major time to staff development. The tendency was strongest in the areas of Political Official attitudes, and Overall Fiscal Health. The four CAA's found with minimal use of volunteers were all agencies where the Director did not commit major time to staff development.

Administration

Two of the ten CAA's were headed by Directors who devoted only "moderate" time to Administration.

These 2 agencies

- o Ranked 1-2 on Morale;
- o Were 2 & 4 on Overall Program Activity;
- o Were 2 & 4 on Community Leader Attitudes;
- o Were 2 & 4TT on Political Officials Attitudes;
- o Were 1 & 2 on Fiscal Health, overall...;
- o Were 1 & 6, on Board Health.

Looking ahead, both agencies slipped seriously between 1981 and 1984, and both are now headed by persons who list Administration as their prime function.

In 1981, both agencies had competent administrators as deputy directors, which freed the director to engage more in other activities.

It is not possible to say that Director role contributed to the decline between '81 and '84. In one case, the Director left after a fiscal crisis he had inherited proved insurmountable. This crisis also brought down his successor, who had been the administrative deputy director.

In the other case, the Executive Director has suffered a prolonged debilitating illness, and his absence caused a gap in direction for the agency, only partly filled by the Deputy Director (Fiscal Officer) who maintained administrative stability while serving as Acting Interim Director.

At all 10 CAA's in 1984, Administration was found to be either the Director's primary commitment, or a major time/attention area.

Board Development and Support.

Three Directors devoted major time to Board Development. Five devoted major time to Board Support. The latter group includes two of the three devoting time to Board Development.

Correlation between executive director time commitment in these areas, and measures of overall CAA Health, were not significant in all cases. Somewhat noteworthy is the fact that the five CAA's with lowest morale ranks, were among the seven CAA's whose director did not devote major time to Board development. But the other 2 CAA's in this category were in the top 3 on morale.

Notable for its lack of significant correlation is the relationship of CAA Director time devoted to Board Development, to Board CAA Health. However, one subarea--Board Performance--was found to be positively related to Director time devoted to Board Support. Four of the five Boards operating satisfactorily had directors who devoted major time to their support. Both Boards whose performance was "unsatisfactory" had directors who did not devote major time to this area.

B. Board Chairperson's Impact on Agency Health (1981)

The level of impact of a Board Chairperson on the operations of a CAA is dependent on a number of things, including the breadth of the Board's mandate and operations; the experience level of the Board, Board Chairperson, and agency director; and the extent of commitment there is--on the part of both executive director and board chairperson--to enabling board members to grow to the point that they can exercise various roles and levels of responsibility. These are not easy things to measure.

In this analysis, the Board's mode of operations is treated as a separate section, which follows the present consideration of the Board Chairperson's impact. The following areas are considered, here, with regard to the Board Chairperson:

- o Level of Activity, measured by the number of hours per month that the chairperson devotes to that role. The numbers obtained in this area are approximate. Accordingly, this data is treated as ordinal, and analyses are based on rank-order correlations.
- o Areas of Activity, divided into positive, basic, and negative kinds of activity. By totalling number and kind of activity, a rank order emerges of board chairpersons who perform the most positive activities, less any negative activity. Positive activity includes active monitoring of programs and fiscal activity, board development, resource development, planning activity, and volunteer work for the CAA. Negative activity includes imposition into day to day administration of the CAA, negative conflict with the director, or disregard of board responsibilities.

- o Relationship With Executive Director, along the dimensions of cooperation/compliance/competition, and support vs. negativity; and frequency of interaction.

1. Areas of Board Chairperson's Activity, and Levels of Board Chairperson Activity

Rank ordering of the ten CAA's, based on (positive minus negative) Areas of Board Chairperson Activity was found to be closely correlated to Level of Board Chairperson Activity (hours per month). The two were found to be positively correlated at a .01 level of significance.

"Areas of Board Chairperson Activity" was found to have positive correlations, significant at the .05 level, with two measures of CAA health. The two areas are staff morale and overall program activity. "Level of Board Activity", which considers amount of time spent per month by the Board Chairperson without reference to whether the activity is constructive, narrowly missed the .05 level of significance in correlation with both staff morale and program activity.

Areas and level of board activity were not found to be significantly correlated with any of the other four agency health measures.

Broad/Innovative Scope of Program Activity and Representation on the Board by Community Leaders were subscales found to be positively related to areas and level of Board Activity, with a higher correlation with areas of activity.

A positive correlation also exists with political officials' respect for the CAA. In this case, level of board activity had a stronger correlation.

2. Relationship of Board Chair to Executive Director

In eight of the ten CAA's, the relationship between Director and Board Chairperson was found to be generally supportive. At one of the other two, it was negative; at the other, mixed.

The negative and "mixed" relationships were both of a competitive nature. Of the eight generally supportive relationships, three were characterized by cooperation, two by compliance, three by a mixture of the two.

No significant correlations were found between the relationships between the Board chair and Executive Director, and any of the overall measures of Agency Health. This was true both for nature of relationship and frequency of interaction.

C. Board Mode of Operations' Impact on Agency Health (1981)

A variety of elements which characterize or differentiate CAA Boards was considered and analyzed with regard to their relationship to CAA health. The elements included

- o Activeness, including two items also included in the Board Health measure--quorums at meetings (and frequency of meetings) and extent of vacancies on the Board.
- o Committee System, how widely boards use committees, and the extent to which the committees are functioned.
- o Staff at Board Meetings, whether the director limits or maximizes staff attendance at board meetings.
- o Public Sector Slots, whether these slots are filled by the public sector persons themselves, or by appointees.
- o Areas of Board Involvement, the extent to which boards are

involved in Planning, Evaluation, Resource Development, Fiscal Monitoring, Program Monitoring, and Personnel.

With regard to Activeness, nine of the ten CAA's met at least ten times per year. Seven of these had quorums 100% of the time, one 75% (9 of 12 meetings.) One CAA failed to achieve quorum at all 12 meetings. One CAA held only 2 meetings, achieving a quorum once. (This agency has eight vacancies on its Board.) Four CAA's had less than a 10% vacancy rate on the Board; two had 10-20% vacancies; four had more than 20% vacancies.

At least some committees were functioning actively at six of the ten CAA's.

At least half of the public officials at five of the 10 CAA's represent themselves on the Board.

Only one CAA was found to have a high level of Board involvement in even four of the six areas mentioned above. Two CAA's reported minimal to no Board involvement in all areas.

1. Board Activeness and CAA Health

Since 9 of ten CAA's met at least ten times per year, and only one did not, it was not possible to conduct substantive analyses of this variable. However, it is noteworthy that the one CAA that does not have regular Board meetings ranked lowest on overall CAA health, and did not rank higher than seventh (tied) on any of the six measures of CAA Health.

Seven of the ten CAA's always had quorums at their meetings. Of the three that did not, one is the lowest ranked CAA which had only two Board meetings--one with a quorum. One of the others had quorums at 9

of 12 meetings--certainly adequate for regularly conducting business for the CAA. One had no quorums out of 12 meetings, relying on executive committee efforts to provide continuity. This CAA ranked lowest on Board Health, but otherwise was close to the middle on all overall scales. Thus there is insufficient evidence related to Board Activeness to identify significant differences on any agency health variable.

Percent of variances on the Board was not found to be significantly correlated to any of the overall measures of CAA Health.

2. Board Committee System

Committee systems were found to be operational and functional at 5 CAA's; mixed--some functioned but others not--at one; and either nonexistent or operating weekly and irregularly at four. Comparison of the 5 CAA's with operating Board committee systems to the four where this was lacking, on the various measures of agency health, revealed the following:

- o CAA's with functional board committee systems were found to be significantly better off with regard to staff morale.
- o An equally strong positive correlation was found for overall program activity. This correlation held for all program subvariables except operating effectiveness, where most CAA's had most of their programs operating effectively.
- o Community Leaders' attitudes towards CAA's followed the same positive correlation, which held for all four sub-items (Board representation, familiarity, respect, and cooperation.)
- o A less strong positive tendency was found for political

officials' attitudes towards CAA's, and for overall Fiscal Health. While the four subscales on political official attitudes at least leaned in the same direction, only one of the seven fiscal health subscales showed significant differences: Volunteers. The five CAA's with functional Board Committees included 3 that use volunteers extremely, while 2 make moderate use of volunteers. The four CAA's with weak/irregular or no Board Committee systems all made minimum use of volunteers.

- o With regard to overall Board health, the pressure or absence of functioning committees did not appear to be significantly related. There was, however, a significant difference with regard to level of Board Understanding, and a strong tendency with regard to Board Performance. (No differences were found with regard to quorums or Board vacancies.)

3. Staff at Board Meetings

At two CAA's the only staff person attending Board meetings was the Executive Director. In both cases, this was the Director's decision. One of these was a dominating director with substantial control over the Board. The other was engaged in a Board development process, attempting to strengthen the Board's ability to participate effectively in planning, decisionmaking, and other Board roles. A third CAA rarely had other staff present. This CAA was Board Dominated. None of these 3 CAA's were among the "healthier" CAA's.

At two other CAA's, attendance at Board meetings was limited to an Executive Team (Director, Fiscal Officer, Secretary at one; Director,

Head Start Director, Secretary at the other.) Both agencies were among the "healthier" CAA's, with no ranking below sixth out of ten, and a mean ranking of 2.5 for one, 3.8 for the other.

Four CAA's either required or encouraged attendance at their regular Board meetings. Three of these were CAA's that were found to be "Healthy" at least four of the six areas. The fourth was ranked fifth on four items, lower on the other two. A fifth CAA required staff to attend its Board meetings, but only held two Board meetings in the entire year. This CAA ranked poorly on all measures of CAA Health measures.

4. Areas of Board Involvement

Six areas which can be important parts of Boards' roles were considered and correlated to aspects of agency health. The six areas were:

- o Planning
- o Evaluation
- o Resource Development
- o Fiscal Monitoring
- o Program Monitoring
- o Personnel

Few CAA's were found to have high levels of involvement in more than one or two areas. Only one CAA had a high level of involvement in four of the six areas. For purposes of correlation with CAA Health variables, CAA's whose boards had moderate to high levels of effort in each area were compared with CAA's with none to low (weak) involvement in the area. Up to two CAA's on different items were characterized as

having "Low to Moderate" levels of effort. These were excluded from the comparisons.

Planning was found not to be closely correlated with any of the six overall measures of CAA Health. Positive tendencies were noted with regard to morale and board overall health, but not to a degree that was significant. (One CAA among four with moderate to high level of effort ranked low on morale, and one CAA with low level of effort in planning ranked high on Board Health.)

Evaluation, was one of the Board activities that was most closely correlated with CAA Health variables. Clearly significant correlations were found with overall Program Activity (and 3 subscales--scope, breadth of program development, and appropriateness of programs operated) and Attitude of Community Leaders towards the CAA (and all of its 4 subscales, with representation of community leaders on the Board being most highly correlated). Strong positive tendencies were noted for Staff Morale, Political Officials' Attitudes (and Cooperation), and Fiscal Health. (Only one fiscal scale revealed a significant positive correlation. Agencies whose Boards spend moderate to major effort on Evaluation used volunteers moderately to extensively, while all four CAA's without Boards actively involved in evaluation made minimal use of volunteers.

The only overall agency health variable that was not significantly correlated with Board's level of effort in Evaluation was Board Health. Interestingly, Board involvement in evaluation was strongly correlated with Boards' understanding of their roles.

Boards' Resource Development, level of effort was not found to differentiate healthy and less healthy agencies. the three CAA's that

tended to be ranked lowest were all CAA's that did not have Boards active in Resource Development. However, the other CAA's seemed evenly balanced between Boards that were active in this area, and Boards that were not. Board Resource Development was clearly not significantly correlated with CAA Fiscal Health (or any of the Fiscal subscales).

Fiscal Monitoring, like evaluation, was strongly correlated with measures of CAA Health. This aspect of Board effort was found to be positive related to all six CAA Health measures--least strongly to Political Official attitudes. New perfect correlations were found with Program Activity and Community Leader attitudes and the subscales mentioned above. A strong correlation was found with staff morale. Positive correlation with overall fiscal health included a very strong correlation between Fiscal Monitoring by the Board, and lack of negative impact of the agency's fiscal situation on morale. Noteworthy, in the opposite direction, is the fact that none of five CAA's with Boards expending effort on fiscal monitoring are among three CAA's out of the ten in this study who own facilities.

Program Monitoring effort by Boards was not found to correlate closely with any of the measures of CAA Health. A tendency is noted with regard to Program Activity being related positively to board program monitoring efforts. This was especially notable with regard to agency programs being need-based--planned rather than based on money being available--much more frequently at CAA's with higher levels of Board Program Monitoring effort, than at CAA's without such effort.

Only 3 CAA's Boards expended moderate to high amounts of effort on Personnel matters. An absolute correlation was found between Overall Board Health, and Boards' expending moderate to major attention to

Personnel matters. All three CAA Boards that spent moderate to high amounts of time on Personnel had quorums at all Board meetings in 1980-81. Only 3 of the six other CAA's considered on this item matched this feat.

D. CAA STRATEGY MIX, AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CAA HEALTH (1981)

1. Four Strategies

A major focus of the evaluation effort undertaken in 1980-81, which provided the basic data presented here, was on the ways in which CAA's applied four strategies in their work. The four strategies are:

- o Service Delivery
- o Community Organization
- o Advocacy
- o Resource Development

Our contract with the Community Services Agency, entered into during the final months of the Carter Administration, called for our discussing all CAA program activity in terms of the four strategies. When our contract was extended, several months into the Reagan presidency, our directive was modified: we were no longer to report on how CAA's applied Advocacy as a strategy. (We did, however, continue to collect the relevant information.)

In considering the strategies in relation to CAA Health, the following aspects of the strategies were considered:

- o Were the strategies considered in planning the course of the agency, or is the strategy mix a reality that has simply "come to be"?

- o Are the strategies seen as linked or separate? (e.g.,--do the strategies, as applied, include advocacy and community organizing elements in the CAA's approach to service delivery or resource development?)
- o Overall strategy of the CAA--its primary emphasis
- o Do the Directors see a difference between actual CAA operating strategy and the strategy mix they would prefer to develop.
- o Relative emphasis of different CAA's, on each of the four strategies.

2. STRATEGY CHOICES AS CHARACTERISTIC OF CAA EMPHASIS OVER THE PAST TWENTY YEARS

As mentioned in an earlier chapter, the "War on Poverty" was "declared" in 1964, with Community Action Agencies designated on its cutting edge. Over the course of time, the role of CAA's--as envisioned/encouraged/permitted by legislation--has been modified. The four strategies that we were asked to consider in our 1980-81 evaluations, and the notable absence of one other, reflect directly on these changes.

In OEO's earliest years, Community Organization would probably have been found to be the strategy of choice--or at least a major component--of a majority of Community Action Agencies. By the late sixties, the focus had begun to shift. Categorical program funding, and a changed agency name, heralded this shift towards Service Delivery and away from activist Community Organizing as a primary strategy. One could consider this second phase (Nixon-Ford years) a time of

consolidation--of power for some CAA leadership, of process for others--but also a time of some shrinkage of funding from federal sources and weakening of CSA as a primary source of CAA funding.

During the Carter presidency, the CAA's were revived somewhat, and given some new responsibilities for programs such as energy conservation/ weatherization and sometimes manpower training. While they were not strongly encouraged to resume active local organizing, CAA roles were more often described as that of spokesman or advocate of the poor. This occurred on two levels--advocating for the individual rights of persons being denied services to which they were entitled, and articulating unmet needs of entire segments of the population.

This advocacy role was not welcomed by the Reagan Administration, which sought to limit spending on social programs and did not welcome locally based articulation of the plight of the poor. In less than one year, the federal agency that funded CAA's (CSA) had been dismantled, replaced by the Community Services Block Grant, which made reduced amounts of funding available to CAA's through state allocations.

Resource Development has become an increasingly important aspect of CAA activity, as the level of funding from government sources grew both scarcer and more restricted. As it becomes an aspect of agency activity that is necessary for survival, under Reagan, the task has become more difficult (as shown in the discussion of 1984 funding levels) because CAA's have been less able to "afford" the "luxury" of a staff person devoted strictly to planning and resource development.

The "missing" strategy from the above is Economic Development. Of the twenty CAA's visited in 1981, two had exemplary activity in this area--but neither was included in the current study. (One, in a suburb

of New York City, had an annual local initiative allocation which is almost as large as the ten CAA's studied, put together. The other was in New Jersey.) The absence of economic development as an area of unique interest to the Federal government may be worth speculation, as it is a way for CAA's to pursue survival and independence from (Federal) funding source priorities. Among the ten CAA's included in this study, none were engaged in major economic development efforts, although one director indicated that this was a future priority. This strategy can be treated as an aspect of resource development, but shows an element of long-range planning which is not always present in Resource Development.

3. STRATEGY MIX RELATED TO CAA HEALTH

This section compares elements of CAA Strategy Mix, with measures of CAA Health, to see which items appeared related at the time of initial visit (1981).

Planned Strategy?

The question of whether CAA's planned their strategy mix, or whether it evolved without conscious planning or focusing, contained unforeseen difficulties of categorization. It appears that six CAA's had developed their strategy mix by conscious planning. However, within these six, the planning was entirely the Director's effort, at one CAA, and largely the result of director influence on two Boards. One CAA was engaged in a process of developing its Board planning capabilities, with the Director providing a major impetus as the Board developed. Two CAA's were implementing strategies that Boards had

clearly concurred with. Of the four CAA's without a clearly planned strategy mix, one was sustaining existing programming while the Director worked with the Board to strengthen its ability to be effective in its planning and evaluation roles. One had a strong director who might have a plan for the agency, but was mostly "waiting for things to get better" with regard to funding sources. One was engaged in Board debates over the agency's future, but this had not translated into clear policy. The final CAA showed some evidence that Board and Director had considered the question of appropriate strategy mix, but had failed to agree upon an appropriate course.

Because of these categorial shadings, the only comparisons that are made--below--are

- o Whether the strategy mix was planned (by anyone) at the time of 1981 visit.
- o Whether there is intent to involve the Board in the planning process.

These are considered, below, with regard to relation to agency health. The latter of the two may also be relevant as a predictor for 1984.

With regard to the first item--whether strategies were planned--the following was found:

- o A tendency towards positive correlation, with regard to Morale, Program Activity, and Attitudes towards CAA of both Community Leaders and Political Officials. In each instance, four highest ranked CAA's were found to be among the six CAA's whose strategy mix was based on planning. Two CAA's that tended to rank lower also had strategy mix based on planning. Consequently, the overall correlation was not significant.

- o A stronger positive correlation, with regard to overall Fiscal Health, with a clear correspondence with regard to the subscale on impact of fiscal on morale.
- o No significant correlation with regard to overall Board CAA Health. However, CAA's with planned strategy mix were found to be much more likely to have a quorum.
- o Relatively few subscales, other than those mentioned above, were found to be significant. Those that were significant included Scope of Program Activity, Community Leader Board Representation, and Political Official familiarity with the CAA.

With regard to a comparison of CAA's with the intent to involve Boards in planning CAA strategy mix, there were no significant correlations between intent to involve Boards in planning, and any of the Agency Health variables. However, it is notable that the two CAA's that clearly had no intent to involve Boards in strategy planning, were consistently ranked at or near the bottom on all measures of CAA health. CAA's with intent, and those with limited, partial, or unclear intent did not differ substantially.

STRATEGIES LINKED

Five of the ten CAA's applied the strategies in a linked, or unified manner. These CAA's elected not to treat each strategy as a discreet activity area. Instead, program activity was integrated. A few examples may be useful:

- o Two CAA's linked Service Delivery and Community Organization by identifying families with housing problems in the process

of determining their eligibility for supplemental fuel assistance. In each instance, persons introduced to the CAA for a service purpose became involved in community organization work that sought to change their relationship to a cause of their initial need for service.

- o Four CAA's linked Service Delivery and Advocacy. This includes working with clients who are referred to public agencies such as the Department of Social Services, to make sure individual rights are not abused. It also, often, involves publicizing the plight of a segment of the population (for example, Senior Citizens paying a high portion of fixed incomes on local property taxes) and calling for solutions to these problems (e.g., a local legislative change.) (By 1984, this type of advocacy had increased greatly, as the CAA's served as spokesmen in opposition to various budget cuts that were enacted or threatened.)
- o Two CAA's linked Resource Development to Community Organization. This includes mobilizing volunteers and local fundraising activities in support of C.O. goals such as organizing a tenants council, women's health project, etc.
- o Two CAA's linked Resource Development and Advocacy, seeking the means to operate progrms that meet the needs for which they were advocating.

The five CAA's with linked strategies included four CAA's that ranked in the top five on Morale, Program Activity, Community Leader Attitude, Political Official Attitude, and overall Fiscal Health. The fifth of these CAA's ranked no lower than seventh on any of these

items--except political officials' attitudes, where they ranked eighth.

This results in positive--but not always significant--correlation with these five measures of CAA Health. One CAA which consistently ranked in the top half did not see its strategies linked, as they concentrated on service delivery, with separate efforts in advocacy and resource development.

The Directors of six CAA's--the five with linked strategies and the one mentioned above that ranked consistently in the top half on all CAA Health scales--indicated that they envisioned an ideal strategy mix that differed somewhat from their current reality. In a sense, these six CAA's can be seen as the CAA's that have given active consideration to what an appropriate strategy mix should be. Together, these six CAA's did have significant positive correlation with overall Program Activity and Community Leader Attitudes measures of CAA Health. They also showed stronger--but not significant--correlation on staff morale and political official attitudes.

Board Health was the one CAA Health measure that was not strongly correlated to these factors.

OVERALL STRATEGY

In 1981, five of the ten CAA's overall strategy could be characterized as "primarily Service Delivery". This includes one CAA that had not yet shifted its priorities, while the Director worked with the Board so they would be prepared to effectively participate in deciding on agency priorities. It also includes one CAA whose approach was "an integrated strategy" built on a strong service base.

Two CAA's operated with "balanced strategies" that contained

strong emphasis on (linked) Community Organization and Advocacy.

Three CAA's operated with strategies that stressed service delivery and advocacy.

Four of the five CAA's whose overall strategy is primarily service delivery are the CAA's whose director did not express an ideal that was any different than their current operation. These four CAA's, which also did not link their strategies together, each ranked in the lower half on the majority of measures of CAA health, occupying seventh through tenth places on composite of the six overall CAA Health ratings. The fifth CAA with a primarily service strategy is the one that operated "an integrated strategy built on a strong service base." Including this agency with the other four may distract the overall practice, because this one agency (ranked second on overall CAA health) did have an integrated approach to agency strategy.

The two CAA's whose overall strategy included emphasis on Community Organization and Advocacy, linked, ranked first and fourth, on composite CAA Health. The three emphasizing Service Delivery and Advocacy are ranked third, fifth, and sixth, overall.

Resource Development does not appear at the core of any CAA's strategy, but is seen as a major part of several "balanced" approaches.

The table which follows summarizes the relationship of CAA's overall strategy to CAA Health.

CAA'S OVERALL STRATEGY RELATED TO RANKS ON CAA HEALTH MEASURES

	Primarily Service Delivery	S.D. In Integrated Strategy	S.D. Plus Advocacy .	Overall Appr., Emphasis on C.O. Advoc.
Morale	5,8,9,10	IT	4,6,7	IT,3
Prgm. Activity	6T,8,9,10	4	3,5,6,T	1,2
Comm Ldr. Att.	7,8,9,10	IT	3T,5,6	IT,3T
Pol. Official's Att.	4TT,7,9,10	IT	IT,3,4TT	4TT,8
Fiscal Health	4,8,9,10	1	3,5,6	2,7
Board Health	2T,7,8,10	6	2T,5,9	1,4
Composite	7,8,9,10	2	3,5,6	1,4

As can be seen on the table, above, the two CAA's with overall approach containing special emphasis on community organization and advocacy, appeared to be very well off on all measures of Agency Health except Political Official Attitudes and Fiscal Health. On these, service delivery--in a planned context, appears to have an edge. CAA's using an un-integrated, primarily service delivery, strategy generally were least well off on all measures of CAA Health.

One interesting point that appears above is the exceptionally close correlation between Community Leader Attitude and Composite measure of CAA Health.

4. LEVEL OF EFFORT BY CAA'S ON EACH STRATEGY, RELATED TO CAA HEALTH

The composite, above, is made of indicators of how much effort CAA's actually spend on each of the four strategies. In summarizing this activity, linked effort was credited to each linked category (resulting in totals exceeding 100%.) The summary table appears in Appendix 3. Below, the data is discussed in terms of its relation to CAA Health measures.

SERVICE DELIVERY

Most (eight of ten) CAA's devoted more effort to Service Delivery than to any other strategy or combination of strategies. Six CAA's devoted 80% or more of their emphasis to Service Delivery. Two others devoted 70-75%. The others indicated less than 50% of their effort was devoted to service delivery. These two CAA's were the same two that employed a balanced approach with emphasis on community organization and advocacy. (These CAA's were found to be highly ranked on four of the six measures of agency health--morale, program activity, community leader attitude, and board health.)

Five of the CAA's indicated that, ideally, Service Delivery should be below 70% of overall CAA activity. These are the same five CAA's that have linked strategies. These CAA's were found to be positively correlated with all overall measures of CAA Health except Board Health. On most items, the small number of agencies did not allow the correlations to reach the .05 level of significance.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Four CAA's devoted more than 10% of their effort to Community Organization. These included the top 3 CAA's with regard to rank on staff morale. One CAA would be added to these four, in counting CAA's which feel more than 10% of their effort should be in CO. The additional CAA ranked fourth on staff morale. The other CAA with 10% effort devoted to C.O., ranked seventh on morale.

All four CAA's with C.O. emphasis over ten percent were among the top five CAA's on overall program activity, including all CAA's whose

program activity is broad in scope and developed based on identified need.

All four of these CAA's were also in the top five on Community Leader Attitudes. All four were rated "Good" on familiarity and respect from Community Leaders. They were the only agencies to achieve this rating.

Fiscal Health and Board Health did not correlate as strongly with CAA emphasis on Community Organization.

ADVOCACY

Five CAA's devoted 20% or more of their effort to Advocacy. These are the same five agencies that indicated that, ideally, less than 70% of their effort should be service delivery. These agencies all have linked strategy approaches, and were found to be positively correlated with all overall measures of CAA Health except Board Health.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The same five CAA's devoted more than 10% of their effort to Resource Development. A sixth--the highest ranking CAA that did not link strategies--indicated that, ideally, more than 10% of their effort should go to resource development. The addition of the sixth agency strengthens the correlation with several CAA Health areas--to significant levels on Overall Program Activity and Community Leader attitudes; and to stronger but not significant levels on Staff Morale and Political Official attitudes.

E. RELATION TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND AGENCY HEALTH

Six of the ten CAA's had generally positive, cooperative relationships with local government. This translated into a variety of things, typical of which were the following:

- o Two of these CAA's had contracts to operate County Department of Transportation systems, and a third had worked with the County to obtain funding to implement such a system. (All three were in rural areas.)
- o Five of the six CAA's had good public sector representation on their Boards, and the sixth had satisfactory representation. (Three of the other four CAA's, without good relations to local government, had poor public sector representation on the Board; the fourth had fair representation, with virtually all public officials appointing alternates rather than participating directly.
- o Three of the six CAA's administrative headquarters were in County Office Buildings. These CAA's benefitted from contributed space, participation in County bulk purchasing systems or supplies, use of County motor pools for repair and maintenance of vehicles, and were somewhat tied into County telephone systems.
- o Most of these CAA's received some funds from the County as cash for local share. These were usually unrestricted funds. (One of the other four CAA's received cash funding from the County.)
- o Two CAA's also were able to obtain cash advances from loan or revolving funds from the County.

- o On the negative side, the three CAA's in County office space all suffered from identity problems, with some beneficiaries believing they were a County agency.
- o Two of the CAA's appeared to have limited their advocacy and organization roles because they wished to maintain good relations with local government.

The extent that relation to local government is related to the Agency Health measures is discussed below.

Significant correlations were found between positive/cooperative relation with local government, and two areas of CAA Health. The areas are:

- o Political Official attitudes towards CAA, where the six agencies with positive relations with local government ranked first through sixth. This finding was not unexpected. It held for all of this element's subscales except for familiarity with CAA.
- o The same ranking (first to sixth) was found correlating positive relation with local government to overall fiscal health. Five of the six CAA's with healthy funding ratios had good relations with local government. The sixth was the only CAA with less than positive relationship to local government which received county cash for local share. (This CAA had enjoyed a good relationship with local government, but this had slipped due to declining agency credibility.) The only CAA with a positive relationship to local government, but without a healthy funding ratio, did not operate a Head Start program. This reduced its funding by at

least 30%, with the corresponding impact on funding ratio.

The only other fiscal subscale that clearly differentiated on the basis of relation to local government was local government fiscal help.

No significant correlation was found relating CAA relationship with local government to staff morale, program activity, community leader's attitudes towards the CAA, or Board Health.

VII: 1981 SUMMARY OF CAA ACTIVITY RELATED TO EACH ASPECT OF CAA HEALTH

Having looked, in the preceding pages, at the extent that various strategies and approaches of CAA's (and their Boards, Executive Directors, Board Chairpersons) were related to measures of Agency Health in 1981, our task is to:

1. Summarize the strategies and approaches that appeared to be related to each agency health measure, in 1981.
2. Compare these 1981 findings (tendencies) with findings from the 1984 revisits. Similar findings in 1984 would indicate that the relationships found between CAA Health and approaches and strategies employed in 1981 held for the conditions existing at the later time as well. Lack of similar findings would lead to questions about differences in conditions at the two points in time and/or questions as to the validity of findings based on such a comparatively small group of organizations.

Outcomes of the first of these two efforts are presented below. 1984 findings appear in the next chapter.

A. Morale

o Mode of Management

Democratic/supportive management - including shared openness in the management process, tendency to delegate responsibility and utilize a democratic style of leadership, appeared to be related to positive CAA staff morale. Tight central control, and autocratic style were related to poorer staff morale. Lack of control--which translated to a more

"laissez faire" style of leadership and staff perception of ineffective weakness on the part of its director--also was related to low staff morale.

Democratic Management correlated closely with use of Normative elements (exclusively or in conjunction with other elements) with regard to Organization Compliance factors. Tight/Central Control correlated closely with Utilitarian and Coercive Organizational Compliance Strategies. Hence, normative approach to organizational compliance related to positive morale, while Utilitarian and Coercive strategies related to negative morale.

o Communication with Staff

Open Communication and Effective 2-way information flow were strongly related to good staff morale. Lack of full open information-sharing was equated with less than satisfactory morale.

Tendencies relating good staff morale to communications measures were found for agencies whose directors maintained open door policies towards staff, and for agencies that conducted weekly senior staff meetings. Unsatisfactory staff morale was related to the opposite tendencies--no open door policy, no weekly staff meetings, and lack of monthly reports required of staff.

Staff understanding and acceptance of the Director's sense of purpose was found to characterize agencies in the same manner as Director's Open Door Policy. Thus, staff understanding appears positively related to staff morale.

o Director Commitment to Staff Development

A perfect correlation was found between Director Commitment to Staff Development, and Staff Morale. CAA's where directors did not show evidence of this commitment lacked good staff morale.

o Director's Strategy for Agency Image

CAA's that were operated in a manner that could be perceived as programmatically integrated--a unified agency rather than a grouping of separate programs--had good to excellent staff morale.

A positive relation also existed between staff morale and Director's preference for CAAs having a high level of public visibility. (This relation was less pronounced than with regard to Unified Agency, alone.)

o Role and Relationship to Board

Staff Morale was found to be at least satisfactory at all CAA's where the Director's role with Board was supportive/cooperative. At each of these CAA's, the director's relationship with the Board was good to excellent. CAA's with less than good relations between Directors and board, where the Director's role was manipulative, "basic" or limited, did not have satisfactory staff morale indicated.

o Director's Allocation of Time

There was a tendency for CAA's whose directors devoted major amounts of time to five or more areas (of ten discussed) to have somewhat better morale than those where directors

concentrated on 3 or fewer areas. (This tendency was not significant.)

Three CAA's Directors indicated that their primary area of time and attention was administration. These CAA's all had unsatisfactory ratings on staff morale.

Strong, but not significant, correlations were found between staff morale and Directors' devoting major time and attention to Resource Development and Networking with Local Officials. Agencies whose directors did not devote major time to networking with public officials were found to have better staff morale.

Agencies where Directors did not devote major attention to Staff Development were found to rank low on staff morale.

Only two CAA's had directors who devoted only a moderate amount of time to administration. These were both found to have excellent staff morale.

o Board Chair Role

Morale was found to be better at agencies whose Boards had functional Committee Systems.

Morale tended to be better at agencies whose Boards were at least moderately active in the areas of Planning, Evaluation, and Fiscal Monitoring, compared to CAA's whose Boards were less active or inactive.

o Board Activity

Morale was found to be better at agencies whose Boards had functional committee systems.

Morale tended to be better at agencies whose Boards were at

least moderately active in the areas of Planning, Evaluation, and Fiscal Monitoring, compared to CAA's whose Boards were less active--or inactive.

o Agency Strategies

All CAA's with good to excellent morale (and 2 others) were CAA's whose strategies were thoughtfully planned. CAA's whose strategy mix came about without active planning tended to have lower staff morale. To a lesser extent, the same relationship holds, with regard to CAA's involving Boards in the planning of strategy mix.

CAA's with linked strategies had better staff morale than those who treated each strategy separately.

Staff morale was lower at CAA's which stressed Service Delivery as their primary strategy with little emphasis on other strategies. Morale was higher where the agencies overall strategy incorporated Advocacy and Community Organization and had a reduced emphasis on Service Delivery.

Positive correlations with morale were found for CAA's with

- o Over 10% of their effort devoted to Community Organization;
- o Over 20% of their effort devoted to Advocacy;
- o Over 10% of their effort devoted to Resource Development.

B. Program Activity

o Mode of Management

Modest tendencies were found relating mode of management to aspects of Program Activity. These were not as pronounced as

the relationship with Staff Morale.

Democratic/Open Management was the predominant style at CAA's whose programs tended to reflect community needs and cover a broad scope of activity.

o Communication With Staff

No notable correlation was found between Program Activity (as a measure of CAA Health) and director's communications with staff. Staff understanding of Director's Purpose tended to be related to Scope of CAA programming.

o Director Commitment to Staff Development

CAA's whose Director was committed to staff development tended to have better overall rankings with regard to project activity. This was most notable with regard to the "Scope of Programs" subscale.

o Director's Strategy for Agency Image

CAA's which ranked highest with regard to overall Program Activity were agencies whose directors wanted the agency to have a high degree of visibility. This was true for all subscales, including a tendency with regard to program operating effectiveness.

Director's concern for a Unified Agency Image tended to be related to CAA Program Health, but less clearly than with regard to CAA visibility.

Director's preference for low visibility for themselves tended to be related to developing CAA programming based on need rather than available funding.

Director's Relationship with Board

A cooperative relationship between Director and Board was found to be related positively to (broad) scope of programs and appropriateness of (needs based) programs for the CAA target areas.

Director's Allocation of Time

Directors who concentrated their major effort on three or fewer areas of activity were found to be at agencies with low over-all rankings on program activity.

Agency Health with regard to Overall Program Activity appeared to be positively related to Directors' putting major effort into Resource Development and Networking with Local Programs. Scope of programs was closely related to director's Resource Development level of effort.

Modest negative tendencies are noted between CAA Health in Program Activity, and two areas. Directors devoting major time to work with public officials were at agencies ranked lower on Program Activity. Interestingly, the same was true--to a stronger extent-- of CAA's whose directors devoted major time to Program Operation.

- o Board Chairperson's Activity Level/Areas

Rankings of Board Chairperson Level of Activity and Areas of Positive Activity were found to be significantly correlated to Overall Program Activity Health (at the .05 level.) This correlation held, as well, for Scope of Program Activity.

- o Board Activity

Program Activity Health was found to be related to Boards having Functioning Committee Systems. In particular, Program Activity Health tended to be found at CAA's where at least

moderate levels of Board Activity was found in the areas of Evaluation and Fiscal Monitoring. Board activity in the area of Program Monitoring was related to CAA tendencies to develop programs based on identified community needs.

o Strategy Mix

As with Staff Morale, there is a tendency for ratings on Program Activity to be better, over-all, in agencies whose strategy mix was thoughtfully planned out. Scope of program activity was similarly related.

Where Boards were not involved in planning strategy mix, agencies tended to rank lower on program activity.

Program activity rankings were positively related to CAA's with linked strategies, especially those seeking to have less than 70% of their effort be Service Delivery. Health Program Activity ratings were negatively related to CAA's with Service Delivery as their primary strategy exclusive of other options.

Positive correlations were found relating Program Activity Health to CAA's with an overall approach emphasizing advocacy and organizing; and to those with lower emphasis on Service Delivery, and at least 10% of their activity in community organization and resource development, and 20% in Advocacy.

C. Community Leaders' Attitudes Towards CAA

o Mode of Management

Democratic Leadership Style was found to be related positively to Community Leader attitudes toward CAA's.

Autocratic and Laissez Faire styles were found to be negatively related. This was found to be the case with regard to all four subscales (representation on CAA Boards, Familiarity, Respect, and Cooperation with the CAA.)

Only slight tendencies are found in the same direction, on other management-style items. Democratic/open style was found to be related to good community leader representation on the CAA Board. No other subscales were closely correlated.

o Communication with Staff

Two-way (balanced) Information-Sharing and Full Openness in Information-sharing tended to be related positively to Community Leader Attitude towards the CAA. This tendency was strongest with regard to two subscales: Board Representation, and Cooperation with the CAA. A modest tendency was also found relating Directors' Open Door Policy to each of the four subscales.

A positive tendency on these subscales is also noted with regard to staff understanding and acceptance of Director's role and approach.

o Director Commitment to Staff Development

CAA's with Directors committed to staff development tended to be among those ranked higher with regard to Community Leader Attitude. This tendency translates into a highly significant differentiation between CAA's with good community leader representation on the board, and CAA's without good representation from this sector. The tendency, to a lesser extent holds for the other subscales as well.

o Director Strategy for Agency Image

A virtually perfect correlation was found between Director's preference for level of CAA visibility, and Community Leader attitude towards CAA. High visibility correlated closely with positive community leader attitude on this overall rating and each of its subscales.

Unified agency image was found to be a concept that correlated closely with community leader representation on the Board, and tended to be positively related on other subscales and overall.

o Role and Relationship to Board

Director's role and relationship to the Board was found to be strongly related to Board representation by community leaders. Only slight positive tendencies were found with regard to other subscales or overall.

o Director's Allocation of Time

Directors who devoted major time to 3 or fewer areas of activity were ranked near the bottom on this measure of CAA Health. CAA's where Directors spent major time in 5 or more areas were ranked substantially higher.

Positive relationships were found between Community Leader Attitude and Director attention to Resource Development and Networking with Local Organizations.

Executive Directors' putting major time into Program Operation was negatively correlated with Community Leader Attitudes.

Community Leader Attitudes were also found to be negative at

CAA's where Directors did not spend major time on staff development.

o Board Chairperson's Level/Areas of Activity

Although Board Chairperson's level and areas of activity were not strongly/significantly correlated to community leader attitude towards CAA, Board Chair areas of activity was positively related to community leader attitudes towards the CAA.

o Board Activity

This measure of CAA health was found to be positively correlated to Boards that have actively functioning committees. Board activity in the areas of evaluation and fiscal monitoring were closely correlated to community leader attitude towards CAA. A more modest tendency was also found with regard to Program Monitoring.

o Strategy Mix

CAA's that actively planned their strategy mix were found to include the CAA's ranked highest on this measure of CAA Health, and two other CAA's.

A strong correlation exists between CAA's which link their strategies, and CAA's rankings on Community Leader CAA Health ratings.

Positive ratings on this measure of CAA health were related to CAA's pursuing overall strategies involving advocacy and community organization, and a lower emphasis on service delivery.

CAA's with over 10% of their activity in the area of

Community Organization were positively related to overall health on community leader attitude rankings, and also to its "familiarity" and "respect" subscales.

Positive overall correlations were also found for CAA's with over 10% of their effort in the advocacy area, and over 10% in resource development.

D. Political Officials' Attitudes Towards CAA

o Mode of Management, Communication With Staff, Commitment to Staff Development, Strategy for Agency Image, Director's Relationship to Board

No close correlations were found between any of the above areas, and Political Officials' Attitudes towards the CAA.

o Director's Allocation of Time

A nearly perfect correlation was found relating political officials' attitudes towards CAA's to the number of areas to which executive directors devote major amounts of time. This same strong correlation was found with regard to Director's time devoted to resource development, and a strong tendency with regard to staff development (no director attention to staff development matched negative attitude of political officials...) Representation of political officials on boards was positively related to each of these items.

Executive Directors' devoting major time to work with public officials did not differentiate CAA's on the basis of Political Officials' attitudes toward CAA's.

o Board Chairperson's Level & Areas of Activity

Board Chairperson Activity was not significantly related to Political Officials' attitudes. A positive tendency was noted with regard to one subscale: respect of the CAA by community leaders.

o Board Activity

Positive tendencies were noted with regard to the relationship of political officials' attitudes towards the CAA, and three areas of Board Activity: the presence of an actively functioning board committee system; at least moderate activity in the area of evaluation; and the same level of activity in fiscal monitoring.

o Strategy Mix

Political officials' attitudes towards CAA's were found to be routinely related to whether strategies had developed as the result of a planned process. This tendency held for two subscales as well: Political Officials' representation on the CAA's Board, and Officials' familiarity with the CAA.

Slight positive tendencies were found with regard to Linked Strategies, and a negative tendency when service delivery is designated as a primary strategy.

A tendency with regard to Advocacy and Resource Development was noted. Both were found to be positively related to this measure of CAA Health.

o Relation to Local Government

A very strong correlation was found to exist--as would be expected-- between Political Officials' Attitudes towards the CAA, and the CAA's relation to local government. This

correlation held for all subscales except familiarity with the CAA (which did not differentiate between groups).

E. Fiscal Health

o Mode of Management

Overall Fiscal Health was not closely correlated with CAA Mode of Management. CAA's with Democratic Management styles did not have ownership of any facilities while three more centrally controlled CAA's were owners of facilities.

CAA's with Democratic, open styles were found to use volunteers extensively, while centralized/authoritarian agencies used volunteers only minimally.

o Communication with Staff

Overall Fiscal Health tended to be related to two aspects of staff communications: openness of information-sharing, and two-way flow of communication.

Lack of two way information flow appeared related to CAA's with serious fiscal management problems and consequent impact of fiscal matters on staff morale. This was also strongly correlated with openness of communication.

Openness of information-sharing also coincided with extensive utilization of volunteers. The same was true with regard to two way communication.

Staff understanding and acceptance of director's role and policies--and director's open door policy--were negatively related to funding ratio--but positively related to lack of serious fiscal management problems and consequent fiscal input or staff morale.

o Director Commitment to Staff Development

CAA's with commitment to staff development were positively related to overall fiscal health, extensive use of volunteers, and absence of serious fiscal management problems and consequent morale troubles.

o Director's Strategy for Agency Image

A modest positive tendency was found relating overall fiscal health to Director's implementation of the "Unified Agency" concept. These CAA's were found to be more likely to use volunteers, and to not have serious fiscal management or morale problems.

o Role and Relationship with Board

Directors at agencies with higher rankings on overall fiscal health were generally those with positive/cooperative relationships with their Boards. Positive relationship with Board correlated with lack of serious financial management problems, while most CAA's without a positive board-director relationship did have serious fiscal management problems.

o Director's Allocation of Time

Directors who devoted major effort to three or fewer areas of activity were ranked lowest on overall fiscal health. A positive correlation was found between number of areas of major activity, and CAA fiscal health.

Directors who devoted major time to resource development were found at virtually all of the CAA's that were in good overall fiscal health. These agencies included all those that used volunteers extensively. Although some fiscal management

problems existed at these agencies, no serious impact on morale was found at CAA's where directors devoted time to Resource Development.

Directors who did not devote major time to networking with local organization made minimal use of volunteers at their agencies.

Three of five directors who devoted major time to work with public officials were at CAA's which owned their own facilities. (No other CAA's owned a facility.) Two of the CAA's had obtained their facilities in transactions with local government--although neither had occurred recently. The most recently obtained facility was purchased on very favorable terms from a local school board.

Director time devoted to staff development was found to be correlated closely with overall CAA fiscal health. This factor also tended to differentiate CAA's which obtained substantial local government support, from those that did not.

o Board Chairperson's Activity Level/Areas

Positive correlations were found between overall fiscal health and Board Chairperson's Activity Level and Areas of Activity. These correlations narrowly missed significance at the .05 level.

o Board Activity

A positive tendency was noted relating overall fiscal health to boards with actively functioning committee systems. CAA's with functioning Board committee systems made moderate to

extensive use of volunteers. CAA's without functioning board committees had minimal use of volunteers.

A strong positive relationship was found between Board Activity in the area of fiscal monitoring, and overall fiscal health. This included a lack of serious impact on morale based on presence of fiscal problems, at CAA's where Boards participate, at least to a moderate degree, in fiscal monitoring. CAA's whose boards are active in fiscal monitoring were found to utilize volunteers more extensively than those where no such monitoring occurred. No CAA's with extensive fiscal monitoring owned their own facilities.

A less strong positive relation was found between Board Activity in the area of Evaluation, and overall fiscal health. This differentiated CAA's with extensive use of volunteers from those with minimal use, as well.

o Strategy Mix

CAA's that developed their mix of operating strategies as the result of agency planning were found to include the CAA's that were most fiscally healthy--based on overall fiscal health ratings--while at least "fiscally healthy" CAA's had not developed their strategies through a planned process. CAA's that used planning to develop their strategy mix were found to avoid serious morale problems based on fiscal concerns, even at CAA's with serious fiscal management difficulties.

CAA's that develop their strategies in a linked/unified manner were seen as more likely to be in good overall fiscal

health. These CAA's use volunteers more extensively than CAA's that operate their strategies in a compartmentalized manner.

CAA's whose primary strategy was Service Delivery tended to be less well off on overall fiscal health, although no strong correlation was found matching positive fiscal health to another primary strategy.

CAA's which devoted 20% or more of their effort to advocacy were generally among the healthier CAA's in terms of fiscal health. A less strong tendency in this regard was found for CAA's that devoted at least 10% of their effort to Resource Development.

o Relation to Local Government

Overall fiscal health and relationship to local government were precisely correlated. The top six agencies on overall fiscal health had close relationships with local government; the bottom four CAA's did not. This translated into a positive correlation between relation to local government and overall funding ratio--with the exception of one CAA which did not operate a Head Start program. A strong correlation, as expected, was found between the "local government support" fiscal subscale, and relation to local government.

F. Board CAA Health

o Mode of Management

With two exceptions, overall Board CAA Health rankings parallel a summary composite of elements of democratic

control at CAA's, minus the number of elements of central control.

Democratic/Open style was found to correlate with positive Board Understanding and Performance of its role.

Autocratically run CAA's were found to have Boards with limited understanding of their role, and unsatisfactory performance.

o Communication With Staff

Communication with Staff was not found to be closely related to overall Board CAA Health. However, CAA's with fully open, 2-way flow of information tended to be the CAA's with better Board understanding and performance of their roles.

o Director Commitment to Staff Development

As above, overall Board Health was not closely related to this item. However, CAA's with commitment to staff development tend to be those whose Boards have also developed with regard to understanding and performing their roles.

o Director Strategy for Agency Image

Director's preference for high visibility for the CAA tended to be related to overall Board CAA Health.

Director's preference for lower visibility for themselves also tended to be related to overall Board CAA Health.

Four CAA's with High Visibility had 100% quorums at Board meetings. Only two of six CAA's that opted for lower overall visibility matched this Board attendance record.

o Director Role, Relationship with Board

Director's role and relationship with Board were not found to

be significantly correlated with overall Board health. However, cooperative and positive relationships were related to two subscales: quorums and Board performance.

o Director's Allocation of Time

Not surprisingly, a positive correlation was found between CAA's whose directors devoted time to Board Support, and overall Board Health. This tendency was also found with regard to Board Performance.

Negative correlations were found between Board Health and Performance, and two areas of executive director attention. Directors who spent major time working on Program Operation and/or with Public Officials did not tend to be found at CAAs with have positive ratings on Board Health.

CAA's where directors did not spend major time on Staff Development tended to be agencies where Boards' sense of their role was not clear.

o Board Chairpersons' Role

Board Chairperson's areas of activity were positively correlated with Board CAA Health, significant of the .05 level. Board level of activity was not as closely correlated. Correlations were found between Board Chair's areas of activity, and Boards' Understanding their Role and Board Performance.

o Board Activity

CAA's that did not have a functioning Board Committee System tended to be weak in the areas of Board understanding of their role, and Board performance.

Boards that were active in the area of evaluation were found to have good understanding of their role.

Boards active in Personnel Matters had 100% success in achieving quorums.

CAA's with less than 10% vacancy rate on their Boards also had 100% success at achieving quorums.

o Strategy Mix

CAA's whose strategy mix was developed through planning tended to be more likely to achieve quorums at Board meetings. Lack of a Board role in planning of strategy mix tended to be indicative of lower overall Board CAA Health.

Positive CAA Board Health was related to CAA's that pursued overall coordinated strategies with emphasis on Advocacy and Community Organization. The same was true of CAA's that did not devote 80% of their effort to Service Delivery.

VIII: REVISITS TO THE CAA'S IN 1984: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, COMPARED TO
1981

A. General Changes Between 1981 to 1984

The ten agencies were revisited during September and October, 1984--three to four years after the initial visits. The section that follows reports on the extent to which tendencies and correlations noted in 1981 were found again in 1984, under partially changed circumstances.

Before presenting this data, some of the pertinent changes are noted, below:

- o In 1981, CAA's and their constituencies were just beginning to feel the impact of the Reagan budget cuts. By the Fall of 1984, agencies had felt its impact and had time to react, adapt, adjust, or collapse in response. Thus, 1984 findings are influenced by the continuing impact of "fiscal austerity."
- o Programs funded by CSA through 1981 were transferred to New York State under the Community Services Block Grant. The programs received an initial 26% cut in its basic "Local Initiative" (core) funding in Fiscal Year 1982, and the annual allocation has remained at this level (a supplemental amount, less than \$10,000 per CAA, was awarded in 1983, out of reprogrammed funds. 1984's allocation returned to the lower base amount.) Thus, by 1984, CAA's had had time to adjust to the cut in core funds, either by modifying programs or administrative procedures, or seeking alternative sources of funds (or equivalent resources) to replace the cut funds.

- o The State, in assuming contractual responsibility for the Community Service Block Grant, assumed legislative mandates to monitor and provide technical assistance to these agencies. The State's procedures in this area had not become effectively routinized by the time of my revisits.
- o Five of the ten CAA's had undergone some type of change in the Executive Director position, from the time of our initial visit. These changes are summarized here:
 - At the time of our initial visit to LCCAA, the Executive Director--who had been there since the agency began--was on terminal vacation leave. The Board selected her replacement--a staff program director--one week after our visit. Thus, at this CAA, there has been continuity since January, 1981.
 - At the time of our initial visit to WHAP, we noted some friction between the Director and his Board Chairperson--who had previously served as Acting Director for a year. For the past two years, the Acting Director has--again--been the person who was Board Chairperson in 1981.
 - PCCAC went through two Directors after replacing the Acting Director who was there at the time of our initial visit. The current incumbent has provided stability in this position for two years. She first joined the agency as Head Start Director on the first day of our initial visit.
 - ACCAA underwent a severe fiscal crisis which contributed

to the "downfall" of the Director we'd met in late 1980, and his successor who had been his deputy. The agency's Transportation Coordinator assumed the Executive Director position in 1982 "because there wasn't anyone else." He surprised some people by not presiding over the agency's funeral.

- MCCAP's director has been suffering for over a year with a debilitating back condition that has led to his being on medical leave for much of the past year. The Fiscal Director has served as Acting or Interim Director during much of this period. A final determination of whether the Executive Director would return was to be made soon after my revisit--thus ending a period of uncertainty and drift for the CAA. (The Fiscal Director has, after the revisit, been named Executive Director--although as of March, 1985, no new Fiscal Director had been brought on Board.)

(As can be seen from these summaries, none of the five "new" directors are new to their agencies or community. However, their mode of operating often differed from their predecessor.)

- o One CAA succeeded in gaining title to its Headquarters, bringing the number of CAA's owning facilities to four of ten. Two others are currently trying to do the same. (One is under increased pressure to do so, in 1985, as its rented building was burned to the ground in March of 1985.) The successful CAA differs from the other CAA's that own

facilities, in that this was purchased from a private owner, by a CAA that does not enjoy close cooperation from local government. (The purchased building had been rented by the CAA for the past five or more years, at below-market rates.)

- o One Director indicated that many of his approaches and priorities had changed, because he had largely accomplished his initial objectives. (Most other "old" directors did not change strategies or approaches, although some changes occurred in response to current community needs and/or due to funding realities.)
- o Only two Board Chairpersons were the same in 1984 as in 1981. Most new chairpersons had been on the Board in 1981. One had not--but she had been President of Head Start Policy Council.

B. Morale

o Mode of Management

As in 1981, strong tendencies were seen in 1984 relating positive staff morale to Open, Democratic Management style. Three CAA's were characterized as fully Democratic Management style. Three CAA's were characterized as fully Democratic/Open in practice. These three ranked first to third on staff morale. Other CAA's had either "Tight/Central" management style, or mixed styles, with the lowest three CAA's applying mixed styles, with the lowest two including elements of "Laissez Faire" within their mixture. Most (7/10) CAA's were found to employ a mixture of elements

with regard to organizational compliance. Since only one CAA (with excellent morale) was seen as obtaining organizational compliance strictly through normative means, no correlation could be attempted on this variable.

o Communication with Staff

As in 1981, staff morale was found to be positively correlated with Full, Open Information Sharing.

Directors' maintaining open door policies towards staff was found to be more closely related to positive staff morale at the time of the 1984 revisit than in 1981, when a modest tendency was noted. On the other hand, the relation of effective two-way information flow appeared stronger in 1981, although it remained a clear tendency in 1984 as well.

Weekly senior staff meetings were found to be related to positive morale in 1981, but this did not appear to be a factor in 1984. Required Monthly reports had tended to be related to positive morale in 1981, but--if anything--the reverse appeared to be the tendency in 1984. Three of the five agencies rated highest on morale required monthly reports; all five of the lower ranked CAA's required monthly reports.

Staff understanding and acceptance of the Director's sense of purpose appeared to be positively related to staff morale in 1981, and the same appeared to be indicated as a (less strong) tendency in 1984.

o Director Commitment to Staff Development

In 1981, a perfect correlation was found between Director

Commitment to Staff Development, and staff morale. A clear tendency was found in 1984, although it was definitely less strong than at the initial time.

o Director's Strategy for Agency Image

Staff morale was more clearly related to the question of whether CAA's were operated in a programatically integrated manner, in 1981. By 1984, all except one CAA director at least intended the CAA's programs to be perceived in a unified manner. (The one CAA that did not ranked lowest on staff morale.) Morale at CAA's where the unified agency concept was operative did not differ substantially from CAA's where the concept had not yet been realized.

Director preference for CAA's having high visibility was positively related to staff morale in 1981. Upon revisit, their tendency was not supported. High visibility was preferred by CAA's ranked highest, and lowest, on staff morale.

o Role and Relationship to Board

The relation noted in 1981, between staff morale and good, supportive/cooperative relationships between Director and Board, was less clear in 1984. Most CAA's (seven of ten) has at least good relations between Director and Board. These CAA's included the four CAA's ranked highest on staff morale, but also two of the three lowest.

With regard to cooperative relationship of director and board being related to staff morale, no such tendency could be reported from the 1984 data. It is noted that the three

CAA's that ranked lowest on staff morale did not have cooperative working relationships between directors and Boards.

o Director's Allocation of Time

In 1981, the mean number of areas to which Directors devoted major amounts of time/effort, was 4.0. A tendency was noted relating positive staff morale to CAA's where the number of major areas of director's activity was five or more. In 1984, the mean number of areas where directors devoted major attention had risen to 5.0. Number of areas did not differentiate CAA's with regard to morale level.

The number of CAA Directors whose primary area of concentration was Administration increased from 3 to 7. In 1981, the three CAA's all had unsatisfactory ratings on morale. In 1984, the three CAA's (out of ten) that did not have Administration as its primary area of concentration had the highest rankings on staff morale.

The number of CAA Directors devoting major attention to Resource Development increased from six in 1981, to eight in 1984. With the top 3 CAA's, and the lowest 5, as ranked on staff morale, all having directors that devoted major time in this area, no differentiation could be made.

CAA's whose directors devoted major time to networking with local officials tended to have better staff morale in 1981. No such correlation was found in 1984.

A negative correlation, found in 1981, between Director's level of activity with Public Officials and staff morale,

could not be reconfirmed in 1984. Seven CAA's now devote major time to this effort, compared to five in 1981. Two CAA's whose directors did not devote major time in this area, were ranked highest on morale.

Effort spent on staff development did not differentiate CAA's with regard to morale, in 1984. In 1981, a parallel was noted between CAA's that were ranked low on morale and CAA's that did not have major attention paid to staff development.

o Board Chair Role

Board Chairperson level and quality of activity, both positively correlated with morale in 1981, were not closely related to morale in 1984.

o Board Activity

In 1981, staff morale was found to be better at CAA's whose Boards had functional committee systems, and tended to be better at CAA's whose Boards were at least moderately active in the areas of planning, evaluation, and fiscal monitoring. None of these areas appeared closely related to staff morale in 1984.

The only Board area of activity that tended to be related to staff morale in 1984 was resource development.

o Agency Strategies

Staff morale tended to be better at CAA's where strategies had been thoughtfully planned, in both 1981 and 1984. Board involvement in this planning tended to be related to positive staff morale in 1981, but was not strongly related in 1984.

CAA's with linked strategies tended to have higher staff

morale then those with fragmented approaches at both times. This tendency was stronger in 1981.

In 1984, more CAA's found Service Delivery to be appropriate as a major program focus. Nonetheless, five CAA's expressed the intent to reduce or keep Service Delivery Activity to below 70% of all CAA effort. These agencies included the CAA's ranked first to third on staff morale.

Modest tendencies were found in 1984, in the same direction as correlations noted in 1981, linking positive morale to CAA's that incorporate advocacy and community organization into their over-all strategies. A similar tendency had been found in 1981, with regard to CAA's devoting at least 10% of their effort to resource development. This did not hold in 1984, as Resource Development was a major activity at CAA's with both good, and inadequate, staff morale.

C. Program Activity

o Mode of Management

Modest tendencies had been noted in 1981, linking mode of management and CAA health with regard to program activity. These were not found to differentiate on this measure of agency health in 1984.

o Communication With Staff

As in 1981, CAA program activity variables were not differentiated on the basis of director communication with staff.

o Director Commitment to Staff Development

The tendency for Director's commitment to Staff Development to be related to positive rankings on CAA Program Activity was stronger in 1981. In 1984, the tendency was clearest on the "Program Development" subscale, where the three CAA's that were growing in 1984 were CAA's with commitment to staff development. (This subscale had not been significant in 1981.)

o Director's Strategy for Agency Image

High rankings with regard to program activity were related, in 1981, to Director's preference for CAA's having a Unified Agency Image, and High Visibility. These items were not clearly related to Program Activity in 1984.

There was a tendency, in 1984, for CAA's whose director preferred low visibility for himself to have higher program activity rankings. This had not been found in 1981.

o Director's Relationship With Board

A positive relationship observed in 1981 correlating director's relationship to Board with two subscales of Program Activity could not be reconfirmed in 1984. This was largely because an increased number of CAA's had positive relations between Director and Board, which left insufficient room for analysis of differences.

A positive relation was found between Program Activity and Directors' (cooperative) role with CAA Boards. This overall relation was stronger in 1984. In 1981, the relationship was stronger with regard to two Program Activity subscales: Scope and Appropriateness of programs.

o Directors' Allocation of Time

A strong tendency was found, in 1984, for CAA's with high overall Program Activity ratings to have directors who devote major time to 5 or more areas of activity. (In 1981, a less strong tendency noted that CAA's ranked lower on Program Activity had Directors who devoted time to three or fewer areas.)

Directors' devoting major time to Resource Development and Networking with Local Organizations had been related to Program Activity ratings in 1981. This relationship was only confirmed for Networking with Local Organizations in 1984. Eight of the ten CAA Directors expended major time on Resource Development and no differentiation was found. The relationship found for Networking with Local Programs held for "Scope" and "Program Development" subscales as well.

Two negative correlations had been noted in 1981. These indicated that Program Activity ratings were poorer when CAA Directors devoted major effort to Work with Public Officials and Program Operations. A slight tendency supported the former of these two negative correlations in 1984. The latter was not substantiated.

o Board Chairperson's Activity Level/Areas

Rankings of Board Chairperson's level of activity and areas of positive activity were significantly correlated to overall Program Activity Health ratings in 1981. In 1984, Board Chairperson's level of activity was not found to be closely correlated, and areas of activity showed only a modest

positive tendency in relation to overall program activity.

Scope of CAA programming, closely correlated to Board Chair Activity in 1981, was not significantly related in 1984.

o Board Activity

In 1981, Program Activity Health was found to be related to Boards having functioning committee systems. In 1984, this was true of the two CAA's that ranked highest on Program Activity, but three CAA's, ranked fifth or lower, also had functioning committees. Thus, the relationship was not significant.

The two CAA's that ranked highest on 1984 Program Activity were the only two CAA's with at least moderate Board activity in Evaluation. This suggests possible support for the tendency found in 1981--that Program Activity Health tended to be found at CAA's with at least moderate Board activity in Evaluation. No such support was found for a possible tendency relating Board Fiscal Monitoring Activity to Program Activity Health.

In 1981, Board Program Monitoring activity appeared to be related to CAA's developing programs based on community needs. In 1984, Program Monitoring tended to be related to overall Program Activity Health, although the subscale that had been related in 1981 did not appear closely related in 1984.

o Strategy Mix

A strong tendency was found, linking positive ratings on overall Program Activity to CAA's actively planning their

strategy mix. This was true in both 1981 and 1984 and was actually stronger in 1984. Also stronger in 1984 was the correlation between Board involvement in this planning process, and program activity health. These relationships held for Program Activity subscales (scope, appropriateness, program development).

A positive relationship was also found between CAA's that linked their strategy efforts, to overall Program Activity. This was a stronger tendency in 1981, but still clear in 1984. Deemphasis on Service Delivery, and inclusion of Advocacy, Resource Development, and Community Organization were positively correlated to overall Program Activity Health in 1981. With the three CAA's ranked highest on overall Program Activity concurring in these positions, the same tendencies held in 1984. They also held for Program Activity subscales, including program effectiveness. Resource Development was less clearly correlated because strong emphasis in this area in 1984 made it a strategy endorsed by both high and low ranking CAA's.

D. Community Leader's Attitudes Towards CAA

o Mode of Management

Although Democratic Leadership style had been related to Community Leader Attitudes towards CAA's, in 1981, this tendency could not be reconfirmed in 1984. Although two of the three highest ranked CAA's (based on Community Leader Attitudes) maintained a democratic style and mode of

management, most CAA's adopted mixed styles that do not lend themselves to these comparisons.

o Communication With Staff

Community Leader Attitudes towards CAA's, which had appeared to be related to Openness of Communication with staff in 1981, was not strongly related to Communication or any of its subscales in 1984.

o Director Commitment to Staff Development

As with the abovementioned items, Community Leader's Attitudes towards the CAA no longer tended to be related to whether director demonstrated a commitment to staff development.

o Director Strategy for Agency Image

Community Leader Attitudes towards the CAA were found to be positively related to Director's preference for CAA's to have high visibility. This relationship had been stronger in 1981 than in 1984. In 1981, the overall correlation was virtually perfect, and all subscales showed positive correlation. In 1984, no subscales showed significant correlation.

In 1981, Director's preference for a Unified Agency Image tended to be related to Community Leader Attitude toward CAA's--overall and on all subscales. In 1984, virtually all CAA Directors except for the lowest ranked CAA (with regard to Community Leader attitude) preferred a Unified Agency Image. No meaningful differentiation was discernable.

o Director Role and Relationship to Board

In 1984, no differentiation was found among CAA's with regard

to the relationship of Directors towards CAA Boards, as most CAA directors had good relations with their Boards. No significant difference in Community Leader Attitudes towards CAA's was found in relation to the director's relationship to the Board.

The four CAA's that were ranked lowest on Community Leader Attitudes were CAA's where Directors' relations with Boards were not strongly positive/cooperative.

In 1981, the strongest correlation was found between Director's role and relationship, and community leader representation on the Board. This was not a strong correlation in 1984 (a slight tendency, barely worth mentioning.)

o Director's Allocation of Time

Number of areas that received major attention of CAA Directors did not differentiate CAA's on the basis of Community Leader Attitude towards them, in 1984. (A relation had been noted in 1981.)

In 1981, a positive relationship was noted between Community Leader Attitude and CAA Director attention to Resource Development. In 1984, eight of the ten CAA Directors--including the top five as rated on Community Leader Attitude--devoted major attention to Resource Development. A tendency can be said to remain, although the real tendency appears to be that executive directors are focusing major attention on resource development.

A positive relationship between Community Leader Attitudes

and Director Time devoted to Networking with Local Organization was found in 1981, but was not supported in 1984. The same is true for a negative correlation to Directors devoting time to Program Operations.

A tendency identified in 1981 with regard to Director time devoted to staff development was not supported in 1984.

A tendency was found in 1984, relating Director attention to Board Support, to Community Leader attitude toward the CAA. No such tendency had been noted in 191.

- o Board Chairperson's Level/Areas of Activity

Board Chairperson's Level and Areas of Activity were not significantly correlated to Community Leader Attitudes in either 1981 or 1984. Modest tendencies in that direction were noted in 1984.

- o Board Activity

Community Leader Attitudes towards CAA's was found to be more positive for CAA's with actively functioning committees, in 1981 and 1984. The tendency was stronger in 1981. Board activity in the areas of Evaluation, Fiscal Monitoring, and Program Monitoring tended to be positively related to Community Attitudes towards CAA's. The tendency with regard to Evaluation was stronger in 1981. The tendency with regard to Program Monitoring was stronger in 1984.

- o Strategy Mix

In 1981, Community Leader Attitudes towards CAA's had appeared to be related to whether CAA's used a planning process to develop their strategy mix. This was not

supported by 1984 findings.

A strong correlation between CAA's which link their strategies, and CAA rankings on Community Leader CAA Health ratings was found in 1981 and 1984. This correlation tended to hold for all four subscales of Community Leader Attitude as well.

CAA's with over 20% of their activity devoted to Advocacy were highly rated with regard to Community Leader Attitudes towards CAA's. This tendency was stronger in 1984 than in 1981. In 1984, five CAA's devoted over 20% of their effort to advocacy, and these were ranked no lower than sixth on Community Leader Attitudes.

More modest tendencies in 1984 supported relationships identified in 1981 between lower emphasis on service delivery, and greater emphasis on community organization.

Resource Development received attention from both high and low ranked CAA's, in 1984, thus not sustaining the 1981 tendency for Resource Development activity to be related to Community Leader Attitudes towards the CAA.

E. Political Officials' Attitudes

- o Mode of Management, Communication with Staff, Commitment to Staff Development, Strategy for Agency Image, Director's Relationship to Board

No close correlations were noted between any of the above areas, and Political Officials, attitudes towards the CAA, in 1981 or 1984, with one exception. In 1984, a positive

tendency was noted relating Executive Directors' preference for high personal visibility, and Political Leader's Attitudes towards the CAA.

o Director's Allocation of Time

Strong correlations in 1981 related Political Officials' attitudes to number of areas of that Directors devoted major time to, and to CAA's where directors devoted major time to Resource Development. Neither of these could be supported by 1984 findings. With regard to Resource Development, eight of ten CAA's--evenly divided among upper and lower halves based on Political Official Attitudes--had directors that considered resource development a major aspect of their activity.

o Board Chairperson's Level of Activity

This was not found to be significantly related at either point in time. The one subscale that tended to be related in 1981 was not found to be significantly related in 1984.

o Board Activity

In 1981, Political Officials Attitudes towards the CAA appeared to be related to presence of an actively functioning Board committee system; and at least moderate levels of Board activity in the areas of Evaluation and Fiscal Monitoring. In 1984, the tendency was found to hold with regard to Board Fiscal Monitoring activity, but not for Evaluation effort. Functioning Board Committee Systems were only found to be related to one subscale: Public Sector representation on the CAA Boards.

- o Strategy Mix

In 1981, Political Officials' attitudes towards CAA's appeared related to whether CAA's strategies had developed through a conscious planning process. 1984 findings did not support this. One subscale, Political Officials' familiarity with the CAA, did appear to be related to this variable in both 1981 and 1984. Political Official representation on the CAA Board was a second subscale that appeared to be related in 1981, but this did not hold in 1984.

Very slight tendencies were noted in 1981 and 1984 with regard to Linked Strategies being related to Political Official attitude. In 1984, this was more notable with regard to one subscale: Cooperation of Political Officials.

No other aspects of CAA strategy mix were found to be related to Political Official Attitudes in 1984. (Tendencies had been noted with regard to both Advocacy and Resource Development in 1981.)

- o Relation to Local Government

A virtually perfect correlation was found between Public Official attitude toward CAA, and CAA Relation to Local Government as a measure of CAA Health. This correlation, very strong in 1981, was even stronger in 1984.

F. Fiscal Health

- o Mode of Management

Overall fiscal health was not closely correlated with mode of management at either time.

Subscales that appeared related in 1981 were not as clearly related in 1984. Facility Ownership no longer correlated with non-democratic management styles. Extensive use of Volunteers no longer correlated with strictly democratic style, although minimal use of volunteers still was related to Centralized Control.

o Communication With Staff

Overall Fiscal Health tended to be related to Full and Two-Way Information-Sharing, in both 1981 and 1984. In both years, some relation was found between Two Way Information Sharing and lack of serious fiscal management problems.

A correlation found in 1981 between two-way communication and CAA's that use volunteers extensively did not hold up in 1984. In 1981 and 1984 staff understanding and acceptance of Directors' Role and Policies was positively related to lack of serious fiscal management problems. This also tended to be related to lack of morale problems caused by fiscal situations at both times. One negative tendency was noted in 1981, but was not supported in 1984. This was Funding Ratio--which in 1981 correlated negatively with staff understanding of Director's role. In 1984, no statistically meaningful differences were noted.

Overall Fiscal Health was clearly less favorable at CAA's where most staff did not indicate understanding and acceptance of the Director's role and purpose in 1984.

o Director Commitment to Staff Development

Overall fiscal health rankings tended to be higher at CAA's

where the Director was committed to staff development, in both 1981 and 1984. Three subscales--Extensiveness of Volunteer Usage, Absence of Fiscal Management Problems, and Consequent Morale Problems--were positively related to this variable in 1981, but no noteworthy correlation was found in 1984.

o Director's Strategy for Agency Image

In both 1981 and 1984, CAA's whose directors felt a unified agency image was important generally were ranked highly on overall fiscal health, and these CAA's were found to be more likely to use volunteers (extremely) and to not have serious fiscal management or morale problems.

In 1984, all five Directors of CAA's who wanted High Visibility for their CAA's had Healthy Funding Ratios of Total Program Funding to Local Initiative funds. Only two of five CAA's that did not prefer high visibility for directors, had healthy funding ratios. No such finding had been noted in 1981.

CAA's whose directors did not prefer high visibility for the CAA in 1984 were found to be less likely to have financial management problems and consequent serious morale problems. This was not noted in 1981

o Director's Role and Relationship With Board

Directors with good to excellent relationships with their boards were more likely to be found at CAA's with higher rankings on overall fiscal health, at the time of both study visits. A tendency for CAA's with good to excellent

Board-Director relationships to have fewer fiscal management and morale problems was also found in 1981 and 1984, but was stronger in 1981.

Directors whose relationship with Boards in 1981 was "Cooperative/ Supportive" had been found to be related to the same items mentioned above for "good to excellent" relationships. In 1984, no such parallel was found.

o Director's Allocation of Time

Number of areas to which CAA Directors devote major time was positively related to overall fiscal health in 1981. A weaker tendency was noted in 1984.

A positive correlation between fiscal health and Director's devoting major time to Resource Development could not be reconfirmed in 1984, as only two CAA's--one ranked high, one low--did not have major effort spent on Resource Development. Volunteer usage was related to CAA Director devoting major time to networking with CAA's in 1981. This tendency was not confirmed in 1984.

A positive correlation of Directors' allocating major time to work with public officials, with CAA ownership of facilities, was noted in 1981. This was not reconfirmed in 1984, as one CAA without a good relation to public officials obtained its headquarters, thus reducing the correlation to non-significant differences.

Director time devoted to staff development was found to be positively correlated with overall fiscal health in both 1981 and 1984. In both years, CAA's without support from local

government tended to be those without CAA Director's devoting major time to staff development. In 1984, this item also differentiated CAA's that tended to have fiscal management problems and consequent morale problems. (This was not noted in 1981.)

Differences with regard to Fiscal Management and/or morale problems were also found for three other areas of CAA Directors' attention, where no such tendency had been noted in 1981. These areas were Program Operation, Board Development, and Board Support.

o Board Chair Activity Level/Areas

Positive correlations were found between Board Chairperson Activity, and overall Fiscal Health, in 1981. In 1984, non-significant, slightly negative correlations were found between these items.

o Board Activity

A positive tendency relating Overall Fiscal Health to Boards with Actively Functioning Committee Systems was not reconfirmed in 1984. However, a strong correlation between Active Board Committee Systems and Extensive use of Volunteers was found in 1981 and 1984.

A strong relationship noted in 1981, between overall fiscal health and board activity in the area of fiscal monitoring, was not supported in 1984. No subscales showed substantial correlations in this variable in 1984.

A less strong tendency had been noted in 1981, between Board Evaluation activity and overall fiscal health. This tendency

was not supported in 1984.

The only area of Board Activity that was related to overall fiscal health (and subscales related to Fiscal Management and Morale problems and use of Volunteers) in 1984, was Resource Development, where a noteworthy tendency was found. This area was not found to differentiate CAA's on the basis of fiscal health in 1981.

o Strategy Mix

CAA's that planned their strategy mix were found to include the CAA's with higher to overall ratings on overall fiscal health, in 1981. This tendency was not supported in 1984. However, Fiscal impact on Morale was positively correlated to Planned Strategy Mix in both years.

In both 1981 and 1984, CAA's with linked/unified strategies were found to be more likely to be in good overall fiscal health, and to use volunteers extensively.

In 1981, deemphasis on Service Delivery, and positive emphasis on Advocacy (and to a lesser extent Resource Development) were related to overall fiscal health. In 1984, no strategy area's emphasis was significantly correlated to overall Fiscal Health.

o Relation to Local Government

Very close correlations were found between Overall Fiscal Health and CAA relation to local government, in 1981 and 1984. While strong in 1984, the correlation was less strong than the precise correlation found in 1981. (In 1981, the top 6 CAA's had close relations to local government. In

1984, six of the top seven CAA's had such close relations, including the top four CAA's.)

G. Board CAA Health

o Mode of Management

Overall Board Health was found to be related to elements of democratic control, in both 1981 and 1984. Most notable in 1984 were the following:

- the top two agencies, with regard to Board Health, employed Democratic/Open management style, while the lowest ranked CAA was Autocratic. The styles of all seven agencies ranked in between, were mixed.
- Weekly senior staff meetings were characteristic of 4 of 5 CAA's rated in the top half on Board Health; and only 1 of 5 rated in the bottom half.

o Communication with Staff, Director Commitment to Staff Development

Neither of these items was found to be closely related to overall CAA Board Health in either 1981 or 1984. In 1981, CAA's committed to Staff Development tended to have Boards that were stronger in the areas of understanding and performance of their role. This was not supported in 1984, although CAA's with commitment to staff development tended to have better success with Boards' achieving quorums.

o Director Strategy for Agency Image

Director preference for high visibility for the CAA tended to be related to overall Board CAA Health in 1981, but this was

not supported by 1984 rankings. In both years, a strong correlation was found between CAA's Board attendance (percentage of quorums) and preference for high visibility for the CAA.

Preference for a unified agency image was found to be positively related to Board understanding of its role in 1984. This had not been a strong correlation in 1981.

Preference for High Visibility of Executive Director was related to low understanding of Board Role in 1984.

o Director Role, Relationship with Board

Director's role and relationship with board were not found to be significantly correlated with overall Board Health in 1981 or 1984. Cooperative relations between Board and Director appeared related to Quorum and Board Performance subscales in 1981, but not in 1984. In 1984, they appeared related to another subscale: Board understanding of its role.

o Director's Allocation of Time

The positive correlation found between overall Board Health, and Director's time spent in Board Support, in 1981, was not confirmed in 1984. Supportive tendencies were found for two Board Health subscales: Understanding Board Role, and Board Performance (as in 1981).

A strong negative correlation between Board Health and Director devoting major time to networking with public officials was found in both 1981 and 1984. In 1981, a negative correlation was also found between Board Health and Director devoting major time to program operations. This was

not supported in 1984.

A tendency noted in 1981--relating directors who did not devote major time to staff development, with CAA's whose Boards were lacking in role clarity--was not found in 1984.

In 1984 a very strong positive correlation was found between overall Board Health, and CAA's whose directors devoted major time to Resource Development. The top six agencies (based on Board Health) had directors who devoted major time to Board Health. This was true of only two of the four lowest ranked CAA's.

o Board Chairperson's Role

Both level of Board Chairperson's Activity, and areas of (positive) activity were significantly correlated, at .05 level, with overall Board Health in 1984. In 1981, only the correlation with areas of positive activity had been significant at the .05 level. The significant correlation also translated to positive correlation with understanding and performance of Board roles.

o Board Activity

In 1981, CAA's with functioning Board committee structures tended to be better off than those lacking in this area, with regard to Boards' understanding and performance of their role. In 1984, overall Board Health, and Board Performance of its role, appeared to be related to functioning Board committee systems.

A tendency for Boards active in Evaluation to have good understanding of their role was found in 1981 and 1984.

Modest tendencies in 1984 also related Evaluation to Board Performance of its role, and overall Agency Health.

In both 1981 and 1984, CAA Boards that were active in Personnel matters achieved quorums at 100% of their Board meetings.

A tendency was also found, in 1984, for CAA's that were active in other areas--Fiscal Monitoring, Planning, Program Monitoring, Resource Development--to be related to overall Board Health, good quorum records, and positive Board Performance.

A 1981 finding indicated that CAA's with low Board vacancy rates had 100% success in achieving quorums at Board meetings. This feat was not repeated in 1984, although quorum rates were generally high at these CAA's.

o Strategy Mix

In 1981, a tendency was found for CAA's whose strategy mix was planned, to be CAA's whose Boards usually had quorums at their Board meetings. This was not confirmed in 1984, although a positive tendency was noted with regard to Board Performance. Planning of Strategy did not correlate closely to Board Health in 1984.

In 1981, Board Health appeared to be related to CAA overall coordinated strategies which emphasized advocacy and community organization and/or had a relative deemphasis on Service Delivery. In 1984, the strategy that was most strongly related to CAA Board Health was Resource Development, with the top five CAA's devoting more than 10%

of their effort to this area, while only one of the bottom five devoted over 10% of their effort to Resource Development. Some tendencies were noted in 1984, relating community organization, advocacy, and lower emphasis on service delivery, to Board performance of its role. Except for advocacy, the same tendencies were found with regard to Board understanding of its role.

IX: THE HUMAN ELEMENT: INTANGIBLE BUT VITAL

I have attempted to present schema for making generalized assessments of how strategies and approaches of agencies, directors, and boards have been related to CAA "health" during recent years, especially since Reagan's election and consequent severe limitation of funding of domestic programs. Attempts at systematic quantification lose something in the translation of human efforts that impact on human situations. The purpose of this chapter is to present several examples of this aspect of "what community action is all about." Most were identified at the time of the 1984 revisit, and demonstrate a vitality that exists and flourishes within CAA's in spite of low salaries and other pressures on these organizations. Examples like these can be found at many agencies, and in some ways are analogous to wildflowers: beautiful, growing in rough soil, often needing little in the way of nurturing except to be left alone or provided with a supportive environment. Also, like wildflowers, a prolonged drought is a serious threat, and funding cutbacks do threaten to make the human beings involved in these examples an "endangered species"... (If one carries the analogy even further, one can optimistically point to the ability of wildflower seeds to wait patiently for favorable conditions, then reemerging after long dormancy...)

Some Examples

1. (Service Delivery) - The senior nutrition program at one Hudson Valley CAA includes two components--a congregate meals program, which provides social activities as well as

nutritional needs to over 200 people at six sites around the County; and a home-delivery program for shut-ins. This second program utilizes four drivers--each delivering approximately 50 meals a day. Two of the four drivers are young women, the other two are a retired couple.

The home delivery program has a clear system of procedures which are fully understood by the drivers. Among these procedures are the following:

- o The meal must be delivered to each person, personally, each day; the individual should actually be seen.
- o If a person does not respond when the driver knocks, the driver phones the office, and backup support measures are undertaken. These include calls to the person's home, any family emergency contact, the County Office for the Aging, and police--if necessary.
- o A consistent schedule should be adhered to, as the people grow to expect the daily visit (and meal) and become anxious if the schedule is not (more-or-less) maintained.

Because of the regularity of the visits, the drivers become a vital life-line for the people they visit. Not only are they often the only social contact of the day, but the regularity of the visits affords consistency day after day--as something to be counted on. The daily visits guarantee a balanced nutritious meal, plus social contact, plus a concerned eye that is able to report on problems of mental or physical deterioration, economic or housing troubles, and so forth--in

time to prevent (or respond to) crisis.

A "typical" crisis did occur, on the day I was interviewing the component coordinator. The phone rang, she answered, and was informed that "Mrs. Sawyer" had been unable to open her door to let in the Driver. Her cries for help could be heard inside the apartment. The coordinator, in turn, told the driver to remain there until help arrived, and placed calls to the County Department for the Aging, who indicated that no emergency number existed for Mrs. Sawyer's family, and to the police. The police responded promptly--as they do partly because of their ongoing experience with the Agency. They were able to gain entry within fifteen minutes--at which point the driver left to complete her rounds. Mrs. Sawyer was taken to the hospital with a broken hip (from a fall.)

The incident led to the coordinator mentioning two other events that had occurred recently. In one, a woman had experienced a heart attack in the morning, alone, and waited for the Driver to arrive. She had 100% confidence that the driver would come, and be helpful and reassuring when she got there. The Driver was counted on, to be the familiar support person who would arrange for an ambulance, and assure that the woman would not enter the hospital anonymously--with no one aware of her whereabouts.

The second incident was more dramatic. The coordinator received a call from the local police: "Don't get too upset, but one of your vans has just been totally crushed at a highway intersection. Our officer at the scene asked us to

call you right away and say your driver is all right."

What had happened was this: a tractor trailer truck was making a left turn, appropriately. It was struck by a speeder trying to beat the light, from the opposite direction. The trailer was knocked into the air, and landed, upside down, directly on top of the second vehicle waiting at the light--the van--crushing its cab. The police approached the van, recognizing its familiar coloring and insignia, and not believing anyone could survive in the mangled, flattened mess, until they heard a woman's voice inside, saying "Oh, shit."

When they freed her (she was the wife of the older couple), her first words were "All these meals have got to be delivered. They're counting on it." She was then taken to the hospital, where, miraculously, she was treated for a bruised elbow, and released.

When the call came in to the CAA, two things occurred very quickly. First, the Coordinator alerted the Executive Director, and the two prepared to leave almost immediately for the hospital. Immediately after notifying the Director, the Coordinator called the congregate meals centers in the area served by the Driver. Backup procedures, in which volunteers deliver meals from these sites, to the homebound, went into effect, and all meals were delivered. Expressions of concern for the endangered Driver were heard all over the route.

The next day (using a substitute vehicle), the driver was

back on her route, delivering meals to her greatly relieved clients, who tearfully welcomed her back.

2. (Advocacy within Service Delivery) - At an upstate CAA, the Weatherization program had been defined, from its earliest days, as a 2-pronged approach to improving the conditions of the poor. On one hand, the agency provided valuable services to people who needed help with energy conservation measures that enabled them to heat their homes more efficiently and economically as the result of a better insulated, more tightly sealed structure and/or other measures. On the other hand, the program hired hard core unemployed individuals--initially through CETA, later by direct hires--and gave them the opportunity to develop work skills and good work habits, in a supportive environment. The Weatherization Director believed strongly in both of these objectives. He provided skill training and worked patiently to improve work habits. He assured quality of work by being responsible for determining the work needed on a home, and inspecting each unit to assure that it had been satisfactorily completed. His personal style encouraged residents to discuss their concerns with him, before, during and after their homes were weatherized, and he has a large scrapbook full of unsolicited letters of appreciation from satisfied beneficiaries.

The Weatherization Program, as designed during the Carter Administration, was based on a tripartite agreement among the U.S. Dept. of Energy, which provided funds for materials; the U.S. Dept. of Labor, which provided crew labor through CETA

training programs; and the Community Services Administration, which funded CAA's as the Administrative and operating mechanism for the program (including outreach and direct program operation.) Its stated purposes were those adhered to by LCCAA's Weatherization Director. By 1983, the primary emphasis of the program--now entirely funded through the U.S. Department of Energy, but still usually operated by CAA's--was on efficiency and quality of weatherization, with a de-emphasis on impact on local employment or development of work habits. Subcontracting Weatherization jobs to private (for profit) contractors was permitted as an option that might lead to improved efficiency and lower cost per completed unit. State procedures of fiscal review and reimbursement also favored agencies that subcontracted weatherization jobs.

In 1983, a State Weatherization Training Program featured a debate on the relative merits of subcontracting and maintaining in-house weatherization crews. This Agency's Weatherization Director spoke as a featured panelist, supporting use of in-house crews. His sensitive speech in support of the two goals of Weatherization, including enabling disadvantaged workers to gain usable skills--without sacrificing quality of work on a home--was well received.

When I revisited the Agency in 1984, I was surprised to learn that this advocate of in-house crews had shifted to subcontracting. The administrative obstacles to sustaining crews had become too difficult. Instead, an alternative was

developed. The Weatherization Director now nurtures the development of small-business entrepreneurs--primarily former crew workers, occasionally "a farmer who's down on his luck lately"--in the same manner that he previously nurtured employees. Bids are solicited monthly, announced in the local "Penny Saver" free newspaper. New prospective bidders are provided, through personalized training/ counseling, a full understanding of what is expected of them on the job, and how to analyze "bid packages" and plan out appropriate charges. As before, the Weatherization Director visits prospective clients' residences, determines the scope of work to be performed, and performs post-visit inspections of all work. His relationship to the clients remains the same, and their trust of him and his subcontractors matches their prior trust of his crews.

When this Weatherization Director inspects homes prior to Weatherization, he finds that many renters are living in conditions that are unsafe or otherwise not up to building, health or fire codes. He personally informs the building's landlord, that the units cannot be weatherized unless the dangerous conditions are corrected, first. If his gentle encouragement does not get the conditions corrected, he contacts a "friend" in the County Code Enforcement Division, and obtains cooperation from this office in getting the problem inspected and corrected. He successfully insists that matters of safety for his contractors and the clients be corrected prior to authorization of work on this unit, even

though this occasionally proved embarrassing to Board Members (County Legislators) who have close ties to some local landlords.

3. (Resource Development) - An upstate CAA serves a county with a high poverty rate (close to 20%), largely found in rural areas and small villages. The area is largely agricultural, with a substantial number of migrant workers present at specific parts of the season, and a growing population of former migrants who elected to remain in the area. One aspect of the "safety net" provided by the CAA for the area's poor is a network of "Food Pantries" and "Emergency Food Closets" at eleven locations (including churches, CAA Community Centers, and so forth.)

One staff member of this agency is the "Food Bank Coordinator". A large, earthy fellow, he does not look like your typical "resource development specialist". But his responsibility is to solicit support and contributions for the food pantry, and he has developed into an exceptionally effective hustler in carrying out his charge.

In recent years, he says that moneys available to operate his program have declined steadily, while the call for the service has risen.

In search of food contributions, and distribution of same, he logs over 100 miles a day in a pickup truck with 80,000 miles on it, which the County has agreed to maintain for the agency, although its days appear numbered. (He is "working

on" a truck rental company for a contribution of a bigger newer truck....)

In the course of the year, he expects to have picked up and distributed over 150,000 pounds of food--triple his 1981 figures. (This is exclusive of the 150,000 to 200,000 pounds of federal surplus food distributed each year for the County.) This effort involves an extensive volunteer network at the eleven food pantries and church sponsored food drives. (A large bin is moved from one market to another, as part of these drives.)

One of his tools, as he solicits products from stores, bakeries, vendors, warehouses, and so on, is an information packet that explains how the contributions made to his program can be claimed as tax deductible contributions. This has led to his regularly obtaining large numbers of day-old sandwiches, salads, milk, and juices from two major vending companies; hundreds of loaves of bread at a time from large commercial bakeries (these are then frozen in one of two large freezers purchased by the CAA with discretionary grant funds for later distribution); and quantities of other items. He also established working relationships with other food warehouse groups in neighboring counties, to exchange surplus that each might obtain--and to assist each other in food transportation when needed.

He laughs as he describes the reaction of supermarket managers when they see him drive up--as he does at least once a week. They scurry to get him "a case or two of something"

just to get rid of him.

His main motivation, he says, is meeting the needs of hungry people--and his main reward (and motivation to continue) is the appreciative looks on the faces of people when he brings a load of sandwiches, etc., to one of the Senior Citizen Centers.

For better or worse, his effort and style are so individualized that the CAA would be hard pressed to re-establish his system if he was unable to perform his job.

4. (Rural Style Community Mobilization) - Rural New York, like parts of rural New England, contains many poor persons whose pride and life style make it difficult for them to ask for, or accept, "a handout." Providing support and services to this population becomes a delicate balancing act which has been well mastered by the staffs of one of CAA's six neighborhood centers and additional "satellite centers."

Typical of the stories told about the staff of these centers is this: a local resident informed the outreach worker at one center that a neighbor was having problems and needed food and other help. Knowing that the neighbor would not want to be stigmatized by being singled out as needing help, and knowing that they would not come in to ask for help, the outreach worker spent a full day visiting families up and down the road from the needy person, so the visit to the needy person would feel as if they were being seen as part of the worker's regular activity.

This type of sensitivity and patient work has resulted in the

centers' gaining appreciation and trust from their constituents.

When we visited this CAA in 1981, to evaluate their program, we indicated that we wanted to meet a few beneficiaries at each site. The center coordinators let it be known that the clients could "pay back" the center by making themselves available to be interviewed by us. Every center was jammed with thirty or more clients who wanted to pay the center back in this manner. Some had walked several miles to be there. (We had no choice but to interview them all.)

In 1984, under pressure of continuing budget tightening, the CAA Director suggested in the county newspaper that the local neighborhood centers might have to be a target of budget-cutting forces. Again, the constituency of each center rallied to express their concern, and was reassured that their centers would not be closed. Alternate solutions still are needed, and the local center staff may find their role changed to require additional time and effort devoted to local fundraising to offset the fiscal cuts, but they are recognized as vital to the community's lifeline.

5. (Climate and Resource Development) - A mid-state CAA, faced with serious budget cuts that impacted on staffing, has gotten substantial mileage from volunteer, allied organizations, and other personnel resources. In addition to tapping into volunteers and intern resources available from the local branch of the State University, and a host of senior volunteers, the agency is also blessed with an active

Board that gets involved as volunteer outreach staff, resource developers, and so on.

Another source of agency personnel in recent years has been the Department of Social Services. A symbiotic relationship exists between these two often combative groups. DSS needs places to assign Work Relief clients who are required to "Work Off" their check, at a nonprofit site. The CAA welcomes their "free labor".

This CAA has been more successful than many other places in retaining "Workfare" assignees. This is attributed to the agency's climate and philosophy. Each Home Relief Worker is adopted and treated as part of the employee "family", rather than as a problem, interloper, or lackey. As part of this process, the CAA has maintained that these workers should be paid at a rate deemed appropriate for their position. Accordingly, the workers are credited with working off their check in fewer hours, at a higher rate than the minimum wage usually applied by DSS. CAA staff provide skill development training--usually on a one to one basis--with these resources. They have been successful in developing good workers for Weatherization crews and records management, fiscal and general program recordkeeping; other clerical, and outreach/information staff. A number of assignees elect to stay additional hours, because of the agency's climate.

Some persons have been picked up, from Workfare, and transferred to "TEAP"--Transitional Employment and Placement. The Department of Social Services pays half of

the salary for a welfare recipient for up to six months, after which time the agency can continue their employment fully at the agency's expense. This has been done successfully by the CAA, on several occasions.

6. (Etc.) - The preceding examples have in common a strong individualized effort--often utilizing initiative that is not prescribed by formal procedures, always with the best interests of constituents at heart, with a bond of trust having been earned between CAA staffpersons and local beneficiaries. A summary of all such efforts could be endless, and would not be beneficial at this point. Hence, a few noteworthy efforts are mentioned here, as further indication of the breadth of such efforts by CAA personnel.

- o The staff of organizers and community service personnel at one CAA have been reduced by budget realities. The smaller staff sustains as high a level of effort--in housing organizing, advocacy, interagency conditions, health support for laid off workers, and so forth--as was previously done with a larger staff. Long hours, a commitment to the agency's sense of purpose, and lots of volunteers help--including Board and ex employees--keeps them going.

- o Tireless effort by another CAA's Board Chairperson, a county legislator, provided the needed support to a new (strong) director, enabling the agency to turn itself around and resurrect itself after periods of crisis and inactivity.

- o Outreach Workers at various CAA's have established relationships in their home communities that are based on years of gradually developed trust. They are now seen as sources of help, advice, and so forth, which can be approached with ease and without expectation of recriminations. (Each of these agencies') outreach staff has been harmed by budget cuts-- and each now spends more time waiting to be asked for help, and less time doing untargeted outreach or organizing.

X: DISCUSSION

A. Study Objectives

The period spanned by this study, from the first field visit to the conclusion of this document, coincides with a highly traumatic period in the history of Community Action Agencies. The period begins with Reagan's 1980 victory. This marked the end of a modest upturn in CAA optimism that had been due to some growth and some encouragement of grass roots advocacy under the Carter Administration. In less than a year, the Reagan Administration dismantled CSA, and turned reduced amounts of CAA funding over to the states via the Community Service Block Grant mechanism. Since that time, CSBG funding has remained at the same dollar level for three years, while inflation has reduced the "real" value of the dollars allotted by over 20%. Thus, in New York State, CAA's have operated with 26% fewer dollars, than they received prior to CSA's demise, while inflation has eroded the purchase power of Federal monies by an additional 20%. Even this level of funding required substantial lobbying to successfully oppose Reagan proposals to eliminate the Community Service Block Grant.

By the time, in early fall of 1984, that I conducted my revisits, most CAA's had adjusted their mode of operations to deal with the reality of reduced Federal support. Since then, Reagan was overwhelmingly reelected, and CAA's are now facing the most serious threat since they were first created. Not only has the newly reelected president backed a fiscal 1986 budget with zero CSBG funding through the senate, but no dollars for CAA's were merged into other block grant proposals. (Previous proposed elimination of CSBG recommended funds

transfer to Social Services Block Grants.) Thus, if Reagan's proposed budget survives the congressional amendment process, funding of CAA's would be deeply harmed. At best, CAAs can expect another year at the same funding level as 1981, with at least some cut in this amount being a strong possibility.

This bleak fiscal picture makes the study that is presented here, more relevant than I could have imagined when it began. It focuses on CAA efforts and strategies during this period, identifies factors related to CAA ability to survive and thrive under these conditions, and is able to discuss ways that the changed role and level of federal funding has already impacted on CAA strategies and operations (as well as CAA health.)

The study's major objectives were threefold:

- o To develop and demonstrate a useful instrument and methodology, for the assessment of the impact of strategies and procedural approaches of CAA directors, staff, and boards, on various measures of CAA Health.
- o To explore the way these approaches and strategies were actually related to CAA Health, at ten CAA's in New York State, at two points in time (1981 and 1984.) These findings would, then, be comparable with findings in traditional organization dynamics literature, thus demonstrating the extent to which such concepts are applicable at CAA's.
- o To use the findings, especially with regard to CAA changes between the beginning and end of Reagan's first term, as a means of assessing the impact of the budget cuts on the

strategies, approaches, operations, and over-all well-being of these CAA's.

The pages that follow discuss these three objectives, based on the data that has been collected and analyzed.

B. Instrument and Methodology

In order to explore the relationship between measures of CAA Health and various elements of director, board, and agency operating styles, procedures, and strategies, it was necessary for me to do the following:

- o Specify the elements that appeared to be relevant; and design procedures and/or instruments that identify and differentiate degrees to which the elements are present, or points along a continuum that characterize an agency with regard to an element.
- o Specify ways of looking at (defining) CAA health, and items that are components of each of these aspects.
- o Specify information and data elements to be gathered that provide measurable differences with regard to these items.

The instruments developed to accomplish this task are included in Appendix 2. They were put together based on a combination of empirical experience with community action agencies and CAA evaluations; understanding of organizational dynamics literature, theory and practice; and a review of evaluation and analysis materials being used in 1980 by various entities in the conduct of CAA evaluations at that time. The 1980-81 evaluation of 20 CAA's in New York and New Jersey further accentuated some of the key elements that should be incorporated into the overall analysis.

The outcome of the two rounds of data collection and analysis

enable us to draw some conclusions with regard to the usefulness and appropriateness of the approach and instruments used. In brief, it is clear that the instruments and procedures were generally successful as tools for the gathering and analysis of the desired information, and the focusing of that information on the analytic and strategic questions that were the basic concern of the study. The instruments were consistent enough for clear comparisons to be made, and these comparisons held up, for the most part; across the two time periods covered by the study.

Discussion of the rationale for inclusion of each element of analysis is incorporated into the discussion of findings which appears in the next section of this chapter.

Some aspects of the information-gathering process were particularly notable and useful. These include:

- o A one page, ten item inquiry for agency directors, asked how they divided their time among the items. The list is comprehensive, with regard to major director tasks, and directors found it a useful self-awareness tool for seeing where their time was concentrated.
- o Areas of Board activity appear to reflect elements of agency health to a degree that had not been anticipated. Information on this item, and other Board items such as frequency of quorums at Board meetings, can largely be obtained by review of documents (Board and Committee minutes, etc.) Interviews with a small number of Board members help to confirm the findings from documents, or to identify the need for--and four--further exploration. Accordingly, this was found to be

a comparatively fast and consistent way to obtain information that could be useful in assessing CAA well-being. As a flag for the identifying of other problems, this may represent an area that can be reviewed quickly. Where problems are identified, a further review of other aspects of agency operations might be appropriate.

- o Exploration of CAA strategy choices provided a consistent way of comparing CAA activity at two points in time, and of comparing CAA approaches to each other. Overall shifts in CAA approach could be gleaned by noting changes or shifts in strategy choice. Since some similar work (discussed below) has been done elsewhere--at least several years ago--there is the possibility of conducting a broader analysis of agencies strictly with regard to strategy choice.
- o An overall Morale rating was obtained by asking staff members to rate their own, and the agency's sense of ten varied morale-related areas. The composite score was found to be a highly useful measure of comparison. Thus, this approach appears to be a useful tool for future attempts to compare morale at differing organizations.
- o Use of Funding Ratio--total funding versus local initiative (core block grant) funding--provided a way of measuring comparative CAA health which compensated for the relative size of CAA's. While a useful measure, it was not found to be the only meaningful measure of CAA fiscal health, and other aspects were more closely related to certain aspects of CAA operations.

Only a few elements that were included in the analysis did not provide any useful differentiation among the CAA's. These are mentioned here as noteworthy for their non-impact:

- o A "Head Start Funding" Factor, based on the percentage of CAA funding for Head Start programs, failed to differentiate CAA's on any variable, although the percentage of CAA funding from Head Start ranged from 0 to 58% in 1981, and 0 to 66% in 1984.
- o An important Program Activity element--Effective Operation--did not differentiate CAA's much, either year. This is because most programs of most CAA's were found to be operating effectively, regardless of other factors. Approximately one-third of the CAA's were found to operate "all" programs effectively, and one CAA only operated "some" programs effectively at one of the two points in time. All other CAA's were found to be operating "most" programs effectively.

This lack of differentiation poses a serious concern, as this was the only one of four Program Activity measures that directly inquired into the quality of program activity. The other three elements address aspects of program choice, rather than quality of existing programs.

C. Limitations of the Study

Before discussing findings, it is appropriate to acknowledge the limitations of this effort with regard to its methodology and the conclusions that can (or can not) be drawn from it. The study treads (perhaps too lightly) on varied methodological grounds, including:

- o Evaluations and Evaluation Research;
- o Ethnological or Organizational Field Observation Studies, supported by focused interviews;
- o Comparative organizational analyses;
- o Longitudinal analysis of approaches and outcomes, at two points in time.

In doing so, it may be seen as being broader than it is deep. It reports on pre-post findings with regard to only ten organizations, although visits to twenty CAA's in 1980-81 provided the basis for its conceptual framework. In reporting on only ten organizations, judgements that are based on statistical analysis are limited--usually being suggestive and/or tentative. Although the ten CAA's are representative of moderate-sized New York State CAA's, the weight of the (statistical) findings is clearly limited. Further study and analysis, with a larger sample of CAA's, would be a worthy effort in the future, but that is beyond the scope of what is possible here. Instead, we rely on the suggestive tentative findings, plus narrative discussion of specific case examples.

A possible area of criticism of the current work could be that the second round of field work was done, because of time and budget constraints, by my traveling and observing alone. Since I was part of a team in the initial round of data gathering, an argument could be made questioning the consistency of the data found. In point of fact the initial visits were all under my direction, and all initial round reports were my responsibility (in a sense, then, being subjected to my review and judgment in the same solitary/final manner as in Round Two.) All Executive Director interviews, and other key parts of each

review, were conducted by me, at both times. Without question, there was consistency in the process and instruments used in data gathering.

Another "limitation" is the exclusion from this study's analyses, of constituents' perceptions of the CAA. Although an instrument had been developed to gather this information and apply its findings as an additional measure of CAA Health, it was not possible to obtain interviews in a manner that assured that a reasonable and unbiased cross-section of the CAA's full constituency was represented. Rather than analyze uneven and inadequate data, this element was dropped from this analysis, although it is certainly something that could be beneficially attempted in future replications of this study, if sufficient support was available. (See Section D3 of this chapter, for further discussion of the contents of this measure of CAA health.)

The lack of variance with regard to measures of "program quality/effectiveness", mentioned in the preceding section, is not, in itself, a weakness of the study. Other analyses might treat this element as a quantifiable measure based on units of service or some other concept, but a conscious decision was made, here, not to compare different types of program with each other, but only against their own stated goals. Under this criterion, most programs of most CAA's were performing satisfactorily. A possible limitation of the study does arise from this lack of differentiation, in that each other element included on program activity was related to appropriateness, rather than quality. Thus, "Program Activity" differences are based on the narrower aspect of program planning rather than on planning and operations.

Given that no claim is made to presentation of a comprehensive, rigorous scientific study, the limitations identified here serve

primarily to caution the reader not to assume too much, based on the findings and discussion presented here. All of the analyses, treated as suggestive, call for further exploration. That exploration can include self-analysis by individual agency directors--to see how appropriate the apparent findings are, when applied to their unique situation; it would also include efforts to generalize the findings by repeating this kind of study on a larger sampling of community organizations. (Regrettably, this latter approach may not find CAA's in the same condition, by the time a larger study might be developed.)

D. Discussion of Findings, I: CAA Activity and CAA Health

In the preceding chapter, findings were reported at a level of detail that is comprehensive but far from easy reading. These findings are summarized within the discussion section which follows, thus providing an option for readers who wish to skip the detail without missing the essential points. Also incorporated, below, are rationales for initial inclusion of each study element, and consideration of how well each element now appears to have been warranted.

Six aspects of CAA Health were considered at two points in time, for ten moderate-sized CAA's in New York State. A range of administrative and programmatic approaches and strategies were juxtaposed against these CAA Health measures, to determine the extent to which they were related to the measures of CAA Health. The outcomes of these analyses are summarized and discussed, below.

1. Morale

Staff morale is an important indicator of CAA health because of

several related factors:

- o Most basically, staff morale tends to be good when staff are satisfied with the outcome of their efforts, the recognition or appreciation received for the work (from supervisors, peers, and/or the community itself), and the positive identity associated with the reputation of the workplace. Also important for good morale are a sense of security about the future of the job (and the organization), satisfaction with earnings (relative to the other rewards of the job and opportunities elsewhere), and comfort with the workplace climate (organizational goals, mode of operations, communications, relationships with peers and supervisors, opportunities to learn/develop/advance; and so forth).
- o Negative morale points to particular problems of the agency. Each type of negative aspect of morale can be seen as indicative of an aspect of an agency's lack of wellness. For example, wide-spread anxiety about job security is likely to be caused by fiscal or programmatic problems of the agency (caused, perhaps, by massive cutbacks in federal funds). It may also imply lack of trust of leadership, and/or insufficient communication with regard to this important matter. Lowered morale with regard to satisfaction over the outcome of one's efforts can be indicative of shifts away from work that staff saw as meaningful (again, possibly caused by budget pressures, but possibly the result of insufficient communication or training with regard to the importance or intent of agency's current approach.) Even dissatisfaction

over salary--a near universal affliction at CAA's--tends to only be articulated as a serious concern when other aspects of the CAA are not providing alternative personal rewards.

- o At most CAA's there is a balance of positive and negative contributors to staff morale. Salaries are almost always too low. Some level of peer comraderie and opportunity to feel good about work in the community usually exists. The factors that contribute to the over-all presence or absence of serious morale problems (i.e., actually or potentially disruptive of the agency's work, or symptomatic of the existence of such disruptions) may be related to the approaches which are analyzed in this study.

In many ways, this discussion of positive and negative morale factors parallels Herzberg's (1966) discussion of "motivation or dissatisfaction. Herzberg suggests that dissatisfaction tends to come from "Hygiene factors", which have to do with the way things are (i.e., environment), such as supervision, working conditions, money, status, security, organizational policies and administration. "Motivating" factors that contribute to positive job satisfaction tend to be related to the job itself, recognition, opportunities for personal growth, achievement, advancement, responsibility. Presence of satisfactory "Hygiene/Environmental" elements do not, in themselves, assure job satisfaction, but their absence leads to dissatisfaction. At CAA's, this becomes somewhat modified, as the organization--its goals and the relationships among staff--can be a powerful mediator which overcomes some of the factors that Herzberg suggests can cause dissatisfaction.

These considerations of morale also provide a test, in a

non-profit, community based setting of group dynamics theories with regard to the relationship of communications and leadership style to staff morale. Likert and Kahn and Katz, for instance, considered the relationship of "Leadership Practices to productivity and morale" in industrial settings, and noted that supervisor's planning and articulating goal objectives appeared important, as did the supervisor's addressing "employee-oriented" concerns. Higher productivity was found where supervisors took a personal interest in the employees and their off-job problems, showed supportive understanding on the job, and took time to teach new things that could lead to promotions. Employee satisfaction (morale) was related to the same supervisor trusts, and hence--to productivity as well.

Literature on the relative effects of Authoritarian, Democratic, and Laissez-Faire styles of leadership (see Lippert and White) has suggested that authoritarian groups are more productive with regard to quantity, while democratic groups tend to produce better quality and sustain higher group member morale.

Thus, findings in this portion of the study may have direct relevance in the main body of group dynamics literature. However, since the groups studied here are CAA's, consideration had to be given to the unique characteristics and objectives of such agencies.

To obtain an overall measure of staff morale, a set of open-ended, questions was asked of agency personnel. these questions inquired as to staff attitude or level of satisfaction with regard to the following aspects of their work experience:

- o Own job;
- o The Agency;

- o Training received or other experience;
- o Opportunities for Advancement;
- o Salary Level;
- o Community Recognition based on work;
- o Relationship of own job to work of the Agency;
- o Relationship with Exec Director;
- o Relationship with Board;
- o Other Staff;
- o Agency facilities.

Analysis of data, with regard to Morale, revealed the following:

- o A comparison of CAA rankings on staff morale, in 1981 and 1984, did not show a significant positive correlation, as two CAA's that had been ranked highest in this area in 1981, were ranked lowest in 1984. Thus, the findings noted below cannot be attributed to the CAA's themselves, exclusive of their approaches, strategies, and so forth, and the changes they undergo over time.
- o Significant positive correlations were found between Morale and one other measure of CAA health--Program Activity, at both points in time. As discussed previously, this relationship is consistent with the concept of morale being influenced by opportunities to perform, and be recognized for, worthwhile effort. It is not possible to say whether the morale rankings are influenced by Program Activity or visa versa. However, it appears likely that morale is influenced by Program Activity,

and that both are influenced similarly by some CAA approaches and strategies, and characteristics of agency leadership.

- o Positive correlations had been found, in 1981, between morale and another CAA health measure (attitude of Community Leaders toward the CAA) but this did not hold up in 1984. Community Leader attitudes appeared to have changed slower than the factors that impacted on staff morale.
- o Elements of Director Style and CAA activity that were related to Open, democratic management; open, full communication with staff; commitment to staff development; and thoughtfully planned out, internally linked strategies were found to be positively correlated to staff morale, in both 1981 and 1984.
- o CAA's that emphasized advocacy and community organization as part of their strategy mix tended to have higher staff morale than strict service agencies, although this tendency was more pronounced in 1981.
- o Directors' devoting primary attention to administration tended to have lower morale in both 1981 and 1984.
- o Tendencies relating Board and Board Chairperson activity to morale were found in 1981, but not 1984.
- o Director's allocation of time appeared to be related to staff morale in 1981, with regard to several areas of activity, but this did not hold in 1984. Director's allocation of time to Resource Development had not been closely related to staff morale in 1981, but was in 1984, even though most CAA Directors found it necessary to devote major time to Resource Development. (The few CAA's where this was not the case

ranked lowest on this item.)

These findings, with regard to the relation of leadership and communications impacts on morale, are consistent with findings in the literature with regard to group dynamics and organization dynamics. (See, for example, Katz and Kahn (1978).)

Democratic/open leadership styles and full, open communications were found to go hand in hand at some CAA's, which happened to be among those that ranked highest on morale and program activity measures of CAA health in both 1981 and 1984. This approach to operating at community action agencies would appear to be appropriate for directors and/or agencies that value the developing of the potential of the group's members as an essential part of enabling the group to achieve its community-oriented objectives. The fact that positive morale also was closely correlated to CAA's which demonstrated commitment to staff development further confirms this notion.

Positive correlations between staff morale and CAA emphasis on advocacy and community organization can also be seen as stemming from a philosophy that seeks to upgrade the disadvantaged through a mobilization and education process which could apply to both the community and CAA staff as one subscale sought to determine, communications can improve both the understanding and acceptance of one's role, especially as it relates to a clearly articulated set of organizational goals and objectives. It is possible that morale was higher because staff had "bought into" the CAA's articulated goals. In 1984, this correlation was not as strong, but still positive. The decline could be attributed to some CAA's de-emphasizing community organization as a strategy (at least publicly). Once staff had bought

into this broad sense of CAA approach and purpose, the narrowing of focus and limiting of activity could lead to a lowering of staff morale.

Staff morale was lower at CAA's whose directors devoted primary attention to administration, and also where director's communication and leadership styles were authoritarian and controlling. This suggests that CAA morale is higher where executive directors are more than managers/administrators. "More," in this case, can refer to the exercise and communication of a vision for the agency, for staff to share or--at least--understand. It can also refer to the playing of roles, within the organization, that enhance its internal dynamics, making it feel more like a "family."

A few "case examples" are presented, briefly, here, to illustrate how these elements were related to staff morale.

- o ACCAA is a CAA for a large rural county in upstate New York. When visited in 1981, this agency had a new director (3 months on the job) and new fiscal officer (5 1/2 months.) Both were able to build from a sound base, as they were preceded by an interim director who successfully corrected past fiscal and management problems and improved the staff's sense of MCCAP as a unified agency in spite of the vast geographic distance it covered, and the relative autonomy of its local neighborhood centers that coordinated services in each area of the county.

In 1981, MCCAP was found to have excellent staff morale, and was tied for first on ranking of this element of CAA health.

Among the key factors contributing to this positive morale were the following:

- o The new Director took an active role in consulting with all

staff--through full staff meetings, component meetings, and program director's meetings--in asking for their input and understanding of the CAA's present and future activity. He both shared his philosophy and hopes for the CAA (increasing its economic development and community organizing roles), and entered into lively discussion with staff in seeking to understand the rationale for the way things were being done. For example, he questioned the value of operating neighborhood centers throughout the county, if their role was primarily service delivery. He learned that the centers had earned the trust of their constituency by being consistent and sensitive in making needed services available, and that this trust enabled the centers to mobilize their constituency when that was warranted.

- o Agency staff took visible pride in their work, and felt that their constituency, as well as agency staff, recognized and appreciated the effort that they put into the work. (Especially for the neighborhood center directors, the job included being on call as a critical part of local crisis emergency assistance--which translated into life-saving activity with regard to assurance that heat was sustained in winter, and food and clothing available to victims of fires. Such efforts were lauded in local newspapers, as well as within the CAA itself.)
- o SCCDP's director provided staff with a sense of confidence with regard to the agency's future, both being active in resource development and program development, and serving as

the center for 2-way communication about programmatic matters. Unlike the 3 other CAA's with good to excellent morale ratings, in 1981, SCCDP's director exhibited a mix of "democratic/open" and "centralized control" elements, with regard to management style. (The three others were predominantly "democratic/open.") This mixed style, combined with open communication, provided a sense that a leader who listened was in control and would exercise that control for the benefit of the agency, its personnel, and its constituency.

- o A good relationship with county government enhanced the agency's fiscal operating capability, thus alleviating any distress about the future of CAA funding.

In 1984, although the agency's relationship to the County remained positive, morale had tumbled. The agency ranked ninth of ten in this area. (The agency which SCCDP had been tied with, for highest rank on morale, also slipped--to tenth of ten. See below.) This decline was directly attributable to a leadership void that had festered at the agency for over a year.

The problem arose from the Director's developing a physical ailment that limited his ability to function as director. Twice, he took leaves of absence because of this ailment, with the fiscal officer serving as acting director. The acting director did not initiate new policies, but sought to maintain operations on an even keel. The director returned from leave, but was seen to be still suffering, and uncertainty over how long he would remain on the job reduced communications to him, while his style became less open except with program heads. This resulted in the following:

- o In the absence of centralized leadership, each component tended to look after itself. The result was a decline in the sense of a unified agency and coordinated strategy.
- o In the absence of centralized leadership offering a sense of vision for the agency, the staff's sense of role and reward from being part of the CAA was somewhat diminished.
- o The agency's emphasis drifted toward primarily being a service delivery organization, although examples of advocacy could still be found.
- o Less communication towards, or from, central leadership.
- o Staff morale was further undermined by two acts of the director:
 - While on medical leave, he went to conferences as head of a regional CAA advocacy organization. This led to criticism by both Board and local press, which questioned his degree of incapacity, his priorities, and the length of time he was on the payroll on medical and personal leave.
 - During a brief return to active service, he informed the local press that the neighborhood centers were threatened by the CAA's funding situation. This was done without first consulting the local staff, and was an overstatement of the realities of the fiscal situation. While subsequent clarifications sought to reassure local staff and program beneficiaries (while also seeking funding support from local townships) the result was an increased fragmentation of program components, and

lowered trust.

This decline in morale occurred at a time when the agency was feeling pressure, financially, because its local initiative funds (used for administration and neighborhood center outreach) were insufficient. The CAA's overall funding picture, with help from local government and substantial head start and weatherization programs, appeared brighter than it actually was, since the infrastructure that enabled each component to function as part of a whole was suffering, thus reducing the effectiveness of most separate units.

- o ACCAA, a smaller rural CAA, shared top ranking on morale with SCCDP in 1981. In 1984 it ranked last (tenth) in this area. Positive morale in 1981 could be attributed to the following:

- o The agency's director employed an open, informal style that encouraged full staff participation in considering agency strategies. Communication was open, two-way; Management style was fully democratic, with responsibilities delegated to unit heads who felt clear about their role within the overall objectives of the CAA, and confident that innovative efforts would be supported.
- o The agency's objectives emphasized incorporating community organizing and advocacy into its general service activity.
- o All staff are located at the same site, thus facilitating the open exchange of ideas and information.
- o Staff were supported in efforts to advance, within or

beyond the agency.

- o The agency's good reputation with local beneficiaries, local government, and other community leaders provided positive identification, sense of accomplishment and recognition to staff members. The staff also was able to identify with, and draw support from, comrades within the organization.

A fiscal crisis developed at the agency, less than a year after the initial visit. This crisis led to the loss or restricting of virtually all CAA funds. By early 1982, the CAA had only three accounts: Head Start, basic core funding, and a nutrition program for "Women, Infants and Children."

The person who became director in 1982 succeeded, eventually, in getting the fiscal crisis corrected, and reestablishing a weatherization contract for the agency. However, morale at this agency remains poor, because of the following:

- o The agency has lost its credibility and respect with both county government, and much of the area's low income population.
- o Staff are disappointed by the total lack of dynamic activism under the current director who put survival at the top of his priority list and has avoided any organizing or other activity that could alienate funding sources or creditors.
- o Given weak leadership and lack of support for sustaining a unified agency concept, each component primarily looks after itself.

- o Lack of positive support within the agency has contributed to a sense of burnout among some key staff.
- o LCCAA ranked last on morale, in 1981. Its director operated in a highly centralized, autocratic manner, with virtually no staff meetings, and with most project directors being limited in their authority to plan and operate their programs. Coercion and intimidation were the main vehicles for obtaining compliance. Staff understanding of their job, and its relation to an overall agency sense of purpose, was limited to lacking. The CAA's headquarters, in a County office complex, contributed to inability to gain much of a sense of identity from the agency. The agency's fiscal officer was too weak to challenge any decisions of the director, and the staff knew it. Nonetheless, the director deserves credit for operating in a manner that gained some level of cooperation from county legislators, and this county support enabled the CAA to function well within a strictly service delivery orientation. A new director, who had been a program director, assumed responsibility early in 1981. At the time of the 1984 revisit, morale was found to be much improved, with the agency ranking third among the ten CAA's. Among the differences found in 1984 were these:
 - o Open 2-way communication had replaced the tight, one-way system in place before 1981.
 - o Responsibility is now fully delegated to program heads. Relationship between director and program heads is now "mutual respect."

- o Regular (bi-weekly) meetings are held now.
- o Staff get more recognition for their successes, both from the director and other staff, but also from an increase in positive articles in the media.
- o The new fiscal officer is liked and trusted, and prepared timely reports for each program.

The agency still has a way to go, but the mood is certainly improved. One area that is still less than optimal, with regard to staff morale, is that the agency is still housed in County office space, which limits its recognition as a distinct entity. Thus, programs (e.g., Head Start, Weatherization, Senior Meals, Neighborhood Centers) are recognized to a greater extent than the CAA.

2. Program Activity

There is no doubt that "program activity" is an appropriate element to consider when assessing CAA health. After all, the bulk of what CAA's do is the operation of programs that--hopefully--have a positive impact on the lives, conditions, and/or attitudes of its intended constituency. However, as will be seen below, our consideration of program activity is not focused in the same way as most "typical" evaluations.

Quantitative information on numbers of persons served, cost effectiveness of various approaches, and so forth, was collected as part of the information-gathering process. However, in order to make comparisons between programs without trying to compare the relative weight of an outreach worker's contact to a year in a Head Start program, program activity as a measure of community action agency

health was boiled down to the following questions:

- o Were (all/most/some/few/none?) the agency's programs operating effectively? (i.e., meeting stated objectives, performing in an appropriately sensitive and skillful manner that earns the trust and appreciation of intended beneficiaries, reaching intended target groups, and so forth).
- o How broad is the scope of the agency's programs? (i.e., are there many/few/or no innovative programs operated by the CAA or, does the agency primarily operate the basic programs whose funding is generally available to CAA's? or is the range of program activity even more limited?)
- o At the present time, how extensive is the agency's program development activity? At the time of our visit, was the agency growing (extending the range and scope of its programs)? Was it sustaining its programs? Declining? or a mix: Growth in some areas, decline in others?
- o How appropriate are the programs operated by the CAA, given the major needs of target area residents, and the options available to them for services or other assistance? At one end of this continuum are agencies whose programs are largely decided upon through a planning process which identifies target area needs and plans programs to meet these needs. At the other end of the spectrum are agencies that appear to be waiting to die, continuing to operate programs where funding has continued, but not seeking any additional funding or other resources to improve the condition of the area's poor. In between are CAA's that primarily respond to the availability

of money, pursuing funding and serving their constituency in the areas where funds are available. (Such agencies, at present, would not be active in community organizing, as the money isn't there. Most activity would be service oriented.) Some agencies seek a pragmatic balance, actively seeking funding wherever they can, if the programs can be adapted to meet identified needs.

By concentrating on these four aspects of program activity, this study avoids the problem of trying to measure the extent to which "body counts" are indicative of agency health. It was not the purpose of this study to replicate extensive evaluation methodologies used to evaluate weatherization, Head Start, or other pieces of each CAA's program, although such evaluation documents were reviewed when appropriate. (Such component evaluations might prove worthwhile, if conducted in conjunction with the type of exploration performed here.)

Major findings, with regard to the relation of agency strategies, approaches, and so forth, to program activity in 1981 and 1984 are summarized below:

- o In both 1981 and 1984, at least 9 of the ten CAA's operated most or all programs effectively. However, in 1984, at least 9 indicated that cuts in funds had impacted on the quantity of activity, even though quality remained satisfactory. Size of outreach or neighborhood service staff was cut at most agencies.
- o The rank order of CAAs at the two points in time--based on overall program activity, was not found to show a significant correlation. Thus, the findings discussed below cannot be

attributed to CAA's, exclusive of their approaches, strategies, and so forth.

- o As mentioned previously, significant positive correlations were found, in both 1981 and 1984, between staff morale and program activity. An even stronger positive correlation was found, in both years, between program activity and another measure of community health: the attitude of community leaders towards the CAA. This appears to be a logical outcome, given that community leader respect should be earned based on current program activity. No such significant correlation was found with regard to attitude of public officials. (This is not surprising, as some effective organizing and advocacy was targeted at local government, while a few CAA's were in counties where public officials showed almost no interest in the CAA's, regardless of the quality and focus of their programs.)
- o A number of tendencies, noted in 1981, were not confirmed in 1984. These included relations between program activity and management style, director commitment to staff development, director's strategy for agency image, and Board Chairperson's level of activity.
- o Communications did not differentiate CAA's, with regard to Program Activity, at either time.
- o A positive relation between Program Activity and Director's having cooperative relationships with their Board was found at both points in time.
- o Directors who devoted major attention to more areas of

activity were found at agencies ranked high on program activity in both 1981 and 1984. Networking with local organizations was an activity closely related to Program Activity rankings at both times. Resource Development had also been closely related to Program Activity rankings in 1981, but no such correlation could be confirmed in 1984, as most directors (8 of 10) were found to be devoting major time in this area (as compared to 6 in 1981.).

- o A modest tendency linked Board Activity in evaluation, to CAA health with regard to Program Activity, at both points in time.
- o As expected, a strong correlation was found between rankings on CAA Program Activity and CAA's actively planning their strategy mix. This was also true with regard to the linking of strategies.
- o Program activity rankings were positively correlated with CAA's that deemphasized service delivery and included Advocacy, Resource Development, and Community Organization in a linked strategy approach.

The fact that different elements appear to be related to this measure of CAA health, compared to those elements that were related to morale, is noteworthy. It suggests that staff morale is related to intra-agency personnel motivation concerns, while program activity health is more related to strategic planning activity. The significance of this finding is tempered by the limitations mentioned earlier, with regard to the Program Activity dimension. Since differences were found with regard to program appropriateness, but not program quality, the emphasis on planning is seen as less surprising.

It remains to be seen, whether a group of agencies that had a range of identified differences in program quality would have had significant differences based on elements such as management style and communications. Organizational dynamics literature findings in this regard are mixed, as well, with some studies suggesting that these elements do not impact on program quality, while others suggest that differences do exist. (Katz and Kahn, for instance, reported findings that suggested that authoritarian leadership correlates to quality of work. Similar findings suggest that person-related leadership, rather than strict task orientation, obtain more productive results.)

In looking at Community Action Agency program activity, the concepts of productivity, quantity, and quality must be filtered through a lens that focuses on the work performed, its beneficiaries, and the characteristic of its personnel. The only CAA program that can--and has--been measured in terms of productivity is weatherization, where number of units, cost of materials and labor per unit, number and type of energy conservation measures applied per unit, and actual energy and cost savings can be measured. But even with weatherization, some agencies have less tangible objectives that are not readily subject to quantifiable measures. Among these are skill development and enhanced employability for staff; education of service recipients with regard to other aspects of energy conservation; involvement of beneficiaries of this service in other components of the CAA; other efforts by CAA personnel to see that clients understand their rights on varied issues, and that pursuit of those rights is encouraged and supported; delivery of the weatherization service in a manner that demonstrates respect for the beneficiary.

Given the mix of tangible and intangible outcome elements, and the variety of program approaches of different agencies, the decision to limit comparisons of CAA's program effectiveness to consideration of extent that CAA programs operating at least adequately appears justifiable. Given the narrowness of differences found on this element, some consideration of further refinement might be appropriate. One possibility would be to come up with a full set of evaluation criteria for each program operated by a CAA, summing these program by program ratings, and dividing by the number of programs operated by the CAA. However, although this may control for differences among CAA program approaches, it would weigh, equally, programs of different magnitude. Suffice to say, this is an area worthy of further consideration.

Some speculation appears to be in order, with regard to the relationships that appeared to be present in 1981, but were not confirmed in 1984. Two possibilities might contribute to the non-confirmation, in 1984, of the tendencies found in 1981. These are:

- o The initial tendencies simply did not hold up under re-analysis; thus, the findings did not point up correlations worthy of discussion; in 1981. This would be a plausible conclusion, given the small number of agencies considered, and the tentativeness of the initial findings.
- o Alternatively, changes in factors effecting the CAA caused changes in either agency activity or agency health, in a way that also changed the present relation between agency activity and agency health. This would suggest that there is a different rate of change in agency health, than there is in

agency activity that was previously related to agency health. As an example supporting this possibility, there was a shift in 1984 away from operating programs that emphasized community organization, but CAA's whose strategies continued to stress community organization and advocacy remained the highest ranked CAA's with regard to program activity. This shift was paralleled by changes in management style at some CAA's, away from democratic/open style towards mixed/authoritarian management (which somehow correlated closer with a service-oriented approach).

It is likely that there is some truth in both of these options. The extent to which the former is true, and the longer term implications of the latter, are worthy of further exploration. If the future brings a period of relative stability to the CAA's, a followup study might be able to contribute to clarifying this matter.

A few brief case examples are presented below, for illustrative purposes with regard to CAA Program Activity.

STAG was ranked first with regard to Program Activity in both 1981 and 1984. At both points in time it received the highest possible rating on each of the four subscales used to develop the composite Program Activity rating. All of its programs were operating effectively although funding cuts had reduced the size of its outreach/community organization unit. The scope of its programs was broad and innovative, as described below. The agency and its program focus was growing at both points in time, despite some opposition from local government. Decision with regard to program expansion and in-house assessments of the appropriateness of current programs were

based on input from community residents, active board members and staff. The decision to expand or refocus were always based on identified needs which the CAA could address more effectively than other vehicles.

STAG operates with a clearly articulated sense of purpose that is clearly understood by staff, board, and community. Its mission statement is posted in large letters in the reception area of the agency's headquarters. Established as "an advocate for the poor and disadvantaged people in the County" the mission statement says "we will plan, create, implement and evaluate programs according to needs of (local residents) in conjunction with community involvement." "Economic independence and self-respect" are objectives that the agency pursues for its constituents.

STAG's emphasis has been on advocacy and community organization, with service-oriented programs operated only in a coordinated context in which all beneficiaries are (regularly) made aware of issues, concerns, and opportunities beyond the specific need that brought them to the CAA. The agency publishes a monthly 8-16 page tabloid newspaper, which is sent to all persons who have been involved with the agency in any program, plus organization that may work with persons who could benefit from involvement with the CAA. It uses this paper plus local media to publicize its programs and to raise issues and advocate for positions on behalf of its constituency. (In doing so, it has been engaged in a running battle with governing officials of the county's largest city, over government decision to expend dollars to subsidize construction of a privately owned modern hotel, while housing needs of

area residents are not benefitting from city support or substantial financing.

The agency's director has been with the agency since 1968, becoming director in 1978. He is popular with staff and board, operating with a fully democratic style of management and a fully open communication system. Although much of the operational style is informal, there are weekly senior staff meetings and less regular meetings of the full staff. All component directors have full responsibility for their programs, plus a clear sense of the agency's being a unified, supportive whole.

Probably more than any other CAA I've seen, STAG approaches being a successful example of the normative compliance system, as its philosophy is internalized by staff and Board.

Among the innovative programs that the agency has become involved in, are the following:

- o Although not primarily a service organization, one staff person (as of 1984, one with two support staff in 1981) provide "one-to-one" services. This primarily consists of referrals to appropriate sources of service or other support, and often to other components of the CAA. One service now provided through this unit grew out of a need that arose because of plant closings in the area. STAG had organized an "Unemployed Council" which identified inability to pay for medical care as a critical need. After over a year of meetings with the County Medical Society, the CAA successfully negotiated an arrangement under which the Medical Society agreed to provide free medical services for uninsured,

unemployed, non-welfare-recipients, upon referral from STAG. This agreement went into effect in June, 1984.

- o As part of its community organizing, STAG provides support to local organizations, including xeroxing, postage, meeting and office space, and staff support. When needed, a small cash reserve fund is also available.
- o Among the groups that sought STAG's assistance in getting organized and then remained as components of the agency are a Rape and Abuse Crisis Center that has trained hundreds of volunteers who staff a 24 hour, 7 day a week hotline providing crisis and followup support to victims of rape and/or domestic violence. This program has grown substantially over the past four years, to the point where it could function independently of STAG. It has elected to remain as a part of STAG.
- o In response to requests for help initiated in the community, STAG now coordinates an 8-County AIDS Task force, which also utilizes numerous volunteers in providing information, education, referral, and so forth.
- o Some small agencies that have "spun off" from STAG purchase fiscal services from the CAA, thus reducing their personnel needs while assuring adequate recordkeeping. This provides a small amount of unencumbered funds for the CAA.
- o Two staffpersons are assigned to outreach and community organization. One is full-time coordinator of "Tenants in Action," which has organized and educated tenants throughout the city and county. In the process, it has also developed a series of booklets educating tenants on their rights. No

alternative source for this written information appears to exist in the County.

- o The previously mentioned monthly newspaper is one of a number of the CAA's activities that receive substantial support from the "Community Labor Coalition" which STAG organized. The Coalition includes most unions operating in the County, and numerous local groups--many of which STAG had organized.

In describing STAG in terms of program activity, there has been no need to contrast 1981 to 1984. Virtually all programs operated in 1981 are still operating, and virtually all--except for CSBG core funding--receive more funds, now, than in 1981. Additional programs, mentioned above, have come into existence. A great deal of staff effort has been spent in sustaining effort in the face of cuts in core funding, and this has had an impact. A few staff are admittedly tired. One was on medical leave at the time of my 1984 visit. Nonetheless, the agency still involves all staff in an annual outreach drive in a rural part of the County, maintains its communication externally and internally, and has not lessened its outspoken advocate role in questioning local government activity or inactivity.

CASC was the highest ranked agency, with regard to program activity, of those that maintained a service delivery orientation. The agency ranked third in 1981, fourth in 1984. All of its programs were seen to be operating effectively, in 1981, but some weakness in program management--including attitudes towards constituents and its manifestations in minor aspects of two programs--were noted in 1984. Thus, in 1984, "most" CAA programs were noted to be operating effectively. In 1981, its program scope was modest, with one large

program (Section 8 Housing) that was not typically operated by CAA's. By 1984, under a philosophy described by the director as "expand to survive," the agency's scope was broad. At both points in time, the agency was growing in terms of programs operated and total funding, although CSBG cuts had resulted in sharp cuts in outreach staffing (a department reduced to one individual) and the loss of a Planner line from the budget. At both points in time, the agency's approach to seeking funding appeared to be a mixture of programs developed based on need, and programs initiated because funding was available.

This agency's director utilized a strongly centralized management style, although some delegation of responsibility for some programs was seen in 1984, "as long as the results are satisfactory." The director is the primary grantsperson, primary provider of information to the board, and primary agency spokesperson. Most information flow is one-way: towards her. Since she is both well respected and well connected, among County and town officials, the agency enjoys a supportive relationship with local government. Virtually all "advocacy" done by the CAA is done by her, as she sits on many boards in the County. She has been director since 1979.

The programs operated by the CAA were not integrated into an overall system in 1981, but operated as separate service entities. In 1984, a recent move brought all program directors under one roof, and this was hoped to lead to improvement in this area. This agency provides evidence that centralized management, combined with a service orientation, can lead to fragmentation of services, a weak staff sense of the CAA and its purpose, and less than optimal staff morale. Some effort was taken, in 1984, to try to improve staff understanding.

The CAA's mix of programs includes the basic CAA programs (core activity through CSBG, Head Start, and Weatherization.) In 1981 it also was operating a substantial "Section 8" Housing program which provided rent subsidies to persons of low to moderate income, to enable them to obtain decent housing at an affordable rate. This program continued through 1984, and the CAA added the following:

- o A runaway and homeless youth program;
- o A delinquency prevention, youth counseling program;
- o Foster Grandparents;
- o An emergency food center that collects food, largely using volunteers, and makes it available to persons in need.

Several large projects were also under development, in 1984, with funding outlook described as "optimistic." This includes the establishment and operation of a shelter for runaway homeless youth, plus two HUD programs--a neighborhood revitalization project and development of new subsidized housing in partnership with a contractor.

As can be seen, from the description above, the CAA does not have active Board or community initiative in the planning process. Instead, the director identifies opportunities and seeks ratification of the opportunities by the Board, which was generally supportive in 1984. (In 1981, the Board had been involved in planning--as two factors fought over allocation of Head Start expansion dollars. But they did not identify or initiate needed program activity.)

BCAP was ranked last, on program activity, at both points in time. While most of the programs that it operated were conducted effectively, the scope of its programming was limited (extremely limited by 1984), and no planning was done to decide on program activity. The CAA

passively received funds that continued to be available. In 1981, the agency was seen as declining, with regard to size or program development. By 1984 it had leveled off, sustaining operations at a limited level.

In 1981, Head Start funds were 58% of the agency's budget, and Weatherization 15%. In 1984, Head Start was 66% of its budget, and Weatherization 18%. These are exceptionally high percentages of total funding. Most of the balance of the agency's funding was CSA/CSBG core funding, at both points in time.

The agency almost lost Head Start in 1982-83. The Head Start policy council, in a dispute with the agency director, opted to become independent, and was initially backed by federal Head Start program staff (but not its grants management division.) BCAP sued, charging that the action of the Policy Council was illegal, and then operated its own Head Start program for the entire year, while awaiting the outcome of the suit. In winning the suit it recovered the cost of operating the program all year, and defeated opposition to the CAA operated program. Since then, the head start program has been operated appropriately, with a director, staff, and policy council that get along with the agency director.

The agency is characterized by the controlling influence of its director, who manages without sharing decisionmaking responsibility, with regard to administrative matters. Information-sharing is limited, but could be characterized as two-way (information to the director, instructions--and occasional words of praise--from the director).

The Director's control is made more complete by the absence of an effective working board (2 meetings in 1981, 0 in 1984, no new

additions to board membership in years; although individual board members consult with the director on larger plans for the target area, and the board chairperson functioned appropriately with regard to the Head Start suit.)

The director has a plan and sense of what can be done with the agency, but it is not widely shared with staff or board. The community knows that the agency exists, as the director has been active in the community for many years, including serving as director of BCAP since its beginnings in 1966. At the present time, this plan consists of waiting out the bad times, being available for new opportunities, and seeking to regain a foothold in the employment and training area that had once been the agency's major source of funds. A conservative county government had not been supportive. (This waiting game may pay off. The director recently informed me--six months after the 1984 visit--that BCAP had "finally cracked the County Office for the Aging" and would be operating a senior meals service.)

The agency's ability to survive has certainly been enhanced by its ownership of its headquarters and one other site, both bought for under \$20,000 many years ago.

3. External Perceptions and Attitudes of the CAA

The way that CAA's were perceived and responded to, by three different groups, were considered indicators of the agency's well-being. The three groups are:

- o Program beneficiaries or potential beneficiaries (residents of the target area eligible for, or in need of, program assistance that the CAA might provide.)

- o Community leaders: persons active in organization in the community, whose opinions are recognized as having some influence over the way that programs or people respond to the conditions of the CAA's target population.
- o Public Officials, including both elected and appointed personages with some type of responsibility over some input of the lives of the CAA's constituency. (i.e., the commissioner of social services, the mayor, or a public chief, but not necessarily the head of the motor vehicle bureau.)

Beneficiaries

Program beneficiary attitude and perception of the CAA was considered on three dimensions/elements:

- o Trust/Mistrust;
- o Is the Agency widely known?;
- o Is the Agency's role clear to those who know of it?

These three elements, it was felt, should provide a clear indication of agency health, as these elements describe the basis for potential client relationships with the CAA. An agency that is trusted by its constituents, is know widely, and whose purpose is understood, will be turned to for help by those in need, and supported by their community for their contribution. Such agencies are also more likely to have devoted time to staff development, to assure that staff are able to function in a manner that earns trust, and communicates effectively (and widely) about the agency's purposes and philosophy with regard to improving the lives of its constituents.

Trust is earned, by the performance of staff in delivering on its

promises. It is earned slowly, by demonstrating both technical/professional knowledge or skills, and the sensitivity needed to understand and work with a target group. See, for example, description of MCCAP's neighborhood center staff, in the previous chapter, as a positive example. The earning of trust can also be done by word of mouth ("My neighbor says you helped her, I wonder if...") Trust can also be lost, quickly. For example, during my 1984 visit to ACCAA, a woman came into the office looking for help with a housing problem. The receptionist, upon advice of the director, referred the woman to the County Department of Social Services. There was no attempt to get the woman to feel that ACCAA could help or advocate on her behalf if she had problems at the Department of Social Services. The woman had come to ACCAA because of her knowledge--either first hand or from friends--that ACCAA was the place to go to get help. By not being well served, it is doubtful that she will think of ACCAA for help in the future.

Being widely known is, again, the result of agency effort, and rarely occurs by accident. It can be the result of extensive outreach and ongoing, visible agency activity, and/or it can be the result of various forms of publicity (which can be positive or negative.) Since CAA's are responsible for addressing needs throughout their target area, not being well known can be indicative of negative agency health, both because of a failure to address areas of need, and because such areas may develop alternative institutions that ultimately compete with the CAA for funding. This occurred in one CAA area, but the CAA corrected this weakness, expanding services to the new poverty areas in the County and inviting representatives of the new areas to join its board.

If program beneficiaries do not understand the scope and purpose of the agency that operates the head start program, weatherization service, or rural transportation system, then the CAA has largely failed to present itself as anything other than a fragmented set of services. If this is the case, the CAA is vulnerable to the type of thinking recently attributed to Governor Cuomo, who responded negatively to urging that New York join 15 other states in providing state subsidies to the federal dollars in the core funding of Community Services Block Grant. His rationale was that existing state agencies already served as vehicles for the services coordinated by CAA's, and he would prefer to use the state's existing mechanism. To the extent that CAA's fail to function in integrated ways with appropriate communications that enable their constituents to understand their purpose, the Governor's position might be valid.

Analysis of the relationship of CAA activity to agency health as measured by beneficiary attitudes was not conducted. Prior to analysis of the data, it was decided that information collected about or from beneficiaries did not consistently reflect a fair cross-section of some CAA's target populations. Rather than develop speculative analysis based on questionable data, this aspect of the analysis was dropped.

After the data analysis described in the previous chapter was completed, I conducted comparisons of the rankings that had been derived by comparing CAA's "beneficiary attitude" ratings (which combined their ratings on the three elements discussed above) with the composite CAA health rating derived by combining the six separate CAA Health measures discussed here. The correlation, in spite of the questionable data, was exceptionally strong. A .77 correlation was

found in 1981, and a .92 correlation in 1984. Both correlations are significant at the .01 level. Thus, a seventh element of CAA health, definitely worthy of further exploration, has been identified.

o Community Leaders

Leaders of organizations that work in the same area as the CAA represent a group of "outsiders" with interests in the affairs of the CAA's target constituencies. Their views on the CAA provide an indication of how the agencies are seen from the outside. While not to be taken as the only measure of CAA health, consultation with community leaders is often used by evaluators to put findings into perspective. In this study, community leader ratings closely paralleled the overall composite ratings of CAA health for both years. Except for the beneficiary ratings mentioned above, no other ratings were as similar to the overall composite ratings.

Four elements were used as contributors to overall community leader attitude ratings. These were:

- o Representation on the CAA Board: Since one-third of each Board is representative of public and private agencies, business, religious groups, and so forth, the presence or absence of community leadership on the board can be a reflection of community leader perception of the worth of CAA activity.
- o Familiarity with the CAA: Basic awareness of the CAA's existence, sense of purpose, and mode of operation is indicative of how well the CAA has made its presence known in at least this segment of the community.
- o Respect for the CAA indicates a community leader's belief that

CAA activity is worthwhile.

- o Cooperation: indication that the CAA has developed ways of working with other organizations can be seen as evidence of CAA efforts to strengthen its ability to meet constituent needs by coordination of services, coalition-building, and so forth.

Major findings relating agency strategies, approaches, and so forth, to perception of CAA's by community leaders, are summarized below.

- o Sufficient variability was found on each of the four subitems considered in this portion of the analysis, to assure that each subitem was contributing something somewhat different to the overall rating.
- o As mentioned previously, this element of CAA health was closely correlated with the "Program Activity" measure of CAA health (significant at .01 level at both points in time.) In 1981, it had also been significantly correlated with staff morale, but this did not hold in 1984.
- o A comparison of community leader attitudes in 1981, to those in 1984, showed a stronger correlation than on the previously discussed measures of CAA health, but the correlation failed to be significant at the .05 level.
- o A number of relationships between CAA activity and this measure of agency health, which appeared to exist in 1981, were not confirmed in 1984. These included mode of management, communication with staff, and Director's commitment to staff development. Thus, community leader

attitude towards CAA's no longer appeared to be related to CAA's applying democratic leadership style, open communications, or support of staff advancement.

Other elements that appeared to be related, in 1981, but not 1984, were Director's time devoted to networking with local organizations, and (negative correlation in 1981) Director time devoted directly to program operations. Agency use of a planning process to develop its strategy mix was also related to community leader attitude only in 1981.

- o Community Leader's attitudes towards CAA's was found to be positive at both points in time when
 - CAA Directors preferred that CAA's have high visibility;
 - CAA Directors allocate major time to resource development (although this was true of most CAA directors in 1984);
 - CAA boards had actively functioning committees, with Boards active in evaluation and fiscal and programmatic monitoring.
 - CAA's had strategies that were linked, overall, and had comparatively high amount of emphasis on advocacy, lower emphasis on service delivery, and some emphasis on community organization.

The findings summarized above suggest that Community Leader opinions and attitudes towards CAA's may change slower than the "reality" of the CAA's operations. For example, of the two CAA's that declined from the top two rankings on morale to the two lowest ranks, one was still tied for highest rank on community leader attitude, while the other ranked last. Another CAA, ranked last in 1981 on Community

Leader attitudes, had made a number of organizational changes that might be expected to improve their ranking on this aspect of CAA health, but its rank only rose to a three-way tie for seventh (i.e., 7-9 out of ten ranks). Some community leaders remained reluctant to become involved with this agency, over two years after it had last been assailed in local press for fiscal abuse and programmatic inadequacies.

The findings also seem to confirm that, in 1984, community leaders' attitudes towards the CAA were based primarily on things that could be seen, tangibly, with regard to CAA activity: outcomes rather than process. This could explain the lowered correlation with staff morale, and with the democratic/open style of leadership and communication that was more prevalent, and more appreciated, in 1981. Favorable community leader attitudes appeared to have shifted towards mixed, programmatic approaches, although two of the three CAA's tied for highest rank in 1984 are CAA's with democratic, open systems.

In presenting brief case examples, below, two agencies are contrasted, as their styles are quite different but the resultant community leader attitude and support is strong at both.

STAG and MCCAP have both been discussed previously, with regard to other aspects of CAA health. The discussion here will be limited to relation to community leaders.

STAG and MCCAP were tied for highest rank on community leader attitudes in both 1981 and 1984. Both enjoy the support of numerous agencies that serve the same target population as the CAA. The strategies that resulted in these good working relations remained virtually unchanged during this period. STAG's approach can be considered centralized and active, while MCCAP's can be seen as more

decentralized and partly communicative, partly cooperative through access.

STAG expended a great deal of agency effort on the organization and support of the Community Labor Coalition, which brings together community agencies and labor unions as a unified force to work for improved conditions throughout the area. The breadth of this coalition has resulted in some interesting exchanges, as some conservative union leaders have found needed support from coalition members with strong neighborhood activist tendencies. On the whole, the coalition is built of grass roots groups, many of them focused on local neighborhood issues (e.g., housing conditions and development in one ward of the City) and their labor allies. Members of the Coalition represent their groups on STAG's Board, and the Coalition has contributed to the agency's efforts to sustain and expand its organizing activities. At the same time, STAG's director and deputy director serve on boards of major service-provider coalitions, often functioning as outspoken advocates of their constituents' rights in these settings.

MCCAP, as a rural CAA covering a broad geographic area, has developed a strategy in which its local neighborhood centers serve as hubs for the service network in each part of the county. The centers convene local service provider meetings to explore cooperation, improve service delivery, identify unmet needs, and avoid unproductive duplication of services. The Centers, based on their relationship with other service providers, are able to facilitate the procurement of services for their constituents, when needed. In some sites, county and nonprofit agencies outstation staff at the local centers. At other places, the CAA provides transportation to needed services. The

agency's board contains 10 slots reserved for representatives of private organizations, all of which are filled by appropriate leaders of private social agencies, church organizations, and the like. Additional community leaders are among the persons appointed by public officials as their representatives on the Board.

In the case of MCCAP, community leader support of the agency may well contribute to the agency's surviving its current difficulties (see staff morale.) The vital role played by the neighborhood centers, in local affairs, may affect the central administrative problems the agency suffered. It certainly has maintained community leader support of the CAA, thusfar.

o Political Officials

Public officials, like community leaders, have an "outsider's" view of community action agencies. The opinions of such public officials, towards the CAA's, does not, in itself, provide a fair overall measure of CAA health. However, the relationship of CAA's to local government has a direct relationship on agency fiscal health, as local government can be a source of funding, contracts, local share match, and other support--alternatively, it can inhibit agency efforts. As discussed in the next section, under fiscal health, a virtually perfect correlation was found between CAA relation to local government, and overall CAA fiscal health at both points in time. As a measure of CAA Health, here, the same four items are considered as for community leaders' attitudes/perceptions towards the CAA:

- o Board Representation (By law, one-third of the seats on the CAA Board are designated for elected public officials, who

have the right to either serve or appoint a representative to the Board.)

- o Familiarity with the CAA;
- o Respect for the CAA (which is not identical to liking what the CAA does...);
- o Cooperation with the CAA (which does directly translate into enhancement of the CAA's ability to function, through information, services, funds or other means.)

The findings, with regard to this measure of CAA health, are quite different from the previous indicators of CAA health. They are presented below:

- o Public Officials' perception/attitude towards the CAA changed very little between 1981 and 1984. The correlation between the two years was .930, significant at the .01 level.
- o Public Officials' view of CAA's was closely correlated to overall CAA fiscal health. In 1981, the correlation rs was .901, significant at the .01 level. In 1984, the correlation was .610, (only) significant at the .05 level.
- o Virtually none of the items related to CAA leadership style, communications, strategy mix, or Board chairperson activity were found to be closely correlated to Public Official attitudes towards CAA's. The only item that showed a correlation at both points in time was an aspect of Board activity: Boards active in fiscal monitoring were found at CAA's that Public Officials were more attentive to. A slight tendency was also found correlating public official attitude to CAA's with linked strategy approaches.

- o In 1981, CAA directors' involvement with resource development was correlated with positive Public Official perception of CAA's. This did not differentiate CAA's in 1984, as most directors were extensively involved in resource development.

These findings seem to indicate that the mode of operations of CAA's has little predictable bearing on public official attitudes towards the CAA, except with regard to fiscal health. Fiscal Health is a two-sided element. On one hand fiscal management effects the confidence of local officials concerned that their visible support of the CAA should not lead to their embarrassment. On the other hand, agency funding levels can be helped by contracts, grants, or other forms of support available from local government. Thus, political official attitudes toward the CAA both contribute to, and are affected by elements of, CAA fiscal health.

The implications of this finding--that relations with public officials or local government are significantly correlated to CAA fiscal health, and that other aspects of agency style and approach are not consistently related to public official attitudes towards CAA's--are certainly interesting. The correlation with fiscal health, and lack of correlation with other elements, suggests that there are two, possibly three distinct aspects to CAA health: one related to fiscal well-being, which is closely correlated by perception of the CAA by public officials; one related to program activity, which is related to perception of the CAA by community leaders. (Board health, discussed later in this section, also appears to be more closely related to this community leader/program activity aspect of agency health.) Morale--which is most clearly related to leadership style,

communication, and a unified strategy including advocacy and community organization--leaned more towards the community leader/program activity measures of CAA health in 1981, but did not by 1984. This can be explained in terms of the impact of Reagonomics on the CAA's. Additional factors--typically fiscal in nature, secondarily programmatic and administrative--impinged on CAA morale in 1984. These are discussed more fully in Section E of this chapter, which specifically discusses the impact of Reagonomics.

Case examples relevant to the attitude of public officials toward the CAA, are presented below.

TCCAA was ranked highest with regard to relations with public officials at both points in time. This agency was created as a new entity in 1979, replacing a CAA that had folded several years earlier due to mismanagement. The board chairperson, an active and vocal supporter of this CAA--has been a county legislator for the past five years. County legislators from both major political parties sit on the board and participate actively in program evaluations and planning, and consideration of the CAA's fiscal crisis. The effort and support of County public officials was necessary for this CAA to come into existence, and to grow in spite of federal cuts.

Shortly before my initial visit, this CAA had hired the head of the Hudson Valley's technical assistance provider organization, as acting director. She came into a situation of poor morale, fragmented staff, and fiscal weaknesses in need of correction. She moved quickly, with the full support of her Board and Board Chairperson, to revitalize the agency fiscally and programatically, and rebuilt morale by demonstrating to staff that she had a sense of vision for the agency.

that assured agency growth, job security, staff development, and a sense of being part of an organization committed to meaningful effort on behalf of its constituents.

County government support included both direct financial support and contracts to TCCAA to operate a rural transportation network that was badly needed.

In addition to support at the County level, the CAA initiated an effort to obtain funding from each township in the county, to offset some of the reductions caused by the cutbacks. This level of local cash contribution has risen steadily. Ties are also maintained with officials of the two small cities in the County. Each has demonstrated support by making space available to the CAA at nominal rent..

LCCAA was tied for fourth in the rankings of the ten CAA's, with regard to public official attitudes, at both points in time. Like TCCAA, LCCAA's board contains county legislators who represent themselves. Unlike TCCAA, this sector of the Board totally dominates the full Board (when they have reason to attend...)

LCCAA's Board Chairperson is a senior citizen, representative of the poor, as was his predecessor. Both were given very little help in becoming effective Board Chairpersons, by the agency director. Board activity did not involve an active role in planning, evaluation, or other aspects of CAA monitoring. The agency director's style has been to provide most information that the Board needs, primarily at meetings. Although this has altered somewhat, in recent years under its new director, the Board is primarily passive, letting the director do what she feels is best.

This agency receives a great deal of support from the County,

including rent-free space in a county office complex for all agency administrative staff. The agency operates strictly as a service delivery organization, although its current director expressed interest in expanding its advocacy and organization roles, somewhat. It has not been critical of county or local governments, nor has it been threatening to any aspect of the county legislator's interests. (A program director received a written reprimand for conducting advocacy activity. The reprimand was caused by activity that embarrassed County Legislators by criticizing activity of landlords who happened to be allied with County Legislators.)

Two CAA's in this study are located in the same county. County government is extremely conservative, and has never given the CAA's any matching moneys or contracts during the past five years. Previously, one of the two received manpower training funding, while the other received nothing because of its "radical" reputation.

Both agencies were invited, in the past 1-2 years to play major roles in the organizing of surplus food distribution in the County. Both have performed that role, taking a slight financial loss that is undoubtedly made up in terms of contacts and experience, and because it gives them some type of opportunity to show, to the County their ability to perform effectively.

There are substantial differences between the two agencies, with regard to quality of programs, scope and quality of program activity, and so forth. But the posture of County government has handicapped both, more or less equally.

4. Fiscal Well-Being

As mentioned previously, fiscal health involves at least two distinct kinds of elements, each of which have been considered central to agency health by some reviewers, evaluators or agency boards and personnel.

Soundness of fiscal management is the purview of auditors who review agency fiscal records and determine the balance of funds expended compared to funds received, during a period of time (usually a year.) The auditors determine whether funds have been managed and spent in accordance with the rules specified by the contract's funding sources. Among the rules applied to CAA funds is a requirement that accounts not be comingled, thus assuring that one program's overspending does not cause a crisis in another program area. This requirement is often subject to bending by CAA fiscal managers, as the alternative to "internal borrowing" when funding sources are late in their payments to the CAA, is to borrow money and pay interest which is not an approved cost item under most CAA contracts. Another rule requires specific bidding procedures for procurements over a certain size, and another puts clear limits on the amount of flexibility that each CAA has in terms of how dollars can be spent. CAA's that do not have clear records of expenditures are in danger of having costs disallowed, even if no malice was intended. Successful operation of CAA fiscal departments is a critical activity, as failure to adhere to these rules can put the agency into critical danger of "going under" if audits determine that moneys have been spent on disallowed or questioned costs, and the CAA is required to correct (make up) the deficit. This has caused the collapse of CAA administrations in the

past, and is part of the story behind the near-demise of ACCAA between 1981 and 1984.

The other major element of fiscal health is the relative sufficiency of resources to enable the CAA to carry out its intended purposes. This can be called economic viability. Audits do not usually make judgments with regard to relationship of funds available to programmatic need, unless a contract requires a level of productivity maintained for dollars spent. Agency viability, on the other hand, requires that resources be available in a manner that they can be applied where needed.

The word resources is used here because CAA's have additional vehicles, besides (grant) funds, for accomplishing their program objectives. These include volunteers, contributed space and services, property owned by the CAA, and other less tangible resources such as access to media.

Nonetheless, cash funding is the primary source of sustenance for the CAA's. And funding comes in two basic forms: Restricted and unrestricted. Restricted funds can only be used for the purpose or program for which they were designated. Unrestricted funds can be used to meet any purpose, including the bridging of gaps in the timeliness of grant awards.

Local initiative, or "core" funding, of CAA's by CSA or CSBG were intended to give agencies the ability to maintain their core administrative activity and such other activity or programs as were considered locally appropriate, usually areas for which no "restricted" funding was available. Most CAA's use their core funding for program

administration, planning/ grantsmanship, outreach and education--often including operating local neighborhood centers and/or deploying organizers or outreach workers.

The number of dollars that CAA's could generate, given the level of their local initiative funding, had been explored during the Carter era as a way of measuring the effectiveness of CAA's--or at least the effectiveness of the CSA local initiative grants. The experience of our initial evaluation of twenty CAA's in 1980-81, plus review of similar evaluations nationally, provided a guideline for defining healthy ratios of total agency dollars to core dollars. Indeed, this ratio had been expected to be one of the major indicators of CAA fiscal health. While it is still considered a useful measure, the present study demonstrated several things that affect the meaningfulness of this ratio:

- o With funding cuts, some agencies slipped below a minimum level of economic/programmatic viability. These cuts were equal in percentage, but impacted on smaller agencies to a greater degree than larger agencies.
- o Agencies that had their own facilities, or facilities contributed by County or other sources, could apply their core funds to other areas, thus making the same number of dollars go further.
- o Agencies that effectively used volunteers or professionals borrowed from local industry or institutions could also extend their capability.

As a result of the considerations discussed above, eight elements were considered as aspects of overall CAA fiscal health, and analyses

were also conducted to see how each correlated to CAA activity and the various measures of CAA health.

The elements of fiscal health were:

- o Absolute number of dollars for each CAA;
- o Funding Ratio: Total funding to Core Funding;
- o Percentage of CAA Funding from Head Start (too large a percentage suggesting that the tail wagged the dog. This did not end up significantly related to any aspects of CAA health or CAA operations);
- o Fiscal Management Difficulties (and their level of severity);
- o Impact of fiscal on morale;
- o Ownership of facilities;
- o Use of Volunteers;
- o Local Government role: cash contributions, space or other contributed services, contracts.

A brief summary of findings relating fiscal health to CAA strategies and activity appears below.

- o Rank order of CAA's "absolute" funding and funding ratio (total funding versus local initiative/core funding) were found to be extremely closely correlated, with significance levels of .01 in both 1981 and 1984. Ranking on these elements of fiscal health did not change significantly between 1981 and 1984, with both having positive correlation over time that were significant at the .01 level.
- o Rank order of the amount of change in funding between 1981 and 1984 had a zero-order correlation with absolute funding and funding ratio, and a low positive correlation to overall

fiscal health.

- o While the rankings did not change significantly, changes in level of fiscal health (from at risk to borderline, border to "healthy") occurred in a small percentage of cases--all in an "improved" direction.
- o Overall fiscal health in 1981 had a very low, non-significant correlation to overall fiscal health in 1984.
- o While 4 CAA's had serious fiscal management problems in 1981, no serious fiscal management problems were noted in 1984. Minimal to moderate fiscal management problems remained at 4 CAA's in 1984.
- o A very close correlation was found between CAA fiscal health and relation to local government. The only other element of CAA health significantly correlated to overall fiscal health ranks was relationship to public officials.
- o Mode of management was not closely correlated to overall fiscal health in either year.
- o Two-way, open communication was related to fiscal health, especially with regard to lack of serious fiscal management problems. Where staff understood and accepted the director's role and policies, there were no serious staff morale problems caused by fiscal conditions, nor were there serious fiscal management problems. Fiscal management problems appeared to be more likely to occur under conditions of tight central management control.
- o Overall fiscal health also appeared to be related to director commitment to staff development in 1981 and 1984.

- o Fiscal Health was related to directors' employing strategies that emphasized a unified agency image.
- o Tendencies that appeared, in 1981, to consistently differentiate several fiscal sub-elements (ownership of facilities, extent of use of volunteers, and presence of serious fiscal management and morale problems) were not confirmed in 1984. This was largely due to changes in the overall fiscal health picture of CAA's, as the number of CAA's using volunteers extensively and owning their facilities increased, with the increase coming from CAA's with different characteristics than those in that category in 1981. In 1984, the reduction in number of CAA's with serious fiscal management or morale problems made differentiation based on these items less feasible.

Fiscal health is clearly an important measure of overall CAA health. Without the resources to effectively pursue its defined objectives, CAA's risk becoming "deformed" in the process of reacting to their economic reality. Without sound fiscal management--regardless of the agency's actual financial size--the agency is at risk with regards to both internal staff morale (and its potential impact on quality of program activity) and with regard to its perception in the community and among public officials (which impact on agency reputation, outreach capability, and likelihood of strong support for the CAA by local government.)

Of the elements of fiscal health included in this analysis, all except one contributed to an enhanced picture of overall CAA health. The portion of CAA funding that was provided by Head Start was the one

element that was not found to be useful. This measure did not clearly correlate with other elements of CAA health--fiscal or otherwise--nor did it correlate consistently with any aspect of CAA strategy or leader approach. I would still contend that an unusually high percentage of CAA funds devoted to Head Start should serve as a red flag for evaluators, who might reasonably question whether the balance of the agency's effort was appropriately broad and effective for addressing other community needs. However, this was not borne out by analysis among the ten agencies included in this study. The extent to which Head Start is integrated with other CAA programs also was not found to be a function of its relative size.

The remaining six elements were found to be discreet, separate elements. Funding ratio was used as an element of overall fiscal health, rather than absolute number of dollars in the agency budget, because this provided a correction factor for agencies of different size. In actual use, absolute dollars and funding ratio were found to be closely correlated (significant at the .01 level.) This is largely due to the number of CAA's in the study that received equal amounts of CSBG core funding (the denominator of these ratios). That this correlations generally held for the larger CAA's suggests that their additional core funding contributed to enhanced resource development efforts through maintenance of personnel (e.g. planner, deputy directors who enable directors to devote more time to resource development) that the smaller CAA's often can no longer afford, given cuts in core funding levels.

Several of the changes in fiscal activity, as summarized above, are indicative of efforts undertaken by CAA's with survival on their

mind. Among these changes are the following:

- o Increased attention, by agency directors, to resource development;
- o Overall improvement in fiscal management at several CAA's;
- o Seeking ownership of agency facilities, by three of the seven CAA's that did not already own their headquarters or other major buildings. Success in this area enhances agency ability to withstand cuts or elimination of (federal) government support.
- o Increased utilization of volunteers and other sources of personnel (including "workfare" and other Department of Social Services programs, employment programs of the Department for the Aging, and "loans" of executives to CAA's by local corporations).
- o Seeking more local support, at both county and township/village levels, to offset federal cuts. This effort to seek more local funding translates in some instances, into a shift in official agency posture away from confronting or threatening their potential (fiscal) benefactors. In other cases, it translates into threats (or actual action) to eliminate local services if deficits are not alleviated by local contributions.
- o Deemphasis, at some agencies, of an active community organization stance, justified in some cases by the unpopularity of community action with funding sources. This deemphasis can be risky for CAA's in the long run as their ability to mobilize their constituency to act on issues

differentiates them from many traditional service agencies, and the relationship of a supportive constituency to voter leverage can often be translated into funding or other cooperation. Shifting away from community organization may buy short-term cooperation from (local) funding sources while weakening CAA ability (individually and jointly) to influence funding decisions at the federal and state levels.

A few case examples are presented, below, of unique or illustrative examples of CAA adaptation to the fiscal realities of the '80's.

- o UHAP has strengthened its relationship with County government by stressing its role as a service delivery organization operating through a network of neighborhood centers and senior facilities throughout the county. At administrative levels, and in literature describing the agency, "community organization" has been deemphasized, largely because of the agency's growing dependence on support from local government. Interviews and observations of UHAP's neighborhood service centers revealed a substantial amount of tenant organizing, consumer organizing, and other efforts that showed as much organizing in 1984 as had been pursued in 1981. When asked about this, a neighborhood center worker replied "Of course we still do it. We just don't talk about it" (or write it up on monthly reports...)

UHAP has also taken unique steps to sustain its level of effort, and support its existing staff in spite of budget constraints. One example is the merger of a staff line for a neighborhood center worker, with a Head Start family worker

line. Neither budget could support a full time worker in a rural sector of the county, but combined, they were able to provide services well, to both Head Start and non-Head Start residents of the area. Such mergers of a CAA staff position with Head Start are extremely rare.

- o TCCAA and MCCAP solicited support from local townships to support their broad local service networks. Both also employed threats or actual cuts in service, in efforts to pressure the county to contribute more. TCCAA dropped unprofitable (but needed) parts of its rural transportation service, saying it could not afford the drain on its general budget. The agency hoped that the county would be pressed into making up the deficit in order to continue the service. This had not been resolved at the time of my 1984 visit. MCCAP's director announced that the agency's neighborhood centers were endangered by budget cuts. In this case, reaction partly backfired. The rallied support for the local centers identified the CAA itself as part of the problem. Nonetheless, solicitation of local government contributions has been initiated in earnest, this year. The agency is optimistic, but no results were visible at the time of my 1984 visit.
- o STAG is one of the few CAA's that did not reduce its community organizing efforts, in spite of funding hardships. Instead, in alliance with its coalition of community and labor organizations, it succeeded in purchasing its headquarters building in 1984. This agency is also most

successful with regard to obtaining volunteer labor and utilizing "workfare" persons placed at the agency by the County Department of Social Services. (See Chapter Nine.)

5. Board Health

The final element of CAA health that was considered is Board Health. Since the board is legally responsible for the agency's policies, programs, and fiscal/administrative conduct, the question of ability of the board to carry out its responsibility would be sufficient reason to include board health as an aspect of overall CAA well-being. Additional reasons for considering this as a measure of agency health are more speculative: If the agency's board was healthy, it would be able to participate in agency planning, fiscal and program monitoring, and resource development... If the agency's board is not healthy, there is no check on potential abuses committed by the CAA director; and no formal vehicle for getting concerns of the poor, local government, and the local private sector to be heard.

Although board composition and some aspects of board responsibilities were generally prescribed by federal regulations, the CAA boards varied widely with regard to membership, levels and areas of activity, perception of the board's role, relationship to CAA staff and directors, and other matters.

A number of aspects of board activity are considered, in this study, as independent variables that are analyzed with regard to how they correlate with each measure of CAA health. This is discussed in chapter 6. Four elements of boards have been identified as indicators of different aspects of board health. These elements, identified

through reviews of CAA evaluations and documents prepared by CSA and private sources on board roles and their evaluation, are discussed below.

- o Percentage of Board meetings achieving a quorum (in past year). This is indicative of whether the board is able to carry on the business it is responsible for, and whether board participation is seen as worth at least some time of its members.
- o Number of Vacancies on the Board (at time of visit.) A board with a large number of vacancies may be able to carry on its required business, but the vacancies usually indicate a problem for the agency in attracting and/or retaining representatives from one or more sectors of the board. Such problems may indicate CAA weaknesses in relationship with a sector of the community, which could mean the CAA is unable to benefit from their input for board planning, and/or unable to capitalize on such boardmembers as supporters of the CAA's pursuit of local support or cooperation from local agencies. It is normal for a small number of vacancies to exist at any one time, as vacancies require some time and process to fill. Less than 10% of the slots being vacant would indicate a healthy board in this respect. Over 20% vacancies would indicate a problem.
- o Board Understanding of its Role. Understanding of the scope of responsibilities that a board can/should perform is necessary for boards to effectively carry out their role. Equally important is Board understanding of the difference

between its (policy) role, and the agency director's (and staff's) role in administering and carrying out this responsibility. At different agencies, the number of board members who fully understand their role ranges from none to all, and the level of understanding varies from full to limited. Where board understanding is limited, the board is unable to function as a full partner in seeing agency activity carried out in a manner that meets board-sanctioned standards.

- o Board Performance addresses both the question of "what does the board do?" and the question "how (and how well) do they do it?" It includes consideration of board activity in planning, monitoring, resource development, and members' serving as liaison between the CAA and their constituency. Each of the three previously mentioned elements contributes to the potential of the board, but actual board performance may be effected by other (external) factors as well.

A brief summary of findings is presented below:

- o Board health rankings in 1981 were significantly correlated to 1984 Board health rankings. This suggests that agency/board systems and procedures do not tend to change quickly.
- o Positive correlations with other measures of CAA health were significant at the .05 level, with Program Activity in 1981, but not 1984; and with perception of community leaders in 1984, but not 1981. No significant correlations were found with morale, fiscal health,

public officials' attitudes towards the CAA.

- o Board Health was found to be related to democratic mode of management, with frequent staff meetings being far more characteristic of CAA's with healthier boards.
- o Director's relationship to staff (including communications) was not significantly related to board health.
- o Director preference for high visibility for the CAA was positively related to board attendance, although not clearly related to overall Board Health in 1984.
- o Director's role and relationship with the board was not closely related to Board Health, in either year. Some relationship was found with individual elements at one time or the other, but not both.
- o Director's allocation of time did not correlate closely to overall Board health, but did appear related to Board understanding and Board performance.
- o A strong negative correlation was found between Board Health and Directors' devoting major time to networking with public officials.
- o Level and areas of Board Chairperson activity were closely correlated to Board Health, especially in 1984.
- o Boards with functioning committee structures were significantly correlated to Board Performance of its role, and in 1984--to overall Board Health.
- o CAA's in which Boards were active in evaluation tended to have good understanding of their roles, and--in

1984--were strongly correlated to overall Board Health.

- o In both 1981 and 1984, boards that were active in personnel matters, achieved quorums 100% of the time.
- o In 1984, Board health was strongly correlated with agency devotion of time to resource development, but was not clearly related to strategy decisions that had appeared relevant in 1981 (e.g., emphasis on advocacy and community organization, lower emphasis on service delivery).

The findings with regard to overall CAA Board health suggest that agencies which operate in a democratic managerial style tend to be agencies whose Boards are enabled to exercise their role more broadly and effectively than Boards at agencies with more authoritarian centralized management styles. This would appear to be consistent, as in each case the Director shares responsibility for plans and focus of agency activity, and provides necessary support that enables others to perform their roles more effectively and generally more independently.

The lack of correlation between Board health and directors' style of communications to staff--and whether they supported staff development--was more surprising, given that a relationship had been found between management style and Board health. If correlation had been found, a generalization might have been made about Director's behavior towards staff and Boards being consistent and directly influenced on the wellness of the Board. The lack of such a correlation indicates that--at least in some cases--Board health exists in agencies where Directors do not support staff development through open communication or staff development practices. Also, in some

cases, director's open communication and staff development efforts can exist at agencies that lack a strong board. This finding may be partly attributable to time--with Director style (and directors!) changing more rapidly than Board characteristics, procedures, and "health". Also, Board strength does not dictate Director style of communications or other matters. The key concept is that Board health can have a life of its own, independent of director's behavior towards staff and CAA, and can actually be either positively or negatively related to director behavior.

The negative correlation found between Directors' devoting time to networking with public officials, and Board health, may be related to Director's efforts to develop one solid base of support. It would seem logical enough, that Directors would cultivate support from sources which could bolster the agency and/or their own ability to operate, and that at times this could be either of these sources. Indeed, at three of the four CAA's where relations with county government were least satisfactory in 1984, major effort had been put in by directors to support solid board effort. However, this and other review of the data indicated that overall Board Health was not consistently related. The three CAA's were ranked high, medium, and low on overall Board Health. If a conscious decision was made to cultivate one relationship or the other, it would certainly be an interesting finding, as relationship to public officials correlated closely with fiscal health, while putting greater time into Board development was more closely related to agency health as measured by program activity and community leader relations. Fiscal health and health on program activity are, of course, not mutually exclusive. Nor was it found that directors devote attention

exclusively to either Political Officials or Board development. (Directors' devoting attention to Board Development was not found to be correlated with Board Health, probably because strong boards do not require as much attention as do boards in need of strengthening.)

Board Chairperson level of activity and areas of activity were found to be more consistently related to Board health, than was agency Director's activity. This indicates that the Board chairperson can be a significant contributor to the Board and Board Health, impacting through the Board on other aspects of CAA activity and well-being. This is a further emphasis of the point made earlier, that Board health is not totally dependent on agency and director activity and, in fact, the reverse is often true.

In our small sample of agencies, Board health was not closely correlated to overall CAA health. As mentioned above, this may be partly a function of time, and partly a function of a degree of independence between board and director effort. In the ideal case, Director and Board are mutually supportive, and the efforts of both contribute to both the programmatic and fiscal well-being of the agency.

One example of a CAA that approaches this "ideal case" is TCCAA. As mentioned previously (see section on Public Officials), public officials sit on this CAA's board, usually preferring to represent themselves rather than appoint an alternate. The public officials contribute to the agency's breadth of focus, and learn from their participation on the CAA Board about community needs and the impact and value of the CAA. This has translated into strong financial and contractual support of the CAA by the County.

At the same time, the Agency's Director utilizes open 2-way

communications, and a generally democratic management style with full delegation of responsibilities to program heads, including various mechanisms enhancing staff development.

At the time of the 1984 visit to this agency, the Board's planning committee was involved in an annual review of all of the CAA's programs. Over the course of three weeks, all program heads made presentations to the committee on their program's accomplishments, community needs, and program goals and needs for the coming year. At the completion of the process, the committee would present its findings--including the cost of each component's projected activities--to the full Board, for decisions on how to most effectively match agency resources to identified needs.

The agency's director and Board are both clearly committed and actively involved in assuring that the agency's programs are based on planning that involves input from staff and board, on behalf of community needs. The agency, through its director and board, are committed to providing opportunities for staff and board to fully participate and grow in this and other areas. With this philosophy and approach, and the support earned through the efforts of the agency director and board chairperson (and staff and board), TCCAA's total budget increased by 46% between 1981 and 1984--the largest percentage increase of any of the ten agencies in this study.

WHOA's director devoted his primary attention, during his first year in office, to developing board potential. This included regular board training and education about its role and scope. Ultimately, this enabled the board to reach the point where it could--and did--provide guidance to the agency with regard to policy matters,

strategies to pursue, and so forth. This period of time, in developing the Board's capabilities, delayed the director's shifting attention to programmatic matters and relations to other community agencies and public officials. In the last year, he has devoted more time to these matters.

Much of the development process with the Board was done by the director, alone. No other staff attended board meetings during that period. This ran the risk of making the board too dependent on the director as the source of most of its information, but did assure a clear understanding of the Board's role and relationship to the director. In the long run, the board has developed into a fairly effective body with leadership that is active in pursuing resources and new program ideas for the CAA. However, in the last year, there has been a decline in board attendance at meetings, and the director expresses frustration that the development effort is undercut by Bylaws provisions that limit the term of Board members to 5 consecutive years.

The agency's Board chairperson describes the Board's role as active, and relationship to the director as healthy--and certainly not a rubber stamp. The board does monitor agency program, reviews fiscal reports (somewhat), deals with personnel and planning issues, and plays a role in resource development through local fundraising projects.

PCCAC's Board, in 1981, contained both remarkable strengths and weaknesses. The Board had no vacancies, and achieved quorums at 100% of its meetings. The Board met regularly, with meetings beginning with a period open to the public for comment, followed by the Board's scheduled business.

All of the Board's public representatives were appointees of

County legislators. The legislators supported the CAA with County cash as the local share for some of its programs, and had bailed the CAA out of two fiscal crises in which the agency received very bad publicity over its fiscal mismanagement or malfeasance.

The Board's private sector representatives were from a narrow range of civil rights groups and black churches, with no representatives from business or industry. The low income representatives were from the three geographic areas that the agency had always served, although at least three additional poverty areas had been identified in the County. The Board had no representatives of the elderly or of target area youth.

The Board's monthly meetings reportedly lasted at least 2 1/2 hours, starting at 8:00 p.m., with many going well past midnight. This resulted in some important business being conducted after many board members had left for the evening.

One such meeting had resulted in the firing of the CAA's director, shortly before our 1981 visit. This occurred late in a meeting where this possibility had not been listed on the agenda. At the time of our visit, the agency's fiscal director was serving--inadequately--as acting director, and the Board's chairperson spent time at the agency each day, partly filling the administrative/decisionmaking void.

This was a case of a Board dominating the agency, including some overstepping of the boundary between policy-making and daily operations. (This overstepping preceded the dismissal of the previous director.) Within the Board, one clique (with the ability to stay up late) dominated the Board. For all of its good intentions and time committed to the agency, the Board contributed to the agency's problems.

(If we looked back several years, we would find that this CAA had a strong director to match this strong board. Once he left, the board fought amongst itself, with two factions each pushing a strong candidate. The compromise appointee never had the full support of either faction... One of the original candidates eventually became the director of a neighboring CAA.)

The 1981-84 period saw PCCAC go through three directors before the present director settled in, consolidating power in part thanks to changes that she was able to engineer with regard to the Board. A number of Board members were removed because they had served their five consecutive years, as limited by the bylaws. The Board added representatives from the unrepresented poverty areas, and the agency has expanded its operations to serve these areas. The balance of control has shifted, with the director able to operate without undue board influence. It is not clear whether the balance has tipped to the point that she no longer is held in check by the Board (she says the Board remains strong...)

The Board still gets 100% rating on quorums, but almost one-third of its slots were empty at the time of my 1984 visit.

E. Discussion of Findings, II: Impact of Reagan-era Budget Cuts on CAA Strategies, Approaches, Operations, and Over-All Well-Being

The rhetoric of the Reagan administration, since its beginnings, has referred to "streamlining government," "turning responsibility for local programs back to local and state government" and so forth. The actual meaning of this rhetoric has been significant reduction in federal support for a wide range of programs and services for the needy

of this nation--including educational support; health and community mental health services; nutrition; employability programs; housing; services for the elderly; youth programs of various kinds; and numerous other efforts designed to provide opportunities for the poor to improve their situation, and supportive services for "the truly needy." We have seen the percentage of persons living at or below the national poverty level grow, while the federal dollars provided for programs and services shrinks. Moreover, the extreme posture taken by the Reagan Administration in its annual budget presentations has forced Congress and local agencies into a defensive posture in which "holding the line" (no reductions in annual funding, no increases even for inflation) are treated as modest victories.

This has certainly not been an easy time for Community Action Agencies. Reduced federal funding, annual uncertainty about the level of funding (with the current Reagan proposal for Fiscal Year 1986, to eliminate the Community Services Block Grant, supported initially by the Republican-controlled senate, being typical but extreme), adjustments to new procedures as state systems replaced the Community Service Agency 9 months after Reagan took office, and a decline in media attention to these types of programs coincided with increased needs for CAA-type activities. The numbers of persons in need increased and the dollars available decreased, both for CAA's and other public and private organizations that assist the poor, elderly, disabled, or other disadvantaged groups.

The period covered by this study is the beginning through the end of Reagan's first term. The period has confronted CAA's with the challenge of remaining viable while core funding--at least from federal

sources--declines, at the same time that constituent needs are expanding. To remain viable, CAA's are faced with the problems of survival, relevance, and effectiveness.

In the preceding section of this document, discussion focused on elements of CAA health that were found to be consistently related to CAA strategies and activities at both points in time. Here, we consider things that changed during this period, and consider the impact of the Reagan-era policies and the climate it has fostered on these changes.

The discussion, here, is limited to findings with regard to ten CAA's in New York State--half in the Hudson Valley, half in Central New York. All are relatively small agencies, in terms of size of core funding received through the Community Service Block Grant. Seven of the ten agencies receive the minimum amount awarded to CAA's through CSBG, and the largest received 1.875 times that amount. New York State assumed responsibility for directly administering this block grant in 1982, under a state legislated mandate to continue to provide the bulk of these funds to the CAA's that had been funded by CSA, under essentially the same operating guidelines.

There appear to be few practical differences in the change from Federal to State responsibility for administration, distribution, and monitoring of these funds. The reduced dollar amount available to each CAA was primarily a matter of federal policy, which the state administers, using the same allocation formula that had been in place prior to transfer of responsibility to the State (as mentioned in Chapter Two, this was subject to criticism by some CAA's, for crediting agencies in more heavily urbanized sections of the state with a higher

percentage of the State's poverty--the basis of the allocation of funds--than would have been found if data had been updated.) The shift to the state resulted in transfer of monitoring responsibilities to new personnel with less familiarity with the CAA's and their operating guidelines. On the other hand, CSBG and Weatherization funds are managed by the same State agency--which was not the case before CSBG funds became state responsibility. (The agency, New York State's Division of Economic Opportunity, has undergone growing pains in setting up its administrative and grants management systems for these programs, but by late 1984 had smoothed out most of its procedural wrinkles.) The only other difference between federal and state oversight is that the State is, in some ways, more accessible and subject to local pressure to attend to concerns expressed by the CAA's. None of these changes were found, by the CAA's, to substantially alter their local modes of operating.

If the change to state administration of the block grant was not a major factor, changes that were noted might be attributed to some of the following:

- o Economic pressures resulting from reduced core funding (a 26% cut in Fiscal Year 1982, and no increases in the succeeding years of double digit inflation).
- o Changes in local political climates, with regard to the acceptability of direct organizing and strong advocacy postures, on the part of CAA's.
- o A shift in federal outlook towards all local community programs, stressing their roles as part of the "safety net" for the "truly needy"--which puts pressure on local agencies

to define their roles in terms of service delivery, and limits the primary target group to a smaller portion of the area's poor.

- o Greater pressure on state and local government to stretch their resources, for human services, in the face of reduction in federal help.
- o De-emphasis, on the part of national media, of attention to local efforts of groups such as CAA's, treating them as a passing phenomenon that is out of step in the 1980's.
- o Response of CAA's--Boards and/or administration--to the pressures and climate of the Reagan years. This response can include changes in personnel or policy, which can result in further changes by the CAA. It can also result in decisions to deal with the new realities without changing agency philosophy--flying in the face of the storm.

All of the above mentioned factors are related to the Reagan-era budget cuts and the climate they have generated. They are considered, below. First, however, it is worth noting that, although the shift of the Community Service Block Grant to the state did not seriously alter agency operations, it did have one major effect: it transferred attention for this funding away from Washington, D.C. Most CAA lobbying shifted its focus to the state level, although a national lobbying organization--the Community Action Foundation--continues to operate at the source of this funding. This shift of attention could have dangerous repercussions for CAA's, if they are unable to focus sufficient lobbying power on Washington, D.C., when 1986 funding comes up for final legislative consideration.

Some of the major changes noted are presented below.

Agency Strategy Mix - Emphasis on Service Delivery as the agency's primary strategy increased at four of the ten CAA's, decreased at four others and remained essentially unchanged at two CAA's (one with a strong service orientation, one with a stronger emphasis on community organization and integration of service with other aspects of CAA activity.) Increased emphasis on Service Delivery resulted in sharply decreased emphasis on community organization; decreased emphasis on Service Delivery translated into some increase in Community Organization at three CAA's. Emphasis on Advocacy increased at four CAA's, remained basically unchanged at four CAA's where it was already seen as an activity worthy of major attention, and declined at the two CAA's whose overall CAA health ratings were lowest. Resource Development received more attention in 1984 from eight of the ten CAA directors.

The greater attention to resource development can clearly be attributed to the perceived need for additional resources in order to remain viable. In some instances, changes in CAA director may have been motivated by the need to pursue resource opportunities more forcefully. Two such changes were accompanied by sharp curtailment of agency community organizing activity.

Emphasis on mixed strategies that stressed advocacy, resource development, and community organization, while deemphasizing service delivery was correlated with agency morale, program activity, and community leader perceptions of the CAA, in 1981 and 1984. It was also modestly correlated with fiscal health in 1981, but not in 1984. This change might be seen as a shift towards service delivery as an

indicator of fiscal health. This would be consistent with the interest of local governments, who are an increasingly important source of funds given the Reagan economic situation.

The increased emphasis on advocacy can also be attributed to the Reagan budget. CAA's are increasingly finding that their constituents are not receiving needed services--often because of problems associated with reduced resources to meet these needs. As a result, some CAA's have increased their efforts to articulate the existence of unmet needs, through media and other vehicles. On another level, the CAA's also find themselves advocating--through local media, and direct communication with public officials and others--for their own role as an agency that can meet some of these needs. A few agencies--notably STAG and (in limited areas) TCCAA--have challenged the policies of local governments with regard to the allocation of resources or delivery of services to the CAA's constituents. At least two agencies have avoided direct challenges of local government because of their dependence on local government funding. Nonetheless, these agencies have utilized their good relationships to advocate--politely--for local government support of their clients' needs.

Improved Agency Functioning

Fiscal - Whether due to a defensive reaction to the harsher policies of the current administration, or just a correction that would have occurred anyway, four community action agencies that had serious fiscal management problems in 1981 were better off in 1984, and a fifth had experienced serious fiscal management problems after 1981 and largely resolved them prior to my 1984 visit. No CAA's were faced with

serious fiscal management problems at the time of th 1984 revisit.

In addition to the agency's need/desire to improve their fiscal management, several other factors were at work. These include:

- o Pressure applied by both federal and state fiscal monitoring, for clear, defensible fiscal records and procedures.
- o Some leniency, in working with CAA's, on the part of federal and/or state audit personnel who sought to resolve old problems so CAA's could get on with their current efforts.
- o In some cases, improved fiscal procedures and monitoring by the state, which made serious efforts to improve on its own procedures. Long delays in payment, resulting from the State's contracting and vouchering system had been a source of CAA fiscal problems in the past, especially for Weatherization funds.
- o Understanding--regardless of how communicated--that local government support would be harder to obtain/sustain if the agency's fiscal house was not in order.
- o Possible impact of our 1981 evaluation reports, which pointed out problems and made recommendations for improvement.
- o The need, under the tighter fiscal situation, for tighter fiscal control. This resulted in replacement of weaker fiscal staff at some agencies.

There is another side to "fiscal health," which has become a harsher reality for some CAA's. Since funding is tighter, "hard decisions" had to be made with regard to both staffing and program operations. As mentioned previously, the two areas that appear to have most consistently been cut, in the face of reductions in CSBG funding,

have been outreach staff, and a "planner/grantsman/deputy director for planning" position. Another aspect of belt-tightening has been CAA reluctance to continue to operate projects that drain the agency's resources. One example of this is TCCAA's decision to drop some rural transportation routes that it operates for the county--because the service operated at a loss which ate into the agency's core local initiative funds. By refusing to continue to operate the service at a deficit, TCCAA hopes to encourage the County to increase its contribution for the service, thus enabling it to continue. If the County does not do so, a needed service would be curtailed for economic reasons.

Another item that most CAA's have agreed to perform, as natural conduits in their counties, is the distribution of surplus food. This has become an elaborate activity which can, for several consecutive days, tie up all agency outreach staff and others. The pennies per pound that the CAA's are paid to handle the tons of food barely pays for the cost of truck rental. Some CAA's are considering dropping out, primarily for economic reasons. To be sure, CAA's have been able to use the "cheese lines" as a natural captive audience for other outreach and information activity. (We know of one such line that was fertile ground for a local political organization's voter registration activity). But decisions with regard to continuing this effort are now a delicate balance of questions about its relationship to the CAA's stated goals, its cost in dollars and staff time, and the relative worth of its public relations values.

More Bang for the Buck?

A conservative argument--advanced by one upstate CAA Board member-- suggests that tighter budget constraints have resulted in CAA's remaining "as effective as ever" while costing less. Among the ten CAA's visited, two were clearly less effective in 1984, having reduced their basic efforts, serving fewer people less well than previously. Most CAA's were less able to sustain as broad an outreach effort as they had in 1981. This clearly reduced effectiveness in advocacy/community organization-oriented CAA's. For those CAA's which emphasized service delivery and de-emphasized organizing and outreach, reduction in core funding had less drastic an impact, since service programs such as Weatherization were expanded for most CAA's. To the extent that neighborhood centers and CAA outreach activity facilitates delivery of services (both CAA services and other government and agency services), cutbacks in core funding would be expected to weaken service delivery efforts as well.

It was not feasible, in the present study, to attempt measurement of cost-effectiveness, as units of service vary from a single contact for advice or referral, to home weatherization, organizing to save a neighborhood, enabling a client to obtain affordable housing, or a year's Head Start services. It would also be unfair to measure the cost of many services where the work is being performed at a lower wage rate than for comparable work (if available) elsewhere.

Other Aspects of Resource Development

Three CAA's owned their headquarters or other facilities, in 1981. One more obtained title to its headquarters in 1984. This

newest owner does not enjoy a close working relationship with local government. Ownership of its own facility should enable this agency--as well as the three others-- to better withstand fluctuations in funding, as ownership of this building enables them to stretch available funding further. Two agencies own their buildings outright; two are paying very reasonable monthly mortgage payments that compare favorably to rent. Two other CAA's were actively looking into pursuing ownership of headquarters buildings, but had not achieved this objective by 1984.

Use of volunteers increased at 4 CAA's between 1981 and 1984, decreasing at none. The number of CAA's with extensive volunteer use rose from 3 to 4. The number of CAA's with minimal use of volunteers declined from four to one. As mentioned under Fiscal Health in the previous chapter, several agencies increased their use of senior volunteers and senior workers paid through the Department for the Aging; and at least four also used workfare personnel assigned by local Departments of Social Services. Fewer took advantage of a Department of Social Services transition program that split the cost of clients for a period of time after CAA's hired them. Agencies such as STAG, which fully integrated personnel obtained from these sources into the agency "family" were more successful in gaining valuable work from the people. Two CAA's have obtained executives on loans from corporations (compared to none in 1981). The number of agencies tapping students as a source of volunteerism increased from two to four.

Resource Development

The increased emphasis on Resource Development, by most CAA

directors, demonstrate the intent of the agencies to expend the effort needed to remain viable. (It is also, regrettably, indicative of the small number of people on each agency's staff who can play a substantial role in this area.)

Less than half of the agencies were able to get concrete resource development support from their boards. The most frequent type of support from Boards was in the conduct of local fundraising activity. Another form of assistance was in the tapping into resource networks for free services or other assistance.

At least two Boards contained members who were actively involved as volunteers in 1984, compared to one in 1981. This change is not considered a major shift, but rather the result of individuals seeing a need and responding to it with time they had available.

Unified Agency Image

By 1984, virtually all CAA directors sought a unified, non-fragmented image for their agency, although half had not yet accomplished this objective. This is a substantial change since 1981, when several directors were satisfied to maintain an agency whose programs had clearer identity than the CAA itself. This change is likely to lead to two positive results: more effective program integration, and a clearer sense of the CAA as a totality which could encourage beneficiaries to seek a wider scope of its available resources, and encourage local funding sources to recognize the full scope of the agency's activities as they consider its worth...

Vibrancy of New York's CAA's

What can be seen in the description of CAA's responses to reduced federal core funding is a twofold process. The funding squeeze definitely hurt many agencies and their clients. Of the ten CAA's included in this study, one could say that we have not recovered, although they have stopped sinking. Of the others, virtually all suffered cuts that reduced the breadth of staff available for outreach and planning/program development. All were faced with the challenge of how to survive and remain viable in this difficult period.

The CAA's have all sought ways to at least reestablish a balance of funding/resources to enable them to operate the programs deemed vital to meeting community needs. Most agencies, after an initial dip at the time of budget cuts in 1981-82, have succeeded in this effort. Seven CAA's increased their total funding by at least 14%, while two were virtually unchanged and one declined in total funding by 25%. If Head Start funding was excluded from consideration, 5 of the ten CAA's would have been in a better funding status in 1984 than in 1981. With the other resource efforts which were employed, most CAA's at least held their own in the face of federal cutbacks--although some refocusing of programs might be expected.

It was expected that the Reagan cuts would put pressure on agencies to establish closer ties to local government as a source of funding. Indeed, this did happen, with the number of CAA's receiving local cash increasing from 6 to 9, by 1984. This local support was suspected of coming with some strings attached: CAA's should not embarrass their funding source through mismanagement; CAA's should

(continue to) meet needs that are of concern to local officials; and CAA's should not embarrass local public officials by direct, critical attacks on the government, organizing opposition to government policy, or advocating in a manner that is strongly divergent from public officials' position. The first two of these three "strings" appear to be sufficiently convergent with regular CAA activity. The third would be most nearly measured in terms of decline in advocacy and community organization, and an increase in direct service by CAA's. CAA advocacy efforts grew stronger by 1984, although this did not imply that advocacy was targeted negatively towards local government--rather, it was an articulation of needs and concerns. Four CAA's reduced their level of Community Organization activity--seemingly suggestive of an impact attributable to a desire to maintain good relations with local government. On the other hand, three CAA's increased their level of Community Organization activity--perhaps based on recognition of need in their communities for organized action to correct imbalances that have been developing in recent years. Thus, we can see a 2-way shift on this matter, with relatively little over-all change in the direction of "pacification" of the CAA's. To be sure, the level of activism at more than half of the CAA's is not very great. But the direction and potential remain, and some agencies appear to be growing in this regard.

XI: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted to see if measures of community action agency health could be developed, and--once developed--related to various elements of activity of CAA directors, Boards, and the agency itself. Factors contributing to CAA health at one point in time were considered as possible indicators of CAA health at a later point in time, with the major change during the intervening three years being the impact of Reagan's budget cuts.

We are able to conclude the following:

1. Community Action Agencies are, indeed, a unique class of organizations that exemplify open systems theory in the "real world." The relationship of CAA's to various aspects of their environment are complex and pervasive, and directly effect both the "input" of resources, information, and support to CAA's, and the "output" of effort by the CAA in meeting the needs of its constituencies. CAA's which typically began from the same impetus in the same era, developed differently based on the intermix of agency and environmental conditions and management and strategic decisions adapted by the Agency Director and its Board.
 - 1a. Study of these agencies is worthwhile to social researchers, both because of their common origins and other shared characteristics, and because of their evolved unique characteristics.
 - 1b. Conversely, there is value for CAA leadership coming to understand the organizational dynamics and environment

organization interactions that influence agency behavior and/or agency health.

2. An instrument can be (has been) developed that differentiates CAA's with regard to at least six measures of CAA health: morale, program activity, community leader attitudes/perception, public official attitudes/perceptions, fiscal, and board. A seventh area--perceptions/attitudes of beneficiaries--could not be fully measured in this study, but the information-gathering with regard to this measure also appears to have been appropriate.
- 2a. While the instrument apparently worked successfully to differentiate CAA's in New York State, there are aspects of the instrument that could use further refinement--especially with regard to possible weighting of various subitems. Different weighting might be appropriate if the instrument was used for different purposes (e.g.--to consider CAA economic well-being, one might not give equal weight to impact of fiscal situation on staff morale, and CAA funding ratio...) Further analysis of data gathered from a broader range of agencies, using these instruments, could result in this further refinement.
- 2b. The size of the study's population (ten agencies) limited the types of analysis that could be performed. However, most data gathered through this type of approach should only be treated at the ordinal level of data analysis, as the wide differences in approaches of each CAA make interval-level comparisons difficult to justify.

3. Our Round One (1981) findings were generally consistent with Organizational Theory literature. Among these findings were the following:
- Director's approach to management and communication were related to staff morale (found in both 1981 and 1984)
 - Program Activity was related to management style in 1981, but not 1984.
 - Mode of Management, Communication with Staff, and Director's Commitment to Staff development were related to Community Leader attitudes towards the CAA in 1981, but not 1984.
 - (Democratic Mode of Management also was correlated to Board Health...)
- 3a. Differences between 1981 and 1984 may be the result of the pressures experienced due to the Reagan-era budget cuts. If so, we may have identified a condition (agency stress?) where some of the organizational dynamics rules do not apply. This is also consistent with much of the debate in the literature with regard to the validity of concepts generated in "laboratory" settings. If agency stress--especially threats to agency viability--distorts the "natural" order of agency priorities, then "ideal" organizational rules may no longer hold. Further research would be required to affirm this notion.
4. Agencies that emphasized community organization and advocacy in an integrated strategy tended to be higher on staff morale.
5. A close correlation was found between political officials'

attitudes towards the CAA, and Agency Fiscal Health. These two elements seem to represent a different cluster of factors, compared to agency morale, program activity, and community leader attitude.

5a. Relation to public officials was not positively correlated with emphasis on Community Organization as part of CAA strategy. In fact, several agencies appeared to have deemphasized their Community Organization activity in efforts to sustain their good relationship to local government. During the same period, a similar number of CAA's increased their emphasis on Community Organization, suggesting that two alternative courses existed for CAA's, with some following each alternative.

6. Although some generalizations can be made, with regard to the relationship of various approaches to elements of CAA health, some of the most important aspects of CAA accomplishments are the result of individual effort that cannot easily be quantified. This type of individual, heroic effort is typically motivated by belief in "the right thing to do," nurtured through support and training by the agency combined with sufficient trust to let the person perform their role as they understand it. This type of nurtured grass roots effort is, to a large measure, what separates CAA's from more traditional agencies, enabling them to reach persons who do not trust, or benefit from, other agencies.

Basic recommendations stemming from this study are divided into two types: Research and Application.

With regard to research, the recommendation is simple. Further research is recommended, using and refining the instrument developed here. The research should consider a larger number of CAA's, although there will never be a comparable pre-post period quite like the one covered by this study. Research should seek to refine some of the notions suggested here, including:

- o when organizational dynamics are influenced by agency items--e.g., will larger agencies be less influenced by this phenomenon?
- o the relative impact, on the various factors, of the length of time that an executive director has been at his/her post.
- o In a few years, a further comparison of CAA's, based on their current emphasis on community organization could be quite instructive. Is C.O. a vestige of the sixties, or a viable part of 1980's strategy? Does the demise of C.O. impact on morale agency-wide, or only among those who played a larger C.O. role in the past?

Basic recommendations with regard to application of the study's findings are also fairly clear. The instruments can be used by directors, boards, or others interested in an agency's direction. Since some elements have been found to be related to particular aspects of CAA health, a decision can be made as to the relative importance of each aspect of CAA health. Analysis of how actual agency or director activity is related to the aspect of CAA health may be useful in determining if the agency is heading in its intended direction. Without considering this the final word, the findings contained here can help to raise useful question for local agency planning.

Perhaps the pooling of experiences of agency practitioners, who have attempted to use the study's findings as a planning aid, might be the most useful form of followup research that might ensue.

While the findings presented here are specifically related to CAA's, the study offers an approach to the analysis of a much wider range of organizations. By considering any group of organizations that were initially created at approximately the same time, with the same mandate, but operating under different environmental conditions and often with different managerial styles, the same types of exploration undertaken in this study is feasible and potentially worthwhile. The same set of "Agency Health" measures are reasonable elements for most such agencies, although Board health may be of less significance in some types of organization. Constituent perception, and sharper focus on programmatic impact might be looked at as areas of Agency health that warrant further attention in other types of agencies. A set of strategic approach and managerial style variables comparable to those applied in this study, could be equally applicable when considering other types of organizations. Questions as to the effect of changes in the local and/or national climate for the study of these organizations would be worth considering.

To adapt the criteria applied here, to primarily voluntary organizations, or those less dependent on government funding, it would be necessary to further reassess the relative weight of each element of Agency health, in the new context. But with this adaptation, the approach could have even broader implications.

Just as there are indicators of "health" in a community based on economic, social, educational, health, and other factors

characteristizing the population and its environment, the study presented here offers a way of applying a comparable set of indicators to the study of organizations in their environments' context. Further research that, could contribute to the refinement of these "organizational health" indicators would certainly be welcome and worthwhile.

CRITICAL ELEMENTS IN THE "HEALTH" OF COMMUNITY
ACTION AGENCIES IN THE AGE OF "REAGONOMICS"

By

MICHAEL SELIGER

- VOLUME TWO -

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty
in Sociology in partial fulfillment of the require-
ments for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

1986

STAG

I. Background

A. Target Area Characteristics

1. Area Served - A county on the Southern Tier of New York State, bordering on Pennsylvania, over one hour South of Syracuse, 3 1/2 hours drive from New York City. Contains an urban corridor along its South end, including a Major city and Twin Villages. Most of the county--outside this industrial corridor--is mixed. The Industrial Corridor has suffered from "Runaway Shops" and other problems (layoffs, closings) plaguing old industry in the northeast. Much of the area's industrial base has been historically anti-union, with low wages prevalent in some of the area's plants. This includes a well known company town industry that, at its peak, kept union pressures away by offering exceptional fringe benefits. Now, in harder times, wages remain low, and fringe benefits have been reduced.

Because of the area's economic shifts (and agency philosophy) the target population is seen as including the "New" and "Working" Poor, as well as rural impoverished, inner city youths and families, hard core unemployed, and the growing elderly population.

2. Type of Area: Rural/Urban Mix, with services needed by rather distinct groups.
3. Population - According to 1980 census data, the County's population of 213,648, had declined 3.7% since 1970. The population along the Southern Industrial Corridor had declined by over 12% in this period. Half of the County's population is along its Southern Industrial Tier, with half of that half in the Major City.
4. Demographics:
 - a. Ethnicity - The County is 97% White. Most of the County's 3,131 Blacks are found in the urban corridor. However, even there, they make up less than 5% of the population.
 - b. % Senior Citizens - Close to 20% of the population is Senior Citizens, close to 30% of whom live at or below the poverty level.
 - c. Poverty - Over 15% of the county's residents are under the poverty level. A higher percentage are eligible for various CAA services that are open to families earning up to 150% of the national poverty guidelines.

5. Major Poverty Factors:

- a. Increasing problems of plant closings and layoffs, contributing to high unemployment and low wages.
- b. Shortage of available affordable decent housing, and very weak code enforcement system.
- c. Rural problems including inadequate public transportation and lack of access to needed services, except via the CAA.
- d. Large elderly population in need of services to stretch limited funds, obtain health and nutrition services, and so on.
- e. Sizable--especially for the area's population--number of reported domestic violence and rape cases.
- f. Lack of local organizations responding to the needs of various groups such as handicapped, AIDS' victims, etc.

II. Status at "Time One"

A. The Community Action Agency (1981)

1. Facilities:

- a. #, type (purpose) - The entire agency was housed in one Central Building, in the Major City. A Weatherization warehouse, in secure space, was the only other building. Two Head Start class sites were scheduled to be opened, within a few months, in rural parts of the County.
- b. Owned by CAA? - No facilities were owned by the CAA.

2. Executive Director:

- a. Longevity - The Executive Director had served in that position for 3 1/2 years, having been with the Agency for 13 years--much of it as Deputy Director.
- b. Ethnicity - White

3. Board Chairperson:

- a. Sector - Private Sector Small Businesswoman
- b. Ethnicity - White

4. Major Programs--1981 Funding Level--(at least 5% of CAA budget)

- a. CSBG (CSA) - \$220,800
- b. Head Start - \$382,150 (includes start-up costs of new program)
- c. Weatherization - \$261,950
- d. Community Nutrition - \$15,200

- e. Employment - 0
- f. Energy Conservation, Crisis Intervention - \$47,000
(balance of ECIP grant--extended to 12/81)
- g. Housing - 0
- h. Fuel Assistance - \$16,125
- i. Transportation - 0
- j. Sr. Outreach, etc. - 0
- k. Other - Rape Abuse & Crisis Center \$42,018

Note: (e.j.) See 5d, below, re use of Office for the Aging and other employment programs

5. Local Support:

- a. Cash Contribution from County or Subdivisions
 - Yes
 - Amount - \$28,602--includes individual cash contributions
- b. Contracts with County or Subdivisions
 - Yes
 - Amount, contract areas - County Department of Social Services - HEAP Intake, \$16,125
- c. Facilities assistance?
 - No
- d. Other Notable In-Kind? (Not much from County or Local Government) However, extensive Volunteer network and financial support by Community Labor Coalition of Agency's monthly newspaper. Use of Student Interns, personnel assigned by County Office of the Aging. Space rented to them for half going rate.

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- a. Total Funding - \$1,054,578
CSBG Local Initiative - \$220,800
Ratio - 4.8-1
Borderline
- b. % of total funding from Head Start - 42%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
Weatherization 24%
- c. Ownership of Facilities No X
But rent is very low (\$1.25/sq. ft. plus heat utilities)
- d. Fiscal Management Problems? Y N X Possible or recent?
 - Staff and Procedures? Satis X
 - Records, Audit Status - No problems
- e. Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Extensive X
Describe: Community-Labor Coalition pays half of the printing and mailing costs of monthly paper

- sent to 14,000 readers. Many volunteers participate in outreach, organizing, etc. 3 Senior Employment Workers; and college student interns.
- f. Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Threat of cutbacks, fear of job loss has contributed to lower morale, anxiety, and some looking elsewhere for work--especially for Weatherization personnel.
- g. Local Gov't role in fiscal:
 Direct Financial Assistance: \$28,602 reported--may include some fundraising
 Contracts: HEAP \$16,125
 Space: None
 Other: Office of the Aging assigns 3 half time Senior Workers

2. Staff Morale:

- a. Are there Problems? (Yes-Slight)

b. Areas of Morale Problems	Ser./ Detri- Mental	Mod.	Min. No Impact	None
- Agency future		X		
- Job future		X		
- Opportunities for Advancement			X	
- Salary Level			X	
- Validity of Work and Agency				X
- Trust among staff			X	
- Relation with Exec. Director				X
- Relation with Board				X
- Facilities				X
- Recognition for Work Done				X
- Communications				X

- c. Is Agency "At Risk?" in this area? Somewhat
 If it weren't for fiscal-caused anxiety and tension--would be no.

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries) (O.K., Fair, Poor)

- a. Trust-Mistrust - Full trust and loyalty
- b. Widely known? - Yes, widely known for serious and outspoken advocacy and organizing roles.
- c. Agency Role Clear (well known)? (CAA vs. Separate Program Identities) CAA identity is clear, and its scope is clear--partly due to its monthly newspaper (sent to all beneficiaries, among others)

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
a. Appropriate representation on Board - CL's	X			
PO's				X*
b. Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's	X			
PO's	X			
c. Respect for CAA Effort?				
CL's	X			
PO's			X	
d. Cooperation/Support with CAA				
CL's	X			
PO's			X	

5. Program Activity

- a. Operating Effectively? (Quality of Progs, Quantity of Service) Yes - all progs
- b. Scope: Broad-Innovative although bulk of funding still comes from the major programs such as Weatherization. Part of CAA's innovativeness is in its integration of programs and services.
- c. Program Development: Growing in spite of local government opposition
- d. Appropriateness: Needs Based-Planned plus response to requests for help and support from local groups.

6. Board

- a. % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year) - 100%
- b. # present vacancies, sector - 7 all public
- c. Board understanding of its role - clear - Board is very active, although not always in roles expected of a Board.
- d. Board performance of its role - o.k.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

- a. Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking
 - democratic/open
 - Delegation to Unit Heads

* 7 of 10 slots vacant.

- b. Perceived by Staff as Supportive/Open
- c. Style: Democratic
- d. Communications with Staff:
 - Openness--full information available
 - Forums for Info-Sharing?
 - # Staff Mtgs./Mo. - 1-2/mo.
 - # Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo. - 4/mo.
 - Staff Reports/Mo. - only as required by funding sources
 - Feedback System for Staff Rpts.? NA
 - Flow: 2-way
 - Approachability/Open-Door Policy?-- Fully approachable--open door, supportive and encouraging
- e. Director's sense of agency purpose:
 - Clear to Director? Yes
 - Understood by Staff? Yes-fully
 - Accepted/Supported by Staff? Yes-fully
- f. Commitment to Staff Career Development? Director is committed and has limited discretionary moneys to pay towards staff training. In house training is informal, of limited specificity. But personnel learn their jobs in well-supported environment.
- g. Attitude Towards Agency Public Image
 - Is unified agency concept important? Yes
 - Agency visibility - should be Hi
 - Exec Director visibility - should be Lo
 - Builds organization by supporting others as spokesperson
- h. Attitude Towards Board, and Exec Dir's role with Board
 - Relationship with Board: Excellent
 - Role with Board:
 - While primarily cooperative, there are elements of Basic, Support, and Manipulation in his approach
 - Role at Board Meetings:
 - Resource, Reporter
 - Communication with Board:
 - Regular Reports? Yes
 - Accessible to other Board contacts? Regularly
 - # meetings/month attended (incl. committees) - At least 4
- i. Time Allocation
 - Prime, Major, Modest, Minimal, None on the 10 items on the attached sheet

EXEC DIRECTOR allocation of time among:

- Resource Development - Major
- Agency networking among CAA's - Min.
- Networking among local organizations - Highest

- Working or dealing with local/state officials or institutions - Lo
 - Representing the CAA at official functions or with media - Lo
 - Agency program operations - Mod
 - Agency Staff development - Mod
 - Agency administration - Mod +
 - Board Development - Mod
 - Board Information and Support - Major
 - Other (specify)
- Prime: Networking among Local Orgs.
Major: Board Info & Support; Resource Development; Administration
Modest: Board Development; Program Operations; Staff Development

Minimal: Deal with Public Officials; Representing CAA in Media; Networking among CAA's

2. Organizational Compliance System:

- a. Normative

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- a. Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo - Over 25
- b. Areas of Activity:
 - Positive: resource development, evaluation and planning, representing CAA in the Community, Volunteer Organizing.
 - Basic: Agenda setting, meetings
 - Negative: None

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

- a. Cooperative
- b. Supportive (both ways)
- c. Frequency of Interaction: # times per month At least 8

5. Board Mode of Operations

- a. Activeness:
 - % of meetings with Quorum in Past Year - 100% (10/10)
 - Frequency of Meetings: (# year) - 10/yr.
- b. Committee System? Functional but they meet only quarterly
- c. Areas of Involvement:
 - Planning? High
 - Evaluation? Moderate
 - Resource Development? High
 - Fiscal Monitoring? Moderate
 - Program Monitoring? High

Personnel? Moderate

- d. Do Public Sector Reps represent selves or appoint?
A few appoint; most ignore
- e. Vacancies and other Operating Problems: 7 of 10
Public Sector Slots vacant, although County Exec.
has now promised to attend

6. Agency Program Strategy Mix Balance among

Actual:

Service Delivery - 40%, including 25% linked to C.O. or
Advocacy

C.O. - 30%, including 15% linked to Advocacy

Advocacy - 20%, plus Above

Resource Development - 10% plus efforts related to C.O.,
Advocacy

Ideal:

100% Linked.

At least 50% C.O.; 50% Advocacy; 50% Service Delivery,
all linked to C.O., Advocacy; 50% Resource Development,
at least half based on the above.

7. Relationship to Local Government:

- a. Mostly critical some conflict. The only areas of
"cooperation" are areas where the County "needs"
the CAA--like for HEAP applications.
- b. Undue influence or control? - Absolutely none.

III. Status at "Time Two"

A. The CAA, 1984

1. Facilities

- a. Any changes since 1981? Y X N
- b. Specify changes: The CAA, through its ally, the
Community Labor Coalition--is now purchasing its
headquarters. 2 Head Start Classroom sites are the
only other facilities.

Locally contributed?

2. Executive Director

- a. any change since 1981? Y N X

3. Board Chairperson

Same as 1981? changed
If changed,

- a. sector - Community (hard to tell--some movement
between sectors)
- b. Ethnicity - White

- c. Other pertinent info. - Has been on Board for at least 4 years.

4. Major programs, 1984 funding level

a. CSBG:	\$165,931	% change - 26%
b. Head Start:	\$455,884	% change + 19%
c. Weatherization:	\$367,238	% change + 42%
d. Nutrition:	0	% change - 99%
e. Energy conserv.:	0	% change -100%
f. Fuel Assistance:	\$22,200	% change + 39%
g. Other: Rape Abuse		
Crisis Center:	\$108,666	% change +157%
AIDS Task Force:	\$30,000	New

5. Local Support

- a. Cash contributions?
- Yes
 - How Amount Compares to '81? Decrease from County, Increase by fundraising
 - Specific amounts - if change
\$10,000 County Cash for Rape Crisis - Youth Program
Over \$20,000 local fundraising (RACC)
and \$10,000 from campaign for Human Development
\$7,400 from Gannett Foundation (Rape Crisis Center)
- b. Contracts with County?
- Yes
 - How compares to '81 - More
 - Specific amounts, if change - HEAP amount increased by 39% to \$22,200
- c. Facilities:
- Any assistance? No help from local government
 - Any change from '81? (same). The one "change" is that the Community Labor Coalition (organized by the CAA) is purchasing the headquarters building; CAA rent goes to the CLC, which uses part of its income to put back into Organizing needs of the Community.
- d. Notable in-kind - This agency stretches its staffing dollars by using 16 persons assigned by Department of Welfare under the Workfare Program; 5 "TEAP" transitional employees whose cost is shared 50-50 with workfare for 6 months; 808 hours of volunteerism from Retired Senior Volunteer Program; plus 3 workers assigned half-time by Office of the Aging. The extent and effectiveness of the work from Workfare people is new since '81. Agency style has been conducive to positive work habits for these persons--not usually the case when they are assigned elsewhere. Here, they are treated

with respect and made to feel a full part of the Team.

B. Agency Health - 1984

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- a. Total Funding - \$1,330,105
CSBG Local Initiative - \$165,931
Ratio - 8-1
Healthy. Agency moved from "Borderline" at Time One into lower end of "Healthy" at Time 2.
- b. % of total funding from Head Start - 34% (-8% from Time One)
Other Programs contributing 20% or more: Weatherization, 27% (+3%)
- c. Ownership of Facilities Yes - via Community Labor Aid Organization. Community-Labor Aid bought building and a large computer.
If yes, is there mortgage? Y X N Large? Y X N
\$75,000 + \$12,000 for comptr.
- d. Fiscal Management Problems? Y N X
- e. Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Extensive X
Describe: See "Notable in-kind" - A 5(d), above.
- f. Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Some staffing loss due to cutbacks, especially in Outreach, but current staff is mostly close and working together well. There has been higher staff turnover due to lack of job security.
- g. Local Gov't role in fiscal:
Direct Financial Assistance: \$10,000 toward Rape Crisis
Contracts: HEAP, \$22,200 Rape Crisis Center - \$16,000 from DFY through County
Space: None.
Other: 16 Workfare workers; 6 TEAP; 3 Office for the Aging

2. Staff Morale:

- a. Are there Problems? (Yes, Slight; Almost None)
- b. Areas of Morale Problems

	Ser./ Detri- <u>Mental</u>	Mod.	Min. No <u>Impact</u>	<u>None</u>
- Agency future			X	
- Job future			X	
- Opportunities for Advancement				X
- Salary Level			X	
- Validity of Work and Agency				X

	Ser./ Detri- Mental	Mod.	Min. No Impact	None
b. Areas of Morale Problems				
- Trust among staff			X	
- Relation with Exec. Director				X
- Relation with Board				X
- Facilities				X
- Recognition for Work Done				X
- Communications				X
c. Is Agency "At Risk?" in this area?	No			
3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries) (O.K., Fair, Poor)
- a. Full Trust - Improved with the Black Community since 1981, as well.
- b. Very Widely known
- c. Agency Role Clear (well known)? Yes (CAA is clearly identified as a unified entity--although Weatherization and Rape Crisis serve distinct groups.)
4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials
- | | Good | O.K. | Fair | Poor |
|---|------|------|------|------|
| a. Appropriate representation on Board - CL's | X | | | |
| PO's (improved--now 5/10 slots filled) | | | X | |
| b. Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's | X | | | |
| PO's | | X | | |
| c. Respect for CAA Effort? CL's | X | | | |
| PO's | | | X | |
| d. Cooperation/Support with CAA | | | | |
| PO's | | | X* | |
5. Program Activity
- a. Operating Effectively? (Quality of Progs, Quantity of Service) All progs
- b. Scope: Broad-Innovative
- c. Program Development: Growing Modestly, in spite of fund cuts and low cooperation from local government.

* Mixed--Cooperation where the County needs them--like HEAP, Workfare. Agency is respected there. But has negative image as harsh critic.

- d. Appropriateness: Needs Based-Planned - Responds to needs, identifies issues and builds from there. For example--they've successfully negotiated arrangement with County Medical Society for free treatment of anyone in need who has no coverage or medicaid--especially helpful for laid off workers.

6. Board

- a. % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year) - 100%
- b. # present vacancies, sector - 5 Public
- c. Board understanding of its role Clear
- d. Board performance of its role Highly satisfactory - Board is very active, outspoken--a force on relevant issues--and takes care of its responsibilities. May relay a little too much on trustability of the Director.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

Different from Time 1? Y___ N X

2. Organizational Compliance System:

Different from Time 1? Y___ N X

3. Role of Board Chairperson

Different from Time 1? Y___ N X Slight Change in Style, not Role. Basis: New Board Chair. Previous Chairperson still active.

a. Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo Over 35/mo.

b. Areas of Activity:

Positive: Policy role, resource development, evaluation and planning, representing CAA, Board Development, Volunteer Organizing

Basic: Agenda setting, meetings

Negative: None

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

Different from Time 1? Y___ N X

5. Board Mode of Operations

Different from Time 1? Y___ N X

6. Agency Program Strategy Mix

Different from Time 1? Not really. Slight shift due to cuts in funding available for Outreach, organizing.

Balance among:

Service Delivery 50%, including 25% Advocacy, 5% C.O.

C.O. 15% beyond SD, Advocacy

Advocacy 35%, including some CO, some SD related.

Resource Development 20% - all linked to above 3 categories

7. Relationship to Local Government

Different from Time 1? Y___ N X Not really.
Increased interdependence with Department of Social
Services.

- a. Mixed relationship, as CAA is effective with HEAP,
cheese distribution, Workfare, senior workers--all
things county needs help with.
Critical/conflict. CAA remains a strong critic of
any County or City programs or policies that do not
appear to be fair to their constituency. Main
target at present is downtown hotel and shopping
mall in the large City, almost entirely bankrolled
with Urban Development moneys and tax breaks, at a
time of serious need for housing.
- b. Undue influence or control? No.

I. Background

A. Target Area Characteristics

1. Area Served: A rural county in northern New York State, with its northern border along the St. Lawrence River. Largest area, geographically, of any County in New York State.

2. Type of Area: Most of the County's vast area is rural, much of it within the Adirondack Mountain Park area. Some of the land is used for agriculture--especially dairy--and including some smaller subsistence farming. The St. Lawrence River, as a source of water power, navigation (St. Lawrence Seaway) and related ports encouraged development along its banks, and the County's largest settlements are along its banks. The County contains one "City" and one "Village" with population between 12,000 and 13,000. Although several universities are located in the County, there is little in the way of employment, culture, or commerce to encourage the County's more curious and innovative youth to remain here, except for the area's open land and natural beauty.

The old industrial centers along the St. Lawrence suffer from the shift of industry away from the Northeast, with resultant high unemployment. Plants and mines have closed in the area, leaving the area's most obvious resources of farm land, navigable water, timber - in the Adirondack Preserve, and attractive natural land as a tourism resource. The County has no Interstate superhighways, and is at least three hour's drive from the nearest major city (Syracuse).

3. Population

The County's population, according to 1980 Census Data, was 114,254, an increase of 1% since 1970 census. The population is 99% white, with most of the remainder being Native American. The two largest population centers are located along the St. Lawrence River, while the three other "sizable" villages (populations under 10,000) are located along the County's principal highway.

An inverse relationship reportedly exists, between population density and degree of poverty in the County. Unemployment, 16% county-wide in 1981, was "only" 11% in the industrial tier along the St. Lawrence. It was reportedly highest in the interior portion of the county with the lowest population density.

4. Demographics

- a. Population is 99% white; almost 1% Native American
- b. Over 12% of the population was senior citizens in 1978, and this percentage has grown since then.
- c. With County-wide unemployment at 16%, 1/8 of the population over 65 and living on fixed incomes, and half of the County's population spread thinly through the County, many on subsistence farms, poverty in the area is clearly high. No exact figure was reported, partly due to reluctance on the part of the North County poor, to acknowledge need.

5. Major Poverty Factors

- High rate of unemployment throughout the County, exacerbated by mine closings and industry leaving the area.
- Except for the CAA's efforts, limited access to services for most residents, due to transportation needs and centralization of services.
- Elderly living on fixed incomes with little access to services needed to enable them to survive well in the cold, rural north.
- Rural poor are reluctant to "accept handouts", seek help, or admit need.
- Distances making it difficult to mobilize rural poor in concerted ways.

II. Status at "Time One"

A. The Community Action Agency

1. Facilities

- a. The CAA's programs are operated from one central headquarters (located in the basement of the Cuntty Civil Defense Building - in space provided, rent free, by the County). Head Start was coordinated from an "annex," several blocks away. The Agency operates programs at 5 neighborhood centers with 4 satellite centers. Head Start sustains 3 delegate programs and directly operates 2 additional classroom sites, plus two home-based programs. Thus, the total number of Agency facilities is 12, plus 3 delegate agency sites.
According to the Agency's Audits, all space is either contributed by localities or rented with local funds.
- b. None of the facilities are owned by the Agency.

2. Executive Director

- a. The Director had been on board for 3 months, at the time of our visit, replacing an Acting Director who had filled in for 3 previous months after a fiscal crisis had been identified. The Director was new to this Agency, having served for 10 years previously as Deputy Director of the CAA in an adjacent county.
 - b. (White)
3. Board Chairperson
 - a. Representative of the Poor - elected to Board by a local neighborhood advisory council.
 - b. White
4. Major Programs: 1981 Funding Level

a. CSA Local Initiative	\$150,000	
b. Head Start	\$389,695	+ USDA
	(\$39,000)	
c. Weatherization	\$144,000	(approx. - CETA defunded month before, and DOE II, III still incomplete, so moneys available...)
e. Employment		(County CETA grants ended 1 month before)
(f. Energy Crisis fund balance)	(2,000)	
g. Housing - HUD Rent Subsidies	\$39,571	
(g. Rural Housing Council	Organized & Spun off	(fiscal support retained)
h. Fuel Assistance	\$40,816	
i. Transportation	\$426,209	
j. Sr. Outreach (CSA \$33,000, County 11,026)	\$44,026	
5. Local Support
 - a. Cash
(Yes)

- Transportation from service centers	\$16,800
- Sr. Program Cash	\$11,026
- Support Grant (Cash)	\$15,000
 - b. Contracts with County
(Yes)

- Transportation (Rural System & Contracts)	\$410,000	(includes 70,000 advance)
- Fuel Emergency, resolving loan fund	\$25,000	
- Fuel Assistance	\$40,816	

- c. Facilities Assistance
(Yes)
 - Central Headquarters, County Phone Lines and Services
 - Local Space Contributions for Neigh Centers, Head Start sites
- d. Other Notable in-kind
 - Extensive Volunteer Activity at all sites
 - County assistance with bulk purchasing, use of County repair and storage facilities, etc.
 - Advances from county on emergency fuel loan fund, and transportation contract advance result in liquidity for the agency.

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- a. Total Funding: \$1,290,000 CSBG Local Initiative
\$150,000
Ratio: 8.6-1 Healthy (Also, very substantial in-kind)
- b. % funding from:
Head Start: 29%
Weatherization: 11%
Transportation: 33%
- c. No Ownership of facilities, but no costs either, thanks to donated space...
- d. Fiscal Management Problems?
 - Recent, possibly some remaining. Serious problems, largely resolved by new personnel, procedures, and reconstruction of 2 years of books)
 - Procedures, although improved, could be tightened more.
 - Audit status - Head Start remained on "High risk" status, as defined by funding source, based on previous problems.
- e. Use of volunteers, in-kind resources: Extensive
- f. Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale? - Not noticeable.
- g. Local Gov't Role in Fiscal:
 - Direct Financial: \$42,826
 - Contracts: \$410,000 plus \$95,000 in advances, allowed to earn high interest by CAA.
 - Space: Major, significant impact, by providing rent-free space for central headquarters and local center sites (by towns, churches, etc.)
 - Other: Use of County telephone lines, cleaning services, county purchasing system; cash advances from county.

2. Staff Morale

- a. Virtually no morale problems noted.
- c. Agency not at risk in this area.

3. Perception of CAA in the Community - Good

- a. Trust, based on relationship to local centers, as key to service/advocacy network locally.
- b. Widely known
- c. CAA role is not totally clear, as clients relate to local centers, which appear somewhat autonomous. These centers are recognized as site and staff for getting help with full range of CAA services.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders & Public Officials

- a. Appropriate representation on Board - Good for both groups
- b. High degree of familiarity with CAA and its role, for both
- c. High respect for CAA, both
- d. Full cooperation, support, both.

5. Program Activity

- a. Most programs operating effectively - impact of CETA cuts on Weatherization and Transportation are unclear
- b. Scope of programming is fairly broad, addressing some needs not usually addressed by CAA's - with strong neighborhood center local program development as well
- c. Program Development: intent is to grow, but actual status is sustaining
- d. Appropriateness - largely based on funding available, but improving its planning process

6. Board

- a. 100% of board meetings achieved Quorums
- b. 5/30 vacancies on board (2 private sector, 3 poor)
- c. Board Understanding of Role: Limited - fairly clear, with active committee structure, but no Board training in 3 years
- d. Board Role Performance: O.K. Does well and is now enabled to do better, re: monitoring - but had problems in the past

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

- a. Mode of Management
 - Central Control, but broad dialogue, discussion
 - Mixed responsibility-sharing: unit heads operate relatively autonomously, but with final approval, backup support, from Director. The buck stops with the Executive Director
- b. Perceived by Staff
 - Supportive, open - but with strong/controlling tendencies
- c. Style:

Democratic process being developed, but some level of autocratic (Mixed)
- d. Communications with Staff
 - Openness: full dialogue, info-sharing process
 - Forums for info-sharing: 4 staff meetings/month (units), 4 senior staff meetings/month, 0 staff reports (info-system being developed)
 - Flow: 2-way, more from Director-outward
 - Approachability? Available for problem solving to directors, but no full open-door policy
- e. Director's sense of Agency purpose:

Fully clear to Director
 Somewhat understood by staff
 Somewhat supported by staff
 (Director did not initially understand power/potential in the local centers)
- f. Director is committed to staff development internally - within the agency, to improve skills, awareness. Will deliver this training himself.
- g. Agency public image - Director feels...
 - Unified agency concept is a priority
 - Agency visibility should be high
 - Exec Director visibility should be high
- h. Attitude toward Board
 - Relationship: good
 - Role: supportive - intends to develop Board training
 - Role at Board Meetings: Manager of information
 - Communication with Board: Support of committee structure; info in regular reports to Board-Program and Fiscal
- i. Time Allocation

Prime: Agency program operations*

* This director's priorities changed within a year - with heaviest emphasis on CAA networking. time for program ops was not sufficient.

Major: Staff development, networking with CAAs*,
networking with local officials, networking with
local organizations, resource development
Modest: Representing CAA with Media, Board Info.
and Suppt., Administration
Minimal Board development

2. Organizational Compliance System:

- a. "Naturally Normative" - North Country Style,
clearly demonstrated by Outreach centers staff
commitment. But Director's focus is "Utilitarian"
- b. Regular meetings pursued, to get a consensus on
purpose, approaches.

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- a. Level of Activity: Over 30 hours/mo.
- b. Areas of Activity:
Positive: Evaluation & Planning, Representing CAA
Basic: Agenda Setting, Meetings

4. Relationship of Exec. Director & Board Chairperson

- a. Cooperative; some compliance by Board Chair
towards Exec
- b. Supportive - more from Exec. Director
- c. Frequency of Interaction - at least 8/mo.

5. Board Mode of Operations

- a. Activeness: 100% Quorums, at 10/10 meetings in
the past year
- b. Functional committee system
- c. Areas of Involvement:
Planning: Low-Medium
Evaluation: Low-Medium
Resource Development - Low
Fiscal Monitoring - Medium
Program Monitoring - Low-Medium
Personnel - Low
- d. 3/10 Public Officials represent themselves
- e. 5/30 seats vacant (2 private, 3 poor)
- f. Staff attending Board meetings: Exec. Director,
Fiscal, Executive Secretary

6. Agency Program Strategy Mix:

- a. Actual
70% Service Delivery, including 20% advocacy
15% Community Organization, including 5% advocacy
15% Resource Development, including 5% Agency
Networking for enhanced service delivery

- b. Expressed Ideal
 - 50% Service Delivery-with more integration of CO, advocacy
 - 20% Community Organization, including Economic Development
 - 25% Advocacy, partly incorporated into SD, CO
 - 20% Resource Development, including Economic Development

7. Relationship to Local Government

- a. Extremely close, cooperative
- b. While there is no evidence of undue influence or control, the potential for the CAA's loss of independent identity exists - in its location in County space, and it is not clear how effective it could be if confrontation with County was required as means of influencing it. (So far, no problem...)

III. Status at "Time Two"

A. The CAA, 1984

1. Facilities

- a. Changes since 1981 - Yes
- b. Central Headquarters is now in a former hospital, now shared by several service organizations. All programs, including Head Start, are now coordinated under one roof. This space requires payment of a share of costs, like a co-op. All other facilities are unchanged, except that number of Head Start sites increased by two. One requires a small rent. This is an improvement, in that the CAA was no longer in County space, so identity was made clearer.

2. Executive Director

- a. Change since 1981? Yes, but or No, but...
- b. Change? The Director has been out - for months at a time - with a deteriorating spinal condition. At time of the Revisit, his Deputy - the Fiscal Director, had just been formally named "Acting Interim Director," although he had functioned to hold the place together for some time. The uncertainty of the original director in and out, often out for months, then back for a few months, back out, with brief returns had left a leadership void. The original director had remained on payroll, for comptime, sick and vacation time, until the week before the revisit. Additional

physical tests and one new form of treatment would determine if he could/would ever return. Since the original director's approach was largely followed, both his and his acting director's philosophy are considered here.

3. Board Chairperson
New person since 1981

- a. Rep of Poor
- b. White

4. Major Programs - 1984 funding

	<u>% Change</u>
a. CSBG: 112,725	- 26%
b. Head Start 705,127 (+USDA)	+ 81%
c. Weatherization 272,000	+ 89%
g. HUD (Section 8) 67,356	+ 70%
h. HEAP 10,447	- 75%
i. Transportation 327,250	- 22%
j. Sr. Outreach 0	-100%
k. Young Volunteers in Action 20,000	New
Delinquency Prevention 12,742	New
Family Support Network 16,150	New

5. Local Support

- a. Cash contributions
 - County Support \$15,000 (No change)
 - Towns (supports satellite center) \$3,000 (New)
 - No Sr. or Transportation Matches (0) - \$27,826
 - Neighborhood Center raised \$24,000 to maintain transport service (New)
- b. Contracts
 - Transportation \$325,000 (- 21%)
 - Delinquency Prevention, Family Support Network 28,800
 - HEAP 10,447
- c. Facilities Assistance
 - Remains substantial, widespread, as before
- d. Notable in-kind
Extensive volunteer network, as before, plus young volunteer program (ACTION grant); use of Green Thumb workers, student interns, and office for the Aging employees... at each neighborhood center.
Two County revolving loan funds totaling \$85,000

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- a. Total Funding: \$1,537,884 CSBG Local Initiative:
112,725
Ratio: 13.6-1 Healthy
- b. % Funding From:
Head Start: 46%
Weatherization: 18%
Transportation: 21%
- c. No ownership of facilities but little cost (other than utilities) due to donated space
- d. Fiscal Management Problems? Yes, but minor
 - Procedures were criticized in recent audit, as could be tighter. (No change since 1981)
 - Fiscal Director, doubling as Acting Director, is overworked.
- e. Use of Volunteers, in-kind resources: Extensive, as before, plus Green Thumb and Sr. Employment assignees.
- f. Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale
Cut in number of positions hurts - makes more demands on those who remain. Executive Director has told press that budget cuts could lead to closings of the centers. This has caused severe morale problems, whether the statement was intended to gain local support, or was serious. So--SERIOUS impact.
- g. Local Gov't role in Fiscal
 - Cash Contributions
County: \$15,000
Towns: \$3,000
Total \$18,000
 - Contracts
Transportation \$325,000
Delinquency, Family Support \$28,700
HEAP \$10,447
 - Space: As before, substantial local support, donated space.
 - Other: County Motor Pool; Assignment of senior work personnel to the centers.

2. Staff Morale

- a. Serious problems exist
- b. Areas of problems: Level of seriousness of problem
 - Agency future - moderate
 - Job future - minimal
 - Opportunities for advancement - minimal
 - Salary level - minimal-moderate (some workers do not receive health benefits)
 - Validity of work, agency - moderate (depends on part of agency)
 - Trust among staff - serious
 - Relation to Exec. Director - serious

- Relation to Board - serious (at least for some)
- Facilities - none
- Recognition for work done - none-moderate (depends on unit)
- Communications - was serious, now moderate.
- c. Somewhat at Risk

3. Perception of CAA by clients

- a. Trust - as before, based on individual programs, centers
- b. Programs, centers are widely known. CAA is not well known.
- c. CAA role is unclear. Programs are recognized. CAA is just the press release threatening local centers.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders, Public Officials

General respect, support, representation unchanged, except some decline in local agency recognition and respect of CAA, but still usually o.k.

5. Program Activity

- a. Most programs operating effectively
Lack of guidance from Executive Director has been harmful to agency's newer programs.
- b. Scope of Programs: Fairly broad, some new efforts
- c. Program Development: Some growth, some decline
- d. Based on available funding

6. Board

- a. 100% of Board meetings achieved Quorums
- b. 2/30 vacancies (1 private, 1 public)
- c. Board Understanding of role: weak - one training/orientation day was held, but attendance was not good
- d. Board performance of role: Barely o.k.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

Yes, changes since time one.

Due to (other) - prolonged illness of director

1. Executive Director Leadership Style

- a. Mode of management:
Executive Director: Absent
Acting Director: Mixed, situational - democratic/passive

- b. Perceived by staff as
Executive: Weak due to absence
Acting Director: Potentially supportive
- c. Style
Executive: Mixed: Autocratic/Laissez-faire
Acting: Laissez Faire; minimal democratic
- d. Communications with staff:
 - Openness: Exec - partial information-sharing
- but insufficient.
Acting - Partial info-sharing, but trying
 - Forums for Info-Sharing:
Acting: Regular staff meetings 2/mo
Sr. Staff: 4/mo
Exec.: Sporadic meetings
Monthly Reports required
No feedback
 - Flow
Largely one-way: to Director
Acting Director now holds information-sharing
meetings to improve this
 - Approachability
Both available for problem solving when
present
Exec, however, wasn't there enough.
Acting is too busy to be fully available, and
also lacks full credibility as problem solver.
- e. Director's sense of Agency Purpose:
 - Clear to Director? Exec - fully, acting -
somewhat
 - Slightly understood (all differently) by staff
 - Slightly supported by staff
- f. Commitment to Staff Development? Low priority at
present.
- g. Agency Public Image (both agree)
 - Sense of unified agency allegedly is
important, but in fact it has not been pushed
at all
 - CAA and Director should be highly visible
(Exec. Director has received bad press for
going to conferences as speaker, while on
sick leave...) Acting Director has not
become known widely, except in his Fiscal
Director role
- h. Attitude Towards Board
For both: good intentions but little activity
towards strengthening board understanding of role
 - Good relationship (exec's is now strained
compassion)
 - Role with Board - provider of information
 - Role at Board Meetings - resource
 - Communication via regular reports, plus
committees, and presence of active chairman.
- i. Time Allocation

Exec. Director

Prime - networking among CAA's

Major - Resource Development, work with local/state officials and institutions

Modest - program operations, administration, networking among local organizations, board information support

Minimal - representing CAA in media, Board development, staff development

Acting Director

Prime - agency administration

Major - resource development

Modest - agency staff development, board info/support, work with public officials

Minimal - networking among CAA's, program operations, board development networking among local organizations

None - representing CAA with media

2. Organizational Compliance System

Normative, to some extent, but also, to some extent, ignored in the name of utilitarianism

3. Role of Board Chairperson

a. Level of Activity: Over 30 hours/month

b. Areas of Activity: Postive: Representing CAA,?
Board Development

Basic: Agenda-setting meetings

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

a. Cooperative - minimally

b. Supportive - more from Bd. Chair - but not much either way

c. Frequency - at least 8/mo.

5. Board Mode of Operations

a. Activeness: 100% quorums, as before

b. Committee System is largely functional

c. Areas of involvement - same as in 1981

d. 2/10 public officials represent themself

e. 2/30 seats vacant

f. Program heads attend board meetings - 8/11 meeting

6. Agency/Program Strategy Mix

a. Actual

80% Service Delivery, including 20% Advocacy

15% Resource Development

5% Community Organization

- b. Acting Director's Ideal (Exec's same as Time 1)
 - 60% Service Delivery
 - 25% Resource Development
 - 15% Advocacy - possibly including or leading to 3% C.O.

7. Relationship to Local Government
Fortunately for the Agency, unchanged.

- a. Largely supportive, broad areas of support
- b. Moving from the County Civil Defense Building slightly enhances the sense of this CAA as an independent entity. A risk remains that the identity could still blur.

I. BACKGROUND: Target Area Characteristics (1981)

1. Area Served: A county in the Hudson Valley, on the East side of the Hudson, approximately halfway between Albany and New York City. The County stretches from the Hudson on the West, to the Connecticut state line on the east, with the Taconic Mountains cutting the County roughly in half--the portion West of the Mountains being more developed, the portion in and to the East of the mountains, rural. The Southernmost portion of the County has become corporate headquarters or large centers for IBM, Texaco, and other major industries.
2. Type of Area: The County is a mixture of old small cities, exurban (far northern) and--growing--suburban (of New York City, with executive homes and corporate centers), and rural poverty. It is also mixed in terms of wealth along its southern border, where population is increasing, and a declining economy in its 2 small, old industrial cities and its rural areas. Population in these areas is declining, and growing older. Minority population in the two small cities is increasing, currently around 25%.
3. Population: The County's population, according to 1980 Census Data, was 245,055, a 10.2% increase since 1970. The old urban-industrial corridor along the Hudson experienced a slight decline during this decade, while areas in the south-central, and northeastern parts of the County grew by 20%, largely due to the influx of workers and executives associated with the industries in the southern end of the County. Other than the two small cities (pop. 30,000, and 13,000, no village exceeds 5,300 in population, and even this village lies in the Hudson industrial corridor and had experienced some decline in population.
4. Demographics:
 - a. Ethnicity: The County's population is 92% white. 25% of the population of the larger city are black. 16% of the population of the smaller city are black, with an additional 12% of its population being recently arrived Hispanics.
 - b. Senior Citizens: Over 20% of the County's population was over 65, with substantially higher percentages in the northern and eastern rural portions of the County. Much of this population is below poverty level.
 - c. Poverty: According to the Agency's 1983 Annual Report, 23,000 county residents were below the poverty line. This is 9.5% of the County's population.

5. Major Poverty Factors (1980):

- Although partly alleviated by CAA efforts, major factors in rural poverty are related to isolation, lack of services, and insufficient public transportation.
- Problems typical of declining small urban areas are found along the Hudson. These include erosion of the industrial base, with corresponding increase in unemployment for those with limited education or skills training; and deterioration in housing.
- The portion of seniors on fixed incomes, in rural areas, highlights the lack of services for this population in terms of health care, support services, nutrition and social services.
- Weatherization and other energy conservation assistance was sorely needed, and lagging, in 1981.

II. STATUS AT "TIME ONE"

A. The Community Action Agency

Note: This CAA, unlike most, was incorporated in 1979. Its predecessor had been mismanaged, and for a while the county programs had been "in receivership."

1. Facilities

- a. The Agency's central headquarters are located in the larger city, where program administration, fiscal, and energy coordination staff are housed, plus a research program: "Women in Poverty." The county is divided into 4 districts served by multi-service centers. Three of these are operated directly by the CAA. The fourth--in the larger city--is operated by a delegate agency, which is partly funded by the CAA, partly by other sources. The Weatherization Program is based at the Eastern multi-service center. Transportation programs are based at a site near the northern center. (The Mid-County and Southern centers are located in the two cities, serving larger areas.) Thus, the agency's programs operate out of six sites, with different centers serving as operating sites for different programs, in a somewhat fragmented way.
- b. None of the facilities are owned by the CAA, or locally contributed (except for Annex of Delegate Agency, and limited use of one town hall for outreach).

2. Executive Director

- a. The Acting Director had been at the agency for one month at the time of the 1981 visit. Since she had been the director of a nonprofit organization that provided technical assistance to the 6 CAA's who make up the Mid Hudson cluster, she was familiar with the Agency and community.

- b. Ethnicity: The Director is white. (Her predecessor was Black).

3. Board Chairperson

- a,b. The Board Chairperson is a white woman on the County Legislature (Public Official sector of the Board).

4. Major Programs--1981 Funding Level:

- a. (CSA) Local Initiative: \$287,100
- b. Head Start is not operated by the CAA
- c. Weatherization--has contract only for rural half of County: \$74,490 (8 month contract)
- f. Energy Conservation - (ECIP) \$36,424 (Balance for 2 year program)
- (h. HEAP \$2,116)
- i. Transportation \$164,700+
- j. (Other) Senior Outreach, Information, Advocacy \$71,020
- k. "Women in Poverty" - Research, Training \$50,000

5. Local Support

a. Cash Support

- (Yes)
- The CAA received \$35,888 in County cash, towards program administration (\$15,896 of this can be seen to have gone to cover transportation cost deficits)
- Grantee also got \$1,850 from local townships, and plans a sizable increase in this for the future.
- (Delegate Agency gets over \$35,000 in local support.)

b. Contracts with County

- (Yes) The following contracts were awarded by the County to the CAA:
 - Senior Outreach, Advocacy, \$71,020
 - Transportation, \$139,308+ (more in '82)
 - HEAP, \$2,116 (more in '82)

c. No facilities support by County

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well Being

- a. Total Funding: \$710,000 CSBG Local Initiative
287,100
Ratio: 2.5-1 AT RISK
- b. % of total funding from Headstart: 0%
% of funding from Weatherization: 11%
(Rural Transportation-DART): 21%

Note: when local funds for administration are added to CSBG, Local Initiative = 45%

- c. Ownership of Facilities? No
- d. Fiscal Management Problems? Minimal/Recent--being resolved:
 - Staff is quite satisfactory. Procedures are mostly OK, but could be strengthened for purchasing control--especially of Weatherization. Another area in need of improvement--and where improvement is planned after other tasks are updated--is involving program staff in fiscal planning/management.
 - Records, audit status are satisfactory.
 - Another problem in this area is that DART, the rural transportation operated by the CAA, was running at a serious deficit, draining CAA resources.
- e. Moderate to Extensive use of volunteers, including student interns and local volunteers at all centers, plus energy volunteer network.
- f. Impending budget cuts were seen as threatening to staff, but this was counterbalanced by the sense of vision and planning imparted by the new Acting Director.
- g. Local Gov't Role in Fiscal:
Direct Financial Assistance:
County \$35,888 (towards Admin--including DART deficit); Local Towns: \$1,850
Contracts: CARE (Sr. Outreach, Advocacy) \$71,020
Transportation \$139,308+ (run at deficit...) HEAP \$2,116

2. Staff Morale

- a. Problems are slight, and largely being effectively dealt with by the new director.
- b. Areas of Morale Problems:
 - Agency future - moderate: uncertainty over future of funding and status of Acting Director
 - Job future - slight problem (anxiety over cuts)
 - Salary level - slight-o.k. unless cuts forced reduced hours.
 - Trust Among Staff - slight - only involves friction with delegate agency and uncertainty over role, re: Energy Program.
 - Facilities - possibly slight, due to several sites for coordinating different programs but not serious...
 - Communications - not as good to neighborhood center level - slight morale problem
 - Recognition for work done - slight in past - improving.

- c. Somewhat of a morale risk, if funding and director situations not stabilized.

3. Perception of CAA in the Community

- a. Trust-Mistrust - agency reputation is o.k. everywhere except in the black community in the larger city, where friction with delegate agency results in their feeling less proprietorship towards the CAA than in the past.
- b. The agency is widely known, thanks to multi service centers.
- c. Most of the agency's operations are seen as agency, rather than service, activity.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders, Public Officials

- a. Representation on Board - PO's - excellent; CL's - good
- b. Familiarity with CAA and its role - PO's excellent; CL's - o.k.
- c. Respect for CAA effort? - PO's excellent; CL's - mostly o.k.
- d. Cooperation/support - PO's excellent; CL's - good, except in larger city - fair

5. Program Activity

- a. Most programs operating effectively. DART costs, and Weatherization management have some problems.
- b. Scope: Appropriate - some special needs of rural areas well addressed; decision not to re-claim Head Start.
- c. Program Development: Sustaining - but potential for growth, with plans initiated to strengthen operations in the face of threatened cuts.
- d. Appropriateness - based on available funding, looking to expand based on needs.

6. Board

- a. % meetings achieving quorum: 75%
- b. Vacancies: 3/24 (2 public, 1 private)
- c. Understanding of Role - Fairly clear, in spite of lack of formal training.
- d. Board Performance - o.k. (fairly effective)

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style

NOTE: Very new Acting Director

- a. Mode: Democratic, open. Delegates responsibility (and supports development of ability to assume responsibility)
 - b. Staff Perception - supportive, open - and competent
 - c. Style: Democratic
 - d. Communications with staff:
 - Open, sharing of agency purpose
 - Forums:
 - Staff meetings: regular, & by component (2-4 mo)
 - Sr. Staff meetings: weekly 4/mo
 - Reports required, to Deputy Director - 1/mo
 - Feedback system: via staff meetings
 - Flow: 2-way, now.
 - Approachability - openness & respect for staff initiative now supported.
 - e. Director's sense of agency purpose/direction is clear to the director, shared, accepted, and understood by at least most staff.
 - f. Director is committed to staff development - internally and beyond the agency.
 - g. Director considers unified agency image important
 - Director feels agency visibility should be moderate to high, but depends on circumstances
 - Director feels her role should be fairly low - allowing for staff to be visible. But makes it clear the buck stops with her = assumption of responsibility by trusted pro.
 - h. Board Relationship
 - Excellent relationship
 - Cooperative (shared responsibility), and supportive (board development)
 - Serves as resource and reporter at board meetings
 - Communicates to board - makes info available... Reports, accessible outside meetings, several meetings/mo.
 - i. Time Allocation
 - Prime - Agency Admin. - prog. ops. - staff development (linked)
 - Major - Resource development, board development, board info/support
 - Modest - Work with public officials, representing CAA at official functions (delegated if feasible)
 - Minimal - networking w/CAA's, networking w/local agencies (delegated)
2. Organizational Compliance System
Normative when possible, coercive with utilitarian rationale when necessary.
 3. Role of Board Chairperson

- a. Level of Activity: over 30 hrs/mo
 - b. Areas of Activity:
 - Positive: Policy, resource development, evaluation and planning, representing CAA, board development
 - Basic: Agenda-setting, meetings
4. Relationship Between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson
- a. Cooperative
 - b. Supportive
 - c. Interaction at least 10 days/month
5. Board Mode of Operations
- a. Activeness - 75% Quorums at monthly meetings (12/yr.)
 - b. Committee System is largely functioning, with some weaker areas
 - c. Board areas of involvement:
 - Planning - low, moderate
 - Evaluation - low
 - Resource development - high (public sector support)
 - Fiscal Monitoring - moderate (hi, but 1-person committee)
 - Program Monitoring - moderate
 - Personnel - low, unclear
 - d. 6/6 public sector reps represented themselves (2 vacancies)
 - e. 3/24 board seats vacant
 - f. 4 staff - exec. dir., fiscal, Dep. Dir. for programs, secretary - attend board meetings, some committee meetings
6. Agency Program Strategy Mix
- a. Actual
 - 80% service delivery, 40% including advocacy (primarily provision of access to needed services)
 - 20% resource development - both local and agency-wide
 - b. Projected (by new director)
 - 40% Advocacy
 - 25% service delivery beyond advocacy, demonstrating needs, and delivering non-duplicated services
 - 20% Resource Development
 - 15% Community Organization plus some C.O. through advocacy
7. Relationship with Local Government

- a. Close, cooperative - through board, contracts
- b. No evidence of undue influence or control

III. STATUS AT TIME TWO

A. The CAA, 1984

1. Facilities

- a. Changes since '81? - Yes
- b. Specific changes:
 - Location of central headquarters moved from larger city to geographic center of county. This results in improved coordination, as all programs are now managed from this central site. Also, agency now directly operates the Mid Hudson service center instead of delegating this. A total of 5 sites are now operated. Additional space will be obtained for new, planned programs.
 - None of the facilities are owned by CAA
 - Site in smaller city is a firehouse, much larger than space in '81, renovated and rented at \$1/yr by the City.

2. Executive Director

- a. no change since '81, except she accepted job as permanent

3. Board Chairperson

- a. No change since '81

4. Major Programs - 1984 Funding Level

a.	CSBG Local Initiative \$215,756	<u>% Change</u>
b.	Headstart \$0	- 26%
		0
		<u>% Change</u>
c.	Weatherization \$306,000	+402%
f.	Energy Conservation: 0 (-36,424)	-100%
h.	HEAP \$18,417	+850%
i.	Transportation \$130,000	- 21%
j.	Sr. Outreach \$75,626	+ 6%
k.	Women in Poverty - incorporated into overall agency \$	-100%

NOTE:

- g. Housing \$57,000 Rural Housing development to "Affiliate" (new)
- j. Sr. Health \$30,000+ facility @ \$1/yr. for fee for service Sr. Day Care

Center (new)

5. Local Support

a. Cash

Compared
to 1981

(-Yes)

County: \$40,185 (but \$20,000 DART deficit) + 12%

Local: \$18,000 +970%

Private: 12,000 (New)

(No delegate agency)

b. Contracts with County:

(Yes)

Sr. Outreach \$75,626 + 6%

Transportation \$130,000 - 7%

HEAP \$18,417 + 850%

Elderly Day Care \$30,000+ (New 10/84)

Shared Housing (13,000) (New)

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well Being

a. Total Funding (Approx) \$1,030,000 Local Initiative
\$215,756 ratio 4.8 (moderate, improved)

(Hard to be exact with DART deficit)

b. % funding from Head Start: 0 (no change)

% funding from Weatherization: 30% (+19%)

% rural transport: 13% (-8%)

Note: When non federal funds are added to CSBG,
Local Initiative = 30% (-15%)

c. Ownership of Facilities - no (no change, although
agency improved its centralization, and got some
\$1/yr. space from county, smaller city)

d. Fiscal Management Problems? None at present.
(This is an improvement from Time One)

e. Volunteer/In-Kind Resources: Extensive
Volunteers treated as a key to stretching agency
resources. Getting some volunteers from industry,
as well as student interns and local volunteers at
all sites.

f. Impact of Fiscal on Morale
Although budget cuts have cost seven staff lines,
there is little evidence that there's any morale
problem at present. Improved from 1981.

g. Local Gov't Role in Fiscal:

Cash:

- County: \$40,185 (both up from '81)

- Local Towns \$18,000

Contracts:

- Sr. Outreach \$75,626 (+6%)

- (Sr.) Shared Housing \$13,000 (new)

- HEAP \$18,417 (+850%)

- Transportation \$130,000 (-7%)
- Elderly Day Care \$30,000+ space (new, 10/84)
- Space:
- Neighborhood center in smaller city, @ \$1/year
- food bank sites in various locales donated
- new senior care program site will be donated/owned by county (slight improvement from 1981)

2. Staff Morale

- a. Virtually no staff morale problems noted.
- b. Salary level is only area where even slight dissatisfaction may be detected.
- c. Agency definitely not at risk in this area

3. Perception of CAA in Community (Beneficiaries)

Trusted

Widely Known

Agency generally perceived as CAA, not separate programs (this was all so in 1981)

4. Recognition/Perception among Community Leaders, Public Officials

a, b, c, d. Recognition, perception by public officials remains excellent. Among community leaders, all 4 are at least good, with respect for CAA-excellent

5. Program Activity

- a. All programs are operating effectively, except for the large deficit in DART (not a service problem, a cost problem).
- b. Scope is appropriate with some innovative elements.
- c. Program development activity: agency is growing
- d. Appropriateness: needs-based, planned

6. Board

- a. % meetings achieving quorum: 83% (5/6)
- b. Vacancies: 4/24 (3 poor, 1 private) - & 2 public officials are seeking reps.
- c. Understanding of role: Clear (improved from '81 - some training)
- d. Board Performance - highly satisfactory

Organization/Operating Characteristics

Virtually no changes from time one, in terms of style, process.

The only changes are noted below:

- 5a. Board now meets bi-monthly instead of monthly; 5/6 quorums in past year (83%)
- 5c. Board areas of involvement show improvement:
- Planning - moderate
 - Evaluation - moderate
 - Resource Development - high
 - Fiscal monitoring - moderate-high
 - Program monitoring - moderate
 - Personnel - low-moderate
- 5d. 6/8 pub sector reps represent themselves
- 5f. 3 staff attend board meetings - no deputy director due to budget cuts
- 6a. Actual balance:
65-70% service delivery including 40% advocacy
10-15% community organizing including advocacy
20%+ resource development

ACCAA

I. Background

A. Target Area Characteristics

1. Area Served - The CAA serves a small County located approximately an hour's drive south of Syracuse, north of Binghamton, and east of Ithaca. Most (83%) of the land is rural with a mixture of woodlands and agricultural land (dairy, produce, orchards.) 60% of the population lives in one Small City and its neighboring villages. The Small City area contains a university and a County Community College.
2. Type of Area (Rural, Suburban, Urban, Mixed...) - Primarily Rural
3. Population - Little changed from '70 census figures of 46,000 population; 27,200 of which were in the Small City and adjacent villages. There are no other population centers. Fewer than 14,000 households in the county.
4. Demographics:
 - a. Ethnicity - Over 99% White.
 - b. % Senior Citizens - 15% senior citizens. An additional 4.5% handicapped. Substantial percentage of seniors below poverty level.
 - c. Poverty - 12% of the adults, other than seniors, were below poverty level. County income level is less than 75% of state average. 1980 unemployment rate of 8.4% was 15% higher than state rate.
5. Major Poverty Factors
 - a. Rural, dispersed poverty with little transportation. CAA obtained funding for rural transport system with County support, not yet operational at time of visit.
 - high unemployment, no local industry to speak of, except University and Orchards
 - Lack of service networks for seniors
 - According to the CAA's statistics, it served close to 40% of the County's population during 1980

II. Status at "Time One"

A. The Community Action Agency (1981)

1. Facilities:

- a. #, type (purpose) - The Agency's programs were all coordinated and operated at one central site, downtown in the Small City. The Head Start program's education component was housed on the grounds of the University, which provided various cost-saving supports and an environment that encouraged upward orientation of its families. A rural center was opened a month later. Some temporary sites served the nutrition needs of WIC participants.
- b. Owned by CAA? - None

2. Executive Director:

- a. Longevity - The Director had been in that position 9 months; with the Agency, 5 years.
- b. Ethnicity - White.

3. Board Chairperson:

- a. Sector - Low Income
- b. Ethnicity - White
- c. Other

4. Major Programs--1981 Funding Level--(at least 5% of CAA budget)

- a. CSBG (CSA) - \$150,000
- b. Head Start - \$261,115
- c. Weatherization - \$175,992 + \$60,008 CETA = \$236,000
- d. Nutrition - \$13,150 (CFNP) + \$37,175 (WIC)
- e. Employment - \$259,310 - (CETA as of 12/80)
- f. Energy Conservation, Crisis Intervention - \$230,000
- g. Housing - (spun off organization)
- h. Fuel Assistance - \$15,635
- i. Transportation - (1979 Grant of vehicles, not yet received)
- j. Other

5. Local Support:

- a. Cash Contribution from County or Subdivisions
 - No
- b. Contracts with County or Subdivisions
 - Yes
 - Amount, contract areas - County Department of Social Services: \$15,635 (HEAP), Pending: Transportation and Housing Code Regulations Development
- c. Facilities assistance?
 - Yes

- How/What - Free space for Head Start at State University
- d. Other Notable In-Kind? - (None)--Substantial Head Start volunteer effort

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- a. Total Funding - \$988,500
CSBG Local Initiative - \$150,000
Ratio - 6.6-1
Healthy. However, \$255,150, or 27% is CETA, and without this, it would be "Borderline".
- b. % of total funding from Head Start - 27%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more: CETA 27%, Weatherization 24%
- c. Ownership of Facilities Yes _____ No X
- d. Fiscal Management Problems? No
- e. Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Extensive _____
Moderate X Minimal _____ None _____
Describe: Head Start uses volunteers extensively, including students from the college.
- f. Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: No problems at time of evaluation.
- g. Local Gov't role in fiscal: Minimal
Direct Financial Assistance: None
Contracts: HEAP \$15,635
Space: (State U contributes space for Head Start)
Other:
None:

2. Staff Morale:

- a. Are there Problems? None at present. Sex Discrimination problem had caused the downfall of previous director, but this no longer impacts on current staff operations.
- b. Is Agency "At Risk?" in this area? No

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries) (O.K., Fair, Poor)

- a. Trust-Mistrust - Generally trusted, especially for specific programs.
- b. Widely known? - Yes--40% of County Population benefitted from Agency programs.
- c. Agency Role Clear (well known)? (CAA vs. Separate Program Identities) - Agency role is changing in direction of community organization. Beneficiary perception changes slower.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
a. Appropriate representation on Board - CL's	X			
PO's	X			
b. Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's	X			
PO's		X		
c. Respect for CAA Effort?				
CL's	X*			
PO's	X**			
d. Cooperation/Support with CAA				
CL's		X		
PO's		X		

5. Program Activity

- a. Operating Effectively? (Quality of Progs, Quantity of Service)- /most/- Program Operations were satisfactory, but recordkeeping in weatherization was inadequate.
- b. Scope: Broad-Innovative - Outreach includes newsletter to all beneficiaries (5/year).
- c. Program Development: Growing
- d. Appropriateness: Needs Based-Planned

(Examples of the above: response to locally identified needs was the development of WIC program, transportation, Head Start Developmental Disabled project.)

6. Board

- a. % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year) - 100%
- b. # present vacancies, sector - 2 (1 private, 1 poor)
- c. Board understanding of its role - generally clear
- d. Board performance of its role: /o.k./

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

- a. Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking

* Some good cooperation in areas such as housing.

** Reluctant cooperation, but willing to be convinced.

- democratic/open
- Delegation to Unit Heads
- b. Perceived by Staff as Supportive/Open
- c. Style: Democratic
- d. Communications with Staff:
 - Openness - full information available
 - Forums for Info-Sharing?
 - # Staff Mtgs./Mo. NA
 - # Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo. - 2 (all program heads)
 - Staff Reports/Mo. - 1
 - Feedback System for Staff Rpts.? Yes - via Deputy Director, and informal contact with Director
 - Flow: 2-way
 - Approachability/Open-Door Policy? Yes. Executive Director's informal style is complemented by more formal, procedural approach of Deputy Director.
- e. Director's sense of agency purpose:
 - Clear to Director? Fully
 - Understood by Staff? Fully
 - Accepted/Supported by Staff? Yes.
- f. Commitment to Staff Career Development? Somewhat. Staff upgrading within the ranks, when possible. Beyond Agency? Educational Advancement is encouraged, supported. Head Start also extensively motivates parents to pursue roles with the CAA, both employment and on its Board.
- g. Attitude Towards Agency Public Image
 - Is unified agency concept important? Yes--and is supported by Agency newsletter
 - Agency visibility - should be Hi
 - Exec Director visibility - Moderately low--supporting local expansion of concerns
- h. Attitude Towards Board, and Exec Dir's role with Board
 - Relationship with Board: Excellent
 - Role with Board:
 - Strengthen Board Capabilities = Support
 - Uses Board as Rubber Stamp = Manipulative
 - At board meetings he serves as resource and a manager of information. Before Board meetings, he holds special briefings - meetings with the Low Income Representatives - to assure that they understand the agenda and issues--to enable them to participate fully.
 - Communication with Board
 - Regular Reports? Yes
 - Accessible to other Board contacts? Fully--open door policy, plus special support of Low Income Sector.

meetings/month attended (incl. committees) -
at least 5

i. Time Allocation (see next page)

2. EXEC DIRECTOR allocation of time among:

- Resource Development - Prime
- Agency networking among CAA's - Lo
- Networking among local organizations - Hi
- Working or dealing with local/state officials or institutions - Mod
- Representing the CAA at official functions or with media - Lo
- Agency program operations (Dep. Dir. does more) - Mod
- Agency Staff development - Hi
- Agency administration - Mod
- Board Development - Hi
- Board Information and Support - o.k.

Prime: Resource Development (including planning, needs identification, and support of problem solutions outside of CAA's scope)

Major: Networking among local orgs, staff development, board development

Modest: Work with officials/institutions, Administration, Program Operations Board Information.

Limited: Networking with CAA's, representing CAA's with media.

2. Organizational Compliance System:

- a. Normative
- b. Vehicles used to establish/maintain the system:
Sharing sense of Agency's C.O. objectives with staff.

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- a. Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo - 30+
- b. Areas of Activity:
Positive: Policy role, resource development, planning, representing CAA, Board Development
Basic: Agenda setting, meetings

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

- a. Cooperative - If there is any compliance, it is in the reliance of chairperson on Director for Procedural guidance.
- b. Supportive - with more support from Director towards Board Chair.
- c. Frequency of Interaction: # times per month - 6 or more

5. Board Mode of Operations

- a. Activeness:
 - % of meetings with Quorum in Past Year - 100% (10/10)
 - Frequency of Meetings: (# year) - 10
- b. Committee System? Yes. Functional
- c. Areas of Involvement:
 - Planning? Regular and extensive
 - Evaluation? Minimal
 - Resource Development? Modest
 - Fiscal Monitoring? Modest but sufficient
 - Program Monitoring? Modest
 - Personnel? As needed
- d. Do Public Sector Reps represent selves or appoint - 6/7 represent themselves
- e. Vacancies and other Operating Problems - 2 vacancies - 1 private sector, 1 poor
- f. Staff attendance at board meetings - all senior staff required to attend

6. Agency Program Strategy Mix
Balance among strategies:

- a. Actual
 - Service Delivery - 50%, 30% including advocacy or C.O.
 - C.O. - 15% - including 10% advocacy
 - Advocacy - 20%, plus mix with SD, CO, and RD
 - Resource Development - 15% including 5% advocacy
- b. Preferred/Expressed
 - Service Delivery - 40%, all 40% linked to CO, advocacy
 - C.O. - 30% - all linked to SD, advocacy
 - Advocacy - 30%, all linked to CO, SD
 - Resource Development - 25% based on above

7. Relationship to Local Government

- a. Cooperative-communication - This is a reversal of previously poorer relationship, based on previous image of agency.
- b. Undue influence or control? No

III. Status at "Time Two"

A. The CAA, 1984

1. Facilities

- a. Any changes since 1981? Yes
- b. Specify changes: Central Headquarters is in same

place. Head Start classes are now in rented space,
not at the State University. This is a decline in
status and condition of this space.

Owned by CAA? No

Locally contributed? No

2. Executive Director

a. any change since 1981? Yes

b. Change:

- Director left 5 months after our first visit, replaced by Deputy, who lasted 8 more months. Severe fiscal problems crippled the agency and the Director's lack of tight administrative management was not appropriate at that time. Deputy's style--stricter and more centralized--caused morale decline without turning agency around.
- If New Director, when did change occur? Current Director accepted position, 1/82. (2 3/4 years ago)--"with a 6-figure deficit" and poor prognosis for survival.
- Ethnicity - White

3. Board Chairperson

Same as 1981 or changed? Changed.

If changed,

- a. sector - Lo income
- b. Ethnicity - White
- c. Other pertinent info. - Former Head Start Policy Council Chairperson

4. Major programs, 1984 funding level

a. CSBG: \$112,725	% change - 26%
b. Head Start: \$406,531	% change + 56%
c. Weatherization: \$375,925	% change + 59%*
d. Nutrition (WIC): \$111,761	% change +300%***
e. Employment: 0	% change -100%***
f. Energy conserv.: 0	% change -100%
g. Housing: 0	% change ****
h. Fuel Assistance: 0	% change -100%
i. Transportation: 0	% change 0*****
k. Other: Adolescent Pregnancy Program: \$10,000	New
Car Seat Restraint Device Program \$5,800	New

5. Local Support

a. Cash contributions?

- Yes/No

- How Amount Compares to '81 - no change
- Specific amounts - if change - NA
- b. Contracts with County?
 - No
 - How compares to '81 - Decrease to 0
 - Specific amounts, if change - Lost one contract
- c. Facilities:
 - Any assistance? No
 - Any change from '81? less - if count State University as Local Government
- d. Notable in-kind
 - Anything especially notable - does not include required local share for HS. Agency operates a 100% volunteer clothing exchange valued at \$100,000/yr. in volunteer time and donations. (Supervised by Head Start.)

B. Agency Health - 1984

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- a. Total Funding \$1,022,017
CSBG Local Initiative \$112,725
Ratio 9-1
Healthy (Having recovered from high risk in 1983)
- b. % of total funding from Head Start - 40%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
Weatherization 37%, (WIC 11%)
- c. Ownership of Facilities No
- d. Fiscal Management Problems? Y X N Possible or recent?
 - Staff and Procedures? Satis_____? X
Problems
Describe: Cash flow remains a problem-related to funding sources.
 - Records, Audit Status - Large deficits were negotiated out of existence by Director. Serious shortage of funding for outreach, basic programs.
- e. Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Extensive____
Moderate X Minimal____ None____
Describe: Only extensive aspect is clothing--see above.

* This had gone to zero in 1982!
 ** For WIC, while losing \$13,375 CFNP funds.
 *** But used County CETA youth in summer program
 **** Spun off organization left owing CAA money. Negative relationship prevailed.
 ***** Planned program failed due to lack of County support. Had to give vehicles back!

f. Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Morale is down among many staff, due to agency's decline in credibility, innovativeness, and ability to deliver services. Largely due to funding cuts.

g. Local Gov't role in fiscal:
 Direct Financial Assistance: 0
 Contracts: 0
 Space: 0
 Other: Workfare personnel assigned to agency, plus TEAP to upgrade them in to agency jobs.

2. Staff Morale:

a. Are there Problems? Yes-Serious

b. Areas of Morale Problems	Ser./	Min.		
	Detri- Mental	Mod.	No Impact	None
- Agency future		X		
- Job future		X		
- Opportunities for Advancement	X			
- Salary Level		X		
- Validity of Work and Agency	X			
- Trust among staff		X		
- Relation with Exec. Director		X		
- Relation with Board	X			
- Facilities			X	
- Recognition for Work Done			X	
- Communications			X	

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries) (O.K., Fair, Poor)

- a. Trust-Mistrust - Growing mistrust of Agency with regard to general services, advocacy. o.k. for Head Start, WIC, Weatherization.
- b. Widely known? - Declining. People still seek it out for help, don't get it, forget it.
- c. Agency Role Clear (well known)? (CAA vs. Separate Program Identities) - Only the separate program identities of the major programs is clear to the beneficiaries.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

a.	Appropriate representation on Board - CL's		X
	PO's	X	
b.	Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's		X
	PO's		X
c.	Respect for CAA Effort?		
	CL's		X
	PO's		X
d.	Cooperation/Support with CAA		
	CL's		X
	PO's		X
5. Program Activity			
a.	Operating Effectively? (Quality of Progs, Quantity of Service) - some - Current programs (Head Start, WIC, Weatherization) are doing fine. However, the <u>Agency</u> has no funds or staff for basic outreach, service delivery, referrals, or advocacy.		
b.	Scope: Basic		
c.	Program Development: Declining - Overall. Two new programs were picked up when opportunities presented themselves.		
d.	Appropriateness:	Based on	Funding
	Available/Largely Stagnant		
6. Board			
a.	% of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year) - 90%		
b.	# present vacancies, sector - 2--both private sector		
c.	Board understanding of its role limited		
d.	Board performance of its role minimally satisfactory		

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

- Have there been changes since time I? Y X N
If yes, causes of change:
- New Director X
- Response to funding realities X
- Board Guidance X - Lack of Guidance 0 (Some improvement noted recently)
- Other

Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach
Different from Time One? Yes. Basis: New Director,
Funding Constraints

- a. Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking
(Perceives himself as Democratic)
 - Mixed. Partly centralized, with regard to dealing with forces outside CAA; partly absent with regard to program coordination. Defines style as Democratic especially with regard to changes in procedures and plans.
 - Delegation to Unit Heads
- b. Perceived by Staff as Weak, Defensive
- c. Style: Mixed - Some autocratic elements, some democratic, some passive laissez-faire.
- d. Communications with Staff:
 - Openness-partial info-sharing
 - Forums for Info-Sharing?
Staff Mtgs./Mo. "occasional"
Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo. (6 - including committees)
Staff Reports/Mo. 1
Feedback System for Staff Rpts.? No system.
 - Flow: Allegedly 2-way. More information goes to Director
 - Approachability/Open-Door Policy? Yes. But has little to offer.
- e. Director's sense of agency purpose:
Clear to Director? Fairly clear. Survival oriented first, then helping people move up, out of poverty through education, employment.
Understood by Staff? Mixed. Most would agree.
Accepted/Supported by Staff? Satisfied to be left alone, in units.
- f. Commitment to Staff Career Development? Barely. Supports concept of upward development of staff, and value of education. But policies are not implemented.
- g. Attitude Towards Agency Public Image
 - Is unified agency concept important? Not emphasized.
 - Agency visibility - should be Hi. Used to prefer low, but now feels high is necessary for growth.
 - Exec Director visibility - should be Lo. Any credit should go to Program Heads.
- h. Attitude Towards Board, and Exec Dir's role with Board
 - Relationship with Board: Good
 - Role with Board:
Operates Programs, Keeps Board Informed = Basic, but manipulative
 - Role at Board Meetings:
Manager of Info. He sets agenda (with

Chairperson), then expedites consideration of all items.

- Communication with Board
Regular Reports? Yes Board Packets
Accessible to other Board contacts? Yes - for business.
meetings/month attended (incl. committees)
2-4

- i. Time Allocation
Prime, Major, Modest, Minimal, None on the 10 items on the attached sheet

EXEC DIRECTOR allocation of time among:

- Resource Development - Hi
- Agency networking among CAA's - Lo
- Networking among local organizations - Lo
- Working or dealing with local/state officials or institutions - Hi
- Representing the CAA at official functions or with media - Lo
- Agency program operations - "Hi"
- Agency Staff development - Lo
- Agency administration - Prime
- Board Development - Lo
- Board Information and Support - Medium
- Other (specify)

Prime: Administration

Major: Resource Development, work w/public officials/institutions, program operations.

Modest: Board Information/Support

Minimal: Board development, staff development, representing CAA with media, networking with local organizations, networking among CAA's.

2. Organizational Compliance System:
Different from Time 1: Yes. Basis: New Director, Fiscal Situation

- a. Coercive/Utilitarian/Normative (or mixed) - Mixed:
More coercive, has rules to be followed; more utilitarian--job is now seen as what's important--more than meeting all needs of the person. Normative within Agency components.
- b. Vehicles used to establish/maintain the system -
Rules new personnel procedures, lack of regular full staff meetings or training, but central location of staff and component training

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- a. Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo Over 40
 - b. Areas of Activity:
 - Positive: Minimal policy role, minimal planning, representing CAA, Volunteerism at Agency
 - Basic: Agenda setting, meetings
4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson
Different from Time 1? Yes
- a. Cooperative with compliance elements (Director dominates)
 - b. Somewhat supportive (both ways)
 - c. Frequency of Interaction: # times per month - at least 6
5. Board Mode of Operations
Different from Time 1? Yes Basis: Weaker Director
- a. Activeness:
 - % of meetings with Quorum in Past Year - 90%
 - Attendance is good as Director keeps meetings short.
 - Frequency of Meetings: (# year) - 10/yr.
 - b. Committee System? Generally functional
 - c. Areas of Involvement:
 - Planning? Medium
 - Evaluation? No
 - Resource Development? No.
 - Fiscal Monitoring? No.
 - Program Monitoring? No.
 - Personnel? Minimal
 - Mostly, items for Board to respond to are prepared by Director, and Board responds.
 - d. Do Public Sector Reps represent selves or appoint - 7/7 rep themselves
 - e. Vacancies and other Operating Problems - 2 vacancies - both private sector
 - f. Staff attendance at board meetings - only Executive Director
6. Agency Program Strategy Mix
Different from Time 1? Yes Basis: New Director
- a. Actual
 - Service Delivery, 70%
 - C.O., 2%
 - Advocacy, 3%
 - Resource Development, 25%
 - b. Preferred:
 - Service Delivery, 75% with 10% advocacy
 - C.O., 0-5%
 - Advocacy, 5-10% including above SD
 - Resource Development, 25%

7. Relationship to Local Government

Different from Time 1? Yes Basis:

a. Neutral or mixed - Some mistrust remains from fiscal abuses, and historical conservative posture of County. Some cooperation from some segments (e.g., Department for the Aging) some potential (e.g., trying again on Transportation).

Critical/conflict

b. Undue influence or control? No. Benign neglect.

UHAP

I. BACKGROUND

A. Target Area Characteristics

1. Area Served: A County, located halfway between New York City and Albany, from Hudson river towns (and one small city) to rural areas in the Catskill Mountain Region.
2. Type of Area: Primarily rural, with one small city and some small villages. Not generally wealthy, but some pockets. Sizable discrepancy between White and Black mean income levels.
3. Population: 158,158 according to 1980 census. (12% increase since 1970). Includes 24,481 in the only small city. No other community contains 7,000 residents.
4. Demographics:
 - a. County is 93% white; 4% black; 3% Hispanic. 1/3 of the County's 6,474 blacks live in the small city.
 - b. Approximately 15% (24,000) county residents were senior citizens, and this number is growing.
 - c. 17,053--or 11.2% of the County is below poverty level, according to 1983 Annual Report.
5. Major Poverty Factors (1980):
 - Unemployment around 11%.
 - Large elderly population on fixed incomes.
 - Urban-type problems in the small city (youth program, unemployment, and education needs; housing problems; unemployment.)
 - Rural poverty problems including lack of public transportation; unavailability of services; housing problems; isolation of the poor.
 - Problems compounded by language barriers in two parts of the County.
 - Some medically underserved areas (rural and urban).

II. STATUS AT TIME ONE

A. The Community Action Agency

1. Agency Facilities (1981)
 - a. #, type:

- Central headquarters houses all program directors. This was a new site, at time of 1981 visit.
- Head Start operates at 5 additional facilities.
- 8 Senior Nutrition sites;
- 3 outreach sites, plus outreach at central Headquarters.

b. Owned by Agency:
Central Headquarters was purchased at modest cost, from local school board.

2. Executive Director:

- a. Longevity: had been there 5 months, hired from "Outside".
- b. Ethnicity: White

3. Board Chairperson:

- a. Sector: Appointee of Public Sector Rep.
- b. Ethnicity: Black
- c. Other: Had been Acting Director for 1 year, until current Director assumed the position.

4. Major Programs, 1981 Funding Level

- a. CSBG: \$150,000
- b. Head Start: \$351,911
- c. Weatherization \$87,600 (includes \$10,000 local county funds)
- d. Senior Nutrition \$326,411
- e. Employment (CETA phased out, 3/81)
- f. Energy Conservation \$87,000 (ECIP)
- g. Housing \$30,000 (Rural Preservation)
- h. Fuel Assistance - spun off

5. Local Support

- a. Cash Contribution from County or subdivisions?
 - Yes, \$10,000 (County).
- b. County Contracts?
 - (only) Sr. Nutrition, \$326,411
- c. Facilities
 - Yes, 3 Head Start Sites and 3 Nutrition sites contributed. Also, Headquarters made available to them by Board of Ed., for \$12,000, payable at \$1,000 per year, interest free.

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal

- a. Total Funding: \$1.05 million Local Initiative: \$150,000
Ratio: 7-1 = Healthy
- b. % of total funding from Headstart: 33%
Weatherization 8%
Senior Nutrition 31%
- c. Ownership of Facilities? Yes, Headquarters
(Headquarters - large old school building, purchased from Board of Education for \$12,000, payable over 10 years, interest free)
Other Contributed Space? - 3 Headstart sites, 3 Sr. Nutrition sites.
- d. Fiscal Management Problems? - Yes, not caused by current staffing.
 - Fiscal Staff and Procedures: Satisfactory - recently developed procedures. New staff - experience appears satisfactory
 - Fiscal Records, Audit Status: problems-unresolved past issues caused by poor recordkeeping, comingling of funds, potential disallowance of moneys. All from before current Admin. team, but plaguing its efforts. Steps underway to resolve the problem, including accountant firm reconstructing the books.
- e. Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Moderate - HS, Home Delivery of Meals
- f. Impact of Fiscal on Morale - Anxiety caused by past problems looming over current program status.
- g. Local Gov't Role in Fiscal:
Direct Financial: \$10,000 County Cash Contribution (to Weatherization) +. 10% of Sr. Nutrition (\$32,641)
Contracts: Senior Nutrition (326,411)
Space: 3 of 5 Headstart, and 3 of 8 Sr. Nutrition sites are in locally contributed space.

2. Staff Morale

- a. There are serious morale problems.
- b. Areas of Morale Problems:
 - Anxiety over Agency Future and Job Future, caused by fiscal records situation (serious...)
 - Some dissatisfaction with salary levels, but not detrimental.
 - Serious mistrust among staff--records stolen from people's desks and files.
 - Some dissatisfaction with communications, with regard to staff not located at headquarters.

- Confusion over relationship to Director and Board chairman in program operations (as former acting director...) (Moderate-serious)
 - No indication of morale problems with regard to facilities, although this had been a problem prior to their moving; the Agency's work and reputation, or opportunities for advancement.
- c. Yes - Agency is at Rick, re Morale.
3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries)
- a. Agency is generally seen in a positive way by beneficiaries - although it is recognized differently by different groups of beneficiaries.
 - b,c. Programs are widely known, but the agency is not strongly identified as a whole.
4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders, Public Officials
- a. Appropriate Representation on Board - OK for both groups.
 - b. Familiarity with CAA and its role - OK for public officials, fairly good for community leaders.
 - c. Respect for CAA effort? (Same as b)
 - d. Cooperation/support with CAA - public officials - good. Community leaders - mostly OK...
5. Program Activity
- a. Most programs operating effectively. Problems with Weatherization management, and outreach standards.
 - b. Scope is Modest/Appropriate, with a strong Sr. Nutrition component, and outreach centers, as well as basic programming. A substantial amount of Innovative programming is noted, primarily built with local initiative funds. (This included a farmer's market, rural housing preservation, wood-for-fuel program, expansion of nutrition program, energy education, etc.)
 - c,d. Program Development is largely based on identified needs, and was only sustaining at the point of the initial visit, while they got their house in order.
6. Board
- a. 0% quorum. In absence of quorum, executive committee meets and acts.
 - b. 6 vacancies out of 24, plus several poor attendees, reduce the functional potential of the board. 2 of the 6 vacancies are in each of the 3 sectors.

- c. There is a lack of understanding of board role, except for a committed minority.
- d. Board performance of its role is partly satisfactory, as the Board Chairman maintains cooperation with County Legislature, and Exec. Committee does function. But lack of quorum and low participation limit effectiveness.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

- a. Mode of Management
 - most nearly Democratic/Open, with elements of Central control. (Retains final responsibility)
 - Delegates authority to unit heads, requiring regular and frequent updates on progress of each unit.
- b. Perceived by Staff as Open, Supportive - trying to bring it together with staff support.
- c. Style is most nearly Democratic - elements of Autocratic.
- d. Communication with staff:
 - Intent is open, practice is partial information-sharing
 - Forums for Info-sharing:
 - 0 full staff meetings
 - 2 Sr. staff meetings per month
 - 2 staff reports required/month
 - Feedback only via sr. staff meetings
 - Information flow is 2 way, but more towards director than from him.
 - While trying to improve communications through staff training, his style supports work-oriented communication, but not an open-door policy.
- e. Sense of Agency Purpose: "enable poor to help themselves"
 - Clear to director and board
 - Not discussed with full staff--but recently presented as Sr. staff training - part understood and supported
- f. No evidence of commitment to staff career development, except for Headstart.
- g. Public Image
 - No attention has been paid to these questions. Some parts of the Agency are not seen as integrated with UHAP, but others coordinate well.
 - Agency visibility, recognition is for individual programs, not the whole.
 - Executive Director's contacts with public officials have been quiet.

- h. Board
 - Exec. Director's relationship with Board is Fair - strained with Chairman, plus poor attendance.
 - Role with Board - Basic and limited there by strong Board Chairman's involvement in Administrative areas.
 - Role at Board Meetings - Resource
 - Communication with Board - Thorough report system from Exec. Director and Unit Heads - all required to attend board meetings.
- i. Time Allocation
 - Prime? - Agency staff development and administration.
 - Major - Work with local officials, local orgs., Board Info.
 - Modest - Board Development, Resource Development, Agency Prog. Ops.
 - Minimal - representing CAA at functions or media
 - None - networking with CAAs
- 2. Organizational Compliance System:
Utilitarian, with some coercive elements.
- 3. Board Chairperson
 - a. Level of Activity: over 50 hours per month
 - b. Areas of Activity:
 - Positive: Monitoring, Resource Development
 - Basic: Agenda, Meetings
 - Negative: Imposition into day to day administration.
- 4. Relationship Between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson
 - a. Some Competition
 - b. Mixed - partly supportive, partly negative due to the extent to which Chairman gets involved in administrative role.
 - c. Interaction is Daily
- 5. Board Mode of Operations
 - a. Activeness - 0% of meetings had quorum (out of 10)
 - b. Committee System is in place and serves as main way board conducts business - Basically functional
 - c. Through committees, board plays some role in
 - Planning - low
 - Evaluation - low
 - Resource development - medium (individual effort)
 - Fiscal Monitoring - low-medium
 - Program Monitoring - Medium - gets reports

- d. Half (3/6) of the Public Sector Representatives represent themselves
- e. 6 of 24 seats are vacant
- f. All senior staff are required to attend Board meetings, including fiscal, exec. program heads.

6. Program Strategy Mix

- a. Actual
 - 80%-85% service delivery, including 30% advocacy
 - 10% resource development, plus
 - 5-10% resource development linked with community org.
- b. Expressed ideal
 - 50% service delivery including 30% advocacy
 - 50% resource development, 25% linked with C.O.

7. Relationship with Local Government

- Positive cooperative relationship, as agency receives support and operates programs for County.
- No evidence of undue influence by County

III. STATUS AT TIME TWO

A. The CAA - Relevant Changes since Time One

1. Agency Facilities

- only change: reduction to 6 senior nutrition sites (from 8).

2. Executive Director

- changed since time one
 - a. new director was board chairperson in 1981, and has been acting director for over one year now. He had been acting director for one year in 1980.
 - b. Ethnicity: Black

3. Board Chairperson

- Changed since time one
 - a. Sector: Private Sector
 - b. Ethnicity: White
 - c. Had been Vice President of Board in 1981.

4. Major Programs, 1984 Funding Level

- a. CSBG: 112,725 (+27,000 local funds, 30,000 inkind) - Fed. \$ -26%
- b. Headstart 477,571 (1983 was 563,321) + 28%
- c. Weatherization 190,047 + 118%

- d. Sr. Nutrition 360,000 (1983 was 386,863) + 11%
- e. 0 - no change
- f. Energy Conservation - 0 - 100%
- g. Housing - 0 - rural conservation spun off
- h. Fuel Assistance 14,000 New

5. Local Support

- a. Cash contributions:
Yes: Increased from 1981
 - County (for CSBG Basic Adm.) 15,000
 - City (for CSBG Basic Adm.) 12,000
 - County General Fund Support of Sr. Nutrition 10,000 + 10% of grant
- b. Contracts with County:
Yes - more than 1981
 - Sr. Nutrition: 360,000 (cut from 385,000 in 83)
 - HEAP: 14,000
 - Summer feeding program: 8500
- c. Facilities Assistance
Yes - no change since 1981
- d. Notable in-kind
In addition to cash, in-kind to CSBG in terms of materials, personnel service, food, etc.--is approximately \$30,000.

B. Agency Health 1984

1. Fiscal

- a. Total Funding: \$1,230,000 Local Initiative 112,725
Ratio: 11-1 = Healthy
- b. % of total funding from Headstart: 39%
% of total funding from Weatherization: 15%
% of total funding from Sr. Nutrition 31%
- c. Ownership of Facilities
(Yes - no change)
- d. Fiscal Management Problems? None at present.
This is resolution of old problems, after current Director returned, new Fiscal Director. Very good system of monthly internal reporting.
- e. Volunteer/In-Kind Resources - use is fairly extensive
 - Uses green thumb (sr. Employment) in Admin, HS, Nutrition
 - Uses workfare workers in outreach centers, nutrition
 - Uses foster grandparents in HS
 - Other volunteers in nutrition, outreach
- f. Impact of Fiscal on Morale - Not too bad. Agency uses various fundraising mechanisms to provide bonuses to (outreach) staff, where funding has not allowed for annual increases.

- g. Local Gov't Role in Fiscal:
Direct Financial:
County: \$15,000 to Local Initiative, and over 10% for Sr. Nutrition
City: \$12,000 to Local Initiative
Contracts:
Sr. Nutrition: \$360,000 (increase from '81, decrease from '83)
HEAP: \$14,000
Summer Feeding \$8,500
Space: No change from '81
Other: County assigns green thumb, workfare, senior volunteers to CAA.

2. Staff Morale

- a. Agency morale is generally improved since '81, but problems remain - moderate overall.
- b. Areas of Morale Problems:
Agency Future - moderate, with some concern over county fund cuts, balanced by generally good relation with all funding sources. Some sense agency--and staff--is marking time...
Job Future - Moderate--serious--especially for outreach staff, who feel there is nowhere to go, no advancement possibilities. But roles are clear and people like their jobs.
Salary Levels are considered too low--having a moderate impact on morale, although people generally like their work, etc.
Sense of validity of work, and agency, general trust of staff, and relation to Executive Director are generally seen positive or, at worst, neutral. Facilities, intraagency communications and recognition for work done also were seen as satisfactory.
Relationship with Board was seen as a moderate-serious morale problem, as staff feel the Board is weak and does not carry its weight, and has not been helpful to the agency's overall development...
- c. With regard to staff morale, the Agency is somewhat at risk. There are morale problems, but they do not seem likely to disrupt agency operations, and some aspects of agency staff cohesiveness are satisfactory.

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries)

- a. Beneficiaries generally Trust UCCAA.
- b,c. The Agency is widely known, an improvement over 1981, when programs were better recognized than the agency.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders/Public Officials

- a. Representation on the Board is OK for both CL's and PO's
- b,c. Familiarity with CAA role, is OK for both CL's and PO's
- d. Cooperation/support is good, with regard to public officials but mixed (fair) with community leaders, as some spun off groups are competitive towards the Agency.

5. Program Activity

- a. All programs are operating effectively, although outreach is hampered by funding limitations
- b. Scope of operations is appropriate - with modest innovation growing out of the overworked outreach centers.
- c. The agency seems to be sustaining, but not growing. They developed, then spun off, rural housing preservation and resource for accessible living (handicapped program) recently. At same time, it's a struggle to hold its own with demands on county funds...
- d. Appropriateness of programming - all current programs are in areas of clear need, and CAA has updated its needs assessment. However, most operations appear to be based on available funding... (between needs based and sustaining)

6. Board

- a. 75% of Board meetings achieved Quorum in past year, although # of Board vacancies was high--most of year.
- b. 4 vacancies out of 24. 2 private sector, 2 public.
- c. Lack of understanding on board remains a problem--except for committed portion of Board. This has improved somewhat since 1981.
- d. Board performance of its role is partly satisfactory, thanks to sincere effort of small part of Board...

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style/Approach

- New Exec. Director since Time One
 - a. Mode of Management
 - Mixed/Situational. Allows unit heads to operate freely, and has regular meetings, but regularly "checks up" on all program aspects. Central control

- with regard to relationship to some funding sources.
- Delegates Operating Authority to unit heads.
- b. Perceived by Staff as Supportive, but relatively weak.
- c. Mixed Style - contains elements of Laissez-Faire, mixed with Autocratic; perceives self as central decisionmaker, based on information input from Project Directors.
- d. Communications with Staff:
 - Partial Info-Sharing. (More info to Director than from him).
 - Forums for Info-Sharing:
 - 0 full staff meetings/month
 - 2 Sr. staff meetings/month
 - 4 reports required/month from staff
 Only feedback is via sr. staff meetings and informal contact.
 - Flow: 2-way thanks to meetings. Primarily 1-way, towards Executive Director.
 - Approachability: Open-door policy on problems and disagreements, and is known by staff not to hold grudges over disagreements.
- e. Director's sense of Agency Purpose
 - Clear, understood by director, board, most staff
 - Generally supported by staff, although some outreach staff quietly go beyond official positions.
- f. Director feels unable to support staff career development
- g. Public Image
 - (Yes) has worked hard at improving sense and reality of unified single agency
 - Feels Mixed with regard to agency visibility. Wants high visibility without threatening local government--feels these objectives conflict
 - Feels Executive Director's visibility should be high, as his role is to see the Agency (public relations, grants; etc...) However, in practice, he is quietly recognized--so, overall, must say medium.
- h. Attitude towards board and role with board
 - Relationship is good
 - Role with board - cooperative pursuit of objectives; but role is basic--operates.

- programs, keeps board informed
- Role at board meetings - information resource, and cooperative co-planner
- Communication with Board - regular, via reports, meetings, contact with board chairman.

i. Time (or priority) allocation:

Prime - agency administration

Major - networking among CAA's; among local orgs; with local officials; program operations (varies based on need); Board info and support; representing CAA with Local media.

Minimal - resource development*; Board Development*; Staff Development*

(* - Dissatisfied by lack of time available for those)

2. Organizational Compliance System:

- Has changed since round one - due to style of new (old) director
(shared sense of goals for agency and community) - developed through regular meetings; but partly coercive - (specific task requirements/reports - to be done in timely manner...) overall effect is utilitarian.

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- Different Board Chairperson
Level of Activity: over 30 hours/month
Areas of Activity:
Positive: Policy, representing CAA
Basic: Agenda setting, meetings
Negative: None

4. Relationship - Exec. Director to Board Chairperson

- a. Cooperative
- b. Supportive
- c. Interaction is "frequent" - 10 days/month?

5. Board Mode of Operations:

- a. Activeness: 75% of Board's meetings had quorum (should be 10 meetings/year only reviewed 8)
- b. Committee System? Irregular, meet sporadically.
- c. Board role in:
Planning - low
Evaluation - low
Resource Development - low
Fiscal Monitoring - low-medium

Program Monitoring - low-medium

Personnel - low-none

- d. 4 of 6 public sector reps represent themselves (2 vacant out of 8)
- e. 4 of 24 seats are vacant - 2 each in public, private. Poverty area reps were recently seated-had been several vacancies in that area.
- f. All senior staff attend all board meetings.

6. Program Strategy Mix

- a. Actual: 80% service delivery, including 30% advocacy
10% community organization disguised as service delivery
10% resource development
- b. Expressed Ideal: 70% service delivery, including 30% advocacy
25% resource development
5% community organization

7. Relationship with Local Government:

- a. Close, cooperative relationship; county and city provides financial and other support. Respect shown for CAA.
- b. County has not exercised undue influence, but CAA has exercised great caution with regard to publicly confronting their source of funding.

PCCAC

I. Background

A. Target Area Characteristics

1. Area Served: PCCAC serves a suburban County within an hour's drive of New York City. The County contains some local industry, and some people work in nearby counties, but New York City predominates as source of employment and culture. There are no cities in the county, only villages, and townships with hamlets. Three villages have suffered deterioration of their downtown sectors, one having gone through an urban renewal "revitalization process." Most of the County's housing is private homes, many owned by senior citizens who constitute the largest bloc of the County's poor. School systems have been affected by declining enrollment in some areas, and by in-migration of groups with special needs, in others.
2. Type of Area: Rural, Suburban, with some less developed areas.
3. Population: 229,903, according to County Planning Board data. (1976), growing in the northern part of the County, declining in the south.
4. Demographics:
 - (a) Ethnicity - Over 90% white. 6% Black - with heaviest concentrations in two villages, the County's largest. 2% Hispanic, mostly in the third largest village. The Black population includes an influx of Haitians into one village.
 - (b) % Senior Citizens: Probably 15% of County's population, 2/3 in poverty.
 - (c) Poverty: 23,000 seniors in poverty, 7% welfare recipients or medicaid, 8% unemployed, 64% of minorities do not complete high school.
5. Major Poverty Factors
 - Deteriorated Housing in 2 villages, and some displacement in a third which has undergone major urban renewal over the past decade.
 - County Office Facilities are located in sites that are not easily accessible to the poorest residents of the County, but can be reached by bus, hourly.
 - Most poverty is in areas that are not primarily poor, or attuned to the needs of the poor.
 - Unique, insular groups of poor - Hassidim, Jackson White, Haitians - requiring special attention to involve them in service programs.

- Growing elderly population, much of it on fixed incomes, in a County with fairly high property taxes, and limited services for the elderly.
- 3 unique populations with high rates of poverty, each in a distinct geographical area:
 - Hassidim in one area populated a part of a township, incorporated it as a village which is almost entirely Hassidic, almost entirely low income.
 - A sizable Haitian community has migrated to the County's largest village, which already had a large poor black population, but never a language problem.
 - In the western part of the County, an isolated group of Mountain residents called "Jackson Whites" is impoverished, lacking in services, and reluctant about dealing with outsiders.
 - Minority unemployment is 50% higher than the County average.

II. Status at "Time One"

A. The Community Action Agency (1981)

1. Facilities:

- (a) #, type (purpose) Headquarters, 2 outreach sites.
2 Head Start delegate agencies
- (b) Owned by CAA? 0

2. Executive Director: Note: An Acting Director had been serving for 4 weeks at the time of our initial visit. His predecessor held the position 8 months, before the Board fired her. (Two Directors and one year later the Director present in 1984 accepted that position. In 1981, she started as Head Start Director on the first day of our visit.)

- (a) Longevity: 3 weeks
- (b) Ethnicity: Black

3. Board Chairperson:

- (a) Sector: Private
- (b) Ethnicity: Black

4. Major Programs--1981 Funding Level--(at least 5% of CAA budget)

- (a) CSBG (CSA) 150,000
- (b) Head Start 510,531
- (c) Weatherization 165,700 (plus some CETA workers)
- (d) Senior Nutrition - 0
- (e) Employment - CETA contracts with County \$892,338

- (f) Energy Conservation, Crisis Intervention - Solar \$1,500
- (g) Housing - 0
- (h) Fuel Assistance - 0
- (i) Transportation - 0
- (j) Sr. Outreach, etc. - 0

5. Local Support:

- (a) Cash Contribution from County or Subdivisions
 - Yes (County)
 - Amount \$93,981
- (b) Contracts with County or Subdivisions
 - Yes - CETA \$892,338
- (c) Facilities assistance?
 - No
- (d) Other Notable In-Kind? - No

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- (a) Total Funding \$1,814,050
CSBG Local Initiative \$150,000
Ratio 12-1
Healthy
- (b) % of total funding from Head Start 28%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more: CETA 47%
- (c) Ownership of Facilities Yes _____ No X
- (d) Fiscal Management Problems? Y X N
 - Staff and Procedures? Satis _____ ? X
 Problems
 Describe: History of past fiscal crises, County bail-outs, bad press, growing reluctance to identify with the CAA by public officials and local agencies.
 - Records, Audit Status: Current Fiscal Director consistently failed to be timely and accurate. No written procedures.
- (e) Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Extensive _____
Moderate _____ Minimal X None _____
Describe: Some at the local centers.
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: No respect, lack of ability to use fiscal information for planning (not timely or accurate). The CAA Board compounded the problem by appointing the unqualified Fiscal Director, Acting Executive Director.
- (g) Local Gov't role in fiscal: County Board has bailed CAA out of fiscal crisis and pays a substantial amount towards Program and Administration, plus very large CETA contract.

Direct Financial Assistance: \$93,981 for Program
and Administration.
Contracts: \$892,338 (CETA--most of County)
Space: 0

2. Staff Morale:

(a) Are there Problems? Yes-Serious.

b. Areas of Morale Problems	Ser./ Detri-	Mod.	Min. No	Impact	None
	<u>Mental</u>				
- Agency future			X		
- Job future		X			
- Opportunities for Advancement			X		
- Salary Level			X		
- Validity of Work and Agency		X			
- Trust among staff	X				
- Relation with Exec. Director	X				
- Relation with Board		X			
- Facilities		X			
- Recognition for Work Done	X				
- Communications	X				

(c) Is Agency "At Risk?" in this area? Yes

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries)
(O.K., Fair, Poor)

- (a) Trust-Mistrust: Beneficiaries of some programs do not trust the CAA, due to poor management of programs, and bad publicity.
- (b) Widely known? Individual programs are known for what they do--and some do well. Agency has bad reputation due to press coverage.
- (c) Agency Role Clear (well known)? (CAA vs. Separate Program Identities)

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representation on Board - CL's			X	
PO's			X*	
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's			X	

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
PO's		X		
(c) Respect for CAA Effort?				
CL's				X
PO's			X	
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA				
CL's				X
PO's		X		

*Until recently, most public seats were not filled. Not filled due to mistrust, due to CAA mismanagement.

5. Program Activity

- (a) Operating Effectively? (Quality of Progs, Quantity of Service) Some programs satisfactory, other poorly run.
- (b) Scope: Modest-Appropriate
There are serious service gaps, especially for Seniors and unique target groups. But they have good range of programs--especially employment.
- (c) Program Development: Sustaining (although hard to tell, with Acting Director)
- (d) Appropriateness: Based on Funding Available - Agency "decided" that employment and education were the key areas to concentrate in--and they do emphasize these areas.

6. Board

- (a) % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year) 100%
- (b) # present vacancies, sector - 0 vacancies--but several new members.
- (c) Board understanding of its role: clear to some
- (d) Board performance of its role: partly satisfactory - Board meetings last 3-5 hours; critical business was often voted on after some Board members left. No Board training. No information received enabling it to function adequately in the fiscal monitoring area.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

Note: Acting Director for less than one month. Director in 1984 assumed that position a year later.

- (a) Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking
 - absent
 - Delegation to Unit Heads
- (b) Perceived by Staff as

Weak, Defensive

- (c) Style: Laissez Faire (functionally speaking)
- (d) Communications with Staff:
 - partial info-sharing (better intention than practice)
 - Forums for Info-Sharing?
 - # Staff Mtgs./Mo. 1
 - # Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo. 1
 - Staff Reports/Mo. - Only as required by funding sources
 - Feedback System for Staff Rpts.? Unclear
 - Flow: 0-way
 - Approachability/Open-Door Policy? (Sad to say, the door may have been open, but no one came in. Actually, he demonstrated enough anxiety that he probably would not have maintained a fully open operation.)
- (e) Director's sense of agency purpose:
 - Clear to Director? No
 - Understood by Staff? Generally no
 - Accepted/Supported by Staff? No
- (f) Commitment to Staff Career Development? N/A
- (g) Attitude Towards Agency Public Image N/A
 - Is unified agency concept important? Agency was highly fragmented, beneficiaries could not get a sense of multi-purpose agency. However, this may have been a Board policy decision, not Director's.
 - Agency visibility - should it be Hi? Med? Lo? - N/A
 - Exec Director visibility - should it be Hi? Med? Lo? Previous Director was fired for not spending enough time in the target communities. Acting Director literally was unaware where some of them are.
- (h) Attitude Towards Board, and Exec Dir's role with Board
 - Relationship with Board: Fair. Previous Director was fired by Board. Acting Director controlled, watched out for, by Board.
 - Role with Board: Maintains relatively even keel, as instructed by Board. = Basic...
 - Role at Board Meetings: Minimal
 - Resource? Previous Directors may have performed this role, but Board dominates.
 - Communication with Board
 - Regular Reports? Presumably, this is the expected role.
 - Accessible to other Board contacts? Yes.
 - Board Chairman visits daily.
 - # meetings/month attended (incl. committees)? N/A
- (i) Time Allocation

Prime, Major, Modest, Minimal, None on the 10 items
on the attached sheet

STYLE OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

EXEC DIRECTOR allocation of time among:

- Resource Development - ?
- Agency networking among CAA's - None
- Networking among local organizations - Minimal
- Working or dealing with local/state officials or institutions - Minimal
- Representing the CAA at official functions or with media - ?
- Agency program operations - Moderate
- Agency Staff development - Minimal
- Agency administration - Hi
- Board Development - No
- Board Information and Support - Moderate
- Other (specify)

3. EXEC DIRECTOR preference:

- Hi vs. Lo visibility of the CAA in performing its tasks - N/A
 - Lo visibility for the Exec Director as CAA spokesperson
- Prime: Administration
Major: None
Moderate: Program Operations, Board Information
Minimal: Network w/local organizations, work with public officials staff development
None: Networking with CAA's, Board Development.

2. Organizational Compliance System:

- (a) Coercive/Utilitarian/Normative (or mixed) -
Passively Utilitarian
- (b) Vehicles used to establish/maintain the system -
none.

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- (a) Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo 35+
- (b) Areas of Activity:
Positive: Policy role, resource development, Board Development
Basic: Agenda setting, meetings
Negative: Imposition into day to day administration (Primarily through conflict relationship with prior director)

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

- (a) Acting Director compliant to Board. Prior Director was partly competitive.

- (b) Supportive (both ways?--or which way) or Negative (which way(s)) Currently, Board is supportive of Acting Director. Previously, was Negative to previous Director, who was a "compromise candidate" between 2 Board factions.
- (c) Frequency of Interaction: # times per month 20 at present

5. Board Mode of Operations

- (a) Activeness:
% of meetings with Quorum in Past Year - 100%
Frequency of Meetings: (# 1 year) - 10
- (b) Committee System? Functional? Irregular? X
None
- (c) Areas of Involvement:
Planning? (Moderate)
Evaluation? (Minimal)
Resource Development? Minimal
Fiscal Monitoring? Not in past 8 months
Program Monitoring? Moderate
Personnel? Major
- (d) Do Public Sector Reps represent selves? No - appoint
- (e) Vacancies and other Operating Problems - 0 vacancies. Lengthy Board Meetings (up to 5 hours) limits effectiveness
- (f) Staff attendance at board meetings? Director, possibly for reports.

6. Agency Program Strategy Mix

Actual Balance: Service Delivery - 85%
C.O. - 1%
Advocacy - 9% at neighborhood centers
Resource Development - 5%

7. Relationship to Local Government

- (a) Mixed - County continues to provide support/financing, but has grown increasingly critical of PCCAC's ability to get into trouble.
- (b) Undue influence or control? No.

III. Status at "Time Two"

A. The CAA, 1984

1. Facilities

- (a) Any changes since 1981? Y X N
- (b) Specify changes: Moved Headquarters from one village to Largest Village, in same building as

Neighborhood Center. Two other neighborhood centers. Now 3 directly run Head Start sites as well as 2 delegate agencies.

#, type

Owned by CAA? None.

2. Executive Director

(a) any change since 1981? Y X N

(b) Change: Two directors came and went before current director accepted the position 1 1/2 years ago. At time of our 1st visit, she had been Head Start Director for 1 hour.

a. If New Director, when did change occur?
Current Director has been in that role 1 1/2 years; but 2 others had occupied the position since '81.

b. Ethnicity - Black

3. Board Chairperson

Same as 1981 or changed?

If changed,

(a) sector - Private

(b) Ethnicity - Black

4. Major programs, 1984 funding level

(a) CSBG: 112,725	% change -26%	
Plus 125,000 County	(+33%) &	more
	requested	

Contribution

(b) Head Start: 964,859	% change +88%

(c) Weatherization: 177,319	% change + 7%

(d) Sr. Nutrition: <u>0</u>	% change <u>0</u>

(e) Employment: 356,627	% change -62%

(Part of one program is co-funded by PIC, for additional \$28,000)

(f) Energy conserv.: <u>0</u>	% change (-\$1500)

(g) Housing: <u>0</u>	% change <u>0</u>

(h) Fuel Assistance: <u>0</u>	% change <u>0</u>

(i) Transportation: <u>0</u>	% change <u>0</u>

(j) Other: Adolescent services (parenting, counsel troubled youth) 65,634 - New

Nutrition (CSBG Discretionary) 10,000

Emergency Food, Surplus Food 3500 surplus food (money loser)

5. Local Support

(a) Cash contributions?

- Yes

- How Amount Compares to '81 - increase
- Specific amounts - if change 125,000 and asking for more (33% increase)
- (b) Contracts with County?
 - Yes
 - 2 Employment (JTPA) pieces, \$274,840;
 - Adolescent Voc. Education 61,547 (plus cofunding from PIC for stipends, \$28,000)
 - (Surplus Food Distribution, 3500)
 - How compares to '81 Less, as less funding was available to the County (Approximately 60% decline)
- (c) Facilities:
 - Any assistance? No
 - Any change from '81? No
- (d) Notable in-kind
 - Anything especially notable - does not include required local share for HS Workfare workers, Foster Grandparents, Office of the Aging Bookkeeper, Executive Loaned from IBM, College Students at Outreach site

B. Agency Health - 1984

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- (a) Total Funding \$1,812,194
CSBG Local Initiative \$112,725
Ratio 16-1
Healthy?
- (b) % of total funding from Head Start 54%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
Employment 20%; Weatherization 10%
- (c) Ownership of Facilities Yes _____ No X
- (d) Fiscal Management Problems? Y ___ N X
- (e) Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Extensive ___
Moderate X Minimal ___ None ___
Describe: See A 5(d) Above
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.:
Not a problem area.
- (g) Local Gov't role in fiscal:
Direct Financial Assistance: Major: \$125,000 - more requested
Contracts: Major - Employment contracts \$356,627
Space: No

2. Staff Morale:

- (a) Are there Problems? (Yes-Moderate)
Ser./ Min.
Detri- No
Mental Mod. Impact None
- b. Areas of Morale Problems
 - Agency future X
 - Job future X

b. Areas of Morale Problems		Ser./ Detri- Mental	Mod.	Min. No Impact	None
-	Opportunities for Advancement		X		
-	Salary Level		X		
-	Validity of Work and Agency		X		
-	Trust among staff		X		
-	Relation with Exec. Director		X		
-	Relation with Board		X		
-	Facilities		X(one site is poor)		
-	Recognition for Work Done		X		
-	Communications				X

(c) Is Agency "At Risk?" in this area? Yes Somewhat

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries) (Fair)

- (a) Trust-Mistrust Improved since '81. Some still confused.
- (b) Widely known? Better than '81 - serving broader constituency. Still weak with Seniors.
- (c) Agency Role Clear (well known)? (CAA vs. Separate Program Identities) Attempting to build unified concept, but still has long way to go...

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representation on Board - CL's		X		
PO's			X	
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's		X		
PO's	X			
(c) Respect for CAA Effort? CL's			X	
PO's		X		
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA CL's			X	
PO's		X		

5. Program Activity

- (a) Operating Effectively? (Quality of Progs, Quantity of Service) most
- (b) Scope: Modest-Appropriate
- (c) Program Development: Growing Modestly
- (d) Appropriateness: Based on Funding Available

6. Board

- (a) % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year)
100%, but for part of year, only 12 on Board
- (b) # present vacancies, sector - 2 public, 3 target, 3 private = 8
- (c) Board understanding of its role (clear, clear to some, limited, lacking)
- (d) Board performance of its role (highly satisfactory/o.k./ partly satisfied/unsatisfactory)

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

- Have there been changes since time I? Y X N
If yes, causes of change:
 - New Director
 - Other - Key Board members have resigned, as their time was up according to bylaws.

Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

Different from Time 1? Yes

Basis: New Director - 1 1/2 years as of '84.

- (a) Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking
Says shes democratic/open, but there are areas of tighter control.
Centralized Responsibility/Delegation to Unit Heads/Mixed
- (b) Perceived by Staff as
Strong, Supportive, Defensive, Mixed
- (c) Style: Autocratic/Democratic/Mixed
- (d) Communications with Staff:
 - partial info-sharing
 - Forums for Info-Sharing? "Regular Staff Training"
Staff Mtgs./Mo. 1
Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo. 1+
Staff Reports/Mo. 1
Feedback System for Staff Rpts.? Through Prog. Heads, Board Meetings, etc.
 - Flow: 2-way
 - Approachability/Open-Door Policy? Limited...
She tries to keep control by not being the first contact for everyone with a problem.
- (e) Director's sense of agency purpose:
Clear to Director? Yes
Understood by Staff? Largely
Accepted/Supported by Staff? Somewhat (High staff turnover, some warranted, some unhappy.)

- (f) Commitment to Staff Career Development?
Internal Agency? Yes - Upgrade from within, staff training
Beyond Agency? Strong Commitment to Employment, Training Programs
- (g) Attitude Towards Agency Public Image
 - Is unified agency concept important? Yes - still needs a lot of strengthening.
 - Agency visibility - should it be Hi? Med? Lo? "Mixed - High for successes, low for problems."
 - Exec Director visibility - should be Hi? But feels she's not there yet - still working on Agency
- (h) Attitude Towards Board, and Exec Dir's role with Board
 - Relationship with Board: Generally Good
 - Role with Board:
Operates Programs, Keeps Board Informed = Basic +
Seeks to Strengthen Board Capabilities = Support
(She "helped" Board remove members who had been there beyond bylaws limits, thereby strengthening her relationship with Board.)
 - Role at Board Meetings:
Resource?
 - Communication with Board
Regular Reports? Yes
Accessible to other Board contacts? Yes
meetings/month attended (incl. committees)?
3 (other staff typically serve on most Board committees)
- (i) Time Allocation
Prime, Major, Modest, Minimal, None on the 10 items on the attached sheet

Prime: Administration (which encompasses all--many are linked)
Major: Resource Development, Networking w/local organizations, work with government officials, program operations (will be less when a program director is hired), staff development, Board development, Board information
Moderate: Network among CAA's, representing CAA with Media et. al.
Minimal: None

Note: Involves Board & Staff in several of these areas.

- 2. Organizational Compliance System:
Different from Time 1? Y X N ___ Basis: New Director
- (a) Utilitarian (primarily)
- (b) Vehicles used to establish/maintain the system
She sets rules, involves staff & board in monitoring - goal oriented.

3. Role of Board Chairperson
 Different from Time 1? Y X N
 (a) Level of Activity: Moderate
 (b) Areas of Activity:
Positive: Policy role, resource development, Board Development, Evaluation and Planning
Basic: Agenda setting, meetings
4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson
 Different from Time 1? Y X N Basis: New people
 (a) Cooperative
 (b) Supportive
5. Board Mode of Operations
 Different from Time 1? Y X N Basis: Many new members, new chairperson.
 (a) Activeness:
 % of meetings with Quorum in Past Year - 100%
 Frequency of Meetings: (# 1 year) - Monthly
 Plus Board Training 4 times/yr.
 (b) Committee System? Functional? ___ Irregular? X?
 None ___
 (c) Areas of Involvement:
 Planning? Moderate
 Evaluation? Somewhat
 Resource Development? Low, but some individuals help
 Fiscal Monitoring? Minimal, as Board--Nowritten reports, but oral reports plus 2 Board Members sign all checks.
 Program Monitoring? Moderate
 Personnel? Somewhat
 (d) Do Public Sector Reps represent selves? No appoint
 (e) Vacancies and other Operating Problems - 8
 vacancies - 2 public, 3 target, 3 private.
 (f) Staff attendance at board meetings?
 Exec. Director, usually fiscal, sometimes Head Start. Senior staff all invited.
6. Agency Program Strategy Mix
 Different from Time 1? Y X N
 Balance among Service Delivery - 70%
 C.O. - 5%
 Advocacy - 12%
 Resource Development - 13%
7. Relationship to Local Government
 Different from Time 1? Y X N Basis: No recent scandals in press.
 (a) Close, cooperative
 (b) Undue influence or control? No.

I. Background

A. Target Area Characteristics

1. **Area Served:** This CAA serves the western portion of a County in the southern part of the Mid-Hudson cluster of CAA's. The area includes two small cities—population 23,000 and 8,500. Downtown parts of both cities are in decline. The rest of the area is more similar to two adjacent rural counties than it is to the eastern part of the County, which is more developed due to its proximity to the Hudson River and New York Thruway. Much of the County is within 60 miles of New York City.
2. **Type of Area:** Mostly rural, although parts feel connected to the New York Metropolitan area.
3. **Population:** 133,000 persons—approximately half of the County's population, live in the CAA's area. Two thirds of this population live in rural townships—the balance in the two cities and several villages. The CAA's primary efforts are focused in the two small cities with some rural services provided.
4. **Demographics:**
 - (a) **Ethnicity:** 92% white. Minorities, however, comprise 15% of the poverty population. 6% Black: 2% Hispanic.
 - (b) **% Senior Citizens:** 13% over 60, accounting for 30% of the CAA's poverty population.
 - (c) **Poverty:** Poverty is scattered throughout the rural areas with concentration in the two small cities plus rural areas that included persons who remained there from migrant camps. In 1981, poverty was estimated at 10% of population. By 1984, 18%.
5. **Major Poverty Factors:**
 - Rural parts of the County are lacking in services, including severe problems with transportation to the County's Department of Social Services. The Dept. of Social Services is located in a complex of County services, outside of a small town, only accessible by car. The poor often have to take cabs from a city in the eastern part of the County.
 - Seniors on fixed incomes have difficulty making ends meet.
 - Housing conditions in much of the County are poor, especially in the downtown parts of the two small cities, where homelessness and alcoholism have become concerns.

- The smaller city suffers from high unemployment, with little new industry in the offing. The County's unemployment rate is higher than the state average.
- Parts of the County have been designated as medically underserved, and many of the County's doctors are reluctant to serve Medicaid patients.

II. Status at "Time One"

A. The Community Action Agency (1981)

Note: The CAA's modest local initiative grant includes partial funding of a Community Health Center which the CAA started but now is much larger than the CAA. 43% of Local Initiative Funds go to this Delegate Agency.

1. Facilities:

- (a) #, type (purpose): The CAA's programs are all operated from one central headquarters (in dilapidated condition) --except for Headstart, Weatherization, and the Delegate Agency. (4 buildings in all)
- (b) Owned by CAA? None.

2. Executive Director:

- (a) Longevity: 10 months.
- (b) Ethnicity: Black.

3. Board Chairperson:

- (a) Sector: Poor
- (b) Ethnicity: Black
- (c) Other: She was in her last term at time of initial visit.

4. Major Programs—1981 Funding Level—(at least 5% of CAA budget)

- (a) CSBG (CSA): \$195,200 including \$85,000 for Delegate Agency. (Delegate portion was reduced to \$60,000 the next year, and phased out by 1984.)
- (b) Head Start: \$222,249
- (c) Weatherization: \$359,712 (including CETA labor)
- (e) Employment: Other CETA moneys used for staffing local initiative program, admin: \$40,960
- (f) Crisis Intervention: \$30,000
- (h) Fuel Assistance: \$8,600
- (k) Other: Alcohol Program \$58,048 (includes CETA labor)

5. Local Support

- (a) Cash Contribution from County or Subdivisions
 - No

- (b) Contracts with County or Subdivisions
 - No, but \$11,100 from State Dept. of Social Services, including HEAP, through County.
- (c) Facilities assistance?
 - No

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- (a) Total Funding: \$904,525
 CSBG Local Initiative: \$195,200
 Ratio: 4.6
 Borderline. Especially given the portion of local initiative funds for the Delegate Agency.
- (b) % of total funding from Head Start: 30%
 Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
 Weatherization
- (c) Ownership of Facilities: No
- (d) Fiscal Management Problems? Possible
 - Staff and systems appear satisfactory, but the agency's low funding level, and amount allocated to its Delegate Agency, present serious limitations.
- (e) Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Minimal (Head Start only)
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Indirect problem—CAA is in building that needs upgrading to improve morale.
- (g) Local Government role in fiscal: None

2. Staff Morale

- (a) Are there problems? Moderate
- (b) Areas of Morale Problems:

	Serious/ Detrimental	Moderate	Minimal/ No Input	None
- Agency future			x	
- Job future			x	
- Opportunities for Advancement				x
- Salary Level			x	
- Validity of Work and Agency				x
- Trust among staff			x	
- Relation with Exec. Director			x	
- Relation with Board			x	
- Facilities	x			
- Recognition of Work Done			x	
- Communications			x	

- (c) Is Agency "At Risk" in this area? Somewhat. The causes of the Morale Problem cause the risk. Morale reflects the funding and building conditions.

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries)

- (a) Trust-Mistrust: Improving, based on quality of program services.
 (b) Widely known? Not widely known outside the village where the CAA is located.
 (c) Agency Role Clear (well known)? Program identities are much stronger than CAA.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representation on Board - CL's PO's			x	x
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's PO's		x	x	
(c) Respect for CAA Effort? CL's PO's		x		x
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA CL's PO's		x		x

5. Program Activity

- (a) Operating Effectively? Yes, all programs.
 (b) Scope: Modest-Appropriate. Some unique programs (Alcoholism, Health Center), but serious gaps.
 (c) Program Development: Barely sustaining. At risk due to lack of money for staff to perform this function.
 (d) Appropriateness: Based on Funding Available.

6. Board

- (a) % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year): 100%, but high % of vacancies.
 (b) # present vacancies, sector: 7/21. 4 Public, 2 Private, 1 Poor. (4 of these were about to be filled.)
 (c) Board understanding of its role: Limited but developing. Over half of the Board is new.
 (d) Board performance of its role: O.K.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

- (a) Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking
 - Tight/central control. Especially with regard to information.
 - Delegation Unit Heads
- (b) Perceived by Staff as: Supportive/Open
- (c) Style: Mixed—Autocratic/Democratic
- (d) Communications with Staff:
 - Partial info-sharing
 - Forums for Info-Sharing?
 - # Staff Mtgs/Mo.: Occasional
 - # Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo.: Occasional
 - Staff Reports/Mo.: 4
 - Feedback System for Staff Rpts.: Verbal
 - Flow: 2-way, but more goes to Director than back.
 - Approachability/Open-Door Policy: Fairly open, regularly shares information, concerns.
- (e) Director's sense of agency purpose:
 - Clear to Director? Yes.
 - Understood by Staff? Fairly well.
 - Accepted/Supported by Staff? Fairly well.
- (f) Commitment to Staff Career Development? Not clearly evident.
- (g) Attitude Towards Agency Public Image
 - Is unified agency concept important? Not articulated as of first visit. By next visit he clearly felt this was important.
 - Agency visibility: Medium. Toned it down, due to negative image with County officials.
 - Executive Director visibility: Medium.
 - Developed gradually as time allows.
- (h) Attitude toward Board and Exec. Dir's role with Board:
 - Relationship with Board: Excellent
 - Role with Board:
 - Seeks to Strengthen Board Capabilities = Support
 - Operates Programs, Keeps Board Informed = Basic
 - Joint pursuit of Agency Goals, based on each's strength = Cooperative
 - Role of Board Meetings:
 - Resource
 - Communication with Board
 - Regular Reports
 - Accessible to other Board contacts
 - # meetings/month attending (incl. committees): 6?

- (i) Time Allocation
Note: the order listed below represents Practice,
not Preference, of the Director.
Prime: Board Development.
Major: Administration, Board Information.
Modest: Staff Development, Program Operations.
Minimal: Networking among CAA's, Networking among
local organizations, work with officials,
Representing CAA with media, Resource development

2. Organizational Compliance System
 - (a) Utilitarian
3. Role of Board Chairperson
 - (a) Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo.= 25+
 - (b) Areas of Activity:
Positive: Representing CAA, Board Development
Negative: Imposition into day to day administration--
somewhat
4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson
 - (a) Cooperative
 - (b) Supportive - both ways
 - (c) Frequency of Interaction: 6+ times per month
5. Board Mode of Operations
 - (a) Activeness:
% of meetings with Quorum in Past Year: 100%
Frequency of Meetings: (# 1 year): Monthly
 - (b) Committee system? Irregular.
 - (c) Areas of Involvement:
Planning: Modest
Evaluation: Minimal
Resource Development: Minimal
Fiscal Monitoring: Minimal
Program Monitoring: Minimal
Personnel: None
 - (d) Do Public Sector Reps represent selves or appoint?
4 vacant, 3 appoint.
 - (e) Vacancies and other Operating Problems: 7/21 vacant
 - (f) Staff attendance at board meetings: Exec. Director
exclusively.
6. Agency Program Strategy Mix
Actual balance among Service Delivery (80%), C.O. (5%),
Advocacy (5%), Resource Development (10%).
7. Relationship to Local Government
 - (a) Critical. County is largely anti-CAA, especially
since CAA, prior to current director, had been
visibly critical of County. Director intended to
mend fences.
 - (b) Undue influence or control? No.

III. Status at "Time Two"

A. The CAA, 1984

1. Facilities

- (a) Any changes since 1981? Yes.
- (b) Specify changes: Same basic building as Headquarters with Weatherization now in same building. Same Head Start site. New program for Teens at separate site.
type: 3
Owned by CAA? No.
Locally contributed? No.

2. Executive Director

- (a) Any change since 1981? No. However, Director has solidified his position and strengthened the agency operating style since '81.

3. Board Chairperson

Changed since 1981.

- (a) Sector: Private
- (b) Ethnicity: White
- (c) Other pertinent info.: Was Vice President in '81. Became President in 1982.

4. Major programs, 1984 funding level

(a) CSBG: \$146,693	% change: -25%
(b) Head Start: \$392,915	% change: +77%
(c) Weatherization: \$270,512	% change: -25%
(e) Employment: 0	% change: -100%, but see 5(d)
(f) Energy conserv.: 0	% change: -100%
(g) Housing: \$100,000 - Homeless Project	% change: New
(h) Fuel Assistance: \$44,536	% change: +510%
(j) Other: Alcohol Program: \$31,300	% change: +5%
Teens: Parenting: \$39,517	
Truancy: \$9,400	

5. Local Support

- (a) Cash contributions:
 - No
 - No change, possibly DFY Local cash - \$5,000
- (b) Contracts with County
 - Commodities Distribution, HEAP
 - How compares to '81: Increased
 - Specific amounts, if change: \$50,000 vs. \$8,500 in '81
- (c) Facilities:
 - Any assistance? No. Actually some blockage, re: Alcoholism Facility.

- (d) Notable in-kind:
 - Uses 3 Green Thumb Sr. Workers for clerical, maintenance.
 - Cheese program pulls large number of volunteers.

B. Agency Health - 1984

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- (a) Total Funding: \$1,034,923
CSBG Local Initiative: \$146,693
Ratio: 7-1
Borderline, but improved since 1981.
- (b) % of total funding from Head Start: 39%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
Weatherization = 27%
- (c) Ownership of Facilities: Yes. Indirect ownership of SRO Project Building—in name of subsidiary organization "PACER"
- (d) Fiscal Management Problems: Possible
 - Staff and Procedures: ?
Describe: Recent resignation of Fiscal Deputy Director. New Person still "feeling their way..."
- (e) Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Moderate
Describe: 3 Green Thumb workers
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Lack of money causes staff uncertainty about jobs and some people have left due to salary not being competitive.
- (g) Local Gov't role in fiscal:
Direct Financial Assistance: 0
Space: 0

2. Staff Morale

- (a) Are there problems? Moderate.

(b) Areas of Morale Problems:

	<u>Serious/ Detrimental</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Minimal/ No Input</u>	<u>None</u>
- Agency future	x			
- Job future		x		
- Opportunities for Advancement		x		
- Salary Level	x			
- Validity of Work and Agency		x		
- Trust among staff			x	
- Relation with Exec. Director			x	
- Relation with Board				x
- Facilities	x			
- Recognition of Work Done			x	
- Communications				x

(c) Is Agency "At Risk" in this area? Somewhat.

3. Perception of CAA in the Community:

- (a) Trust
- (b) Widely known? Improved since '81 - but not there yet.
- (c) Agency Role Clear: No. "They see CAA doing a lot of things but they don't know why." Also, some programs have separate identities.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representation on Board - CL's PO's		x		x
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's PO's		x x		
(c) Respect for CAA Effort? CL's PO's		x	x	
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA CL's PO's		x	x	

5. Program Activity

- (a) Operating Effectively? All programs, within funding limitations. Community Services program has been severely reduced, due to funding.
- (b) Scope: Broad-Innovative
- (c) Program Development: Growing

- (d) Appropriateness: Mixed - Needs Based-Planned/Based on Funding Available

6. Board

- (a) % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year)
6/12
- (b) # present vacancies, sector: 5/21. 1 Private, 4 Public.
- (c) Board understanding of its role: Clear to a few. High Board turnover, limited opportunities for training.
- (d) Board performance of its role: O.K.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

- Have there been changes since time I? Yes.
If yes, causes of change:
 - Change in style of Director as Agency evolved under his leadership.
- 1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach
 - Different from Time I? Yes.
 - (a) Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking:
 - Mixed/situational - democratic/open
 - Delegation Unit Heads
 - (b) Perceived by Staff as: Supportive/Open
 - (c) Style: Mixed - Autocratic/Democratic
 - (d) Communications with Staff
 - Partial info-sharing, tries to be.
 - Forums for Info Sharing?
of Staff Mtgs./Mo.: ?
Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo.: 4/mo.
Staff Reports/Mo.: 1/mo.
Feedback System for Staff Rpts.: Informal
 - Flow: 2-way
 - Approachability/Open-Door Policy: Limited by overwork.
 - (e) Director's sense of agency purpose:
Clear to Director.
Understood by Staff: Somewhat.
Accepted/Supported by Staff: Yes.
 - (f) Commitment to Staff Career Development: Undeveloped
 - (g) Attitude Toward Agency Public Image
 - Is unified agency concept important? Yes, but not yet successful.
 - Agency visibility, should it be: Medium.
Situational
 - Exec. Director visibility: Low if possible.

- (h) Attitude Towards Board, and Exec. Dir's role with Board:
- Relationship with Board: Good
 - Role with Board:
Seeks to Strengthen Board Capabilities = Support
Operates Programs, Keeps Board Informed = Basic
Joint pursuit of Agency Goals, based on each's strength = Cooperative
 - Role at Board Meetings: Resource
 - Communication with Board:
Regular reports.
Accessible to other Board contacts? Yes.
meetings/month attending (incl. committees): 4?
- (i) Time Allocation
- Prime: Administration
- Major: Resource Development, Program Operations, Board Information/Support, Networking among Local Organizations, Dealing with Officials
- Modest: Networking among CAA's, Staff Development Board Development
- Minimal: Representing CAA in media/functions (Low Mode, etc.)

2. Organizational Compliance System

- Different from Time I? No. Basis:
- (a) Utilitarian

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- (a) Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo= 30?
- (b) Areas of Activity:
Positive: Policy role, evaluation and planning, representing CAA, Board Development
Basic: Agenda setting, meetings

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

- Different from Time I? Yes. Basis:
- (a) Cooperative
- (b) Supportive (both ways)
- (c) Frequency of Interaction: 5+ times per month

5. Board Mode of Operations

- Different from Time I? No. Basis: ?
- (a) Activeness:
% of meetings with Quorum in Past Year: 50%
Frequency of Meetings: 12/year, but some were changed to Executive Committee or canceled due to lack of quorum.
- (b) Committee System: Irregular.

- (c) Areas of Involvement:
 - Planning: Somewhat
 - Evaluation: Minimal
 - Resource Development: Minimal
 - Fiscal Monitoring: Minimal
 - Program Monitoring: OK
 - Personnel: —
 - (d) Do Public Sector Reps represent selves or appoint:
1 represents self; 2 appoint; 4 vacant
 - (e) Vacancies and other Operating Problems: 5 vacant —
4 public, 1 private
 - (f) Staff attendance at board meetings: Director.
6. Agency Program Strategy Mix
- Different from Time I? Yes. Basis: Increased emphasis on Advocacy.
Actual balance among Service Delivery (60%), C.O. & Advocacy (25%), Resource Development (15%).
Prefers more resource development, more effective C.O. Advocacy. More integrated service efforts.
7. Relationship to Local Government
- Different from Time I? Yes.
(a) Neutral or mixed. Conservative Legislature still hinders CAA efforts, but there are now areas of cooperation and respect.
(b) Undue influence or control? No.

I. Background

A. Target Area Characteristics

1. Area Served: This CAA is the Community Action Agency for the entire County, except for its largest city—which has its own CAA. The CAA's jurisdiction includes 27 municipalities, mostly rural, plus one city—population 50,000 and suburban areas around both the County's cities. The County is located in Central New York State, east of Syracuse. The area's largest employers are government facilities—3 large State Mental Hygiene Facilities and a large Air Force Base. Some manufacturing, including Revere Copper, is also present in the area. The target area covers 1,200 square miles, and even its one city is spread out compared to other cities—with agricultural areas within the City Limits.

According to the CAA's Director, the CAA's poverty population (like the rest of the County) is spread out geographically except for small concentrations in housing projects.

2. Type of Area: Mixed
3. Population: The area's population of 181,426 remain virtually unchanged over the past decade.
4. Demographics
 - (a) Ethnicity: 98% White, 1.3% Black, 0.7% Hispanic
 - (b) % Senior Citizens: 15% of the Population
 - (c) Poverty: Close to 8% of the County's residents are below the poverty level. Less than 20% of these are on Public Assistance. The remainder are either working poor, or senior citizens.
5. Major Poverty Factors
 - Lack of decent housing at favorable prices for Low-Middle income people.
 - Factors related to rural poverty, especially with regard to access to services, and lack of rural transport.

II. Status at "Time One"

A. The Community Action Agency (1981)

1. Facilities
 - (a) #, type (purpose): The Agency operates out of 27 sites—3 different sites for Program Administration and coordination of programs; 5 Head Start sites; 20 local town facilities for Outreach and Rental Housing Assistance; and 12 summer feeding program sites. The main administrative facility is located in County Office Building in the largest city (outside the agency's geographic area). Most space is contributed by local or county government.
 - (b) Owned by CAA? None.
2. Executive Director
 - (a) Longevity: Over two years at time of visit.
 - (b) Ethnicity: White (Female)
3. Board Chairperson
 - (a) Sector: Public
 - (b) Ethnicity: White
4. Major Program--1981 Funding Level--(at least 5% of CAA budget)
 - (a) CSBG (CSA): \$150,000
 - (b) Head Start: \$359,892 + \$28,700 USDA
 - (c) Weatherization: \$330,382 (includes \$44,000 CETA)
 - (e) Employment: (Gets CETA help from County now)
 - (f) Energy Conservation, Crisis Intervention: \$30,000
 - (g) Housing: \$395,500 (Rental Assistance--Hud Sect. 8)
 - (h) Fuel Assistance: HEAP - \$15,000
 - (k) Other: Summer Youth, Summer Feeding - \$49,774
5. Local Support
 - (a) Cash Contribution from County or Subdivisions
 - No
 - (b) Contracts with County or Subdivisions
 - Yes
 - Amount, contract areas: HEAP, \$15,000, Summer Feeding

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well-Being
 - (a) Total Funding: \$1,359,248
CSBG Local Initiative: \$150,000
Ratio: 9-1
Healthy
 - (b) % of total funding from Head Start: 28%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
 - Weatherization: 24%
 - Rental Assistance: 29%
 - (c) Ownership of Facilities: No

- (d) Fiscal Management Problems: Yes. Recent. Fiscal problems predate current staff.
- Staff and Procedures? Mostly satisfactory, minor problems.
Describe: Not all procedures are clearly spelled out in current fiscal manual. However, staff are well trained.
 - Records, Audit Status: Old record—from period of Fiscal Problems.
- (e) Use of Volunteers, In-Kind Resources: Moderate.
Moderate use of volunteers; extensive use of contributed space and County equipment
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Not significant—other problems impact on Morale.
- (g) Local government role in fiscal:
Direct Financial Assistance: None
Contracts: HEAP (\$15,000) = 1% of Agency budget.
Space: Extensive - County, City, Local.

2. Staff Morale

(a) Are there problems? Yes, serious.

(b) Areas of Morale Problems:

	Serious/ Detrimental	Moderate	Minimal/ No Input	None
- Agency future				x
- Job future				x
- Opportunities for Advancement				x
- Salary Level				x
- Validity of Work and Agency			x	
- Trust among staff	x			
- Relation with Exec. Director	x			
- Relation with Board		x		
- Facilities	x			
- Recognition of Work Done		x		
- Communications	x			

(c) Is Agency "At Risk" in this area? Yes.

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries)

(a) Trust-Mistrust: Mixed—mostly trust; mostly locally oriented, not agency as a whole. Agency's Head Start beneficiaries trust Head Start, but mistrust CAA.

(b) Widely known? Yes.

(c) Agency Role Clear (well known)? (CAA vs. Separate Program Identities): Program identities are stronger than Agency. Head Start in conflict with rest of CAA.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representation on Board - CL's PO's		x		
	x	(Most represent themselves, but some conflicts on Board)		
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's PO's	x x			
(c) Respect for CAA Effort? CL's PO's	x			
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA CL's PO's	x x	x		

5. Program Activity

- (a) Operating Effectively? All programs.
- (b) Scope: Modest-Appropriate. Most innovative or unique aspect is subsidized Rental Housing role.
- (c) Program Development: Growing
- (d) Appropriateness: Based on Funding Available, with assessment of how this relates to agency goals.

6. Board

- (a) % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year): 100%
- (b) # present vacancies, sector: NA ("Most Board seats are filled" — believed to be 1 or 2 of 21 - Private)
- (c) Board understanding of its role: Clear to some. Poor sector is not effective, and needs more information from sources other than Director.
- (d) Board performance of its role: Partly satisfactory. (Board does not receive regular training; is largely dependent on Director for information; contains conflicts; but definitely participates in decisionmaking, although sometimes manipulated.)

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

- (a) Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking
 - Tight/central control
 - Mostly centralized responsibility, some delegation to Unit Heads (Units are "permitted" to operate on their own, "as long as results are satisfactory")
- (b) Perceived by Staff as: Strong, Controlling

- (c) Style: Mixed - Autocratic/Democratic, she says.
- (d) Communications with Staff
 - Openness: Partial info-sharing
 - Forums for Info-Sharing:
 - # Staff Mtgs./Mo.: 0
 - # Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo.: 2, plus meetings with individual program heads.
 - Staff Reports/Mo.: 1 - usually, through Dep. Div.
 - Feedback System for Staff Rpts.: Through Dep. Div.
- (e) Director's sense of agency purpose:
 - Clear to Director: Yes.
 - Understood by Staff: No.
- (f) Commitment to Staff Career Development: Unclear - no evidence.
- (g) Attitude Towards Public Image
 - Is unified agency concept important? (Yes - at least in concept) (In action - not so clear.)
 - Agency visibility: High.
 - Exec. Director visibility: High. (She sits on a large number of Boards around the County.)
- (h) Attitude Towards Board, and Exec. Dir's role with Board:
 - Relationship with Board: Good (84), Fair (81)
 - Role with Board:
 - Uses Board as Rubber Stamp = Manipulative (Apparently tries this at times.)
 - Role at Board Meetings:
 - Primary resource, manager of info.
 - Sometimes seen in role of "Leader" of Meeting
 - Communication with Board
 - Regular Reports
 - # meetings/month attended (incl. committees): 5+
- (i) Time Allocation:
 - Prime: Agency Administration
 - Major: Resource Development, Board Information Support, Networking Among Local Organizations, Working/Dealing with Officials
 - Modest: Board Development, Networking among CAA's
 - Minimal: Program Operations, Staff Development, Representing CAA in Media

2. Organizational Compliance System

- (a) Mixture of coercive and utilitarian.
- (b) Vehicles used to establish/maintain the system:
 - Control over information, intimidating dominance within the physical space.

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- (a) Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo: 20+

- (b) Areas of Activity:
Positive: Policy role
Basic: Agenda setting, meetings
Negative: Conflict relationship with Director

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

- (a) Competitive
- (b) Negative both ways

5. Board Mode of Operations

- (a) Activeness:
 % of meetings with Quorum in Past Year: 100%
 Frequency of Meetings (#/year): 10/year
- (b) Committee System: There are Committees. Some meet regularly, others as needed. Wide gaps in what Board role could be.
- (c) Areas of Involvement:
 Planning: Weak
 Evaluation: Weak
 Resource Development: None, in spite of legislators on Board
 Fiscal Monitoring: Fair
 Program Monitoring: Weak-Fair
 Personnel: Fair
- (d) Most Public Sector Reps represent selves
- (e) Vacancies and other Operating Problems: Minimal vacancies (2/21 ?).
 Operating Problem: Legislators fight at Board meetings, while the poor are not able to fully participate.
- (f) Staff attendance at Board meetings: Exec. Dir., HS Dir. others always welcome. (Fiscal sends report--rarely comes) Wx comes often

6. Agency Program Strategy Mix

Balance among	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Expressed</u>
Service Delivery	75%	70%
C.O.	4%	3%
Advocacy	12%	15%
Resource Development	9%	12%

7. Relationship to Local Government

- (a) Close, cooperative
- (b) Under influence or control? Problem of being closely identified with County causes some confusion as to whether the CAA is separate from the County government in minds of clients.

III. Status at "Time Two"

A. The CAA, 1984

1. Facilities

- (a) Any changes since 1981? Yes.

- (b) Specify changes:
Consolidation of facilities to one Admin/Program
Coordination site in the only city in CAA target
area.
Owned by CAA? Tried to buy building, but lost bid
to BOCES, and now rents 1 full floor from BOCES.
(Would have rented to BOCES, if won the bid.)
Locally contributed? Local School Board sold it, at
modest price.
2. Executive Director
(a) Any change since 1981? No.
3. Board Chairperson
Changed since 1981.
(a) Sector: Public--represents Mayor on the Board
(b) Ethnicity: White
(c) Other pertinent info: Had been on Board in '81, but
this is his first term as Chairman.
4. Major programs, 1984 funding level
- | | |
|--|----------------|
| (a) CSBG: \$112,725 | % change: -26% |
| (b) Head Start: \$644,172 +
USDA 52,128 | % change: +80% |
| (c) Weatherization: \$337,505
(+ Niagara Mohawk- Summer-
\$13,000) | % change: + 2% |
| (g) Housing: \$496,539 | % change: +26% |
| (h) Fuel Assistance: \$17,000
(Asking \$22,000) | % change: +13% |
| (j) Summer Feeding: \$67,000 | % change: +34% |
| Foster Grandparents: \$143,130 | % change: New |
| (k) Youth Programs: Runaways,
Delinquency Prevention:
\$134,000 | % change: New |
- (Note: Runaway Program's \$112,000
includes \$50,000 for operating in
2 other counties)
5. Local Support
(a) Cash contributions:
- Yes. County and Local cash match to DFY
Delinquency Program.
- How Amount Compares to '81: Increase
- Specific amounts: +\$9,000.
City contributes \$52,000 in Community
Development moneys to assist CAA in relocating
its offices there.
- (b) Contracts with County?
- Yes.
- How compares to '81: Same contracts, larger
amounts. HEAP = \$17,000 (+13%); Summer Feeding
= \$67,000 (+34%). (Could call DFY contract,
rather than cash, as well.)

- (d) Notable in-kind: Agency claims \$650,000 in volunteer and in-kind contributions. \$400,000 of this is surplus food distribution, which they play to get out of.

B. Agency Health - 1984

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- (a) Total Funding: \$2,023,587
CSBG Local Initiative: \$112,725
Ratio: 18-1
Healthy
- (b) % of total funding from Head Start: 34%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
 - HUD Sect. 8: 25%
 - Weatherization: 17% (May grow.)
- (c) Ownership of Facilities: No. (Tried, not successful.)
- (d) Fiscal Management Problems: Possible
 - Staff competent, capable. However, procedures for keeping Board and Agency informed are not as good.
 - Records, Audit Status: OK, except Auditor also expressed concern about records system, communication.
- (e) Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Moderate
 - Head Start, Surplus Food, etc., nothing extraordinary.
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Minimal.
- (g) Local government role in fiscal:
Direct Financial Assistance: City: \$52,000, for new facility rehab. + \$9,000 cash match - county, local - DFY.
Contracts: HEAP, Summer Feeding.
Space: Contributed or lower rent for all HS Centers; still have a room from County in County Seat; use of town halls for Housing, Outreach; and relationship with BOCES results in modest cost for new Headquarters.

2. Staff Morale

- (a) Art there Problems: Yes, moderate.

(b) Areas of Morale Problems:

	<u>Serious/ Detrimental</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Minimal/ No Input</u>	<u>None</u>
- Agency future		x		
- Job future		x		
- Opportunities for Advancement		x		
- Salary Level			x	
- Validity of Work and Agency		x		
- Trust among staff	x			
- Relation with Exec. Director		x		
- Relation with Board			x	
- Facilities			x	
- Recognition of Work Done				x?
- Communications		x		

(c) Is Agency "At Risk" in this area? Somewhat. It's improved and improving. Problems in some areas: none in others.

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries)

- (a) Trust-Mistrust: General trust, but weaker in some areas—especially where outreach was stronger in the past.
- (b) Widely known? Generally—bud some decline due to staff cuts.
- (c) Agency Role Clear (well known)? (CAA vs. Separate Program Identities): Effort is made to communicate unified agency concept, but identity is blurred due to historic closeness to County, and to fragmented system until recent site change.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representa- tion on Board - CL's	x			
PO's	x			
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's		x		
PO's		x		
(c) Respect for CAA Effort?				
CL's	x			
PO's	x			
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA				
CL's	x			
PO's	x			

5. Program Activity

- (a) Operating Effectively? Most programs. Some question as to style of HS program, and Outreach—combined with Food Pantry—is weak due to small staff (1 person left).
- (b) Scope: Broad
- (c) Program Development: Growing
- (d) Appropriateness: Needs Based-Planned. Primarily based on opportunistic assessment of funding opportunities, but there is an underlying core/play to program expansion.

6. Board

- (a) % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year): 100%
- (b) # present vacancies, sector: 3; 1 private, 1 public, 1 poor.
- (c) Board understanding of its role: limited.
- (d) Board performance of its role: partly satisfactory.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

- Have there been changes since time I? No.

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

- Different from Time I? No.
- (h) Attitude Towards Board, and Exec Dir's role with Board
 - Role at Board Meetings:
Resource
Manager of Info.
Note: At several Board meetings, she also prepared and signed Board Minutes, and sometimes agendas.

2. Organizational Compliance System

- Different from Time I? No.

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- Different from Time I? Yes. Basis: New chairman—with more time, less intellect.
- (a) Level of Activity: 30+ Hrs/Mo
- (b) Areas of Activity:
 - Positive: Policy role, representing CAA, volunteerism
 - Basic: Agenda setting, meetings

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

- Different from Time I? Yes.
- (a) Compliant. Board chair is influenced by Director.
- (b) Supportive. Board chair supports Director, and is backed by her for doing so.
- (c) Frequency of Interaction (# times per month): 10+

5. Board Mode of Operations

- Different from Time I? Yes, practically the same.
Small changes.
- (a) Activeness:
% of meetings with Quorum in Past Year: 100% (same)
Frequency of Meetings (# 1 year): 9/year (was 10)
- (b) Committee System: Irregular (same)
- (c) Areas of Involvement:
Same as previous visit. Limited effectiveness.
- (d) Do Public Sector Reps represent selves or appoint:
2/7 Rep selves. Previously more rep'd self.
- (e) Vacancies and other Operating Problems: 3 vacancies
out of 24. Old conflict problem no longer a major
issue.
- (f) Staff attendance at Board meetings: No change.

6. Agency Program Strategy Mix

- Different from Time I? No.

7. Relationship to Local Government

- Different from Time I? No.
- (b) Undue influence or control? Effort being made to be
less visibly linked to County—including move from
County space—too soon to measure effect.

BECAP

I. Background

A. Target Area Characteristics

1. **Area Served:** This Agency serves the Eastern part of a mid-Hudson County, approximately 60 miles from New York City. Its primary service focus is a small city located on the Hudson River. This city, mover 50% minorities, has been in decline for over a decade. Most of the CAA's efforts are concentrated in the most impoverished part of the city, although some services are offered to neighboring townships.
2. **Type of Area:** A small urban city, with largely rural townships around it. The CAA functions as a small urban CAA.
3. **Population:** The City's population declined 10.6% during the seventies, to 23,438 according to the 1980 census. The more affluent surrounding townships bring the total population within the CAA's boundaries to 100,000. Only one small township and village receive attention from the CAA, outside of the City.
4. **Demographics**
 - (a) **Ethnicity:** The City's population is 35% Black, 15% Hispanic, 49% White. Surrounding is over 90% White.
 - (b) **% Senior Citizens:** NA--Possibly 10% in the City...
 - (c) **Poverty:** Severe. Unemployment over 17%; the City contains half of the County's welfare population, but less than 10% of the County's population. Alcoholism twice the national average.
5. **Major Poverty Factors**
 - A deteriorating sector of a small city, reflecting all types of urban blight: alcoholism, 2 welfare hotels ("the dumping grounds for the County Welfare Department), very high unemployment, higher youth unemployment, dilapidated housing, and so forth.
 - Lack of cooperation from local government, either to the CAA, or to effective code enforcement.
 - Inadequate transportation options, for welfare recipients who need to travel to the County Welfare Complex (located next to the Town Dump, ten miles outside the City).
 - No public transportation to nearest major industrial employers--who are located across the Hudson.
 - Concentration of Low Income Housing--including 3 projects, one senior project, and 2 welfare hotels--in a small geographic area.
 - Some industry located on the river has left the area, further exacerbating the unemployment.

- A long-hoped-for revival, largely based on plans developed to build "New York's fourth jetport" and an accompanying fast rail link to mid-Manhattan, appears totally stalled.

II. Status at "Time One"

Note: This agency, one of the last seen in 1981, represents the most severe case of funding cut by Reaganomics. Agency lost \$1 million in funding in less than a year, and never fully recovered.

A. The Community Action Agency (1981)

1. Facilities

- (a) #, type (purpose): 6 - Headquarters, "Community Services/ Weatherization" Building, "Senior Citizens Storefront," 3 Head Start Centers.
- (b) Owned by CAA? Headquarters and one other building (largely unused).

2. Executive Director

- (a) Longevity: 16 years
- (b) Ethnicity: Black

3. Board Chairperson

- (a) Sector: Private
 - (b) Ethnicity: White
- Acting Chairperson was appointed in 1980, and continues to function without formal election.

4. Major Programs—1981 Funding Level—(at least 5% of CAA budget)

- (a) CSBG (CSA): \$150,000 (But FY '82 had cut this to 56% of this effective November '81)
- (b) Head Start: \$355,757
- (c) Weatherization: \$90,000
- (d) Senior Nutrition: (voluntary donations)
- (e) Employment: 0 (Over \$500,000 in CETA contracts canceled, 9/30/81). Some hope of County CETA referring personnel for them to use, train.
- (f) Crisis Intervention: \$15,000.
- (h) Fuel Assistance: ("Hope" for a contract by Jan. '82. 0 at the time).
- (j) Sr. Outreach, etc.: (included in basic Community Block Grant)
- (k) Other: \$37,250 as grantee for 6 Agency Nutrition and Training Grants. Assumed: \$10,000.

5. Local Support

- (a) Cash Contribution from County or Subdivision
 - No
- (b) Contracts with County or Subdivisions
 - No

- (c) Facilities assistance?
 - No
- (d) Other Notable In-Kind?
 - None from County or City.

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- (a) Total Funding: \$625,000
CSBG Local Initiative: \$150,000
Ratio: 4.2-1
Borderline
- (b) % of total funding from Head Start: 58%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more: (None -
Weatherization = 14%)
- (c) Ownership of Facilities: Yes
If yes, is there mortgage? No
- (d) Fiscal Management Problems: Possible
 - Staff and Procedures: Satisfactory.
Describe: Staff has done their work for many
years.
 - Records, Audit Status: Most recent audit
recommended tighter procedures.
- (e) Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Minimal
Describe: Senior Center and Head Start use
Volunteers; Director could call on community for
support, but generally does not.
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Funding
crisis has caused anxiety, low morale.
- (g) Local Government role in fiscal: None.
Direct Financial Assistance: 0
Contracts: 0
Space: 0

2. Staff Morale

- (a) Are there problems? Yes, serious.

(b) Areas of Morale Problems:

	<u>Serious/ Detrimental</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Minimal/ No Input</u>	<u>None</u>
- Agency future	x			
- Job future	x			
- Opportunities for Advancement	x			
- Salary Level	x			
- Validity of Work and Agency		x		
- Trust among staff			x	
- Relation with Exec. Director		x (serious in Head Start)		
- Relation with Board			x	
- Facilities				x
- Recognition of Work Done		x		
- Communications		x		

(c) Is Agency "At Risk" in this area? Yes

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries)

- (a) Trust-Mistrust: Vague--lack of understanding of Agency and what it does. Program beneficiaries appreciate good services.
- (b) Widely known? No--except for director.
- (c) Agency Role Clear (well known?) (CAA vs Separate Program Identities): No. Separate programs are known in limited areas.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representation on Board - CL's PO's			x	x
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's PO's		x	x	
(c) Respect for CAA Effort? CL's PO's		x		x
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA CL's PO's		x		x

5. Program Activity

- (a) Operating Effectively? (Quality of Progs, Quantity of Services): Most programs operate adequately, provide decent services within budget

- (b) Scope: Limited
- (c) Program Development: Declining
- (d) Appropriateness: Stagnant

6. Board

- (a) % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year):
50%, (1 of 2)
- (b) # present vacancies, sector: 8 vacancies: 4
public, 5 low income; (one extra in private sector).
13/21 filled.
- (c) Board understanding of its role: lacking
- (d) Board performance of its role: Unsatisfactory. 2
meetings in past year; 8 vacancies, unbalanced
representation; no fiscal control or monitoring; all
committees inactive.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

1. Executive director Leadership Style, Approach

- (a) Mode of Management of Program Operations,
Decisionmaking
 - Tight/central control
 - Centralized Responsibility
- (b) Perceived by Staff as: Strong, controlling
- (c) Style: Autocratic
- (d) Communications with Staff
 - Partial info-sharing
 - Forums for Info-Sharing
Staff Mtgs./Mo.: 0 (Very occasional, if
necessary)
Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo.: 0
Staff Reports/Mo.: 0
Feedback System for Staff Rpts.? —
Agency is small enough that most communication
is face to face, with little written down.
 - Flow: 2-way, but very limited.
 - Approachability/Open-Door Policy: No open door
policy, but he does get around regularly to see
everyone.
- (e) Director's sense of agency purpose:
Clear to Director? Yes
Understood by Staff? Partially
Accepted/Supported by Staff? Somewhat—by some
- (f) Commitment to Staff Career Development: Given the
severity of layoffs, this is difficult to measure.
Internal Agency? There are a few examples of the
Director's supporting/encouraging growth off staff
persons to reach their potential in job performance,
and grow with the agency.
Beyond Agency? No.

- (g) Attitude Towards Agency Public Image:
 - Is unified agency concept important?
Preferable—but mainly concerned with survival.
 - Agency visibility: Medium
 - Exec. Director visibility: Medium—depends
- (h) Attitude Towards Board, and Exec Dir's role with Board
 - Relationship with Board: Good with individuals on Board. Board as a whole is weak.
 - Role with Board:
Uses Board as Rubber Stamp = Manipulative
 - Role at Board Meetings: (Infrequent)
"Leader" of Meeting
 - Communication with Board:
Regular Reports? No
Accessible to other Board contacts? One-to-one discussions, partly related to CAA.
meetings/month attended (incl. committees):
0 of CAA, more of community.
- (i) Time Allocation
 - Prime: Administration (including "Protecting Turf From Vultures")
 - Major: Program Operations, Work with Public Officials
 - Modest: Staff Development, Network among CAA's, Network among Local Organizations
 - Minimal: Resource Development, Board Development, Board Information, Representing CAA in media or official functions.

2. Organizational Compliance System

- (a) Mixed—Coercive/Utilitarian
- (b) Vehicles used to establish/maintain the system:
Administrative Direction.

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- (a) Level of Activity: Hrs./No. = ? 5
- (b) Areas of Activity: representing CAA.
Negative: Inactivity

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

- (a) Cooperative, somewhat compliant by Chairperson towards Director, but slight independence.
- (b) Supportive both ways (when Director needs support)
- (c) Frequency of Interaction: # times per month—2 ?

5. Board Mode of Operations

- (a) Activeness: Only 2 meetings in past 12 months
% of meetings with Quorum in Past Year: 50%
Frequency of Meetings (#/year): 2 in past year.
Bylaws require monthly.
- (b) Committee System: None. It exists on paper, but is totally inoperative.

- (c) Areas of Involvement:
 - Planning: 0
 - Evaluation: 0
 - Resource Development: 0
 - Fiscal Monitoring: 0
 - Program Monitoring: 0
 - Personnel: 0
 - (d) Do Public Sector Reps represent selves or appoint:
 - Most are vacant. One represents self. 2 appoint.
 - (e) Vacancies and other Operating Problems: 8
 - vacancies; so system for selecting poor.
 - (f) Staff attending at board meetings: Many staff
 - attend the few meetings.
6. Agency Program Strategy Mix
 Balance among: Service Delivery (80%), C.O. (2%),
 Advocacy (10%), Resource Development (8%).
 - Everything except Service is individual effort of
 the Director.
7. Relationship to Local Government
 (a) Mixed—County provided CETA funds in the past, but
 cut them off due to budget. No overt negative
 actions by County, but no positive either.
 (b) Undue influence or control? No.

III. Status at "Time Two"

A. The CAA, 1984

- 1. Facilities
 - (a) Any changes since 1981? No
- 2. Executive Director
 - (a) Any change since 1981? No
- 3. Board Chairperson
 - Same as 1981
- 4. Major programs, 1984 funding level
 - (a) CSBG: \$119,512 % change: -20% (Annual of
 \$112,725, plus \$7,000
 carry-over moneys given
 to all CAA'S)
 - (b) Head Start: \$571,769 % change: +58%
 - (c) Weatherization: \$154,275 % change: +70%
 - (e) Employment: \$7,711
 (Summer youth) % change: None in '81
 - (h) Fuel Assistance: \$5,402 % change: None in '81
 (HEAP) (May increase to \$25,000)
 - (j) Other: Cheese Distribution: (Approx. \$1,000 - does
 not cover expenses)

5. Local Support

- (a) Cash contributions:
 - No
 - How Amount Compares to '81: No Change
- (b) Contracts with County:
 - Yes
 - How compares to '81: Had none at this time in '81.
 - Specific amounts, if change: JTPA = \$7711
HEAP = \$5,000 - \$25,000
- (c) Facilities:
 - Any assistance? No, except low rent from Housing Authority for one HS classroom.
 - Any change from '81? Same
- (d) Notable in-kind:
 - Volunteerism for cheese.

B. Agency Health - 1984

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- (a) Total Funding: \$869,309
CSBG Local Initiative: \$119,512
Ratio: 7.3-1
Borderline
- (b) % of total funding from Head Start: 66%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
Weatherization
- (c) Ownership of Facilities: Yes
If yes, is there a mortgage? No
- (d) Fiscal Management Problems? No
 - Staff and Procedures: Satisfactory
 - Records, Audit Status: OK
- (e) Use of Volunteer, In-King Resources: Minimal
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Virtually none. The people who remain are survivors, satisfied to just be there.
- (g) Local Government role in fiscal:
Direct Financial Assistance: None
Contracts: Minimal (\$15,000)
Space: No

2. Staff Morale

- (a) Are there problems? Moderate

(b) Areas of Morale Problems:

	<u>Serious/ Detrimental</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Minimal/ No Input</u>	<u>None</u>
- Agency future			x	
- Job future			x	
- Opportunities for Advancement		x		
- Salary Level		x		
- Validity of Work and Agency			x	
- Trust among staff			x	
- Relation with Exec. Director				x
- Relation with Board			x	
- Facilities			x	
- Recognition of Work Done				x
- Communications			x	

(c) Is Agency "At Risk" in this area? No

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries): OK

- (a) Trust-Mistrust: OK, especially thanks to Cheese Distribution
- (b) Widely known? Only for cheese
- (c) Agency Role Clear (well known)? No. Separate Program Identities.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representation on Board - CL's PO's		x		x
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's PO's			x x	
(c) Respect for CAA Effort? CL's PO's		x		
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA CL's PO's			x x	

5. Program Activity

- (a) Operating Effectively? Program Quality is mostly satisfactory. Quantity is not great.
- (b) Scope: Limited
- (c) Program Development: Sustaining
- (d) Appropriateness: Stagnant

6. Board

- (a) % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year): 0
- (b) # present vacancies, sector: 8—same as in '81
- (c) Board understanding of its role: limited
- (d) Board performance of its role: Unsatisfactory. Individual effort is OK.

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

- Have there been changes since Time I? No.

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

- Different from Time I? No.
- (a) Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking:
 - Tight/central control

2. Organizational Compliance System

- Different from Time I? No.

3. Role of Board Chairperson

- Different from Time I? No.

4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson

- Different from Time I? No.

5. Board Mode of Operations

- Different from Time I? No.

- (a) Activeness: Even Less than 1981
% of meetings with Quorum in Past Year: 0
Frequency of Meetings (#/year): 0

6. Agency Program Strategy Mix

- Different from Time I? Yes.

Balance among: Service Delivery (95%), C.O. (0%),
Advocacy (1%), Resource Development (4%).

7. Relationship to Local Government

- Different from Time I? Yes.

(a) Neutral. Slightly more cooperative. Director sits
on Private Industry Council.

(b) Undue influence or control? No.

I. Background

A. Target Area Characteristics

1. **Area Served:** This CAA serves a County in Northern New York State, between Rochester and Syracuse. The area's economy is primarily agricultural, requiring an influx of migrants during its two crop seasons (summer cherries and autumn apples) plus related activities such as food processing plants. The western part of the County also is a suburb of Rochester, with some workers commuting. With the exception of Mobil Chemical, in the westernmost part of the County, there are no significant industrial employers in the County.

While there is some transport in and out of Rochester, and a local transport system now makes six loops around the County each day, public transportation in the area is still lacking throughout most of the area.

There are no cities in the area, only a number of small to modest-sized villages, plus rural areas.

2. **Type of Area:** Mostly rural, with some suburbs of Rochester in its western portion.
3. **Population:** Total population was 82,440 according to 1980 census.
4. Demographics
 - (a) **Ethnicity:** The population is over 90% white, with less than 4% black, and a growing Hispanic population estimated at 3%. 4,600 migrants—largely from the South, but also including a Puerto Rican contingent that works through the autumn canning season.
 - (b) **% Senior Citizens:** The CAA'S Planning Document indicates 15% of the County are over age 60.
 - (c) **Poverty:** Is found throughout the County, although it is less prevalent along the Western suburban edge of the County. (See "Major Poverty Factors," below.)
5. Major Poverty Factors
 - Rural poverty characteristics such as lack of transportation, limited access to services, isolation.
 - High proportion of seniors on fixed incomes, living near or below the poverty level, accounting to close to 15% of the population.

- A large portion of the population (12,200 persons) permanently residing in the County are employed only seasonally, as agricultural and/or cannery workers. Thus, almost 15% of the population is marginal, agricultural poor.
- County unemployment rate, 9.1% in 1980, was over 2 points above the State average. Rate is higher for women, minorities.
- An additional 4,600 agricultural migrants are present in the County during parts of the year, putting an additional demand on the County's limited service network.
- Gaps in Service Delivery System off County and Local nonprofit agencies.

II. Status at "Time One"

A. The Community Action Agency (1981)

1. Facilities

- (a) #, type (purpose): The CAA operates at 9 buildings. Its Administrative Headquarters is one floor of a County Office Building, in a complex of County buildings. 4 buildings—2 Head Start, one Senior Center, and one Neighborhood Center—are located on the same site, in buildings owned by the CAA (purchased from the County) or rented by the County to the CAA. The other sites are Head Start site, 2 Neighborhood Centers, and a senior "Krafter's Boutique."
- (b) Owned by CAA? 2 of 4 buildings on the site in one town.

2. Executive Director

Note: At the time of initial visit the Agency's only Director since 1966 was on terminal vacation leave—and maintained only telephone contact with the program. She was officially replaced by her recommended successor—who'd been a program director—at the next Board meeting.

- (a) Longevity: The old Director had been there 15 years. Her replacement, 0 days in that position.
- (b) Ethnicity: Old Director was a white Nun. New Director is Black.

3. Board Chairperson

- (a) Sector: Rep of the Poor (Senior Citizens)
- (b) Ethnicity: White
- (c) Other: Board is dominated by County Legislators. Except for the Legislators, most Board members were elderly—and many were not actively involved.

4. Major Programs—1981 Funding Level—(at least 5% of CAA budget)

- (a) CSBG (CSA): \$150,000

- (b) Head Start: \$214,289
- (c) Weatherization: \$258,223
- (d) Senior Nutrition: \$124,574 (recently taken over by County)
- (e) Employment: (742,000 CETA funds recently taken over by County) \$122,000 - Summer Youth Employment + \$132,000 Voc. Education.
- (f) Energy Conservation, Crisis Intervention: \$313,097 + Solar \$145,997
- (h) Fuel Assistance: \$171,463 (operated entire program)
- (j) Sr. Outreach, etc. : RSVP - \$29,061, Renovation of Sr. Center - \$12,835, Krafte's Boutique - \$25,000
- (k) Other: Nutrition Advocacy - \$15,710, Summer Youth Recreation - \$6,000

5. Local Support

- (a) Cash Contribution from County or Subdivisions
 - Yes
 - Amount: Somewhat unclear, as some money is shuffled. At least \$12,835 to renovate Senior Building
- (b) Contracts with County or Subdivisions
 - Yes
 - Amount, contract areas: Senior Nutrition, Summer Youth, Energy Assistance
- (c) Facilities assistance
 - Yes
 - How/What: Central Headquarters in County Building, most other facilities sold to CAA or rented to CAA by County

B. Agency Health

1. Fiscal Well-Being

- (a) Total Funding: \$1,448,523
 (Books were not in good shape, some funding still reported only because books not closed. So this is a best estimate of current operating programs.)
 CSBG Local Initiative: \$150,000
 Ratio: 10.5-1
 Healthy. Although evidently there are troubling signs due to some cuts and program transfers and one-time County monies.
- (b) % of total funding from Head Start: 15%
 Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
 Weatherization - 17%, Employment-related programs - 17%
- (c) Ownership of Facilities: Yes
 If yes, is there mortgage? Yes. Large? No.
 (Mortgage payments in lieu of rent paid to County.)

- (d) Fiscal Management Problems: Yes
 - Staff and Procedures: Problems
 Describe: Fiscal Director was an alcoholic, who failed to maintain current records and reports in a manner that could identify problems or violations of law.
- (e) Use of Volunteer, In-King Resources: Minimal
 Describe: RSVP is a volunteer program, appropriately coordinated by the Agency, involving 200 volunteers.
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.: Moderate--salary concerns,...
- (g) Local Government role in fiscal:
 Direct Financial Assistance: Not clear--but includes \$12,885 to renovate Senior Building
 Contracts: Everyday Energy Assistance
 Space: Headquarters, 2 other sites. (Very complicated overlapping of who is paying who for space--with County renovating a facility it purchased from CAA, with funds obtained from CAA purchase of adjacent building, which is makes payments towards mortgage, instead of rent, with Federal Funds...)

2. Staff Morale

- (a) Are there problems? Yes-Serious. Under the old Director, information was tightly controlled, initiative stifled, motivation low. When she resigned, a void existed, with uncertainty, mixed with relief.

- (b) Areas of Morale Problems:
- | | Serious/
Detrimental | Moderate | Minimal/
No Input | None |
|--|-------------------------|----------|----------------------|------|
|--|-------------------------|----------|----------------------|------|

(As of resignation of old Director, as new Director had not yet impacted at all.)

- Agency future			x	
- Job future			x	
- Opportunities for Advancement			x	
- Salary Level	x			
- Validity of Work and Agency				x
- Trust among staff	x			
- Relation with Exec. Director	x			
- Relation with Board	x			
- Facilities			x	
- Recognition of Work Done	x			
- Communications	x			

- (c) Is Agency "At Risk" in this area? Yes

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries)
- (a) Trust-Mistrust: Agency programs are known, appreciated, somewhat trusted, especially among seniors.
 - (b) Widely known? Programs are known. CAA is not well understood as entity.
 - (c) Agency Role Clear (well known)? Separate Program Identities.
4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representation on Board - CL's PO's	x			x
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's PO's		x	x	
(c) Respect for CAA Effort? CL's PO's		x	x	
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA CL's PO's		x	x	

(Legislative Portion of Board dominates Board, while Exec. Director dominates them.)

5. Program Activity
- (a) Operating Effectively? Most programs.
 - (b) Scope: Modest-Appropriate. Broader than some agencies with regard to energy, nutrition, but narrower in its emphasis on Seniors as primary target.
 - (c) Program Development: Declining
 - (d) Appropriateness: Based on Funding Available (But appropriate)
6. Board
- (a) % of Board Meetings Achieving Quorum (Past Year): 100%
(Board meetings held at noon, lunch served, time limited).
 - (b) # present vacancies, sector: 1 poor
 - (c) Board understanding of its role: Limited or lacking
 - (d) Board performance of its role: Unsatisfactory.
(Fails to exercise responsible role, served as rubber stamp for Director, not representative of full target consistency...)

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

(Completed here for old Director. Current Director info is described for 1984 revisit and is essentially unchanged since 1981.)

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

- (a) Mode of Management of Program Operations, Decisionmaking
 - Tight/central control
 - Totally Centralized Responsibility
- (b) Perceived by Staff as: Strong, Controlling
- (c) Style: Autocratic
- (d) Communications with Staff
 - Closed
 - Forums for Info-Sharing:
 - # Staff Mtgs./Mo.: 1/yr.
 - # Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo.: 4
 - Staff Reports/Mo.: NA—No fiscal reports.
 - Very little in writing.
 - Feedback System for Staff Rpts.: No.
 - Flow: 1-way - from Director "down"
 - Approachability/Open-Door Policy: Not very approachable, especially with problems, questions, or criticism.
- (e) Director's sense of agency purpose:
 - Clear to Director: Yes
 - Understood by Staff: No
 - Accepted/Supported by Staff: Not fully understood.
 - Some staff have clear sense of purpose, and it is appropriate—but not clearly attributed to Director, CAA goals.
- (f) Commitment to Staff Career Development: Limited Internal Agency? She pushed for replacement. Beyond Agency? No.
- (g) Attitude Towards Agency Public Image (This is presumptive, best guess.)
 - Is unified agency concept important? No.
 - Agency visibility: Medium
 - Exec. Director visibility: Medium
- (h) Attitude Towards Board, and Exec Dir's role with Board
 - Relationship with Board: Excellent (But 100% supportive Board)
 - Role with Board:
 - Uses Board as Rubber Stamp = Manipulative
 - Role at Board Meetings: Manager of Info, "Leader" of Meeting
 - Communication with Board
 - Regular Reports at Board Meetings

- (i) Time Allocation
 - Prime: Working/Dealing with Officials
 - Major: Program Operations, Administration, Resource Development
 - Modest: Board Info
 - Minimal: Board Development, Staff Development, Representing CAA in media, Networking with Local Organizations, Networking among CAA's.
- 2. Organizational Compliance System
 - (a) Coercive
 - (b) Vehicles used to establish/maintain the system: Aggressive domination, manipulation of information and manipulation of work staff.
- 3. Role of Board Chairperson
 - (a) Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo 20?
 - (b) Areas of Activity:
 - Basic: meetings
- 4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson
 - (a) Compliant - Executive Director dominates
 - (b) Supportive - Board defines its role as supporting the Director
 - (c) Frequency of Interactions (# times per month): 5 ?
- 5. Board Mode of Operations
 - (a) Activeness:
 - % of meetings with Quorum in Past Year: 100%
 - Frequency of Meetings (#/year): 10/year
 - (b) Committee System: None
 - (c) Areas of Involvement:
 - Planning: Minimal
 - Evaluation: None
 - RESOURCE Development: None
 - Fiscal Monitoring: Virtually None
 - Program Monitoring: None
 - Personnel: Virtually None
 - (d) Do Public Sector Reps represent selves: 100%
 - (e) Vacancies and other Operating Problems: No problem with vacancies. Weak, passive Board, except for deals between Exec. and Legislative Board Members.
 - (f) Staff attendance at board meetings: Only the Exec. Director
- 6. Agency Program Strategy Mix
 - Balance among: Service Delivery (80%+), C.O. (0%), Advocacy (10%), Resource Development (10%). Actual and expressed are same.
- 7. Relationship to Local Government
 - (a) Close, cooperative

- (b) Undue influence or control? Yes. CAA is often identified by the public as a County institution. County Legislators dominate the Board, and limit Agency's potential for criticizing government practices.

III. Status at "Time Two"

A. The CAA, 1984

1. Facilities

- (a) Any changes since 1981? Yes
 (b) Specify changes: No change except as listed below:
 #, type: One Neighborhood Center was closed. One new HS site (rented).

2. Executive Director

- (b) Change: Director began in Jan. '81
 If New Director, when did change occur? 1/81
 Ethnicity: Black

3. Board Chairperson

- Changed
 If changed,
 (a) Sector: Poor
 (b) Ethnicity: White
 (c) Other pertinent info.: Senior. Alert, concerned.

4. (a) CSBG: \$112,725 % change: -26%
 (b) Head Start: \$437,263 % change: +105%
 (c) Weatherization: \$300,925 % change: +17%
 (d) Sr. Nutrition: \$141,369 % change: (+12
 over old amount,
 but new in that
 County had taken
 it over in
 1981.)
 (e) Employment: 0 % change: -100%
 (f) Energy convers.: 0 % change: -100%
 (h) Fuel Assistance: 0 % change: -100%
 (i) Transportation: 0 % change: --
 (j) Sr. Outreach, etc:
 RSVP: \$32,969 - % change: +10%
 including cash (local cash
 match amount)
 Foster Grandparent: \$155,922
 Krafters: \$36,00 (reduced, but in RSVP)
 (k) Food - extensive local contributions

5. Local Support

(a) Cash contributions?

- Yes
- How Amount Compares to '81: Increase
- Specific amounts: \$25,000 Contingency Fund
3,000 RSVP Cash Match
3,600 to Krafters Boutique

(b) Contracts with County?

- Yes. For all Senior Nutrition Meal Preparation, Delivery.
- How compares to '81: The Sr. Nutrition Funding had been taken over by County, then re-contracted to the CAA.
No Energy Assisting Program contract.

(c) Facilities

- Any assistance? Yes
- Any change from '81? Same

(d) Notable in-kind:

- Operating RSVP, Foster Grandparents.
Exceptional resource development by Food Bank coordinator.

B. Agency Health - 1984

1. Fiscal Well Being

- (a) Total Funding: \$1,095,125
CSBG Local Initiative: \$112,725
Ratio: 9.7-1
Healthy, but less so than in 1981.
- (b) % of total funding from Head Start: 43%
Other Programs contributing 20% or more:
Weatherization - 30%
- (c) Ownership of Facilities: Yes
If yes, is there mortgage? Yes. Large? No,
\$500/mo. on 2 buildings.
- (d) Fiscal Management Problems: No.
Describe: New Fiscal Director, procedures,
straightened out old problems.
- (e) Use of Volunteer, In-Kind Resources: Moderate
Vast increase over previous.
- (f) Impact of Fiscal on Staff, Morale, etc.:
Reduced, less of a problem.
- (g) Local Government role in fiscal:
Direct Financial Assistance: \$31,600
Contracts: Sr. Nutrition
Space: Arrangement - 2 buildings sold to CAA,
2 rental to CAA, on same site.

2. Staff Morale

- (a) Are the problems? Slight

(b) Areas of Morale Problems:

	<u>Serious/ Detrimental</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Minimal/ No Input</u>	<u>None</u>
- Agency future			x	
- Job future				x
- Opportunities for Advancement			x	
- Salary Level				x
- Validity of Work and Agency				x
- Trust among staff				x
- Relation with Exec. Director				x
- Relation with Board	x			
- Facilities			x	
- Recognition of Work Done			x	
- Communications				x

(c) Is Agency "At Risk" in this area? No

3. Perception of CAA in the Community (Beneficiaries)

- (a) Trust-Mistrust: Generally trust
- (b) Widely known? Not widely known as agency—programs are known.
- (c) Agency Role Clear (well known)? Although program integration is stressed more, the Agency is still more recognized for each separate component.

4. Recognition/Perception Among Community Leaders and Public Officials

	Good	O.K.	Fair	Poor
(a) Appropriate representation on Board - CL's				
PO's	x		x	
(b) Familiarity with CAA and its role - CL's				
PO's		x		
(c) Respect for CAA Effort?				
CL's		x		
PO's		x		
(d) Cooperation/Support with CAA				
CL's			x	
PO's		x		

5. Program Activity

- (a) Operating Effectively? All programs. Some very special outcomes resulting from individual initiative. Improved inter-component cooperation as well. Head Start is the least integrated, but relationship has improved, too.

- (b) Scope: Modest-Appropriate
- (c) Program Development:
Sustaining, Mix of Grow & Decline
- (d) Appropriateness: Mostly Based on Funding Available

6. Board

- (a) % of Board Meeting Achieving Quorum (Past Year):
78% (2/9 no quorum, 2 others, exactly half)
- (b) # present vacancies, sector: 3—1 public 2 poor
- (c) Board understanding of its role: limited
- (d) Board performance of its role: partly satisfactory;
improved, but still weak

C. Organization/Operating Characteristics

- Have there been changes since time I? Yes
If yes, causes of change: New Director

Note: The style of this Director has been in effect, operating since January, 1981. Accordingly, the Agency's "Health" as of 1984 could be predicted based on the 1981 Agency status, plus this style of operating...

1. Executive Director Leadership Style, Approach

Different from Time I? Yes. (See preceding note.)

- (a) Mode of Management of Program Operations,
Decisionmaking
 - Democratic/open
 - Mixed—Primarily delegation to Unit Heads, some elements remain centralized
- (b) Perceived by Staff as: Supportive/Open
- (c) Style: Mixed—Autocratic/Laissez Faire
- (d) Communications with Staff
 - Openness—full information available
 - Forums for Info-Sharing
 - # Staff Mtgs./Mo.: Infrequent
 - # Sr. Staff Mtgs./Mo.: 2
 - Staff Reports/Mo.: 1
 - Feedback System for Staff Rpts.: Informal & meetings
 - Flow: 2-way
 - Approachability: Open-door policy at all times
- (e) Director's sense of agency purpose
 - Clear to Director: Fairly Clear
 - Understood by Staff: Largely
 - Accepted/Supported by Staff: Generally
- (f) Commitment to Staff Career Development? Limited by Resources, but committed to increasing staff awareness and exposure.
Internal Agency? Improved system of training, communication, understanding of purpose.
Beyond Agency? NA

- (g) Attitude Toward Agency Public Image
 - Is unified agency concept important? Yes, but not yet there.
 - Agency visibility: High
 - Exec. Director visibility: High (In practice visibility is medium)
 - (h) Attitude Toward Board, and Exec Dir's role with Board
 - Relationship with Board: Good
 - Role with Board: Operates Programs, Keeps Board Informed = Basic
 - Role at Board Meetings: Resource, Manager of Info
 - Communication with Board: Regular Reports
Accessible to other Board contacts. Regularly sees Chairman.
meetings/month attended (incl. committees):
3 ?
 - (i) Time Allocation:

Prime:	Work with (Local) Officials	) These
Major:	Administration, Resource	) 4 are
	Development, Staff Development	) about
		) equal!
Modest:	Program Operations, Networking with CAA's, Network with Local Orgs., Board	
	Development, Board Information and Support	
Minimal:	Represent CAA in Local Media	
2. Organizational Compliance System
- (a) Normative, as much as possible. Utilitarian as needed.
 - (b) Vehicles used to establish/maintain the system: Open Door, Communication, etc.
3. Role of Board Chairperson
- Different from Time I? Yes. Basis: Different Chairman
 - (a) Level of Activity: Hrs/Mo - 25 ?
 - (b) Areas of Activity:
 - Positive: Policy role, evaluation and planning
 - Basic: Agenda setting, meetings
4. Relationship between Exec. Director and Board Chairperson
- (a) Cooperative/Compliant. Board remains weak, lazy, not too effective, but improved and more vigilant.
 - (b) Supportive (both ways). Board generally supports Director, who feeds them information.
 - (c) Frequency of Interaction: # times per month - 6 +
5. Board Mode of Operations
- Different from Time I? No.

- (a) Activeness:
% of meetings with Quorum in Past Year: 78%
Frequency of Meetings (#/year): 9/year
- (b) Committee System: Irregular. Planning & Evaluation Committee is reportedly more active now, as is Fiscal Committee.
- (c) Areas of Involvement:
Planning: Modest
Evaluation: Minimal
Resource Development: None
Fiscal Monitoring: Minimal
Program Monitoring: Minimal
Personnel: Minimal
- (d) Public Sector Reps represent selves
- (e) Vacancies and other Operating Problems: 3 vacancies
- 1 public, 2 private
- (f) Staff attendance at board meetings: Exec. Director

6. Agency Program Strategy Mix

Balance among	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Preferred</u>
Service Delivery	75%	50% + Pt. of Advocacy
C.O.	2-3%	5-10%
Advocacy	12-15%	30%
Resource Development	10%	15%

7. Relationship to Local Government

- (a) Close, cooperative
- (b) Undue influence or control? Still a serious identity problem for the Agency. County cooperation provides money, space, and Board stability, at the cost of latitude for programs beyond service activity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The listing of materials below includes materials referred to in the text, and some of the additional materials used in the development of this volume.

- Abt, C. (1979). "Government Constraints on Evaluation Quality", in Datta and Perloff, eds., Improving Evaluations, p. 43-52. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Agronoff, R. ed. (1983). Human Services on a Limited Budget. D.C. International City Management Association.
- Beam, G. & Simpson, D. (1984). Political Action: The key to Understanding Politics, Athens, Ohio: Ohio U. Press.
- Booth, Paul. (1974). "What the 1960s Mean in the 1970's". Chicago: Midwest Academy.
- Boyte, Harry. (1980). The Backyard Revolution - Understanding the New Citizen Movement. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Boyte, Harry. (1984). Community Is Possible. New York: Harper & Rowe.
- Castells, Manuel. (1977). The Urban Question. London: Edward Arnold Publishers; Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Clark, Kenneth & Jeanette Hopkins - (1969). A Relevant War Against Poverty. A study of CAP's and observable social change.
- Community Action Congress. (1983). "Distribution of Poverty--Allocation of CSBG Funds - An Analysis" Albany.
- Community Council of Greater N.Y. (1966). Issues in Community Action Research, N.Y.
- Community Services Administration (1981). Grantee Program Management System: Planning and Evaluation Tools CSA, Washington, D.C.
- Cronbach, L. et al. - (1980). Toward Reform of Program Evaluation, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Datta, L-E & Perloff, R. (eds.) (1979). Improving Evaluations. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Duncan, W.J. (1981). Organizational Behavior, 2nd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981.

- Etzioni, Amitai. (1961). A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations Glencoe, Free Press.
- Gilbert and Speck. (1975). "Conflict Political Influence and Citizen Influence in Community Action" (Model Cities) Sociological Review.
- Gittel, Marilyn. (1980). Limits to Citizen Participation: The Decline of Community Organizations Beverly Hills, Sage.
- Gramson, William A. (1968). Power and Discontent. Homeward, Ill., Dorsey Press.
- Gurel, L. (1976). "The Human Side of Evaluating Human Services Programs: Problems and Prospects", in Guttentag and Streng, eds. - Handbook of Research Evaluation v. 2, p. 11-28, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hawley, Willis and Wirt, Frederick. (1968). The Search for Community Power Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert - (1978). The Social Psychology of Organizations, 2nd ed. Chicago: Wiley.
- Katznelson, Ira. (1981). City Trenches N.Y.: Pantheon.
- Kimberly, J.R., Miles, Robert, and Assocs. (1980). The Organization Life Cycle: Issues in the Creation, Transformation, and Decline of Organizations San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Knapp, M. (1979). "Tinkering with Open Systems: Organization Perspectives on Education Program Evaluation", in Datta and Perloff, (eds.) Improving Evaluations, pg. 61-70. Beverly Hills: Sage
- Koehler, J., Aratol, K, & Applbaum, R. (1976). Organizational Communication: Behavioral Perspectives, N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Lens, S. (1969). Poverty: America's Never Ending Paradox A History of the Richest Nation's UnWon War. N.Y.: Crowell.
- Marris, P. & Rein, M. (1967). Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States, New York: Atherton.
- Max, Steve - (1976). "Organizing the Urban Crisis" Chicago, Midwest Academy.
- Max, Steve - (1977). "The Economy and the Energy Crisis" Chicago, Midwest Academy.
- Max, Steve - (1978). "The New Economic Situation and the Challenge to Citizen Organizing" Chicago, Midwest Academy.

- Moynihan, Daniel P. (1969). Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Moynihan, D. ed. (1970). Toward a National Urban Policy. N.Y.: Basic Books.
- N.Y. State Division of Economic Opportunity - (1984). "Community Action... 20 Years and More," Albany.
- N.Y. State Division of Economic Opportunity - (1985). Community Service Block Grant Program Management Plans, Albany.
- Parachini, Lawrence F., Jr. - (1980). A Political History of the Special Impact Program Cambridge, Mass: Center for Community Economic Development.
- Patterson, James T. (1981). America's Struggle Against Poverty 1900-1980. Cambridge, Mass: Cambridge U. Press.
- Perlman, R. & Gurin, A. (1971). Community Organization & Social Planning. New York: Wiley.
- Piven, Frances F, & Cloward, Richard A. (1982). The New Class War, N.Y: Pantheon.
- Piven, Frances F, & Cloward, Richard A. (1979). Poor People's Movements, N.Y: Vintage.
- Piven, Frances F, & Cloward, Richard A. (1971). Regulating the Poor, N.Y: Random House
- Putzman, Leonard. (1980). Planning Useful Evaluations. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Rosenbaum, D. - (1984 October 25). "In Four Years, Reagan Changed Basis of the Debate on Social Programs." N.Y. Times, P. B20.
- Rossi, P. (1979). "Past, Present, and Future Prospectus of Evaluation Research" p, 17-34 in Datta and Perloff, (eds.) Improving Evaluations. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Rossi, P. & Beck, R. (1981). "An Overview of Evaluation Strategies and Procedures" in Human Organization, 40 (44), Winter.
- Scheible, S. (1968). Poverty is Where the Money Is. New Rochelle: Arlington House.
- Sugarman, Jule M. (1981). "Human Services in the 1980's". McLean, VA, J.M. Sugarman.
- Sundquist, J. ed. (1969). On Fighting Poverty. New York: Basic Books.

- Susser, Ida. (1982). Norman Street: Poverty and Politics in an Urban Neighborhood. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Van de Ven, A., & Ferry, D. (1980). Measuring & Assessing Organizations. N.Y.: Wiley.
- Weissman, Harold. ed. (1969). Community Development: The Mobilization for Youth Experience, N.Y.: Association Press.
- Wurzburg, G. (1979). "What Limits the Impact of Evaluations on Federal Policy?" in Datta and Perloff, (eds.) Improving Evaluations, p. 35-42. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Zurcher, L. (1970). Poverty Warriors, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Also: Seliger et al: 20 separate Evaluations of Community Action Agencies, Summary of Findings from Evaluating CAA's, Community Organization Training Manual, Community Needs Assessments - A "How To" Guide (edited)