

712.25
(17471)
C65

SUMMER IN NEW YORK 1965

Economic Opportunity Committee
100 Church Street
New York, N.Y. 10007



SUMMER IN NEW YORK -- 1965

ANALYSIS OF SUMMER PROGRAMS
CARRIED OUT WITH ANTI POVERTY FUNDS

Under the Auspices of

THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL AGAINST POVERTY
and
THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE

Dr. Arthur C. Logan, Chairman
Anne M. Roberts, Executive Director

Prepared by
THE COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK

James W. Fogarty, Executive Director

Geoffrey R. Wiener, Chief Consultant, MSW, ACSW

Norman Feldman, Consultant, MSW, ACSW

Nelly Hartogs, Consultant, Ph. D., ACSW

Richard Kraus, Consultant, Ed. D.

Owen F. Peagler, Consultant, MA

*COVER: "Summer In The City" -- Young girls on Manhattan's
East 13th Street prepare for an original play in Spanish which
they will present for their neighborhood.
(Photograph by Ken Wittenberg)*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I Introduction	1
Background Information	2
Eligibility	2
History	3
Mechanics of Funding	4
List of Agencies	5
II Role of Community Council and its Consultants . .	6
III Administrative Procedures	
1. Administrative Requirements	8
2. Granting of Funds	8
3. Non-budgeted Items	9
4. Insurance and Bonding	9
5. Bookkeeping Methods	9
IV Statistical Analysis	10
V Program Analysis	16
1. Reaching the Heretofore Unreached	16
2. Services to Poverty Areas	17
3. Family Involvement	17
4. Use of Indigenous Personnel	18
5. Planning and Decision Making by Indigenous Groups	18
6. Evening and Week-end Activities	19
VI Problem Analysis	20
1. Selection of Grantees	20
2. Staff Selection and Training	21
3. Working with Indigenous Groups	21
4. Multiple Funding	21
5. The Self-Help Concept	22
VII Conclusions and Recommendations	23
VIII Appendix	28
Memoranda I - II - III	28
Program Description Form	35
Agency Summaries	38

SUMMER IN NEW YORK -- 1965

I. INTRODUCTION

Recreation and leisure-time activities are no longer regarded as luxury items in a person's budget or his life. They are recognized as essential to individual and community well-being, to be planned for and made available to everyone irrespective of their ability to pay. That recreation needs are far greater for those families living under crowded conditions in substandard housing and with scant financial resources is generally accepted. The increasing provision of public recreation service and facilities on all levels of government illustrates this recognition. It is therefore natural -- indeed, essential -- that recreation planning should have a role in the Anti Poverty programs which the City of New York is providing for its disadvantaged.

There were many other compelling reasons why the City should embark on a large-scale, planned recreation program during the summer of 1965, utilizing existing basic resources of public and private organizations as having the necessary experience, core staff and physical facilities:

1. Recreation activities provide concrete services for all ages in a non-threatening, non-stigmatized "threshold" experience which can involve almost everyone as a participant or spectator. Through this satisfying entry experience, the way can be paved for the acceptance of other aspects of the Poverty Program which dig more deeply towards the roots of the problem, such as counseling, skill training, education and job-finding.
2. It is possible to offer recreation-type responsibilities to existing neighborhood instrumentalities (both formal organizations and informal associations), whereas it is more difficult to involve neighbors in providing counseling, case finding, job training and job finding roles. These latter functions require specialized skills and longer training.
3. Recreation in family groups is a welding experience. Doing things together which are enjoyable places a different aspect on all intrafamilial relations. Opportunities can also be provided for temporarily separating children from parents, providing much-needed relief and growth for all concerned.
4. A recreation program can provide a training ground for neighborhood youth and adults in assumption of responsibility and in the leisure-time and human relations fields specifically -- two of the most promising future areas for service.
5. Recreation planning offers an opportunity for neighborhoods to feel a part of the War on Poverty since they can easily be involved around these problems and programs.
6. A good recreation program has been proven to be a positive social control mechanism. Major social organizations, including law enforcement agencies, have traditionally sponsored recreation activities as a safety valve mechanism, channeling energies in a positive direction.

Background Information

New York's Summer Program of 1965 was made possible by the Economic Opportunity Act passed by Congress in 1964. The law envisions an end to poverty in the United States through grants which will strengthen, expand and innovate in the fields of "education and training, provision of jobs, youth opportunities, family unity, better living conditions and better housing." The components of the Summer Program collectively encompassed all of these areas in varying degree, so that the inclusion of "recreation" in the name of the project itself is somewhat misleading. Recreation was indeed an important part of the whole effort, but not to the exclusion of other services, to which it was closely linked.

The staff manual of the Office of Economic Opportunity specifically lists "providing recreation . . . services and facilities" as one of the activities which communities might undertake. Despite this, when the proposal from the City of New York reached Washington in June 1965, there was scepticism expressed by the Office of Economic Opportunity as to whether such a request for funds could be entertained. After full debate it was determined that the program met the essential purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Eligibility

The upper limit of poverty was originally determined as \$3,000 a year for a family of four. It was immediately realized that conditions and costs of living varied widely in the United States, so that a generalized figure of this sort had very little relevance to the City of New York. In October 1964 the Annual Price Survey of the Budget Standards Service, Research Department of the Community Council estimated the average requirements for good nutrition and health, at low to moderate cost, for a City family of four as \$6,625. Despite this and the passage of considerable time, New York has not established its own criteria. The Federal limit has since been recognized as \$3,310, and in Philadelphia this has been increased by \$500 for each dependent over the basic four, to a maximum of \$6,000 annually. The Summer Program was not required to administer a means test to recipients of services, although the \$3,000 figure or being on Public Welfare were both used as guidelines. In addition, the operations were more or less strictly limited to the sixteen poverty areas and pockets of poverty accepted by the Anti Poverty Operations Board, although there is recognition that these may need redefinition.

The delineation of the 16 poverty areas represents an adaptation from a study done by Dr. Shirley Jenkins for the Community Council of Greater New York and published in May 1963, Comparative Recreation Needs and Services in New York Neighborhoods. The study is based on a city-wide survey by questionnaire of year-round community subsidized group work and recreation programs which primarily serve a neighborhood population in four main categories: playgrounds, scouting, part-time and full-time recreation centers, both public and private. Religious, fraternal, cooperative, management or trade union sponsorship was not covered but was discussed in the appendix. The purpose of the study was to identify the neighborhoods of greatest comparative need for recreation and group work services. To secure this, 74 neighborhoods were compared on a combined index of socio-economic need based on three selected characteristics: income, juvenile delinquency and changing ethnic composition. The two most needy parts of the city were found to be the South Bronx and Northern Brooklyn. Of the 16 poverty areas accepted by the poverty program, nine are in these two neighborhoods.

A detailed and specific program analysis of the Community Council's report by Margaret Wood, Group Work and Recreation Committee Secretary, showed:

1. "Maldistribution of services and facilities with fewer services in Brooklyn, The Bronx and Queens than in Manhattan.
2. Negroes and Puerto Ricans are served largely by public agencies. Few voluntary group work and recreation agencies are located in areas of heavy concentration of these minority groups.
3. Programs for teenagers consisted mainly of athletics with little provision for activities of a cultural and educational nature.
4. Services for girls are fewer than for boys, especially for teenagers.
5. Few programs are scheduled on weekends, holidays and vacation periods.
6. The 16 areas of greatest socio-economic need in the Study are areas subsequently used by the Mayor's Report on Poverty."

History

In April 1965 the Office of Economic Opportunity indicated to the City of New York that there would be funds available for a Summer Recreation Project and requested that proposals be prepared. It appeared the O.E.O. would have money left over at the end of the fiscal year on June 30th; thus there was an opportunity to fund large-scale recreation activities in urban centers where school vacations, summer heat and idleness take their greatest toll. If the funds were allocated prior to the deadline, they could be expended subsequently. Furthermore, no one in the nation wished to see a repetition of the violence which had characterized too many recent summers.

The City's Economic Opportunity Committee already had on hand 22 proposals from various organizations requesting funds for special summer programs. It became imperative to communicate the availability of money to as many organizations as possible in order to secure more proposals. Since May was already here and considerable time would be involved in the technical process of putting proposals in order for funding by Washington, no time could be lost. While a major emphasis of the Economic Opportunity Act is involvement of the recipients of service in planning and decision-making, it was apparent that the limited time available precluded fully implementing this most important step at the outset, although major involvement was possible as the programs were developed. As a result, it was necessary to first turn to the major public and private organizations which had traditionally carried out large-scale recreational activities. Four City agencies offering such programs in the public sector are the Youth Board, the Board of Education, the Department of Parks, and the Housing Authority. In addition, a large number of city-wide voluntary organizations operate many recreation centers.

The City's Economic Opportunity Committee asked the Community Council of Greater New York — whose major function is to coordinate the voluntary social welfare efforts in the city — to convene a meeting of the large recreation and group work agencies, public and private, in order to plan proposals to the Office of Economic Opportunity. It was held on May 19th, Mrs. Leonard Bernheim, Chairman of the Council's Committee on Group Work and Recreation, presiding. At that meeting, Mrs. Anne M. Roberts, Executive Director of the Economic Opportunity Committee, was requested to discuss the set of guidelines which had accompanied the invitation. She emphasized that the programs were to be designed to cover the period from school closing to school opening (June 28 through September 10). The population as defined by the Federal poverty standard of \$3,000 annual income was to be the target. The 16 poverty areas were to be the locale of activities. Focus should be on family involvement through both participant and spectator activities. Emphasis should be placed on teenagers and adults between the ages of 17 and 35. Maximum effort should be made to employ neighborhood people and to use volunteers to carry out staff responsibilities, wherever feasible.

The organizations were requested to submit their proposals in outline form, with budgets attached by Friday, May 21. This left them a scant 48 hours. A subsequent meeting of a sub-committee was called for Friday morning at 9 a.m. to help process proposals received and consider further the criteria to be established. The next few weeks were dedicated to the technical task of developing proposals on the required forms of the O.E.O. for Community Action Programs. The final proposal forwarded to Washington consisted of 63 individual components and a total financial request of \$13,701,000. Ten percent of this sum had to be a non-Federal contribution, from either the organizations carrying out the programs or the City of New York.

On June 25 thirty-two organizations received telegrams from Council President Screvane, Vice Chairman of the New York City Council Against Poverty, announcing that their requests had been granted, but no details were given. The next day Governor Rockefeller gave his approval. It took considerably longer, however, for the funded organizations to secure a copy of their budgets as approved by the O.E.O. This resulted in serious delays in employing staff and initiating programs.

The Mechanics of Funding

Two basic requirements had to be fulfilled by each organization before it could receive any money from the Federal government. 1) The Civil Rights Compliance form had to be submitted, indicating that there would be no discrimination of any kind in the use of the grant and 2) a statement to the effect that each organization had read the conditions governing grants under Sections 204 and 205 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and intended to comply with them had to be submitted. Some organizations delayed in complying with these requirements, so that the City of New York was unable to forward the necessary compliances to Washington, and the Federal funds were not released promptly. Factors relating to delayed funding and the problems it created are discussed under "Administrative Procedures." Finally on July 19th, with the City having had to borrow money to advance funds for the initial payment, 25 percent of each organization's grant was released. In some instances, programs had been initiated prior to this date, but the delay worked a hardship on many staff members who remained unpaid for several weeks. In other cases programs had lost 2 weeks before starting and some components, although funded, never got started at all.

List of New York City Agencies Receiving Summer Grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity

	Requested Amt.	Approved Amt.
1. Archdiocese of New York	\$ 363,300	\$271,547
2. Associated YM-YWHA's of Greater New York	94,600	39,967
3. Board of Education	6,708,642	668,349
4. Catholic Charities - Diocese of Brooklyn	622,340	125,650
5. Catholic Youth Organization, Archdiocese of N. Y.	181,724	124,351
6. Chelsea Area Meetings for Planning	6,322	4,160
7. Community Council of Greater New York	27,237	21,415
8. Council of P. R. and Hispanic Organizations of the Lower E.S.	3,040	1,640
9. Federation of P. R. Organizations of Brownsville	4,729	2,300
10. Ft. Greene-Navy Yard Youth Program	16,415	11,575
11. H & R Board Neighborhood Conservation Bureau (Bloomingdale)	5,560	3,390
12. Independent Juvenile Baseball League	4,170	100
13. Manhattan Valley Spanish Civic Association	32,490	32,490
14. Nativity Mission Center	8,140	6,640
15. Negro Action Group	14,635	10,610
16. New York City Housing Authority	277,427	175,827
17. New York City Mission Society	15,687	13,987
18. New York City Youth Board	317,253	201,308
19. Play Schools Association	40,502	24,662
20. Police Athletic League, Inc.	149,420	107,424
21. Prospect Heights Neighborhood Program	21,238	19,888
22. Puerto Rican Action Group	600	300
23. Puerto Rican Athletic League	2,140	100
24. Tilden Day Camp	10,000	10,000
25. Two Bridges Neighborhood Council, Inc.	120,295	105,965
26. United Hispanic Movement	1,810	790
27. United Neighborhood Houses of New York	181,500	90,231
28. United Puerto Ricans of Lower Manhattan	4,764	825
29. West Side Association of Community Centers	12,898	8,198
30. Williamsburg YM-YWHA, Inc.	10,474	10,474
31. YWCA of New York	44,480	29,465
32. YMCA of Greater New York	421,049	141,002
33. Youth in Action	2,594,511	440,351
	<u>\$12,319,392</u>	<u>\$2,704,981</u>

II. ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY COUNCIL AND ITS CONSULTANTS

As stated earlier the Community Council of Greater New York was entrusted by the Economic Opportunity Committee with the task of coordination and evaluation of the Summer Program. To carry out this assignment, it received a grant of \$21,415.

The Economic Opportunity Committee's requirements were as follows:

1. Coordination of 'Summer Crash' programs conducted by public and voluntary agencies in order to:
 - a. eliminate duplication and over-concentration in specific areas;
 - b. identify gaps in services in geographical areas and for particular groups;
 - c. consult with agencies to increase impact of projects on poverty population through enriched, more varied and experimental programs, increased cooperative effort and more equitable coverage of all areas.
2. Evaluation of how well the needs of low income groups were being met in each area through conferences (a) with agencies on their own evaluation procedures and tools; (b) with appropriate neighborhood groups and leaders.
3. Prepare recommendations for continuing services to target population, commensurate with available funds, through:
 - a. utilization of plans developed by neighborhood groups to run their own programs;
 - b. employment of residents of low income areas;
 - c. strengthened cooperation among public and voluntary agencies and neighborhood organizations.

The Council appointed five consultants to implement these charges. Their assignments to the different organizations were based on a combination of criteria:

1. A history of the consultant having worked previously with a particular agency and staff.
2. Knowledge of the neighborhood and community composition in which the organization operates.
3. The consultants' individual areas of interest and skill.

Although the consultants carried out their assignments in the frame of reference of their previous professional experience, they also adhered to guidelines which were generic to all:

1. to be helpful and supportive to the organizations in every phase relating to the fulfillment of their contract with the City and the O.E.O.
2. to assist in the development of programs and of administrative procedures
3. to encourage cooperative and collaborative arrangements with other organizations in all neighborhoods in order to make the fullest use of resources and avoid overlap, duplication and competition.

While it had been understood that responsibility for fiscal management was not to be theirs, the consultants soon found reality to be otherwise. They discovered they had to utilize an inordinate amount of time as mediators between the Economic Opportunity Committee and the organizations, interpreting one to the other, communicating requirements which had not been clearly delineated or understood and which made unrealistic administrative demands.

It was hoped that channels of communication could be opened up between organizations serving the same geographic location and that duplication and overlap of services could be eliminated if they became known. There was realization on the part of the consultant staff that the Summer Program constituted only a portion of the leisure time activities in certain neighborhoods, so that it was evident that the directive to evaluate gaps and duplications depended on an extensive knowledge of all other activities being carried on. For this reason, it was impossible to follow through on this portion of the assignment in the very limited time of the summer, to the satisfaction of the staff. Another major focus was the development of self-evaluative procedures on the part of organizations in order to relate their activities to the total anti poverty program. This objective was achieved in the main through the relationship established between consultants and administrators.

Since there was little time in which to develop forms or procedures for reporting, the consultant staff decided that the number of clerical demands made on operating staff in the field should be kept to an absolute minimum. Over the course of the summer three memoranda were written and sent to organizations (see appendix) acquainting them with procedures which had to be followed. One comprehensive form was devised for the purpose of reporting statistical data both as to ongoing agency function and specific summer programs. Also included was a request for a brief statement as to what the organization hoped to accomplish during the summer.

The consultants carried out their task through field visits and established relationships in which administrators called them freely for guidance and assistance. There was a marked difference in the amount of time spent with organizations, based on the expressed needs of administrators and the degree of experience which a particular agency possessed. Where a large agency with many years' history and extensive supervisory staff of its own was carrying out activities with which it was thoroughly familiar, there was less need for the consultant to spend a great deal of time. On the other hand, with the small, inexperienced "grass roots" organizations the demands upon the time of the consultant were often extensive. Some required daily visits until activities became established, or program plans and budgets were rethought and authorization for changes secured from the O.E.O.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

A number of administrative problems arose during the summer. Some of these were attributable to the fact that the Summer Program was generated and funded in a month's time; from the May 19th meeting urging the development of proposals to June 22nd when the Honorable Sargent Shriver gave his approval to the grant. Many other difficulties arose as a result of the newness of the anti-poverty program as a whole.

The City's Community Action Staff was charged with facilitating the process leading from application to funding. Certain Federal forms — C.A.P. forms — had to be filled out. The Community Action Program Guide, Volume 1, issued in February 1965 described the required procedures. The City's Community Action staff had processed a few proposals a month since its creation in January 1965. Within less than a week after the day of notification, May 19th, one consultant, with help from the Community Action staff, received 63 proposals. No clear directives had been developed for certain standard items to be included in every Community Action budget. There was no time in which to call in each organization for consultation and clarification of their requests, so that some potentially good programs which might have been strengthened in consultation with Community Action staff were ultimately disallowed by the O.E.O. In the rare instances in which a proposal was developed with consultant help, few problems were encountered during the operating period.

1. Administrative Requirements

The first three weeks of the Summer Program were spent by the organizations in keeping abreast of the conditions to be met in order to receive funds. Consultants were called upon almost daily by the Economic Opportunity Committee to communicate some new requirement to the funded groups. This constant state of emergency occupied an unconscionable amount of time and made program considerations secondary when they should have been primary. Specifically, the fulfillment of the Civil Rights Compliance and the agreement to conform to the conditions in Section 204 and 205 of the C.A.P. Guide, were not communicated clearly to either consultants or organizations. What seemed to be a simple, routine matter became a major problem, because no one realized that only upon receipt of all these compliances — from all participating programs — could the O.E.O. transfer the necessary funds.

The City's requirement that organizations secure either blanket or specific position bonds to cover those members or employees handling money, prior to receiving any part of their grant, became a common source of frustration and hardship. While this may represent legitimate safeguard of tax funds, it entailed for organizations a non-budgeted outlay, and in the case of small groups an expenditure of funds which they did not have and could not easily raise.

2. Granting of Funds

The organizations received the first 25% of their total grant on July 19th, despite the fact that some programs had started several weeks before. While this constituted relatively little hardship for large,

traditional private agencies possessed of reserves and capital funds, it meant that the smaller organizations — and one large public one — were unable to pay their staff for periods of 3 to 6 weeks. This worked severe hardship on some people, who had to borrow to pay their rent and feed their families. There is no way in which this kind of treatment of employees can be justified, nor any valid administrative reason why such a situation should take place.

Some programs were unable to hire staff and get under way to carry out their proposals prior to the actual receipt of funds. This resulted in a foreshortened project which had difficulty in achieving its goals for this reason alone. It also resulted in a longer period of exposure to summer's hazards for the population the program was designed to help. Because of an inability to compete for staff at a time when most people were securing summer positions, many organizations reported having to make serious compromises on staff qualifications. This must have affected the quality of service which the whole Summer Project was able to assure. Finally some components were so irreparably damaged that they had to be dropped altogether.

3. Non-budgeted Items

Many organizations, new to the process of "grantsmanship," omitted very important items from their projected budgets. There was no recourse once the proposals had been approved by the O.E.O. There appears to be limited administrative flexibility and no budgetary provision for possible emergencies. In two instances formal requests for budget amendments were made after funding, through channels to Washington. Responses were not received until the summer was almost over, and both were denied. When the City of New York was asked to assume the bill for such unbudgeted items as liability insurance, it also found that it could not honor the request.

4. Insurance and Bonding

The problem of insurance was far more complicated than merely a failure on the part of the organizations to request the necessary budgetary allotment. Small organizations with grants in several instances of less than \$1,000, found they could not comply with the law to pay Workmen's Compensation Insurance, because their initial allocation (25 percent of their grant) would not cover a down payment to the State Insurance Fund of \$225, for an eventual probable minimal bill of \$28. The difference was to be returned to them upon audit by the State Insurance Fund, months after the termination of the project. They also found that no insurance company in the City wanted to issue them liability insurance and that they had to pay excessive rates, usually for much longer periods than the projected 10 weeks. Store front operations, running a maximum risk of theft, could not obtain burglary insurance.

5. Bookkeeping Methods

This problem could have appropriately been discussed under item 1 in this chapter. It was decided that it deserves specific comment as it pertains to the small indigenous organizations. The bookkeeping requirements made by the City were by no means unreasonable as far as the large organizations were concerned. Any problems encountered were easily clarified and disposed of.

Where the small and mostly new emerging groups were concerned the difficulties were considerable. In order to meet the mandatory requirements, non-budgeted expenditures had to be incurred such as securing the services of a bookkeeper. Vouchers had to be submitted in triplicate, a time-consuming and costly procedure for organizations having neither office equipment nor previous administrative experience. Since no further funds could be issued after the initial 25% unless these demands were met, the small organizations found themselves caught in a bureaucratic vicious circle which forced the spending of program money on non-program items in order to secure funds allocated for program.

IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

There was never any doubt in the consultants' minds that the backbone of this report would have to be provided through some quantification of this summer's activities. On the other hand, it was equally clear that they were not engaged in a research project per se. Furthermore, since the attempt was to keep bureaucratic procedures at a minimum for the member agencies, it was not possible to engage in the kind of refined statistical reporting that might be considered appropriate for the analysis of this program. Two major questions, however, had to be answered if any evaluation was to be supported, namely:

- 1. what service did the organizations offer during the summer and
- 2. who were the recipients of these programs?

As a result, two tables were developed, as shown below, reporting the population served and the nature of services offered.

The main statistical reporting instruments used were the Program Description Form (P.D.F.) and Memorandum No. 2 (see appendix). The former had been devised at the outset for the purpose of description and projection. Because of time shortage, however, it was used by many of the organizations for summarizing the summer's activities. In addition, the consultants used their individual knowledge of agency programs to interpret and codify the submitted reports.

Table I - Population Served (See next Page)

Terminology to be used was a source of great concern to the consultants. After careful consideration it was decided that definitions had to be arrived at in order to relate clearly the terms used to their specific meaning in the Summer Program.

Population - is essentially to mean people and represents the count of individuals of all ages involved in the Summer Program. There were varying degrees of intensity of participant, recipient and action roles. Generally, population served is exclusive of staff employed, although there were instances of dual roles, including staff-recipient situations which are pinpointed whenever possible.

The attempts at gathering uniform reports from agencies did not always succeed, particularly because the variety of programs required different age breakpoints. Thus, the figures that show teenage and child populations must be understood as the nearest possible to an exact count.

Where, as in the case of several agencies, population was reported in family units, the units were multiplied by four, since the family of four is considered to be the basic one by the O.E.O. However, this may have resulted in undercounting the number of people involved, particularly in low-income communities.

The number of adults reported served reflects actual involvement in specific programs, exclusive of larger groups reached through block associations, community events, etc.

TABLE I
POPULATION SERVED (including staff involved)

ORGANIZATIONS	TOTAL POPULATION		DIRECT SERVICE			S T A F F				Audiences***
	# Served*	% New**	Children 1-12	Teen Aged 13-20	Adults 20 & up	PAID		VOLUNTEER		
						Indigenous	Other	Indigenous	Other	
1 Archdiocese of New York	39,000	75	N.C.	N.C.	N.C.	507	117	700	-	25,300
2 Associated YM-YWHA of Greater N.Y. .	781	94	396	385	-	71N	23	7	-	-
3 New York City Board of Education . . .	44,875	40	9,600	33,080	-	-	858	-	-	-
4 Cath. Charities, Diocese of Bklyn. . . .	3,060	65	204	2,856	-	61	34	42	-	N.C.
5 Cath. Youth Org. of N.Y.	8,062	35	5,146	1,920	-	148	300	250	40	N.C.
6 Chelsea Area Meetings for Planning. . . .	4,000	60	670	473	N.C.	6N	1	10	-	N.C.
7 Community Council of Greater N.Y. . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
8 Council of P.R. & Hisp. Org. of LES . .	400	60	N.C.	N.C.	5	10	-	N.C.	-	N.C.
9 Fed. of P. R. Orgs. of Brownsville. . . .	75	100	35	-	40	8	-	2	-	-
10 Ft. Greene-Navy Yard Youth Program . .	10,261	15	2,264	1,943	50	17	-	-	-	5,000
11 Bloomingdale Neighborhood Consv. Proj.	1,800	85	1,300*	-	300	8N	2	N.C.	4	-
12 Independent Juvenile Baseball League	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13 Manhattan Valley Spanish Civ. Assn. . .	3,800	100	500*	58	N.C.	65	3	N.C.	-	N.C.
14 Nativity Mission Center	195	25	195	-	-	10	6	10	-	-
15 Negro Action Group	175	100	40	20	72	4	5	15	-	-
16 New York City Housing Authority.	8,149	50	3,646	2,608	1,895	20	120	N.C.	-	-
17 New York City Mission Society	1,900	50	415	246	N.C.	38+	1	-	-	-
18 New York City Youth Board.	84,455	75	13,335	4,155	10	144+	38	N.C.	-	25,000
19 Play Schools Association.	1,710	100	428	-	282	26	6	30	-	1,000
20 Police Athletic League, Inc.	10,000	90	5,800	4,200	-	20	26	N.C.	-	-
21 Prospect Heights Neighborhood Prog. . .	200	70	70	130	-	11	7	-	-	-
22 Puerto Rican Action Group	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
23 Puerto Rican Athletic League	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24 Tilden Day Camp	102	100	85	17	-	-	6	20	6	-
25 Two Bridges Neighborhood Council. . . .	583	20	423	-	160	20N	53	1	-	-
26 United Hispanic Movement	40	100	-	-	40	-	-	-	-	-
27 United Neighborhood Houses of N.Y. . .	24,342	42	15	5,531	15	146	2	7	-	18,811
28 United Puerto Ricans of Lower Man. . . .	280	100	406	N.C.	44	-	-	-	-	250
29 West Side Assn. of Community Ctrs. . . .	462	50	126	12	65	30	-	10	-	-
30 Williamsburg YM-YWHA, Inc.	126	100	68	263	-	22	-	-	13	2,200
31 YMCA of New York	2,531	90	1,454	401	-	10	22	-	-	1,800
32 YMCA of Greater New York.	3,655	75	1,454	401	-	90+	34	-	-	36,000
33 Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth in Action . . .	37,178	100	300	458	420	307N+	18	-	-	-
TOTALS	291,397	67%	46,921	58,756	3,398	1,799	1,687	1,104	63	115,361

c These 5 groups combined all or part of their Grants to form Puerto Rican Cultural Association. (Statistics #'s 22 & 23 included under #8.)

LEGEND:
* Actual contact but not all direct service.
** Exclusive of those served, i.e. spectators only
*** Estimated numbers
+ Teenagers on staff but also served
N Neighborhood Youth Corps included in this figure
N.C. Activity reported but no count submitted

Whenever available, the number of registrants was used in preference to all other figures. In cases where attendance in special activities appeared to be less than numbers registered it was done because (a) there was no available explanation of the difference, (b) there was no clarification in regard to partial or non-attendance and (c) registration was held to indicate some degree of awareness and involvement. Where attendance appeared significantly higher, it was not used since it was held to represent a duplicate count of registered individuals.

Where a consultant was aware of the existence of certain programs for which no breakdown of statistics could be obtained, the initials N.C. for No Count were used.

Service as used here is held to mean a variety of contacts running the gamut from continuous to occasional. This was predicated on the fact that few of the programs expected to offer an in-depth approach. The concept of the program under scrutiny held that even casual exposure — as in cultural enrichment programs, for example — could have meaning beyond the mere contact in a given point of time. It was therefore deemed proper to posit that all recipients involved had been reached, if in varying degree. It will be noted that in Table I there is an attempt to refine this all-embracing definition by differentiating as follows:

- * Actual contact but not all direct service
- ** Estimated numbers
- *** Spectators only

In relation to Direct Service (Table I), it must be remembered that the youngster wandering into a recreation program for 10 minutes appears statistically as the equivalent of a youngster who is served in a membership day camp operation from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., since both have a count of one in the columns.

With this reservation in mind, it was found that 109,075 of a total of 291,397 people were identified as having been directly served during the summer. 54 per cent of the total number are teenagers, and less than 4 per cent are adults; the remainder are children below the age of 12.

If the totals for direct service are combined for the 3 age categories and the estimated audiences, it is found that 66,223 people reported as part of the population served are not clearly accounted for. This discrepancy can be explained by the "not counted" (n/c) programs as reported by individual agencies, which were, nevertheless, reflected in their overall totals.

New — The use of this concept in the Program Description Form relates to the O.E.O. directive that new approaches be devised in order to reach people more effectively, as well as population previously not served. Programs have been defined for this report as new if they had not been previously carried out by a particular organization. Conversely, people were considered new population if they had never been served within that particular organization before.

This simplified categorization does not do justice to the problem since the report had to take into consideration the nature of the location in which activities were carried on. The overall finding of 67 per cent new population reached is the result of combining estimates by program administrators, consultants' observations and individual agency reports. An absolute number of new people reached was arrived at for each organization and the sum was divided by the figure for the total population reached. Out of all the organizations, 11 were completely new, i.e., reached 100% new population.

Indigenous — The directive to employ, as well as serve, the indigenous population was basic to the summer program. While the target group can be defined as residents of neighborhoods designated as

poor, this does not suffice when describing those employed during the summer. "Indigenous" staff and volunteers are defined for this report as: residents of the area untrained and poor, in contrast to "others", defined as professionals and semi-professionals — whether residents of the area or not.

Unfortunately, the lack of uniform reporting did not permit clear accounting for full-time versus part-time staff. As a result, the total staff figure may tend to suggest a larger-than-actual number of hours. However, it is a correct reflection of the number of staff involved during the summer. In spite of the concerted effort to give preference to employing indigenous residents, Table I suggests at first that their number — 1799 — is about equal to the 1687 others. This finding might raise questions relating to the self-help aspect of the program, or even the amount of supervision required by indigenous staff. However, one must underline the fact that the 838 teachers employed by the Board of Education represent about 50% of all "others" employed. This information influences the relative significance of the overall figure of indigenous employed, which is seen as proportionately larger and therefore well in keeping with the O.E.O. guideline. In addition, staff analysis (Table I) had to be divided four ways, because the use of volunteers was a vital part of the self-help concept which is discussed elsewhere.

There had been much question whether indigenous volunteers could be attracted if there were salaries offered for similar work. The answer seems to be that it can be done, since 1100 people were so involved. This finding supports the community action aspect of the summer program, and is further confirmed by the insignificant number (63) of volunteers from outside the immediate community. The overall figure of 1100 is considered conservative, as some large organizations failed to record their totals in this category.

Table II — Nature of Services (See next Page)

Since the diversity and quality of services are being discussed in various parts of this report, it is proposed to comment here but briefly, for the purpose of clarification, on some specific findings.

In attempting to quantify the nature of programs, choices had to be made as to how to group the basic services that had been offered during the summer. It must be understood that because it was necessary to group these activities under certain headings, it is probable that the overall total may under-count rather than over-count the variety of services within an individual agency.

While 117 component parts appear to have been at 425 different locations, the bulk of broad geographical distribution fell within the purview of the large, traditional organizations. These organizations, despite a large number of locations, tended to be the least creative in terms of implementing new and untried approaches. This dichotomy between large numbers and new programs does not imply lack of quality or impact for traditional, ongoing services. Comparing the number of new programs (0) to the number of old programs (X), it was felt that despite the original O.E.O. commitment and directive for the implementation of new and untried ways, that the traditional-type program was still significantly larger — about 25% — with 107 expanded programs against 75 new ones.

Where the picture was mixed, i.e., ongoing programs with some new features included, they were reported as expanded (X), as in the 38 agencies within the United Neighborhood Houses and the 16 in the N.Y. City Housing Authority centers where new components were often built into old programs. It was not possible to reflect this statistically but it must, in fairness, be mentioned. It would have been interesting to attempt to match new programs with number of new population reached, but paucity of reporting instruments did not permit such refinements.

It is worthy of note that all the parent-centered programs were new, as were most of the vocational skill programs for adults, and the educational-tutoring programs for teenagers. Only 4 organizations

LEGEND: 1 Day Camp - Play Streets - Lounge/Canteen
 2 Athletics - Sports (Little League - Tournaments - Swimming, etc.)
 3 Cultural enrichment (Community events - Arts and Crafts - Trips)
 4 Educational - Tutoring - Counseling - Leadership training
 5 Vocational Skills
 6 Performing arts (participation)
 7 Community Action (Housing - Block Association, etc.)
 8 Parent - Centered programs - Consumer Education

X Expanded ongoing program
 0 New Program
 C See Table I

Organizations	Component parts	Locations	Children 1-12								Teenagers 13-20								Adults 20 & up							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
			0	X	X	0					0	X	0	X	X	X	0									
1 Archdiocese of New York	1	39																								
2 Associated YM-YWHA of Greater N.Y.	4	8	0	X	X	0					0	X	0	X	X	X	0									
3 New York City Board of Education	6	138	0	X	X	X					0	X	X	X	X	X	0									
4 Catholic Charities, Diocese of Bklyn.	2	7	0	X	X	X																				
5 Catholic Youth Org. of Arch. of N.Y.	5	21	X	X	X	X																				
6 Chelsea Area Meetings for Planning	1	6																								
7 Community Council of Greater N.Y.	1	1																								
8 Council of P.R. & Hisp. Orgs. of L.E.S.	3	1																								
9 Fed. of P.R. Orgs. of Brownsville	1	1	0																							
10 Ft. Greene-Navy Yard Youth Program	1	12	0	X	X																					
11 Bloomingdale Neighborhood Consv. Proj.	1	1	0	0	0																					
12 Independent Juvenile Baseball League	1	1	0	0	0																					
13 Manhattan Valley Spanish Civic Assn.	1	2	0	0	0																					
14 Nativity Mission Center	1	1	0	X	X	X																				
15 Negro Action Group	2	1	0	X	X	0																				
16 New York City Housing Authority	16	16	0	X	X	X																				
17 New York City Mission Society	1	5	X	X	X	0																				
18 New York City Youth Board	4	16	X	X	X	X																				
19 Play Schools Association	1	2	X	X	X	0																				
20 Police Athletic League, Inc.	1	50	X	X	X	X																				
21 Prospect Heights Neighborhood Program	1	1	0																							
22 Puerto Rican Action Group	1	1	0																							
23 Puerto Rican Athletic League	1	1	0	0	0																					
24 Tilden Day Camp	1	1		X	X	X																				
25 Two Bridges Neighborhood Council	1	1		X	X	X																				
26 United Hispanic Movement	1	1																								
27 United Neighborhood Houses of N.Y.	38	53																								
28 United Puerto Ricans of Lower Manhattan	3	1	X																							
29 West Side Assn. of Community Centers	3	4	X																							
30 Williamsburg YM-YWHA, Inc.	1	1	X	X	X																					
31 YMCA of New York	2	2	0	X	X	0																				
32 YMCA of Greater New York	5	20	X	X	X	0																				
33 Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth in Action	6	12																								
Totals	117	425																								

TABLE II
NATURE OF SERVICES

involved teenagers in community action, although United Neighborhood Houses had seven such components among its members. Nine community action programs existed for adults. Nearly all of the agencies offered some form of day camp, athletics and cultural enrichment to children below 12. Similarly, programs for teenagers included the largest number of components in athletics and cultural enrichment. Thus, both a content analysis and a numerical count confirm the statement that the bulk of programs was to be found in the traditional type of recreational services.

Although the O.E.O. directives urged that the target for the summer program be mainly adults and teenagers, (particularly ages 17 to 35) it is suggested by the findings in both Tables that these two age groups cannot be involved unless the younger children are also cared for. Those programs attempting to reach parents had to provide services for their young children, in order that the parents might participate. Conversely, the large number of young children needing day camp services permitted the employment and involvement of many more teenagers than could otherwise have been served.

It has been said elsewhere in this report that the medium of work is a crucial tool in the War Against Poverty. Therefore, those programs where teenagers were paid as staff but the recipients of service as well have been marked with a plus sign. In spite of the conviction that all programs which employed teenagers in real, rather than contrived, jobs did indeed serve them, this symbol appears only where the double approach was clearly defined as a part of program content. The participation of the Neighborhood Youth Corps staff has been reported wherever known, by adding N to the staff number. This figure does not indicate the total number employed but only shows awareness of their participation in this program. There was a large number so involved, but the P.D.F. did not request this information as a separate statistic, since the funds for their reimbursement came from another source than the Summer Program grant.

In keeping with the agreed upon definition for "service" in this program, it would have been inappropriate for this report to attempt to rate the depth of any approach through statistical reporting. Some of this information is available, however, in the individual Agency Summaries included in the appendix. Finally, it is urged that it be clearly understood that while these statistics were carefully computed, they must be seen as reliable guidelines only, rather than perfect numerical counts of this summer's activities.

V. PROGRAM ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

Certain specific criteria will be discussed here which are based on the overall goals of the Summer Program and the stated purposes of the grantees in their individual proposals. These criteria will be applied to the program as a whole, and an assessment will be made of the degree to which the goals were achieved this year. Brief illustrations of the most effective efforts made by different organizations will be used.

1. Reaching the Heretofore Unreached.

The overall statistics indicate that the summer components carried out by 32 public and private organizations were responsible for programs in 425 different locations. Nearly 300,000 people were reached of whom it is conservatively estimated that 67% had not previously been served either because the organizations themselves started this summer, or because the traditional agencies expanded their ongoing programs and established new components, reaching out, in many instances, to new geographic locations in their neighborhoods.

Most encouraging was the way in which many established organizations conscientiously and enthusiastically went about involving the previously unserved poor. The YMCA, for instance, has traditionally been an organization largely supported by membership fees. Thus, it had served, in large measure, a segment of the population able to pay its own way. During this past summer the "Y's" sought out and rendered significant service to those unable to pay.

The Associated YM and YWHA's of Greater New York are in some measure a similar example. They have long had a philosophy that the community membership should pay for service, to the limit of its ability. While many scholarships are given every year, fees for day camp and other activities have been out of the reach of poverty groups. During the summer four "Y's" reached out into peripheral areas of the communities they served in Flushing, Coney Island, East Tremont (Hunts Point), and the Rockaways, to serve primarily minority group residents in programs which involved cooperation with a neighborhood council, the Board of Education, churches, and many other community groups. To these operations they brought their professional leadership and supervision while establishing new lines of communication and cooperation.

The Williamsburg YM-YWHA served more than 100 Chassidic youngsters in a special program. They are members of a religious sect somewhat aloof from the rest of the Jewish community and seriously separated from the mainstream of our society, in which they must live. The assent and cooperation of the religious leaders of these youngsters was secured for this effort.

The Spellman Center of the Catholic Youth Organization on the Lower East Side reached out to a group of as many as 150 unorganized "street" youngsters, four or five blocks from their center, establishing a baseball league which functioned in a very successful manner during the whole summer with volunteers.

The Tilden Day Camp, an unsubsidized Board of Education operation in Brooklyn with a regular

summer fee of \$140 per child, reached out to more than 100 children in the Brownsville and East New York section, involving them in a qualitative program of organized activities and cultural enrichment, as well as an experience in interracial and intercultural relations.

These are but five examples, briefly related, of many efforts made during the summer to reach heretofore unreached people. A number of other organizations made successful groundbreaking efforts to involve the parents of youngsters served, as will be discussed later.

2. Programs to provide services in hard-core, most-needed poverty areas.

To evaluate achievement in this area one must visualize the map of the City of New York on which the 16 poverty areas and the location of Summer Recreation Program components have been marked. It is immediately apparent that there is a significant geographic imbalance, and that pockets of poverty can be identified in other areas as well. The exceptions to a very uneven distribution are the large public programs, such as the Board of Education Centers. The Borough of Manhattan again received a majority of services during the summer. The Community Council's Recreation Study of 1963 reported this same imbalance, and it would appear that relatively little has been done to change the situation. On the other hand, it is recognized that the Summer Recreation grant underwrote only a part of the services which were carried on this summer around the City.

3. Programs to place stress on family involvement and activities.

Family-centered activity was not a major focus of this summer's program. There were significant gains made in establishing beginning contacts with parents through their children, often reached for the first time. Many organizations reported trips and outings connected with youth programs which involved the whole family, and individual parents were often pressed into service as volunteers. The excuses voiced in final reports from organizations for not reaching whole families cited the lack of time in which to recruit and involve them, as well as the fact that family and adolescent activities do not always mix. Another factor mentioned was the budgetary limitation on rental of buses -- a successful, if expensive, manner of involving whole families. This item should be carefully considered in the future, rather than indiscriminately cut, as happened this summer.

Three organizations had family involvement in the form of parent participation as a major focus. The Play Schools Association conducted successful workshops for parents of two neighborhoods, one in the Bronx and one in Queens, designed to increase their enjoyment, their self-confidence and their "parenting" skills, through learning about their children, how to play with and entertain them, to sew and paint for them, and to provide enriching cultural experiences for them. Social service help was also available. The Bloomingdale Conservation Project program operated along similar lines, having the parents of 300 pre-school children as their principal target. In both Bloomingdale and the Play Schools project, the parents and children were able to go on trips of a general interest and cultural nature, such as the Shakespeare-in-the-Park or the World's Fair.

The Two Bridges Neighborhood Council on the Lower East Side carried on an intensive remedial reading program for 423 youngsters whose native tongues were English, Spanish and Chinese. The parents of the children were invited to four weekly workshops, where their interests were considered, as well as their children's. One hundred sixty parents responded to these Friday morning sessions, which were conducted in three languages. The Youth Board and the YWCA programs included component parts devoted to working with mothers in cultural enrichment and vocational skills activities, while taking care of their children in day-camp. Youth-in-Action had both family trips and home visiting, which focused on consideration of the family as a whole. Five small Puerto Rican organizations on the Lower East Side pooled their resources to stage a Fiesta in September, involving the total family group as actors and audience.

4. Programs to involve the hiring of indigenous personnel on various levels of responsibility, primarily sub-professional aides, etc.

Program statistics indicate that of 3486 staff employed 1799 were indigenous personnel. The problem of employing all staff was complicated by tardy funding and hurt by high salaries paid by Project Headstart, which attracted key trained personnel away from Summer Program organizations. These conditions, in some measure, encouraged the employment of neighborhood people. Many reports noted with pleased surprise how successful this necessary "compromise" proved to be.

A few organizations had outstanding levels of employment of indigenous personnel, such as the more than 60 used by the Manhattan Valley Spanish Civic Association. The Mission Society's East Harlem project and Youth-in-Action in Bedford-Stuyvesant promoted indigenous personnel to important leadership positions and had no reason for regrets. On the other hand, the experience of the summer consultants proved more than once the importance of the trained professional as well.

With respect to criteria for the employment of summer staff, it is necessary to discuss the Board of Education policy of employing only licensed personnel. The Board had the largest grant in the Summer Program and employed no indigenous poor to speak of because of the inflexibility of their requirements. There is substantial question whether the maintenance of a strict policy of licensing based on teacher certification does in truth result in providing a higher calibre or more committed summer staff. In many instances licensed teachers, because of the formality of their orientation, have been found to be poorly adapted to informal education and recreation work with low income groups. Since a number of those specially licensed by the Board of Education for summer positions possess only the minimal requirement, two years of college, plus an examination, it is questioned whether these criteria are valid. Out of a total grant of \$2,705,000 to the City of New York, the Board of Education received \$668,000. It seems unfortunate that they were unable to employ indigenous personnel, considering that this was a major objective of the O.E.O. grant.

5. Programs to involve planning and decision making by neighborhood groups of indigenous people

Planning and decision making by neighborhood groups take time, and time was the element most lacking from the summer program of 1965. Almost every final report by the organizations indicated that the majority of decisions had been reached by professionals before recipients were involved. The exceptions to this rule were the small grass roots organizations which were totally constituted of residents of the neighborhood. In the Lower East Side there were five small Puerto Rican organizations which received grants from the O.E.O. ranging from \$100 to \$1600. None of these grants afforded full development of their proposals. They were therefore encouraged by their consultant to pool part of their resources in an effort to develop a program which would have some significance to all. The community organization process was carefully preserved, and the decisions were reached by the people themselves to stage a joint Puerto Rican Fiesta at the end of the summer. This process occupied a lot of valuable time but did meet the criterion established by the O.E.O. and will yield dividends long after the end of the summer.

Even where voluntary neighborhood efforts had evolved into formal organizations with a Board of Directors, as in the case of Manhattan Valley and Brownsville, the summer program could not have met the minimum standards necessary for compliance with both O.E.O. and New York City requirements without professional help and guidance.

While these represent the more significant examples of involvement and decision making by neighborhood groups, it is fair to say that every organization was aware of this criterion and implemented it up to the limit of its ability within the available time. Teenagers were organized into policy-making committees and councils; parents were encouraged to speak their mind in parent meetings and suggest policy changes; some notable examples of cooperation and coordination took place. Among the latter was the dialogue which took place between Youth-in-Action and the Catholic Youth Organization of the Diocese of Brooklyn. While neither could be called strictly a neighborhood group, since both had professional staff, at least planning and decision making were not always done unilaterally. If any

future summer program is contemplated, the planning and decision making by indigenous personnel should be stimulated in February, rather than artificially created in July.

6. Programs to be carried on through the summer period with stress on evening and weekend activities.

There are very serious difficulties inherent in carrying on six and seven-day programs from school closing in June until school opening in September. Staff is largely unwilling or unable to work during the entire period. Programs must depend to a great extent on school personnel and youth who are themselves still in school or college. While programs can begin by July 1st, if they have sufficient advance notice of funding, they are rarely prepared to continue until Labor Day, since this means no vacation whatever for staff which must go into winter jobs immediately. By the same token, six or seven days per week of intensive work with youth in urban settings is more than most people can absorb for a ten or twelve-week period. Even when sufficient funds were available to permit split staffing there was the problem of continuity of coverage and the necessity of establishing new relationships with weekend staff. The Board of Education became acutely aware of this problem in many of its centers this year.

Experience this summer showed that some programs started closing as early as August 16th and that the majority terminated by the end of August. A great many of them did not schedule regular weekend activities. Depending on the age group for which activities were planned, there were varying needs for weekend coverage. To arrange for family outings on weekends would seem to be particularly constructive. Wherever available, such programs met with great success, as in the CHAMP outings.

Because a number of programs were unable to start as soon as they had planned, several asked for and secured permission to extend their activities through September 10. The Police Athletic League for instance, had been unable to carry out a component of its proposal known as the Play Mobile. With the unspent funds, they kept a number of play streets open through September 10 and extended play street activities into weekends where they had not been planned for that time. The Board of Education centers perhaps had the most comprehensive proposal for coverage on weekends. A number of their staff reported that the group of youngsters which utilized the facilities on Saturdays and Sundays was completely different from those who came during the week. It was suggested that the former represented youth who did work and were perhaps less in need of the service, whereas those unoccupied seemed to find other use for their time on weekends. This should be explored further before a blanket assumption is made that all organizations should provide full weekend coverage.

VI. PROBLEM ANALYSIS

1) Selection of Grantees

A total of sixty-three proposals were received by the Economic Opportunity Committee staff, twenty-two of which had originally been submitted before the emergence of a special summer program. Thirty-three of the sixty-three proposals were funded. Budgets were, in almost every instance, severely cut by the O. E. O. One of the thirty-three organizations refused to accept its token grant of \$100, so that there were thirty-two actual operations, including the work of the Community Council of Greater New York, charged with the coordination, consultation and evaluation role.

Looking forward to future summers, it is to be hoped that clearer criteria will be developed for the selection of those organizations to whom funds should be granted. These must, however, be sufficiently broad in their conception not to exclude arbitrarily all new and imaginative proposals which do not fit a predetermined mold. There is a problem of policy determination here which could not be given full consideration this past summer because of lack of time. Complaints from some organizations in final reports concerned being "straitjacketed" by their own coordinating groups, such as in the case of United Neighborhood Houses, rather than by either the O. E. O. or the City Economic Opportunity Committee. In addition, there were organizations whose proposals were denied by the O. E. O. which were subsequently given money by the City, without explanation as to why this occurred, or even notification of the Summer Program consultant staff that it had taken place. While there may indeed be separate and complementary areas of concern for the O. E. O. and the City, these should be clarified in statements of policy.

The list of organizations refused grants included the New York City Department of Parks. The basis for deferment was that the program proposed (recreational aides in playgrounds) should be staffed from the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The Department of Parks operates 876 playgrounds, and its departmental budget has been so curtailed that many of these are unstaffed or understaffed with recreation personnel. To provide proper supervision of a host of Youth Corps youngsters who have few skills and limited, if any, experience in accepting responsibility, requires a major training facility, which the Park Department does not have. Specifically, professional personnel to set up training and provide staff supervision are basic necessities for such a program. Neighborhood parks are the first place to which youth and adults in a poverty area gravitate, so that if they were to be staffed adequately, there might be a unique opportunity to establish contact with the group which it is most necessary to reach. From this initial contact, the type of knowledge and relationships could be developed which would permit involvement in more significant activities. For success, such an effort on a pilot basis in 1966 would require a different concept of their roles on the part of both the Department of Parks and the funding sources.

Among the organizations funded were eight so-called "grass roots" associations. All of the proposals came independently from community groups, as a result of previous contact with Anti-Poverty staff. By grass roots is meant those organizations formed from the informal associations of neighbors seeking to solve community problems of concern to them, with little or no professional assistance. Excluded from

this list are erstwhile grass roots groups which have since become bureaucratized and are professionally staffed. With one exception, the grants to these eight groups were small, ranging from \$100 to \$1,600. One group, as already stated, refused its grant of \$100, considering it an insult.

It is the consultants' understanding that the type organization represented by these grass roots groups is a kind for which the Economic Opportunity Act was written, and it is regrettable that the manner in which the Summer Program was developed precluded their more general involvement. Some of the small groups which were denied funds might well have been assisted in the development of their proposals, if time and staff had been available in May. A total of eighteen originally applied, of which eight received funds. This is a percentage of success and failure comparable to the overall record of thirty-three out of sixty-three funded. But here the similarity ends.

2) Staff Selection and Training

Organizations seeking staff this summer faced a great many problems. Mentioned in every final report was the difficulty arising from the tardiness of notification concerning the funding. Overall, there did not seem to be a dearth of recreational personnel available, but there was a great shortage of specialists. For instance, an entire clinical component which had been planned by the Two Bridges Remedial Reading Project could not be carried out. There were also numerous complaints that Operation Head-Start was able to attract personnel who otherwise would have been available. The Head-Start payscale was far in excess of anything projected for the Summer Program.

Another great handicap faced by organizations was the virtual impossibility of taking time for formal in-service training of new staff. Most organizations reported that they had no alternative but to throw people into working situations immediately, preferably under experienced and competent supervision of older workers. In many instances, this was not possible, and a number of organizations, in their final evaluations, mentioned that the whole level of their operation had been considerably below the quality which they had anticipated. Already dwelt on at some length have been criteria for employment of staff utilized by the Board of Education. There is nothing in the quality of its operation to indicate that the staffing standards which have been imposed have resulted in superior service.

3) Working with Indigenous Groups

Understanding the small indigenous groups requires special skills, very different from the competence needed to receive and process formal applications for funds from large organizations. The level of sophistication of the former is lower, and their ability to express their needs and desires is often limited, sometimes by a lack of familiarity with English. An inordinate amount of staff time is required, from beginning to end, in working with these groups. Patience as well as empathy for their aspirations are of utmost importance. It is far easier to dismiss their appeals for selfhelp and substitute grandiose schemes dreamed up by experts in grantsmanship which request vast sums for traditional agencies and project the reaching of more "clients". But are they reached and is there any real self-help involved in the latter process? Sometimes there is, if personnel of the large organization has devotion to its task, time, warmth and integrity. But too often the "numbers racket" rules, and the beautifully typed reports, statistics and financial statements belie a kind of bureaucratic welfare disbursement which is superficial, hence ineffective.

4) Multiple Funding

In a few instances, organizations received funds from several different sources which were used to implement the Summer Program. It might well be that a group could request funds through different sources

for different components which would not result in duplication. During the summer this situation applied specifically to member agencies of coordinating groups such as Fort Greene - Navy Yard, CHAMP, United Neighborhood Houses and the West Side Association of Community Centers.

While there can be no question as to the value of coordinating agencies, from the consultant's point of view it creates the problem of attempting to evaluate programs through the eyes of an intermediary. It is also a source of confusion when it comes to clear delineation of budgetary allocations. In addition, the consultant finds himself caught up in the problems which arise between operating organizations and their own coordinating groups.

It is not said that there was conscious misrepresentation; nor is it suggested that public funds were ill-spent, but there are, apparently, some local "paper" coordinating and planning organizations, the funding of which deserves further scrutiny. Time did not permit careful sifting of proposals this summer, so that these situations were not realized before grants had been made.

5) Self-Help Concept

The self-help concept which is emphasized by the Economic Opportunity Act as being an essential part of the planning of anti poverty community action programs is not easily defined. For the purpose of this report it is accepted to mean a partnership of community members sharing the same problems and concerns involved in a joint effort to find solutions through action.

In individual therapy, self-help has long been recognized as a tool of major importance for the patient's improvement. Unfortunately, there is only a partial analogy between the problems of individuals and of groups in this regard. Basic to the therapeutic process is the principle that the patient should be involved in making decisions and sacrifices commensurate with his ability to do so. It must be emphasized, however, that this process is based upon continuous interaction with a guiding and controlling influence, the therapist. It is all too easy to overlook the need for such guidance and control in the case of community groups. "Going it alone" is not necessarily self-help. By the same token, neither is the acceptance of funds from the Federal government for the mere provision of services to people who have not been involved in decision making. Obviously, the soundest policy lies somewhere between these extremes. Skill is required on the part of enabling staff, whether educators, social workers or recreation specialists, to know when to encourage neighborhood people to go on their own toward a solution to their problem and when the professional must intervene.

With these reservations in mind, we have counted the number of people within the "target group" to whom services were made available this summer and the untrained residents of neighborhoods who were employed. This count does not pretend to establish that the self-help concept has been realized. During the Summer Program there was a minimum of recipient involvement in the planning stages. When programs became operative, there were great differences in the manner in which those served were involved in the process, ranging from passive acceptance of service offered to full-scale participation, depending on the nature of the project and the orientation of the personnel in charge. Given the necessary imagination and true commitment to the idea, it seems possible to include a self-help component in almost every project, the crucial factors being community participation and areas of real decision-making for the participants.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Viewing the overall results of the Summer Program, the consultants and the individual project administrators are convinced of its positive impact. The body of this report supports the position that the program did involve a substantial number of heretofore unreached people and did provide them with services which brought them both enjoyment and a better feeling about themselves as members of the community. Hopefully, this constituted preparation for coping more adequately with the problems and frustrations of urban living. What remains for discussion are the lessons learned from the summer's experience, the pitfalls to be avoided and the gains to be consolidated.

Reaching the Target Group

There is a question in the minds of some people whether, in truth, there are hard-to-reach people, or only agencies, which are hard to reach. There were some organizations in the Summer Program which seemed to maintain their business-as-usual pattern without any significant modifications. There is also the unanswered question as to whether changes in agency practice such as those indicated in this report are permanent, or whether they terminated with the end of activities on September 10th. Some components financed from Federal funds appeared to be strictly "poverty projects," temporary in nature and set apart from the on-going operation of the parent institution, rather than an integral part of it. Only time will tell whether any permanent impact from the use of these funds has been achieved on the philosophies and structures of traditional agencies.

Gaps and Overlaps

One of the assignments given the consultant unit was to identify gaps and overlaps in recreation services throughout the city. As mentioned earlier, this was impossible to do in so short a time, but the need for such a study was reinforced by the summer's experience. Even if the City's Community Progress Centers carry out part of this task when they become operational, many areas will, nevertheless, remain uncovered.

Essentially this is a research task involving the identification of needs and the evaluation of resources. Without such information no one will ever know whether poverty funds are well or poorly spent. In fact, it is a task which must go on continually, for it is the only sound guideline for establishing new services. Since every change shifts the whole community balance, it is imperative that criteria be developed before priorities are established.

There seems to be general agreement that the original sixteen poverty areas designated by the Community Council's study of 1963 are no longer the only or necessarily the most needy areas. A city is an ever-changing panorama, and it may well be that the plans detailed for Community Progress Centers six months ago are already outmoded. A broad perspective is necessary for determinations of this sort, which can only come from action-oriented research and evaluation.

Planning of the Summer Program

Every final report mentioned that there was no time for planning the programs for the summer of 1965. It is assumed that there is hardly a need to recommend that this process be initiated for next summer almost immediately and that organizations be notified before April what funds they will have to expend on which specific program. It is only thus that the City can hope to have a quality operation, carried out by the best possible staff.

The recipients of service should be involved in developing the activities which they feel are needed in their neighborhoods. This requires community organization prior to the conception and submission of proposals to the Economic Opportunity Committee. A method should be developed for assuring that there is community-wide involvement in the planning process. This aspect also relates directly to the concept of self-help. During the summer of 1965 it was necessary to waive even the Federal requirement that the community contribute 10% of the total cost of the project, by having the City pay almost all of it. Another year the 10% might be assessed, but more imaginatively interpreted by the Office of Economic Opportunity for small organizations without any money. Even the large agencies, if forced to contribute cash, are merely robbing Peter to pay Paul, since some other aspect of their service must, of necessity, suffer.

Another planning problem which will require special study is that presented by the Board of Education program. This past summer's budget of \$668,349 was the largest grant. Of this amount 25.07% was for the maintenance of facilities, in the form of custodial charges. When one considers that the past summer marked only the paltry beginnings of the anti poverty effort and that school buildings are often the best or only facilities available in neighborhoods, it would appear that custodians are going to become very wealthy from poverty funds. The Office of Economic Opportunity was loathe to allow other organizations any funds for basic maintenance, so that there appears to be an inequity in this situation. More important, while the Poverty Program must pay for services it requires, one might seriously question its use of funds to benefit special groups which do not come within the purview of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Finally, if future summer programs include a large number of voluntary organizations, as well as indigenous groups, planning should be made for a functioning council of organizations to meet with whatever administrative unit is charged with the overall coordination and supervision of the program. While such a group was a distinct intent of the consultant unit at the Community Council of Greater New York this year, it proved to be impractical in the time available. Meetings of all component program administrators should also be scheduled, for exchange of information, evaluation and policy recommendations to the Economic Opportunity Committee.

Self-Help Aspects

Bearing in mind the limitations discussed earlier in relation to the self-help concept, its relevance is strongest in relation to work with indigenous groups. While they do require special "care and feeding", they also can help us look for new approaches and experimental programs. Only an indigenous group this summer tried to make caseworkers out of neighbors in a few weeks time. Only an indigenous group had the temerity to run a cultural day camp when it had never previously run anything. Only an indigenous group served, with the funds allocated for a specific component of its program, twice as many as it had said it would. Only an indigenous group raised a substantial amount of money to make up for what the O. E. O. did not allocate, to carry out the group's objectives. None of these programs was excellent by professional standards; all were imaginative. But the reservoir of leadership trained in the efforts made will benefit all the neighborhoods and groups involved for many years to come.

The conclusion which the summer consultants have drawn from their very gratifying experience in working with small neighborhood organizations is that the kind of help they were able to render must be continued, expanded, and consolidated.

Unrealized Program Opportunities

A number of the final reports from organizations involved in the Summer Program begged for social service help beyond what they had been able to secure. Their experience was that as they delved more deeply into their communities and reached out to new people they encountered more need for direct service, of a counseling or case work nature. It might be feasible to develop a trouble-shooting case work unit available to organizations fielding summer operations for the process of referral. This is far more complex, as everyone knows, than merely to give one person with a problem the name of an agency. The City's family agencies, on a coordinated and cooperative basis, could staff such a unit.

Involvement of the whole family was seen by the Economic Opportunity Committee as one of the goals for the summer activities. There are limited ways in which this can be achieved, since there are different interests at various ages.

For many poor families, bus trips take the place of a car, often the way in which others achieve some family activity these days, by sharing on trips. This past summer there was severe curtailment of the use of buses when proposals were reviewed, because it is both an expensive item and also a way in which a poorly planned and executed program can be made to appear imaginative and exciting when it is not. Another year there should be criteria established which would require that planned trips demonstrate their connection with other components and purposes of the program, for it then will be possible to finance more well-conceived trips, rather than arbitrarily excluding almost all such proposals. Family programming can be enhanced by such a development.

One of the ideas which the consultant staff of the Community Council was unable to carry out this summer was a program exchange, possibly through the medium of a weekly newsletter. This year it found organizations putting on excellent dramatic performances with varying audiences, while others were struggling to find worthwhile activities in which to engage their members. Some new and imaginative program ideas should have been communicated to everyone. It may well be that there were youth in need of jobs and unfilled jobs in another organization. Free tickets went to waste for events, because the organization which received them could not use all of them, and there was little way of knowing who could.

Work Programs

Work programs and the training of youth in "saleable skills" constituted a substantial portion of the summer's efforts by organizations. Many reported that there was an urgent need for work for youth below the age of 16, as well as those between 16 and 21. There is no more important task that an anti poverty program can achieve than preparing young people to earn their living, the most crucial form of self-help in our society. This applies equally to youth and adults. It is urgently recommended that research be instituted to analyze the impact of the employment of neighborhood people in the poverty programs. Regrettably, it was not possible for the consultants to evaluate the many work programs encountered in any depth. Their consensus, however, is that while real work programs are undoubtedly the most positive weapon in the War Against Poverty, a negative, contrived work experience is devastatingly destructive. Questions also arise around the long-range effectiveness of temporary work. Do those so employed have more serious social problems which reassert themselves as such positions terminate? A mere head count of people employed has relatively little meaning, but it does have a relationship to the most important aspect of the total poverty effort — people have money in their pockets who never had it before.

Public Administration Problems

Organizational problems of a structural and regulatory nature have been discussed earlier. It must be underlined, however, that there were instances during the summer when personality factors and lack of sympathy on the part of some poverty operations staff also made for unnecessary obfuscation. There is a tendency on the part of many public officials to prefer to make grants to large bureaucracies which can be depended upon to account accurately for funds in whatever number of copies are required. This has resulted in an inflexibility, ill-adapted to waging any war, including the War on Poverty. These administrative problems point up the necessity for the Economic Opportunity Committee to rethink its total structure, as well as its tie to the Controller's Office of the City of New York. While safeguards for tax funds are essential, if the result is discouraging the participation of small, indigenous groups, then new administrative machinery can and must be devised.

The Need for Professional Consultation

The arrangement which assigned the role of consultation and evaluation to the Community Council of Greater New York was based on both philosophical and practical reasons. The majority of organizations carrying out Summer Program components were private, nonprofit agencies. The Community Council is their coordinating arm, and it is highly desirable to retain the involvement of the voluntary welfare segment in all aspects of the poverty program. The Economic Opportunity Committee of the City, being the fund-granting agency, had an essential role to play to insure that each organization receiving money carried out its contract. When the Committee wisely delegated a part of this responsibility to the Council, it served to remove the "police role" of the Committee one important step from the harried administrators of activities in the field. The Council consultants constituted a buffer and acted as interpreters of public policy to operating organizations and of organizational problems to the public agencies. This proved to be a sound and successful arrangement, as evidenced by the relationships which were established between the Council's consultant staff and the operating organizations, as well as with the Economic Opportunity Committee, the New York State Office of Economic Opportunity and the Federal O.E.O.

The two present component parts of the City's Community Action Development Division of the Economic Opportunity Committee are concerned with receiving and facilitating the development of proposals and performing the "watchdog" function, known as Program Audit. The Consultant Unit at the Community Council performed a third and wholly complementary function, helping organizations which had received funds to implement good programs. It is recommended that there be a continuing Program Consultation Unit to help community action programs in the pre- and post-operational stages. The personnel to staff such a unit should have professional training in at least one of the social science disciplines, as well as extensive administrative experience. New York City has unequalled resources of this calibre, available on a full or part-time basis.

Conclusion

To conclude, the summer's experience can be summarized as follows:

1. Many old-line, traditional organizations reached out to new populations under the stimulus of the criteria established, to work with those who met the test of being in need and who resided in the 16 poverty areas. This represented an important cooperative venture between private and public welfare in the War on Poverty.
2. A number of completely new programs were established, both within the older organizations and the new, so-called "grass roots" associations.

3. New channels of communication were opened up between organizations serving the same geographic areas who had never collaborated before. These will, it is hoped, continue to accumulate dividends for the people in communities, in terms of the most effective and efficient use of available resources.
4. An emphasis was placed on activities which could have a significant and permanent impact on the lives of the participants, as a result of emphasizing "upgrading," educationally, vocationally and in terms of the development of leadership potentialities.
5. As a result of this summer's experience, a number of guidelines can be developed for work in similar efforts in the future. These should contribute to the success of community action projects, in general, as well as summer programs specifically.
6. New York's neighborhoods which were saturated with recreation and informal education services this past summer did not have street riots as in 1964; nor did the perennial tensions and gang fights of every summer before take place. While it is not possible to attribute this calm situation solely to anti-poverty efforts, it is not presumptuous to assume that satisfying activities for nearly 300,000 people had a salutary effect on the social fabric of the City.
7. An important objective to bear in mind for the future is that the Summer Program must not be seen as a palliative, a way of keeping the lid on, of beguiling residents of poverty areas into thinking they do not have serious problems. It must be a positive force for social change. This can only be accomplished with careful advanced planning, involving both recipients of the intended services and professionals.
8. It is hoped that the Summer Program may become a link between year-round community activities, rather than an isolated experience. At the same time, summer presents a unique laboratory situation to try out experimental approaches and should be so used. It is only thus that the anti poverty programs will seek out and find solutions to the most challenging of all problems in an age of plenty.

COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK

225 Park Avenue South • New York, N. Y. 10003 • Telephone: SPring 7-5000
Memorandum #1

To: Organizations in New York City Summer Recreation Program:

From: Geoffrey R. Wiener, Chief Consultant

The Community Council of Greater New York has been assigned by the Anti Poverty Operations Board to undertake the coordination of the Summer Recreation Program which received a total of \$2,782,252 in Federal and City grants on June 25, 1965. Of the 61 proposals submitted, 33 were funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington. Each organization has by now received a telegram to that effect from Deputy Mayor Paul Screvane, in his capacity as Vice Chairman of the New York City Council Against Poverty.

In almost every instance budgets were cut. You should now have a detailed budget in hand from the Office of Economic Opportunity on what is commonly referred to as a CAP 25 form. The regulations required that reasons for budget cuts be detailed on this form. CAP stands for Community Action Program, which is the major part of Title II of the Federal Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. On some of the CAP 25 forms there are special instructions and requirements listed at the bottom which must be followed. There is also a paragraph in small print under "C" which relates to permitted flexibility in the use of funds. Each organization will receive further instructions and forms for reporting expenditures from the Anti Poverty Operations Board, 100 Church Street, Room 1933. Questions on fiscal matters may be addressed to Mr. Thomas C. Lawrence, 566-6796 or 6797.

The Community Council, Summer Program Consultants and Their Role:

A folder is enclosed which describes the membership and role of the Community Council of Greater New York. It has been charged by the New York City Anti Poverty Operations Board with the following responsibilities:

1. To assist in coordinating programs and services to prevent overlap and duplication; to identify gaps in service which should be filled; to provide whatever assistance may be needed in terms of program operation, planning, development, administration, etc.
2. To stimulate and assist in the process of program evaluation; at the end of the period to develop an evaluation report of the total program and its component parts.
3. To prepare recommendations with the operating organizations for more effective coordination and improvement of services in the future based on results of the 1965 summer experience.

Four consultants under the supervision of Geoffrey Wiener will be working with the participating organizations this summer. All are experienced professionals who are looking forward to seeing the months ahead used in the best interests of the children, youth and adults in the neighborhoods you serve. Dr. Nelly Hartogs, Mr. Norman Feldman, Dr. Richard Kraus and Mr. Owen Peagler represent between them training and years of practice in social work, education (elementary, adult and university levels), sociology and recreation. We shall be calling you within the next few days to arrange an appointment to discuss your plans, your progress and your problems. Please do not hesitate to call us at SPring 7-5000 if the need arises.

Planning . . . Coordination . . . Leadership

in Health and Welfare Activities

COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK

225 Park Avenue South • New York, N. Y. 10003 • Telephone: SPring 7-5000

Memorandum #2

August 9, 1965

To: Organizations in New York City Summer Recreation Program

From: Geoffrey R. Wiener, Chief Consultant, Summer Recreation Project

The purpose of this memorandum is to acquaint all organizations with the kind of information we feel it necessary to have at the end of the summer in order to plan for and secure additional funds for future programs. Rather than send out more statistical forms -- which cannot cover every situation adequately because of the variety of programs funded -- we give you these Guidelines for Reporting. Some aspects are repetitions of the Program Description Forms we asked be filled out at the beginning of program. We still want these forms, if not submitted before this. We also want a complete report following these guidelines by September 10, 1965.

What We Want to Know at Summer's End:

I. Participants:

1. How many people were involved in programs for how long and how often?
2. What ages were served? What interracial participation was achieved and how?
3. Did the activities reach those for whom the Economic Opportunity Act was written: families with an annual income of \$3,000 or less. If so, how? Did we reach new members not previously involved? If so, how? Did you succeed in serving the family as a group? If so, how?
4. What part did participants play in determining policy and choosing the activities which were undertaken?

II. Activities:

1. What new activities were developed which proved successful in achieving the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act?
2. What major gaps in both the type and amount of service have been identified and where do they exist?
3. What activities did not succeed in reaching the objectives which you had for them and why not?

III. Facilities:

1. Where did activities take place? Were they owned, rented, or borrowed, public or private? Did they represent added use of existing facilities and new cooperative arrangements with other organizations? If so, what were they? Were they adequate for the task?

IV. Community:

1. Development of leadership: what added assumption of responsibility by neighborhood people can we point to? What discoveries of and use of talents and skills among non-professionals have we made?

Planning . . . Coordination . . . Leadership

in Health and Welfare Activities

2. List the organizations, both formal and informal, with whom you have worked and describe the coordination and cooperation among these which has been brought about by this program. What new channels of communication have been opened up and what should be continued?

V. Staff:

1. How many full-time, part-time and special staff were employed? How many were from the neighborhood? Have we assigned new responsibilities to youth and what has been the result? How many volunteers have we used and in what positions? Will they continue to serve their communities after this experience? Were organizations able to find staff to carry out their plans in a satisfactory fashion?

VI. Administration:

1. What problems have been encountered by your organization during the planning, initiation and implementation of the program? How were these solved?

VII. General Recommendations:

1. What gaps and duplications in neighborhood services can you identify?
2. What services should be continued throughout the year?
3. What services should be repeated next summer with more time for planning and training?
4. What assistance would be helpful to you in future planning of cooperative programs of this type?
5. What self-help programs developed this summer by neighbors, neighborhoods and organizations should be continued and further developed? Suggest ways in which this can be done.

If each organization carries out a self-evaluation using these guidelines and adding whatever seems important to the participants in programs as well as the staff, we shall have a body of knowledge which will be of real service to our community in the future. The five consultants will be happy to help with suggestions for following through with this important task, if requested. We feel it is as important as accounting for the funds entrusted to your organizations. We expect reports from each organization by September 10th at the latest.

COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK

225 Park Avenue South • New York, N. Y. 10003 • Telephone: SPring 7-5000

Memorandum No. 2

9 de Agosto del 1965

A: Organizaciones en Nueva York Participantes en los Programas Recreativos de Verano

De: Geoffrey R. Wiener, Jefe Consultor, Proyecto Recreativo de Verano

El propósito de este memorándum es para familiarizar a todas las organizaciones en respecto a la clase de información que creemos muy necesaria tenerla disponible al finalizar los proyectos de este verano. En vez de enviarles mas formas estadísticas, las cuales no cubrirían cada situación adecuadamente, debido a la variedad de los distintos programas capitalizados, les estamos proporcionando las siguientes líneas como guía para la preparación de los reportes. Algunos de los aspectos que les vamos a pedir nos informen, son repeticiones de la información previamente les pidieramos en las Formas Descriptivas de los Programas, las cuales les pedimos fueran llenadas al principio de los programas de verano. Deseamos recibir la información que les vamos a pedir para Septiembre 10, 1965, al igual que las Formas Descriptivas de los Programas, para aquellas organizaciones que todavía no las hayan enviado.

Información que estamos interesados en recibir al terminar los Programas de Verano.

I. Participantes:

1. Cuantas personas participaron en los programas, por cuanto tiempo, y las veces que fueron participes?
2. Las edades estimadas de los que fueron atendidos. Que participación inter-racia se llevo a cabo?
3. Los actividades que se llevaron a cabo, sirvieron el propósito a aquellas personas para las cuales fueron establecidas por las Obras de Oportunidad Económica? Tuvimos la oportunidad de extender nuestro servicio a personas, que anteriormente no habían participado en estos programas? Pudimos satisfactoriamente servir la familia como un grupo?

II. Actividades:

1. Que nuevas actividades fueron desarrolladas, las cuales probaron ser un éxito, en lograr el propósito principal de las Obras de Oportunidad Económica?
2. En respecto al ejemplo y la importancia de los servicios, que brechas pudieron ser identificadas, y donde existen las mismas?
3. Que actividades no tuvieron éxito y por lo tanto no deben de ser repetidas en el futuro?

Planning . . . Coordination . . . Leadership

in Health and Welfare Activities

III. Facilidades:

1. Donde se llevaron a cabo dichas actividades, Fueron en propiedades compradas, alquiladas, prestadas, pu'blicas o privadas? Representaron una adicio'n en respecto al uso de las facilidades existentes? Fueron apropiadas para el uso de las tareas?

IV. Comunidad:

1. Desarrollo de iniciativa. Que responsabilidades adicionales tomaron los participantes en dichos programas, las cuales podemos hacer mencio'n de ellas? Que descubrimien tos pudimos encontrar en respecto al talento y las habilidades de las personas que participaron y los cuales no son profesionales?
2. Identifique las organizaciones, bien sea formales o informales, con las cuales hemos trabajado en estos programas. Que niveles de coordinacio'n y cooperacio'n entre ellas salieron a relucir debido a dichos programas? Cual fue' la estructura social del vecindario al principio del programa de verano y que nuevos medios de comunicacio'n fueron establecidos? Debido a la experiencia adquirida durante el programa de verano, sera' posible que un grupo de organizaciones continu'en trabajando en conjunto, para lograr una mejor comunidad?

V. Empleados:

1. Cuantos empleados trabajando tiempo completo, parcial, o empleados especiales fueron utilizados? Cuantos de ellos salieron del vecindario? Hemos asignado nuevas responsabilidades a la juventud y cuales han sido los resultados? Cuantos voluntarios fueron usados y en que posiciones? Podra'n continuar sirviendo la comunidad despues de esta experiencia? Fue' posible para las organizaciones el conseguir empleados suficientes, para llevar acabo sus planes de una manera satisfactoria?

VI. Administracio'n:

1. Que problemas fueron encontrados por las organizaciones durante el per'iodo de planeamiento, iniciacio'n y implementacio'n de dichos programas? Pudieron obtener ayuda las organizaciones cuando la necesitaron?

VII. Recomendaciones en General:

1. Que brechas y duplicaciones en servicios podemos identificar?
2. Que servicios deben de ser continuados durante todo el año?
3. Que servicios deben de ser repetidos el próximo verano, con mas tiempo disponible para planeamiento y entrenamiento?
4. De que uso o valor les servira a las organizaciones un servicio continuo de consultores, para planear los proyectos y aconsejar en la coordinacion de recursos en los vecindarios?
5. Que elementos de ayuda mutua o propia entre los vecinos, vecindarios, y organizaciones pueden identificarse, basado en la experiencia adquirida durante el verano? Como pueden ellos sentirse seguros de poder continuar con su propia o mutua ayuda?

Si cada organizacio'n lleva a cabo una evaluacio'n de si misma, usando las lineas de ayuda anteriormente indicadas, y añadie'ndole cuanto crean ser de importancia para los participantes en los programas, al igual que los empleados, tendremos entonces una fuente llena de conocimientos, la cual sera' de gran ayuda para nuestra comunidad enel futuro. Los cinco consultores tendra'n sumo placer en ayudarles con sugerencias, para continuar con esta importante tarea, si asi lo desean. Creemos esto tan importante, como el contabilizan los fondos que les fueran confi'ados a sus organizaciones.

COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK

225 Park Avenue South • New York, N. Y. 10003 • Telephone: SPring 7-5000
Memorandum #3 September 3, 1965

To: Organizations in New York City Summer Recreation Program

From: Geoffrey R. Wiener, Norman Feldman, Dr. Nelly Hartogs, Dr. Richard Kraus
and Owen F. Peagler

Bouquets:

The City's Summer Recreation Program has been remarkably successful. This could only have occurred with high calibre and devoted work on the part of the men, women and youth, both paid and volunteer, involved in the 32 organizations and 370 separate operations in the field. In our opinion, many things have been learned which will make future efforts easier and even more fruitful. We look forward to your recommendations, to be contained in the organizational reports due September 10th.

For the Consultant Staff the summer has been both instructive and fun. We thank you for making it this way, on both counts.

Pictures:

The Anti Poverty Operations Board is very anxious to have a photographic record of summer activities. Will you please send us a copy of your best pictures, preferably in 8 x 10 glossy prints? We can reimburse for reasonable costs -- and will!

Property Accountability:

We refer you to page 57 of the CAP Guide, dated February 1965. Permanent equipment purchases are "owned by the grantee subject to reimbursement to the Office of Economic Opportunity for excess of cost over a fair rental value for the period of actual use". In other words, if your purchase cost is higher than rental cost you may be asked to pay the difference.

Parent Work:

The Anti Poverty Operations Board is very anxious to collect data on successful methods and techniques of work with parents. Will you kindly furnish us with any significant data or ideas you have from the summer's experience? A conference, with Operation Head Start participation and other interested organizations, may be held in the near future.

Next Summer:

It now seems likely that there will be special programs similarly funded next summer. You may be sure that there will be planning beginning in February rather than May and that those who participated this year will be relied upon for help in taking advantage of the lessons learned this summer.

Report:

Our report of this past summer's experience will be sent to each of you. It depends, however, on receiving your reports by September 10th.

Planning . . . Coordination . . . Leadership

in Health and Welfare Activities

COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK

New York City Summer Recreation Project 1965

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION FORM

1. Name of agency or organization: _____

Address: _____ Telephone: _____

Director, or Person Reporting: _____ Title: _____

Parent or affiliated organization, if any: _____

Specify nature of relationship: _____

2. Community served: Give geographical area _____
or boundaries from which bulk of
participants are drawn: _____

Socio-economic level(s) of community: _____

Ethnic composition of community: _____

Other recreational or social agencies which serve community: _____

3. Population served by your agency in regular (year-round) program:

Age*	Approx. Number Served	Approx. Percentages of Ethnic Origin			
		White	Negro	Puerto Rican	Other
5 or below					
6 -- 8					
9 -- 11					
12 -- 13					
14 -- 19					
20 -- 25					
26 -- 45					
46 -- 59					
60 and over					

* Place in wider brackets, if necessary

Program Description Form

Socio-economic background of participants: please characterize as a group, or by percentages: _____

Is there family participation? _____ Explain: _____

4. Program of Agency: Briefly describe major components of year-round agency program, and submit descriptive materials (brochures, bulletins, outlines) for folder:

Anti-Poverty Summer Community Recreation Project

5. Special Summer Program Under Grant: Please respond to the following questions:

Those to be served:

Age Group(s)	Sex	Ethnic Composition	Numbers	Brief statement of program content (classes, clubs, special events, etc.) Please append printed materials, if available. Give statement for each group, if more than one group.

Facilities to be used: (give address(es) (if many, append list)

Yours: _____

Other agency's: _____

Nature of Community Involvement or cooperative participation: do you belong to a council of agencies in the community, make use of neighborhood advisory groups, etc.? Please explain:

Program Description Form

Schedule: Beginning and ending dates of program; days and hours: _____

Staff: Describe nature of staff assignments (paid professionals (year-round and summer), volunteers, etc.) To what extent are indigenous leaders used?

Is this program totally new, or an extension of existing or previously operating programs? Explain: _____

To what extent are you serving participants who have not previously been in your program? _____ Comment: _____

7. Please state as precisely and clearly as possible, what you hope to accomplish in your special summer program, and what you see as your major task, in terms of:

Specific program activities you intend to carry out, and people you intend to reach:

Desired outcomes for participants:

Other comments:

SUMMARIES

#1 - The Archdiocese of New York, 451 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022

Agency Description - The Archdiocese of New York is the religious and administrative headquarters of the Roman Catholic Church in the City of New York, except for the Boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens. It sponsors a great many family, youth and adult activities through its parishes throughout the year, of a religious, educational and recreational nature.

Summer Program - "Summer in the City" operated in 39 centers in parishes located in Manhattan and the Bronx from July 6 to August 15. The two purposes of the program projected were (1) to offer concrete services relevant to the causes and effects of poverty, and (2) to promote increased interpersonal and intergroup relationships in the neighborhoods. The components were: (1) pre-elementary school in cooperation with Operation Headstart, (2) pre-high school open to both parochial and public school children of the 7th, 8th and 9th grades, (3) open recreation in open areas, primarily the streets, (4) group discussions for mothers, (5) teenage enrichment through a community center-type program, (6) adult enrichment through early evening meetings concerning the problems and opportunities in the neighborhood.

Statistics - While no records of enrollment or attendance were kept by the centers, and the number of people reached varied from center to center, it is estimated by the director that an average of one thousand persons in each center were affected in varying degrees each week, or a total figure of 39,000 including spectators.

Evaluation - Most of the centers were operated by priests and nuns, with the nuns carrying out family visits and discussion programs. Paid staff in the area of art, drama and music worked with local volunteers to implement the cultural enrichment components. Observation of the program by the consultant was limited to two centers in Central Harlem, and there appeared to be active involvement of a large number of youth and some adults, in informal recreational activities. Efforts to communicate information from the diocesan level to the consultant were minimal, unfortunately, and it is therefore difficult to make more than a superficial evaluation.

Recommendations - If a similar program is funded another summer, arrangements should be made for registration and attendance records, with an age breakdown. Also, more successful arrangements should be worked out for observation and evaluation. While the activities were open to all, without regard for race, creed or color, they were almost entirely carried out in church settings by personnel in religious garb. There are those who will not participate under these conditions who would no doubt benefit from the program.

#2 - Associated YM-YWHA's of Greater New York, 33 West 60 Street, New York, N.Y. 10023

Agency Description - The Associated YM-YWHA's of Greater New York operate 15 community centers in New York City and in the surrounding suburban areas of Nassau and Westchester counties. Their functions include group work and recreation, nursery and day care programs, camps, adult and older adult activities, as well as large programs for schoolage and teenage youth, mental health and programs for orthopedically and mentally handicapped children. Centers operate on a neighborhood basis.

Summer Program - During the summer, the Y's had four different components with O.E.O. funds. They operated through the Flushing YM and YWHA, the Henrietta and Stuard Hirschman Y of Coney Island,

the East Tremont YM and YWHA and the Gustave Hartman YM and YWHA of the Rockaways. Additional activities were planned for and funded, but the time did not permit staffing. Those programs provided included: social, cultural and recreational activities; tutorial services; play school and day camping; and work experience projects in manual, clerical, and sub-professional capacities.

Statistics - A total of 781 participants were involved in activities, exclusive of community planning and parent contacts. Seventy-one indigenous people were employed as staff, many of them from the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Evaluation - The basic professional direction came from year-round trained social work staff. Many new channels of communication were opened up when the staff worked with indigenous lay leaders and groups. For example, in Flushing, a pattern of communication was established for the first time with the local Baptist churches serving low-income Negro congregations. The Y's themselves became more sensitive to the needs of local poverty populations and are likely to serve a larger number in their year-round programs. They increased their out-reach in the community, providing a stimulus to planning which should last long after the summer is over. Program and policy planning were carried out with community-based groups, such as the Coney Island Community Council, Flushing Youth Service Council, Rockaway Community Council and the Interracial Youth Center Committee of Coney Island. The Y seemed to take hold quickly and professionally to render a quality service to their neighborhoods, despite the late funding. For instance, the new community center opened in a public school in Flushing developed a quality, although rather mass-oriented program, with cultural programs in the arts as well as social activities and athletics. A post-season day camp, utilizing ideal facilities on Staten Island was able to be mobilized and served youth right up until the opening of school. In Coney Island a teen canteen operated in a storefront by the Coney Island Community Council received strengthening, supervision and consultation from the Coney Island Y, while all decisions were reached by the community group.

Recommendations - The director of the Associated Ys has stated that "None of the services would have been available were it not for the governmental funds provided under the CAP program". As a result of the stimulus provided by the Associated Ys this summer in the CAP program, most of the neighborhoods worked in are involved in developing their own CAP proposals for year-round activities. It is recommended that organizations such as the Associated Ys, with experienced professional staff, be encouraged in the future to provide their leadership to the development of poverty operations in communities which need this help. This agency subscribed to the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act and carried out its work in a conscientious, highly professional manner.

#3 - Bureau of Community Education, New York City Board of Education, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 10001

Agency Description - The Bureau of Community Education operates a year-round program of recreation activities and adult education in several hundred school centers throughout the City.

Summer Program - The summer project offered an intensification and expansion of its regular program. For young children, it offered 30 vacation day camps with O.E.O. funds, and extension of swimming pool operations in 14 centers. For teenagers and young adults, 52 evening community centers, 15 new vacation day camps, 12 low-income housing centers, 14 swimming pools with expanded programs. The children's vacation day camp innovated more highly structured group activities and a richer program of special services than in the past. For teenagers, the day camps and evening centers included a diversified range of activities, such as sports and games, arts and crafts, music and drama.

Statistics — The program reports an over-all number of registrants in the amount of 44,875, resulting in a total session attendance of 1,002,300. These figures are in addition to the Bureau of Community Education's regular summer program.

Evaluation — There was considerable diversity among the programs observed. Some vacation day camps were housed in fairly new, attractive and well-equipped school buildings. Others were in rundown, even dismal, structures with limited facilities. Some had apparently high morale and attendance; in others there appeared to be poor organization, attendance and morale by comparison. Twenty-eight centers reported active teenage councils that took on responsibility in planning. In six of the housing centers, adults volunteered to assist in developing program activities for teenagers and/or to form advisory councils. The following problems must be identified:

- a) **Staff** — Lateness of notification made it difficult to obtain qualified and capable personnel, as many teachers had been attracted by higher pay elsewhere.
- b) **Indigenous Personnel** — In spite of the Antipoverty Program objective of hiring indigenous personnel, this could not be done due to the personnel requirements of the Board of Education; nor could the neighborhood be involved effectively in planning, mainly because teachers-in-charge were new to the community.
- c) **Facilities** — Several new vacation day camps were either in completely unsuitable buildings or in close proximity to already existing programs.

In general, most of the problems found were related to the late notification of funding and the consequent lack of time for hiring staff and developing programs. With the above reservations in mind, it can be said that the Bureau of Community Education's summer program did succeed in achieving its major objectives.

Recommendations — Many recommendations were made by the roving coordinators of the Bureau. To mention a few which are considered sound by the consultant:

For young children, it was suggested that all Antipoverty vacation day camps should serve school lunches. There is a definite need for teacher in-service education on methods of working with children in deprived areas, on some aspects of guidance, on ways of involving the community, and on the organization and functioning of advisory councils. For teenagers, the use of cultural arts specialists should be increased; more special bus trips should be made available; more equipment and materials (reading and musical) should be provided; programs should be geared to stress the educational aspects, such as beginning orientation or training in appropriate job skills; leadership and responsibility-building experiences should be stressed; vocational advisors and guidance specialists should be provided to work with teenagers in day centers or evening programs, thus implementing the concept of recreation as a threshold experience. While the Bureau did not carry out any major experiment with respect to the involvement of the poor in the neighborhood planning and community organization, it had not been expected to do this. The weaknesses which appeared in the program were, in summary, caused chiefly by three factors:

1) Lateness in notification, 2) the necessity to employ a number of teachers or teachers-in-charge who were automatically qualified for these positions by virtue of teaching certification, but who lacked other qualities or skills desirable for recreation leaders in such a program, and 3) the necessity to establish a large number of new centers, rather than use funds flexibly both to do this and to strengthen existing programs.

#4 — Catholic Charities of Brooklyn, 191 Joralemon Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Agency Description — Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Brooklyn operates programs through the Catholic Youth Organization in Brooklyn and Queens in its many parishes.

Summer Program — In a program called Release Energies Project, Catholic Charities was funded for 6 evening teenage centers, an afternoon and evening gymnasium program and a day camp. The following areas of Brooklyn were to be served: Prospect Heights, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brownsville, Park-Slope, Red Hook and South Brooklyn. The teen centers were open 6 days a week from 6 pm to 11 pm and were one of the summer programs which ran regularly on Saturdays. Various activities, such as sewing, sports and tournaments, arts and crafts, and, in some centers, cooking were the major program offerings. Staff at each center included a director, up to seven paid professionals, depending on the size of the program, and several aides indigenous to the neighborhood who were members of the local parish.

Statistics — A total of 2,856 teenagers were served by a staff of 95, 61 of whom were indigenous to the neighborhoods.

Evaluation — In the 4 Catholic Charities' programs visited, the facilities were being well utilized and were located in a neighborhood where need for such services was very evident. There were planned activities, and for those young people who wanted less structure, there were athletics and the opportunity to just meet and talk. Services were provided on an open-door basis, in an effort extended beyond the parish members. Planning of the Catholic Charities' special summer program was accomplished by calling together parish priests and diocesan representatives to plan programs based upon needs as seen by the clergy. Because of the pressure of time, there was no attempt to consult community leaders, grass-roots leaders, or to get counsel from residents of the areas to be served. The lack of participation by indigenous people constituted a serious weakness in the total project. It had a "doing for" rather than "doing with" quality.

Recommendations — It is evident that future programs must be planned with the communities in which they are located. Efforts must also be made to not only maintain an open-door policy, but attract neighborhood participants who are clearly not parish members. While Catholic Charities did do some preliminary joint planning with Youth in Action, in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, planning another year with all organizations, formal and informal, in the various neighborhoods should be a requirement.

#5 — Catholic Youth Organization — Archdiocese of New York, Inc., 122 East 22nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10010

Agency Description — The CYO is described as a non-sectarian, non-profit recreation and group work agency serving large numbers of children and youth in Manhattan and the Bronx. Although its programs are offered in neighborhood centers, in parish and church halls, with both priests and nuns involved in administrative or leadership roles, there is no religious content to the general recreation and group work program. The majority of individuals serving in supervisory or leadership roles are lay and representative of various faiths.

Summer Program — The summer program expanded and intensified programs in six major CYO centers:

- 1) Cardinal Spellman Center, Lower East Side
- 2) West Side CYO Center, Chelsea
- 3) Kennedy Memorial Community Center, Central Harlem
- 4) Drew-Hamilton CYO Community Center, Central Harlem

- 5) Casita Maria Community Center, Hunts Point Section of Bronx
- 6) Carver Community Center, East Harlem

and 15 smaller parish programs. It included recreation and group work projects designed to relieve tensions, while drawing on indigenous neighborhood leadership in 7 high hazard poverty areas in New York City.

It offered (a) day camp scholarships to children of poverty-stricken families, (b) cultural enrichment for children and youth, (c) training of indigenous teenage or young adult leaders, (d) family-centered activities and (e) a special program for senior citizens. Program activities ranged widely, including regular day camp activities, play street services, athletic leagues, an extensive trip program, a series of amphitheater performances and various forms of cultural participation. Families were involved in carrying out and planning of activities and special events, in many cases actually conducting recreational events for their children. Strong efforts were made to develop indigenous leadership. Almost 90% of all leadership was drawn from the neighborhood where the program was operated.

Statistics – There were 8,062 children, teenagers, young adults, adults and senior citizens involved in 21 separate group work and recreation projects. The Antipoverty grant made it possible to offer a large number of scholarships, thus including children from poverty backgrounds for the first time. This is due to the CYO practice of charging a fee for its day camp which, though moderate in nature, had excluded these children before. As a result, many children from poverty backgrounds were served along with children of higher socio-economic backgrounds. The CYO report indicates that Puerto Ricans and Negroes accounted for approximately 60% of the participation.

Evaluation – The Community Council consultant, on the basis of personal observation and reports submitted, has a strongly favorable reaction to this program. Attendance was consistently high with groups operating enthusiastically under apparently strong leadership. Teenagers and young adults benefited from their training which helped to create in them a strong sense of personal responsibility, as well as provide a summer employment situation. Community relations and parental participation appeared to be good. While, undoubtedly, the program had a special attraction to Catholic children and youth, it did also serve those of other faiths. In the majority of settings the teenagers demonstrated personal involvement and a high level of interest. While this program was in no sense a pioneering or unusual venture, it succeeded in serving a large number of children and youth with intensified and expanded summer recreation programs and a sizeable group with employment and leadership training. These it appeared to accomplish quite successfully.

Recommendations – No specific recommendations are offered, except to note that the director of the Catholic Youth Organization has begun to develop a tentative pilot program to involve youth leadership training in a camping setting and hopes to obtain funding to support this effort. In the judgment of the Community Council consultant, without having seen the proposal outlined in detail, on the basis of the quality of 1965 CYO summer operation, he would recommend that it be given serious attention.

#6 – Chelsea Area Meetings for Planning, 215 West 23rd Street, New York, N.Y.

Agency Description – CHAMP is the local council representing six Chelsea area agencies: McBurney YMCA; CYO West Side Center; Chelsea Community Center at P.S. 11; St. Peter's Church; Guadalupe Church; Hudson Guild. CHAMP coordinates and plans programs for the Chelsea area on an inter-agency basis. It acts as a clearing house for problems and problem groups and helps in the exchange of referrals in the Chelsea community.

Summer Program – The program was designed for youngsters ages 8-18, but also involved parents and families in some activities. The major emphasis was on athletic activities such as a softball league and swimming meets; also special trips, a teenage dance, a family outing. In addition, 25 teenagers met regularly during the summer to establish a committee to set up a teen coffee shop in Chelsea. This activity eventually culminated in a Chelsea All-Teen Conference at the end of the summer. Beside the six member agencies, an additional 12 agencies in the area participated in some of the programs.

Statistics – It is estimated that CHAMP involved 4,000 persons during the summer's ten-week program, while it reached and worked directly with 1,769 people. The dichotomy between the two figures is the result of a large community involvement, such as attendance at dances and one-shot outings, particularly those which involved parents, as well as children. CHAMP functioned under one coordinator and teen aides, assisted by community aides, some volunteers and seven Neighborhood Youth Corps teenagers. The staff recruited children for the programs through canvassing the neighborhood and visiting parents.

Evaluation – The CHAMP program was delayed in starting because of the problems of funding which we have described elsewhere. It was, however, able to offer 10 weeks as planned by continuing later than expected. Because the various activities involved the cooperation of so many agencies at many different locations, it was not possible to observe any program per se. Thus, the main source of information was a close working relationship with the President of CHAMP, a professional group worker. It is recognized that because of the specific community situation in the Chelsea-Clinton area, there may have been some overlapping of services in this part of the City. In spite of this, however, it is the feeling of CHAMP that not all children who needed service were reached. For example, they uncovered a totally unserved area between 14th and 18th Streets, west of Eighth Avenue. While CHAMP was funded as one agency, it is not possible to evaluate it as such, since in reality it only exists on paper and represents the activity of six different organizations. Furthermore, some of the agencies belonging to CHAMP also belonged to the West Side Association of Community Centers (#29) which was also funded for a variety of projects and which will be discussed elsewhere. In spite of these limitations, it is felt that CHAMP rendered an important service in a neighborhood which houses many poor people and offers, generally, services geared to the middle classes. CHAMP does not claim to have reached mainly new clients. On the other hand, these clients were poor and unserved, since there had never before been this type of summer program in Chelsea.

Recommendations – It would seem from the Chelsea experience this summer, that this area might well profit from a close examination as to the needs of its poverty stricken population. It would also appear that the existence of a plethora of social services in an area does not necessarily mean that the poor are being served. The CHAMP final report listed 17 different recommendations, relating to the needs of the area and covering such programs as the performing arts, interagency athletics, training programs for school drop-outs, a centralized employment service for teenagers, the need for a neighborhood council and a teenage council, the lack of services to teenage girls, the lack of services during weekends to all children, and children with special problems in particular, the need for more playground space, the need for a cooperative volunteer bureau to centralize efforts and finally the need for a full-time, year-round coordinator for CHAMP. These are seen as sound recommendations.

#7 – The Community Council of Greater New York, 225 Park Avenue South, N.Y. 10003

Agency Description – The Community Council of Greater New York is the central facility through which more than 1000 public and voluntary social agencies seek to coordinate their efforts more effectively to serve the health and welfare needs of the City's eight million people. It has 23 corporate members who number the 1000 organizations as their members.

Summer Program – The Community Council was funded to establish a Consultation Unit to coordinate the summer program through the use of five consultants, charged with facilitating the work of the operating organizations. The aim was maximum utilization of existing resources, objective assessment of the program's impact and the development of plans which apply the lessons learned during the summer for more effective continuing service.

Statistics – The Council unit was composed of a chief consultant, four consultants and a secretary. No direct service was given.

Evaluation – As discussed in the body of the report, the consultants were assigned to the 32 operating organizations in relation to their available time, interests and experience. Contacts were immediately made with administrators, and the problems which the organizations had were given priority. Early in the summer these related largely to administrative procedures which had to be carried out in order to receive funds. A number of budgets were changed in minor respects, after clearance with the Office of Economic Opportunity. In some instances entire program components were added or deleted, since conditions had changed since proposals were submitted in May. In all of these situations the consultants functioned in an advisory and expediting capacity, interpreting the needs of organizations to the Economic Opportunity Committee and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and interpreting public policy to the operating organizations. Later in the summer more time was spent in an assessment of the quality of activities offered, and suggestions were made for variation and enrichment where deemed necessary.

The time factor made it imperative that consultants establish relationships quickly and that they offer their services in such a manner that they could and would be accepted. The danger was that administrators might consider their presence as interference and threat. In so far as it is possible for the unit to make an objective evaluation, the consultants found their relationships generally sound and helpful to operating personnel. There was a wide range in the degree of acceptance, balanced by a range in the need for help by the groups. Small, indigenous organizations required much more time and direct intervention at times to facilitate decision making.

Reporting by organizations at the end of the summer varied in quality and volume. The two basic instruments used were the Program Description Form and Memorandum #2 (see appendix). The final report of the consultant unit was composed jointly by the five members and will be distributed to all funded organizations.

Recommendations – The urgent need for consultation to agencies carrying out community action projects was established, it is believed, and should be continued. Advantages were felt to accrue from the fact that the consultant unit was not physically and organically a part of the Economic Opportunity Committee, which had a different role to perform, as the funding agency. It is recommended that the consultant role continue to be carried out from outside the poverty program and that the unit be established early enough to participate in the planning period for the summer program. It is also recommended that cognizance be paid to the special problems faced by indigenous groups and that they receive special consultant help, both before funding and during the operational period.

#8 – Council of Puerto Rican and Hispanic Organizations of the Lower East Side, 16 Clinton Street, New York 10002

Agency Description – The Council of Puerto Rican and Hispanic Organizations of the Lower East Side is composed of twenty-four member groups comprising neighborhood, home town and civic groups, as well as a merchants' association. The Council's year-round activities are concerned with educating its member-

ship on community issues and coordinating both organizations and individuals active in public matters concerning the community. It also conducts programs in home management and consumer education with volunteer instruction. The Council was encouraged to form by Mobilization for Youth, which still provides staff services to it.

Summer Program – The summer program was funded for courses in leadership training, consumer education and home management, and an entirely new component to the organization called Parent-Child Relations program. The latter began in August. In one facet of the program nine neighborhood residents were trained to offer individual services on an aggressive, reaching-out basis to families referred by churches, other agencies and Council members. These indigenous workers were trained for two weeks to be able to make concrete suggestions as to available resources for help with many problems. They then would help the clients (their neighbors) to use the appropriate resource.

Statistics – Unfortunately there was little time in which to establish an ambitious projected program after funding arrangements were completed, and there are no definitive statistics indicating the number of families reached. A total population figure of 400 has been arrived at, with 10 indigenous staff paid, including a director and nine neighborhood case aides. The Council also played a role in formation of the Puerto Rican Cultural Association (see Summary #34).

Evaluation – The Council's activities were delayed in starting and less than wholly successful. The consumer education component had difficulty in employing a staff member. The leadership development program proceeded as planned but was not outstanding. The new and imaginative program to train neighborhood case aides was carried out, but with the short time span and lack of criteria for judgment, it is difficult to evaluate its success. The Council did offer its course opportunities to its member organizations, but there was no evidence of the offer being taken advantage of. The Council was a very important part of the new Cultural Association and a somewhat controlling force in its development. It had engendered considerable hostility among some of its regular member organizations who did not consider it truly indigenous. The summer experience did not serve to resolve these feelings.

Recommendations – With proper safeguards so that the neighborhood case aide service does not extend beyond the competence of its staff, this could be developed into a valuable experiment, although not unique. The original idea consists in sponsorship by a community-based cultural association, rather than a Mobilization for Youth or an established family agency. Skilled professional help would seem to be necessary in the training phase and for consultation, if not supervision. The Council must also mend its fences with its own members, who feel it is anxious to dominate them.

#9 – Federation of Puerto Rican Organizations of Brownsville, Inc., 395 Livonia Avenue, Apt. 4C, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Agency Description – The Federation of Puerto Rican Organizations of Brownsville is a loosely organized group of independent, local Puerto Rican organizations which was established in 1964. No office or telephone is maintained, and the business of the organization is conducted from the home of the president. A Board of Directors and an Executive Committee meet at intervals to make policy for the group, whose purpose is to coordinate the various non-profit associations representing the Puerto Rican community.

Summer Program – The proposal submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity contained a number of ideas for helping the Puerto Rican residents of the area, through remedial reading programs for children, a child care program for mothers who had to go to the Welfare Department or hospital clinics, etc., a Young Adult Club, community film program, a library, adult English classes and high school

equivalency test instruction, as well as civil service. Also a housing clinic, consumer cooperative and family outing program. Only a part of these components was funded, and not all the components for which funds were granted were able to be launched. Only half of the total grant of \$2300 was actually picked up by the Federation.

Statistical Report – A total of 75 people were actually reached by the programs of the Federation this summer, including 40 adults and 35 children under 12, for whom a child care program was operated. There was a total of ten indigenous people employed on a part-time basis during the summer, in the children's program and as instructors in the civil service and high school equivalency preparation courses.

Evaluation – It must be said that the program of the Federation hardly got started this summer and lacked any administrative organization or strong leadership. In the limited time available it was not possible for the consultant to help train those who might develop into leaders. Unfortunate choice of one individual by the organization, charged with carrying out responsibilities, made for dissension and charges and counter-charges. The child care program was impoverished from every point of view – facilities, staff, equipment, reliability, etc. Only the need was rich, and unmet. While the classes for adults in high school equivalency and civil service examination preparation did take place part of the summer, attendance was bad, and there is real question concerning the quality of the instruction.

Recommendations – The consultants came in contact with no more needy area or group this summer than that encountered in Brownsville. It is therefore recommended that priority be given to the establishment of a battery of needed services, with adequate funding and consultation. The Federation of Puerto Rican Organizations can provide the starting point from which to begin to work with the Spanish-speaking community of Brownsville. While the community should be the decision-maker concerning what it needs and wants, it is clear that it cannot reach these decisions without skillful and extensive help.

#10 – Fort Greene Navy Yard Youth Program, Inc., 108 St. Edward Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11205

Agency Description – The neighborhood served by the Fort Greene Navy Yard program is made up primarily of a series of city low-rent housing projects. Much negative publicity has been in the press in recent years concerning mugging, juvenile delinquency and rape in that area of Brooklyn. The situation is much improved at the present time.

There are many youth-serving agencies in the area, and 12 organizations got together to form a coordinating unit called the Fort Greene Navy Yard Program.

Summer Program – The program as funded and carried out was a coordinating body for the 12 member organizations to coordinate the youth programs in the area and to plan and carry out cooperative programs for all youth.

Staff included a project director, 1 secretary, 1 community organizer, 1 bookkeeper, 1 custodian and 44 older teens and adults indigenous to the area. A central office was set up in a store front on Myrtle Avenue to house the director and his staff.

Cooperative programs planned and carried out by the Fort Greene Navy Yard Youth Program were the following:

1. The Official Grand Opening Ceremony of the new office took place.

2. An area-wide youth council composed of representatives from the member agencies was established.
3. A basketball tournament between the member agencies was organized and run.
4. Employment aid for youth and adults resulting in 200 jobs was furnished.
5. The Fort Greene Navy Yard Area Youth Rally and Parade was carried out.

Statistics – Combined registration of the member agencies is 5,261 children. Within the area there are two day camps run by mothers which provide service to 400 younger children. 1,943 teenagers and 2,264 children were served during the summer with staff reported as including 17 indigenous workers.

Evaluation – The Fort Greene Navy Yard Youth Program did an excellent job of coordinating the youth serving organizations in the area. Recreational activities were well planned and coordinated and had high appeal to the young people.

Recommendations – It is recommended that an expanded program of vocational guidance, cultural experience and remedial education be the objective of any future program, to provide a well-rounded service to the area. The Fort Greene Navy Yard Youth Program should seek an active relationship with the Board of Education, the Police Athletic League and other organizations serving youth in its area. The concept of an over-all coordinating body for agencies serving a close geographic area is sound and should be encouraged. In its future planning, it should also include recipients of service, as well as organization officials of its member agencies.

#11 – Bloomingdale Neighborhood Recreation Committee, 310 Riverside Drive, New York

Agency Description – The Bloomingdale Neighborhood Recreation Committee is affiliated with the Bloomingdale Neighborhood Conservation Association, Inc. and is part of the Neighborhood Conservation Bureau of the Housing and Redevelopment Board. This program is concerned with housing and tenant education, code enforcement, health and safety, neighborhood improvement and the development of community groups.

Summer Program – The summer program was designed to contribute to the development of a recreational and cultural program for the parents and the children involved in the Bloomingdale Family Program. It covered the area between 96th and 110th Streets, between Central Park West and Riverside Drive. The program was located in a marginal playground in Central Park near 100th Street and Central Park West and included in its program such activities as arts and crafts, cultural enrichment through trips, and exposure to the performing arts, discussion groups, etc.

Statistical Report – The BNRC estimates that it has dealt with 1300 children who visited the playground in the park, but its many activities were centered on the 300 parents with whom the staff worked, 85% of whom were estimated to be newly reached. The program ran for eight weeks, as planned.

Evaluation – In spite of many hurdles, Bloomingdale can be said to have run a successful program this summer. The problems it had to deal with were mainly due to the fact that the marginal playground on which the program was located had no comfort station. A prohibitive amount of time, effort and energy was spent by the Project Director and the Community Council consultant in trying to convince the Park Department that the best solution to this problem would be the installation of a portable toilet (Port-O-San). These efforts were to no avail, and the Department remained adamant, the position being that "such a facility would be unsightly and unsanitary." Through a combination of misinterpretations and unclear communications, the Port-O-San facility was installed outside the playground after the project had suffered greatly for two weeks.

#15 - The Negro Action Group, 115 Pitt Street, New York 10002

Agency Description - The Negro Action Group is an organization of residents of the Lower East Side who primarily live in low-income public housing projects between Houston and 13th Streets and in tenements nearby. The organization was initiated with the aid of Mobilization for Youth and still receives staff assistance from that agency. The regular year-round activities are directed towards developing good community relationships between ethnic groups in the area, and the group participates in social action issues of importance to the community, while stimulating the development of Negro leadership.

Summer Program - The Negro Action Group provided a day camp experience this summer for approximately sixty neighborhood children with the support of O.E.O. funds. The camp was located in a public school building on Delancey Street and was directed by a teacher who had been employed by the group. There were 15 indigenous volunteers helping the 4 paid group leaders, and activities were carried on five days a week, with many trips and, later in the summer, family trips on Saturdays.

Statistics - A total of 175 people were served through the day camp activity, including 40 young children and 20 teenagers. Seventy-two adults were involved in various roles as aides, on trips and in their parent responsibilities in relation to the day camp. A total of 9 paid staff were employed, 4 of whom were from the immediate neighborhood, and 15 indigenous volunteers contributed their time.

Evaluation - This first attempt by a small indigenous group to operate a complicated day camp operation was a worthy one, if less than ideal. There was a very school-like quality to the operation, a rigidity in the atmosphere of the class-rooms which can perhaps be attributed to their locale and a strong desire on the part of the group to succeed in the eyes of a critical community. The Negro Action Group itself tried to dissociate itself from the day camp at first and insist that it operate as a separate entity, when it most needed the group's counsel and support. Toward the end of the summer some success was achieved in closing this breach. A new direction was given to the program when parents were involved programmatically, and success was achieved when more than 70 of them, including some fathers, went on a Saturday trip with the day camp. As a result, the organization began to plan the development of a year-round program aimed at strengthening the family as a unit.

Recommendations - The Negro Action Group should continue to receive staff help to develop its program to strengthen the family as a unit, since this is a new and untried area of great importance in the poverty effort here and elsewhere. The fact that the attempt is being made by an indigenous group which is rapidly learning to develop its own leadership and program makes it even more important that the emerging self-help attributes be nurtured.

#16 - New York City Housing Authority, 250 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10007

Agency Description - The New York City Housing Authority manages City, State and Federally-financed housing projects in which more than 500,000 New Yorkers live. In almost every project there are community facilities constructed for the use of tenants and the surrounding community residents.

Summer Program - The summer request of the Authority to the Office of Economic Opportunity was for funds to expand recreation and education staff in 16 of the centers which were seriously undermanned and for which there are no private agency sponsors. The grant was to "expand and intensify leisure hours programs of recreational activities." Special emphasis was placed on evening and weekend programming. All of the 16 community centers were in projects located in designated poverty areas.

Statistical Report - A statistical analysis of the 16 Housing Authority programs indicates that almost all of them were of a day camp, teen canteen, athletic or cultural enrichment-trip nature. The 8,149 people served broke down into 3,646 between the ages of one and twelve, 2,608 teenagers and 1,895 adults. Approximately half of the participants had not been previously reached by the community centers.

Evaluation - The program visited by the consultant combined with the narrative reports submitted, indicated routine community center operation, but when one realizes that there was no program whatever in some of the projects and therefore no staff background of knowledge of community and residents, this is understandable. Were the Authority notified of available funds sufficiently in advance, there would be no doubt that tenants could be actively involved in determining program and decision making. There is no question of the urgent need for the community centers to be adequately staffed on a year-round basis. Further, there would seem to be a need for more outreach into the community on the part of staff, to utilize existing resources more fully and to promote an exchange between project population and surrounding residents. This requires consistent, skilled staff committed to working with the indigenous population and with a knowledge of community organization techniques.

Recommendations - There is no question but that the Housing Authority should be funded again for summer programs in those areas where it is unable to secure private agency sponsorship or operate centers with its own funds. Low income public housing projects contain substantial numbers of tenants who qualify for the poverty program, and all housing centers work as well with the surrounding community. It is in this area that there was perceptible weakness this summer, as indicated; more emphasis should be placed on community planning with other organizations. Also, activities which touch the problems of poverty more significantly than does a pure social and recreational program should be encouraged.

#17 - New York City Mission Society, 105 East 22nd Street, New York, N.Y.

Agency Description - While the Mission Society was the official sponsor of this program, called "Teenagers Serve Their Community", it was really within the purview of the Metro North Citizens Committee. It was part of the Community Rehabilitation Program already underway in the Metro North area, which serves 96th to 107th Streets, from Lexington Avenue to the East River Drive.

Summer Program - This was an expansion of a grass roots activity in the area in a recreational and educational program for children and teenagers under indigenous leadership. 35 neighborhood teenagers, boys and girls, were selected and employed to act under the supervision of Metro North's staff in a variety of activities: job training, which included craft skills, clerical skills, street-crossing guards, tutoring children, recreational and athletic activities (Little League Baseball Clubs), community organization and housing. In addition, some of the youngsters were selected for two weeks' out-of-town work-camp training and taught practical skills, which they then put to use in service to the community upon return.

Statistical Report - The organization estimates that it reached 1,900 people during the summer in a variety of activities, 246 of whom are teenagers and 415 are children. It employed 38 indigenous staff, 35 of whom were the main recipients of this program and being paid to serve the community while being trained as leaders. Because this is not a new program, they claim realistically to have reached no more than 50% people not reached before.

Evaluation - The City Mission program must be characterized as a truly original approach to the problems of a poor and delinquent neighborhood. The area in which it operates has long been known as one having high incidence of almost every social and health problem. The concept which envisages training young

people to serve their own neighborhood has now been applied in this area for five years, and it has yielded impressive dividends in leadership development and in physical and social improvements in the community. This summer was no exception. The infusion of a variety of social services over the years has had its effect, but it is the involvement of the residents, youth and adults, which has made this area a community within the urban mass society. One must also recognize the strong leadership which has been developed, as evidenced in the work of Ramon Diaz, an indigenous social worker, developed with the inspired direction and dedication of the Rev. Norman Eddy.

Recommendation – The highly successful summer program led to the recommendation that a modified form be funded through the winter. The principle which it is important to support is that if teenagers are respected and trusted to carry out really useful jobs, they will usually rise to the occasion. The program proves that youngsters growing up in the most deprived areas can be helped to develop a sense of dignity and purpose, if they feel needed and constructively involved.

#18 – New York City Youth Board, 79 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Agency Description – The New York City Youth Board is the official City agency whose charge it is to detect and prevent delinquency, and "has dedicated itself to the welfare and protection of the city's youth." Its summer proposals represent the expansion of program responsibilities that could not be carried out without additional staff and funds. The one exception to the concept of expansion was a new project called the Careers Development Program.

Summer Program – The program was divided into four component parts: the aforementioned Careers Development Program, the Block Coordination Program, the Cultural and Special Events Program, and the New York City Exploration Program. The Careers Development Program was new in that it worked specifically with girls and with mothers on Welfare, and young children mostly belonging to those families. The intention was to broaden the horizons of the mothers and girls through a variety of approaches (not necessarily related to each other): trips, cultural experiences, and the teaching of vocational skills. The youngsters were involved in a Day Camp Program. The Block Coordination Program ran in eight different locations in combination with Play Streets. The Exploration Program served all five boroughs without any specific geographical location. The Cultural Enrichment program expanded the existing program of dances and community events.

Statistical Report – The agency reports that it served a total number of 84,500 people, 25,000 of whom comprise a conservative estimate of audiences only, engaged in dances and block parties all over the City. It employed 144 indigenous teenagers in a variety of jobs and served about 17,500 youngsters below the age of 20.

Evaluation – This program suffered a great many setbacks because of the difficulties it had in getting its money from the City, a problem due mainly to the fact that it is a City agency. Therefore, staff had the handicap – as did all other organizations – of starting two weeks late, but, in addition they had to operate for the next 3 ½ weeks on the resources of the staff and credit cards. Considering that some of the programs were projected around the availability of cash – for example, taking youngsters to lunch and teaching them how to order, pay and tip (an integral part of the Careers Development Program) or paying for bus or train fares ahead (as part of the Exploration Program) – the lack of money became a serious problem. The insecurity generated led some staff to leave the program earlier than expected, and many adjustments had to be made throughout the summer. In spite of this, the Careers Program did proceed as planned, and can be considered a success, so much so that the agency is planning to continue it in a modified form through the winter. The Block Coordination Program was successful where-

ever good leadership was available, and less so where this was not the case. The more successful block programs will be continued throughout the winter, in order not to lose the momentum gained. While the Youth Board encountered many problems this summer, it is felt that it and many youngsters gained from the experience and that the involvement of temporary staff may have added in many ways to its insight and adaptability.

Recommendation – It is recommended that this agency's experience in working with teenagers be used again next summer. The preparation for the program should be made well ahead of time. In addition, the manner in which the funds are to be handled by the City and transferred to the Youth Board must be decided upon before funding. It is also recommended that the summer program coordinator for the agency be employed before the rest of the staff, so that there can be cohesion and administrative communication before the activities start.

#19 – The Play Schools Association, Inc., 120 West 57 Street, New York, N.Y. 10019

Agency Description – The Play Schools Association is a voluntary agency working closely with public and private agencies to provide constructive play experiences for school-age children after school and during the summer. As a consultant, standard setting and training agency, it conducts a pilot program in two year-round laboratory centers, doing research on programming for children of various ages and in various disability groupings.

Summer Program – The summer program focused on the need to work with parents in disadvantaged areas, offering two parent workshops in various recreation activities: general recreation; homemaking and cultural activities; leadership aid program; a parent education and discussion program and intensified counseling services. Programs were located in P. S. 42 in the Bronx and P. S. 19 in Queens (Corona Elmhurst). Each center had a project director, program specialist, two social workers, 12 parent aides, clerical workers, specialist teachers, etc.

Statistical Report – Two hundred and eighty-two individual families or households participated in the program. Of these, 113 families had been involved in the regular Play School program before. Ten percent of the total group were public assistance families. The over-all number of children reported in the families involved is 428.

Evaluation – This program was successful in involving a substantial number of adults. One of the centers appeared to be markedly more successful than the other. While the target of the program was to be families drawn from the poverty population, statistics indicating that only thirty out of 282 families served were on public assistance suggest that this goal may not have been reached. The most successful elements appeared to be the trips and outings around the City, including those to cultural events; the Parent Room, with special interests and activities; bazaars, exhibits and special luncheons. The schedule of weekly workshops originally proposed was too rigid and inflexible. However, each of the centers developed family nights and special workshops based on the interests of their participants. The leadership aide program appeared to function well. While the element of pay was undoubtedly one of its attractions, it would appear, based on the high level of interest shown by the aides, that they felt it was a meaningful and important experience for them.

Recommendation – The program, should, if renewed, be approved and funded at a much earlier point. Because of the lateness of notification, it was extremely difficult to obtain professional staff. The effectiveness of the program in reaching the hard-core poverty group, and involving them in its planning and conduct more fully, must be reviewed. If there were any serious weaknesses of the program, they lay in this area. Based on the groundwork established this summer, it should be possible to achieve each of these goals more fully another year.

#20 – The Police Athletic League, Inc., 34½ East 12 Street, New York 10003.

Agency Description – The Police Athletic League is a private agency and is sponsored by the Youth Division of the Police Department for the provision of recreation and social services to neglected areas. It operates year-round community centers and playstreet programs during the summer.

Summer Program – The P.A.L. expanded its summer playstreet operation by fifty streets with O.E.O. funds this summer. A Playmobile program was also funded, but the agency was unable to implement this component because of the tardy funding, except for one armobile which operated in Brooklyn. Of the fifty playstreets, 13 were located in the Bronx, 4 in Queens, 15 in Manhattan, 17 in Brooklyn and 1 in Staten Island. A few of these streets were not new, having been operated by P.A.L. in 1964, but they had been dropped in this year's regular program planning for lack of funds. Funds not expended in the Playmobile program were used for some weekend activities at the end of the summer and also to extend the playstreet program to September 10 from August 28.

Statistical Report – It is almost impossible to give a definitive count of the activity in a playstreet program, but the agency estimates that the fifty streets financed by the O.E.O. served 10,000 youngsters on an ongoing or consistent basis, including approximately 5,800 children between 1 and 12 years of age and 4,200 teenagers. Of a staff of 46, twenty were indigenous personnel.

Evaluation – Because the agency was notified of funding at such a late date, all regular staff had been hired and trained. This presented a problem in recruiting and training additional staff for the fifty streets. The problem was solved by hiring many underqualified, indigenous poor who proved to be fairly suitable. Training was accomplished through assigning new people to experienced block directors for a week. Where inexperienced personnel were not paired with experienced people, blocks were not as well organized. Immediate supervision was not as helpful around program content as it might have been, limiting itself, by and large, to administrative details. Playground centers in the Bronx seemed well utilized, and participants were heavily involved in programs. The director of the Bronx and Queens Boroughs was very competent.

Recommendations – Workers in the playstreets and playground centers should be helped to be more alert to social problems, and some system should be set up for helping recreation leaders to assist people to get the needed services. There would seem to be an opportunity for developing a much more qualitative service from the excellent vantage point which the workers on the blocks have. This will require advance planning and working together with other neighborhood resources, much of which could not occur this summer because of tardy notification of funding. The agency should be utilized another summer.

#21 – Prospect Heights Neighborhood Program, 466 Sterling Place, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Agency Description – The Prospect Heights Neighborhood Association, Inc. is a cooperative venture which brings together citizens of the neighborhood and the skills and resources of public and private agencies to make the community a better place to live. The program is administered by a Board of Directors with a staff of director, assistant director, a community organizer and a secretary.

Summer Program – The summer program consisted of a day camp on wheels for 50 boys and girls from 11 to 13 years and a drop-in lounge for 50 to 75 boys and girls from 13 to 18. The day camp program provided daily trips of a recreational and cultural nature and utilized a staff of a director, four counselors and four indigenous counselor aides. Recreation, social and cultural experiences were provided at the evening drop-in lounge. A social worker-director was in charge with the aid of a specialist in arts and crafts and a specialist in music and dance. A maximum of six neighborhood aides were approved

for the lounge. Prospect Heights Neighborhood Association also administered a Headstart Program for 30 pupils and a remedial reading program for another 15.

Statistics – The Program served 200 youngsters, 130 of whom were teenagers. Out of a staff of 18, 11 were indigenous. It is estimated that 70% of its youth had not been reached before.

Evaluation – New, previously unserved children were involved in the Prospect Heights program which was generally well run and well attended. Overlap in service existed in the summer programs in the Prospect Heights area that should in future be avoided. Including the Day Camp on Wheels, there were three known programs for the 6 to 12 year old group in the area, and within the same area there were three teen centers. The staff of Prospect Heights found the Day Camp on Wheels difficult to administer effectively and somewhat disappointing in content.

Recommendations – The community might be better served by Prospect Heights if the agency expanded a summer remedial reading program and developed an adult program to achieve greater involvement of parents and other low-income adults in recreation, education and employment counseling. Such a program would provide a better balance of services to the people of the community, and the PHNP appears to have the skill and community support to be effective.

#22 – The Puerto Rican Action Group, 16 Clinton Street, New York 10002

The Puerto Rican Action Group, which received a grant of \$300, turned over this entire amount to the Puerto Rican Cultural Association, with the permission of the Office of Economic Opportunity. For details of the Cultural Association, please see Appendix, Summary #34.

#23 – The Puerto Rican Athletic League, 749 Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive, New York 10002

The Puerto Rican Athletic League, which received a grant of \$100, turned over this entire amount to the Puerto Rican Cultural Association, with the permission of the Office of Economic Opportunity. For details of the Cultural Association, please see Appendix, Summary #34.

#24 – Tilden Day Camp, 5711 Tilden Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Agency Description – Tilden Day Camp is a special Fee Day Camp operated under the auspices of the New York City Board of Education and using Bureau of Community Education Personnel. It is located in a neighborhood of one or two-family homes near the Tilden High School and the Meyer Levin Junior High School. The camp provides a full day's program for children age 6 to 14. Groups determined by age number approximately 16 to 17 members, with a regular counselor and other specialists when needed.

Summer Program – The program proposed to "grant summer scholarships to the children of poverty-stricken families . . . Additional funds . . . will permit us to accept approximately 100 additional children from deprived areas". Tilden Day Camp charges a normal fee of \$140.- for a full two months season. Prior to the Summer Recreation funding there had been a scholarship fund which granted 80 half scholarships (1 month) to children of poor families.

Statistical Report – The O.E.O. summer grant served an overall number of 102 children – 21 full season and 80 half season – up and above the Camp's regular program. The parent's scholarship committee selected the children in the Anti-Poverty program as it does all scholarship applicants, in consultation with school administrators who knew the children. There were 57 families represented whose incomes were under \$3000.-; of these many had more than one child in the day camp.

Evaluation – Based on the consultant's observation, discussions with staff and some conversations with participants, Tilden Day Camp appeared to be a well operated summer program with high quality leadership and facilities (with the exception that park and natural outdoor surroundings were not used). The O.E.O. program represented chiefly an extension of needed recreational services to children from areas of extreme poverty and was successful in terms of its specific purpose. Its most unique element was that it served large numbers of Negro children (3 or 4 in each group) who had previously been involved in a school integration bus program, and who now were also involved in social and recreational programs with white middle-class children with whom they had gone to school.

Recommendations – For this program to be most effective the following suggestions are offered:

1. Earlier notification of grant.
2. A more intensive effort to recruit large numbers of heretofore unreached children from the most deprived adjacent areas of the city.
3. A modification of the Board of Education licensing requirement or possibly the establishment of a non-licensed sub-professional category of group leader to permit the hiring of indigenous personnel.
4. Fuller involvement of parents in program planning and activities.

#25 – Two Bridges Summer Remedial Reading Program, 99 Madison St., New York 10002

Agency Description – The Two Bridges Neighborhood Council was established in 1952 as the coordinating group for more than twenty public and private organizations serving the health, education, welfare and religious needs of the residents of the area between and around the approaches to the Brooklyn and Manhattan bridges on the Lower East Side. The Council's activities have included year-round athletic programs, coordination of efforts and social action in health, housing, education, civil rights, delinquency control and social and physical planning of the community.

Summer Program – The Remedial Reading Program of the Council was developed during the winter of 1965 by a committee of neighbors and professionals and presented to the Anti Poverty Operations Board in March. In June it was added to the Summer Recreation Program. This year marked the third reading program sponsored by the Council during the summer, but the proposal differed in that it was much more qualitative in its design and anticipated reaching many more children than hitherto. The three major facets of the proposal were intensive, daily reading help to children, carefully planned work with the parents of these youngsters in workshop sessions, and clinical measurement of the progress of all child participants, as well as help to those with severe problems. The latter component could not be instituted, because it was found impossible to secure the necessary trained staff after late notification of funding.

Statistical Report – In all, 423 youngsters were served, including 173 Spanish-speaking, 123 English and 127 Chinese. Each child came for two hours a day from July 6 through August 20, or a total of 64 hours of intensive reading help in individual and small group sessions. Each of twenty classes was staffed by an experienced public school teacher, a trained teenage tutor (paid by the program) and from one to three additional volunteers. Fridays were reserved for a trip program with neighborhood agencies for the children and the parent workshop sessions for the parents. These latter were carried on in three languages, English, Spanish and Chinese. One hundred sixty parents took advantage of this opportunity.

Evaluation – The intense involvement of the children and the devotion of the teaching staff of the Remedial Reading program were unusual. Youngsters seldom looked up from their work when a visiting adult walked into the room. Attendance was excellent throughout the session, despite the temptations of

trips and camps. A complete evaluation of the reading progress made had not yet been made, but it was obvious that a great many children gained. There are extensive plans for follow-up this fall with the schools from which the children came. While there was little service-recipient participation in the planning of the project, since it was highly technical and began in January 1965, the children and parents served represented families in need because of poverty, unfamiliarity with English (recent immigrants) and youngsters who, if not helped to read, would surely represent the next generation of those to be served by a poverty program. In all, this program was excellent. The parent involvement through workshop sessions was highly successful.

Recommendation – The Two Bridges Neighborhood Council has requested that the program, in an attenuated form, be continued throughout the year. This request is made with the thought that the gains made this summer could be consolidated and that the strengths and weaknesses of the program could be used as guides for similar efforts by other communities. It is recommended that the basic program be continued, experimenting with different ways of carrying it out during the school year and encouraging the use of library and reading generally. Parents should continue to be met with, and the recipients of service should be involved in the decision-making process, including planning.

#26 – United Hispanic Movement, 196 East 3 Street, New York 10009

Agency Description – The United Hispanic Movement is a small voluntary association of Puerto Rican and other Spanish-speaking people on the Lower East Side, 95% of whom are welfare recipients. Their year-round program is almost entirely directed toward the problems of relationship with the Department of Welfare and informing themselves about the benefits to which they are entitled. Mobilization for Youth provides advisory staff service and paid the rent for their storefront headquarters for six months. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Migration Division, also provides some advisory services.

Summer Program – The Summer Program was funded for three sewing machines, some materials, and a home management consultant to conduct a course. The \$200 for the latter cost was contributed to the Puerto Rican Cultural Association budget, and arrangements were made for the Movement's members to take the similar course offered by the Council of Puerto Rican Organizations. (See Appendix, Summary #34, for details).

Statistics – The sewing machine course was delayed until early September because the volunteer instructor was on vacation and arrangements had to be made to secure the storefront before the machines could be purchased. Insurance companies were unwilling to insure, and the Movement did not have money enough for machines, security, etc. These complicated arrangements occupied almost the entire summer, in excellent process and decision-making by the group. In addition, the members were so hungry for recreation opportunities denied in their proposal by the O.E.O. that they ran two benefit luncheons at which they raised almost \$100, with food donated. This money was used to plan a World's Fair trip for entire families.

Evaluation – The process engaged in by this small, deprived group of welfare recipients was the essence of grass roots self-determination, and the dignity realized from their successes should lead to further gains. Even though the sewing classes only started at the end of the summer, they will continue. The hurdles faced were largely overcome, and the Movement was the only organization to engage in self-help to the extent of raising funds to replace those denied them in their original proposal. The fund-raising luncheons were outstanding for their success, their esprit and cooperation, and their cheerful defiance of being considered by society generally as being "on the bottom", on Welfare.

Recommendation – Because the Movement is, so far as is known, unique in being an association composed

almost entirely of welfare recipients determined to make the best of their lot and assure themselves and their families of dignity, self-respect and everything to which they are entitled under the law, they should be encouraged and supported, while not dissuaded from asserting their independence, as far as feasible, of public sources of help. Data from the experience with the group can become an important source of new ideas for ending dependence among welfare recipients and suggestions for modifications in welfare policy.

#27 - United Neighborhood Houses of New York, 114 East 32 Street, New York 10016

Agency Description - United Neighborhood Houses is the city-wide federation of more than fifty settlement centers in New York. It provides the settlements with a forum for the exchange of ideas and information, coordinates joint action, helps develop new programs and speaks for the settlements in seeking needed social reform.

Summer Program - During the summer, United Neighborhood Houses had twenty-nine agencies operating thirty-eight separate components of the Summer Program funded by the O.E.O. In addition, United Neighborhood Houses itself carried out three programs which involved all the member agencies: a teen conference involving more than 400 in preparation and participation, a performing arts evening in which 90 youth performed, and a job readiness trip for 26 teens. All of the activities under the United Neighborhood Houses grant were focused on teenagers.

Statistical Report - A total of 5,531 were served in activities which had a wide and varied content, as seen in the statistical table. Educational activities were the most common, with 30 components. Cultural enrichment activities included 24 programs. Twenty-one canteen/lounges operated. Only 9 programs had a strong athletic focus. Twelve programs carried out training in vocational skills, and there were 7 community action components. In the city-wide program there were only four agencies which involved teenagers in community action, including U.N.H. An over-all average of 42% of those reached by U.N.H. members had never been served before by the settlements. A number of program components were new to the individual houses, but this does not show up in the statistical table, because when the agency as a whole is considered, the particular activity is not original.

Evaluation - While it is difficult to characterize 38 programs in a few words, by far the majority of the U.N.H. components were carried out well. Some of the plans revealed new and original ideas, and this can be attributed in part to the fact that United Neighborhood Houses has encouraged and financed to a limited extent similar summer efforts for the past six years. The programs offered by U.N.H. give evidence of the seriousness of their effort to have an impact on the youth served, to increase their ability to cope with life and its problems through "upgrading".

Recommendations - With time for planning in future summers, the settlements should improve the content and staffing of their activities. The member houses have the necessary experience in involving neighborhood residents in the planning process, but this could not be realized this year. The O.E.O. grant was double the amount which United Neighborhood Houses was able to make available to its members without this help, and the number of people served reflected this expansion. Future focus should be on involvement of indigenous population in the decision-making process; further effort in education, training and job finding; perhaps development of broader criteria within which member houses could develop their own imaginative and experimental ideas. The cultural programs appeared to have a marked impact on the youth involved, and a follow-up should be instituted to measure the effect of such efforts on a long-range basis. The Youth Conference should also be repeated another year.

#28 - The United Puerto Ricans of Lower Manhattan, 320 East Fourth Street, New York 10009

Agency Description - The United Puerto Ricans of Lower Manhattan is a small grass-roots organization composed almost entirely of residents of Fourth Street, between Avenues C and D. It was organized by Mobilization for Youth and continues to receive staff assistance and funds for administration and rent from that agency.

Summer Program - The summer program offered tutoring services to Elementary School children and tutoring for high school equivalency and civil service tests. These programs were designed to serve small groups, perhaps fifteen in each course, and both courses served a demonstrated need for this community.

In addition, the organization was funded for a film program. Finding that it was able to obtain films from the Youth Board and the Public Library, free of charge, it contributed its \$300 for films to the funding of the Puerto Rican Cultural Association. For details of this, please see Appendix, Summary #34.

Evaluation - The United Puerto Ricans is an organization of "the local poor". Decisions are made by its membership, but it is dependent on the Mobilization professional staff person for the necessary administrative functioning. In the absence of this staff person, when he was on vacation, the group was unable to discuss the functioning of the program and the budget. This lack of sophistication is a serious deficiency, interfering with the organization becoming self-sufficient. Program did not therefore operate at a satisfactory level, carrying out its commitment.

Recommendations - This organization requires more professional staff time than it has had to become independent. If a joint Puerto Rican organization effort continues on the Lower East Side, the United Puerto Ricans should be part of it and learn by participation with others more experienced.

#29 - West Side Association of Community Centers c/o Hudson Guild, 447 West 25th Street, New York, N.Y.

Agency Description - The West Side Association of Community Centers was formed to work cooperatively for the general betterment of the West Side of Manhattan, from 72nd Street to the Battery. The member agencies are Chelsea Neighborhood Center at P. S. 11, Clinton-La Salle Community Center, Greenwich House, Hartley House, Lincoln Square Neighborhood Center and Hudson Guild Neighborhood House.

Summer Program - The program for the summer consisted of three (3) component parts: a snack bar run at the Hudson Guild by 15 teenagers for the youngsters in the agency and in the neighborhood; a skills development program for adults, divided between Hartley House and Greenwich House; and a Day Camp Program at P. S. 11.

Statistical Report - It is difficult to give a clear picture of the activities engaged in by this particular organization. The Day Camp Program lists 460 children served. But, it must be clearly understood that the exact same report is also included in the CHAMP (#6) Report. 44 adults were served in a typing course and clerical skills development programs which were located in two (2) different agencies. The number of staff reported for all operations is 30 indigenous aides.

Evaluation - As has been indicated, it is extremely difficult to evaluate this particular program, because of the feeling that there was considerable overlapping with the services of Hudson Guild and of the member agencies of CHAMP, as well as United Neighborhood Houses.

Contact with this particular program was had through the Hudson Guild's Assistant Director, who agreed that the picture was confusing. In addition, budget lines in this situation were not clear,

as the Hudson Guild tended to allocate additional funds from other sources whenever it was deemed necessary. Undoubtedly a certain number of people have been served, and four (4) agencies are known to have cooperated with each other in an Anti-Poverty Summer Program. Written reports were very scarce, as the West Side Association elected to write a narrative report, rather than to conform to the Program Description Form.

Recommendation – Regardless of the benefits that may accrue from this type of coordinating activity and funding, it is suggested that organizations with a paper identity be avoided in preference to agencies that can be identified – hence worked with directly and specifically – unless the coordinating organization has a staff clearly assigned to fulfill this function.

#30 – YM-YWHA of Williamsburg, Inc., 575 Bedford Ave., Brooklyn 11, New York

Agency Description – The Williamsburg YM-YWHA fills the role of a neighborhood settlement house offering leisure time, recreational and athletic, as well as cultural, arts and crafts and special interest programs. It serves all ages and operates in a community which is approximately 25% Jewish. Jews in the area can be said to be preponderantly orthodox, having a large number of Hassidic Jews.

Summer Program – The project, though open to all, aimed to serve specifically 100 children from the Hassidic group which does not generally participate in "Y" activities. It offered the classical components of day camp activities, separately to boys and girls, as well as lunches and trips into the community.

Statistical Report – 126 children, ages 5-14, participated in the 8 weeks program. None of these children had been members of the "Y" before, and while it was projected to serve 100, the project had to close its intake because it could not accommodate more than 126. It is to be noted that the 22 indigenous staff meant not only residents of Williamsburg, but specifically orthodox Jews who would be acceptable to the parents of these children. It is also worthy of note that as a result of this program, 10 Hassidic parents became involved as volunteers, accompanying the group on trips. Because the number of children served was 25% larger than expected, the agency overspent approximately \$450 on its grant, an amount which the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies through the YM-YWHA Board agreed to pay.

Evaluation – The fact that this program served more children than it had expected to is an indication that it can be described as highly successful. The serious concern the agency had about parent resistance and religious leaders' hostility, evaporated as the program got underway. While about 30 children were withdrawn during the first week, this set-back was more than made up for. This was an unusual program, but there is no doubt that it was within the purview of the O.E.O. basic prescription. While the group was characterized by belonging to a religious sect, they also are poor, within the \$3,000 a year limit, except that usually there are more than 2 children per family. Few of these people are on relief, since dignity and self-help are part of the sect's religious values.

The project rendered a basic service to the youngsters involved, since in spite of the fact that many of these children are very bright, they are not often encouraged to realize their full potential, lest it may wean them away from the ultra-orthodox Hassidic creed. Thus, the main benefit of this program was the acquaintance of these children with the outer world; helping them to view "others" with tolerance and without suspicion. Unless this is done, they will be forced unavoidably into marginal employment when they grow up. These children are often raised as strangers in their own land, and the exposure can enhance their sense of security and the breadth of their view.

Recommendations – Because of the specific group of people likely to be dealt with in this situation, it would be recommended that this summer's experience be repeated next summer. This is particularly important because the Hassidic group permitted its children to become involved only because the program was funded by government money. It would not have permitted a similar involvement if the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, to whom the "non-observing" Jews, had paid for the program.

#31 – Young Women's Christian Association, 610 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Agency Description – A national membership organization which offers group activities, adult education and education for children, teenagers, young employed women and young married women.

Summer Program – The summer project was located in two YWCA branches in poverty areas. The Upper Manhattan Branch ran a program called "Summer Holiday for Mothers", which involved the mothers in vocational skills (sewing) and better health activities while their children were being taken care of in a traditional children's nursery program. The second project was located at the West Side YWCA in connection with the Clark Center for the Performing Arts, and aimed to provide an intensive experience and exposure to the performing arts to teenagers of the neighborhood around the West Side Branch, who because of their lack of money never had been involved at Clark Center before. In addition, there was a puppeteer program, which involved the making of puppets to be used in a puppet show to be then taken around the City for performances to other groups.

Statistical Report – 263 teenagers were involved at Clark Center in a variety of arts and dramatic classes, including dance, ballet, stage setting, acting, etc. By the end of the summer they presented a full musical "Bye Bye Birdie" to an estimated audience of 2200 people in five (5) presentations. The result of this enterprise was so successful that the Clark Center offered 10 scholarships to some of the children involved. Two teachers volunteered their time once a week during the coming winter to continue to work with these youngsters.

At the Upper Manhattan Branch, 68 children were involved in the Nursery Program, and 65 mothers participated in the sewing classes and related activities.

Evaluation – The Clark Center Program did not only reach new children and offer a new program to them, but it represents a dramatic departure for the YW from its traditional activities. As a membership agency, the YW has been largely geared to the needs of the middle class, i.e., the client who can afford to pay. This summer it dealt with the poverty group, and while no doubt the children profited from their experience, it is felt that the YW has also been helped to broaden its scope. Because of its lack of experience in working with this type child, the puppet show was not as successful as it might have been.

Recommendations – It is believed that with the experience gained during the summer, the YWCA would be in a position to continue to reach out to those most in need. It experienced the problems typical of many large, traditional agencies, of some inflexibility in administrative lines of communication, making it difficult to move quickly and creatively when an opportunity is presented. The dramatic workshop was outstanding, and the agency should be used in the future to capitalize on the significant gains realized this summer.

#32 – Young Men's Christian Association of Greater New York, 422 Ninth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Agency Description – A membership organization which offers programs of social, religious and recreational activities at all Branches.

Summer Program – The summer program was divided into five locations –

1) Bronx Union branch – a cultural enrichment program which involved teenagers in a variety of performing arts, including the presentation of a musical (drama classes, etc.), a dance group and an Afro drum group. In addition, they were involved in some evening programs for teenagers and their parents, and in "Operation Safe Play," as it was called, in cooperation with the Police Athletic League.

2) The Bedford branch was involved in a neighborhood Day Camp, in connection with the Bedford-Stuyvesant Block Association. It offered lobby games, arts and crafts courses, group discussions, youth-group-sponsored anti-delinquency programs, swimming and gym. Essentially they operated Day Camp units emanating from needy blocks.

3) West Side branch – operated an evening Day Camp, a youth Center program, involving young adults in constructive evening recreational activities, including group discussions and interpersonal contacts in a permissive yet supervised atmosphere.

4) Harlem branch – ran a street club group program. Although this program ran along traditional Harlem YMCA Day Camp lines, the program was new in that it was introduced to a new group of recipients. It aimed to involve unsupervised youngsters in supervised recreational and athletic entertainment. The activities were carried out at neighborhood parks, and scheduled baseball Little League activities were a major part of the program.

5) Concerned with the operation of summer program-coordination and supervisory staff emanating from the Headquarters.

Statistical Report – This agency, due to its highly efficient coordinator, presented a very clear statistical picture of its activities for the summer. It worked directly and regularly with 1,855 youngsters, 401 of whom were teenagers. It reached 3,655 people, 1,800 of whom were audiences of the musical "Felicity", presented by the Bronx Union, as well as some of the shows given by the Afro Drum Group and the Dance Group. The "Y" employed 90 indigenous staff during the summer, and it estimates that it reached 75% new population. These numbers do not reflect the number of parents and families who were affected by services rendered to their youngsters, as some other agencies have done in statistical reports.

Evaluation – The YMCA has conscientiously fulfilled its commitment during the summer. It has given ample substantiation of the number of people reached, and the areas in which it has worked. As had been said in another connection, while there is no doubt that the youngsters have been served, it is felt that the summer's experience has been equally as profitable to the YMCA's point of view with respect to whom it wants to serve. As in the case of another agency, the existence of a temporary executive to evaluate and coordinate programs has permitted the opening of new vistas and the suggestion of new programs, which are not usually within the purview of a membership organization.

Recommendation – It is certainly hoped that the YM will put to good use the experience it gained during the summer, and suggested that it engage again in such programs during next summer.

#33 – Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth-In-Action, 1180 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Agency Description – Youth-in-Action was established with New York City funds in 1964 as a research organization to determine the needs and problems of the Bedford-Stuyvesant community. The agency was able to move from research to active implementation of program with the O.E.O. grant for the summer. YIA has the responsibility for the Community Action Program in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area and is administered by an indigenous board of directors and an executive director and staff.

Summer Program – YIA conducted the following activities with service centers in a dozen locations in the community:

1) Leisure Time (cultural) Project to develop constructive use of leisure time, discover hidden talent, develop self-realization through concrete enrichment in self-expression and develop good human relations and social responsibility.

2) Family Education and Service to provide valid information to local families about services to the general community, to provide full interpretation of these services, job training, baby sitting service, group counseling and remedial education.

3) Truant Program to develop methods to curtail school drop-outs by working at the critical point of truancy, involve parents in their children's remediation, provide remedial education and counseling.

4) Unwed Mothers Project to assist unwed mothers to prepare themselves for the responsibility of parenthood through education and counseling and to encourage them to prepare for jobs.

5) Youth Leadership Program to bring youth from all parts of the community together to search for identity and a "truer" self-image, to help youth improve ego strength, sense of dignity and inter-personal relationships.

6) Adult Training Program to train local residents for jobs and to develop within the community a core of skilled persons able to render essential services.

Statistics – The Agency estimates to have served 37,178 people, 36,000 of whom are audiences. It worked directly with 420 adults, 458 teenagers and 300 children. There is the second highest number of direct service to adults reported for the entire summer program. Of the total staff of 325, 307 were reported as indigenous including 300 Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Evaluation – The YIA summer program was faced with the implementation of a tremendous proposal in a very limited period of time, and at a time when it was still awaiting many key staff members. There has been a conscious effort on its part to seek the cooperation of existing organizations in the community, and it succeeded in involving, employing and otherwise reaching the poor. Because programs were based upon sound concepts and realistic goals, the community responded generally with a cooperative and positive attitude towards YIA. The summer constituted an important building period, during which the organization excited the community and rendered, by and large, a quality service to youth and adults involved in activities.

Recommendations – Though coordination efforts are noteworthy, several large community service programs are operating in Bedford-Stuyvesant with little communication with other service organizations. It is recommended that YIA or the Economic Opportunity Committee take the lead in setting up a day-long conference for all agencies in the community to work out procedures for sharing information, joint planning, and the elimination of gaps, overlaps, and competition.

#34 – Puerto Rican Cultural Association, operated from the offices of the Council of Puerto Rican and Hispanic Organizations of the Lower East Side, 16 Clinton Street, New York 10002

It became clear early in the summer that the six small Puerto Rican organizations on the Lower East Side were inadequately funded to carry out individual programs of real significance, in the available time. Most of them, as they had been advised, had requested funds for pure recreation purposes and these were in most instances not granted. The money they were allocated was primarily for instructional clas-

ses and represented a small part of their original requests. There was hostility towards the Economic Opportunity Committee among these groups, since they felt they were being discriminated against; in fact, two of the organizations voted to reject their token grants, one subsequently reconsidering and joining the Puerto Rican Cultural Association, to which it assigned its total budget.

The consultant attempted to bring the five remaining groups together in an effort to develop a co-operative venture in which all could share, by elimination of some funded components in order to provide money for a new program. The Puerto Rican Cultural Association was formed to help Puerto Rican youth develop a sense of pride and identity with their heritage. The five groups were the United Puerto Ricans of Lower Manhattan, The Puerto Rican Athletic League, the Council of Puerto Rican and Hispanic Organizations of the Lower East Side, the United Hispanic Movement and the Puerto Rican Action Group. Each of the organizations, except for the Council, contributed a part of its grant to fund the new Association with \$900. The Council, an important force in the organization of the new group, offered to share its program with members of all the other groups.

A representative to a Central Committee to plan and administer the affairs of the Cultural Association was selected from each organization. This Committee agreed to present a typical festival or Fiesta at the end of the summer to familiarize the youth with some of the folk art and culture of Puerto Rico. The Fiesta was held in the East River Amphitheatre early in September, with approximately fifty actors, dancers and singers ranging in age from five or six to adults. There were about two hundred in the audience.

The participating groups agreed generally that the festival had been a success and discussed continuing it as an annual event, perhaps involving the Puerto Rican business community in its support in the future.

712.25 (7471) C65

Community Council of Greater
New York.

Summer in New York, 1965; analysis of summer programs...

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE

100 Church Street

New York, N.Y. 10007

Anne M. Roberts, Executive Director



Staff Department Heads

Martin Kotler, Deputy Director
D'Jaris Watson, Assistant to Director
for Community Development Program
Jose Morales, Supervisor, Community Progress Centers
Muriel Greenhill, Educational Programs Officer
Henry Rosner, Acting Director, Neighborhood Youth Corps
Mary C. Kohler, Consultant, Neighborhood Youth Corps
Lawrence Houston, Associate Director
for Program Development Design
Sydney Shiff, Consultant for Small Business Development
William R. Fry, Chief Counsel
Thomas C. Lawrence, Fiscal Officer
William E. Price, Administrative Manager
Timothy Cooney, Executive Secretary
to New York City Council Against Poverty
Thomasina W. Norford, Liaison
to Anti-Poverty Operations Board
William Pain, Director, Public Affairs