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Saint Paul Model Cities
Educational Impact Study Report

The Saint Paul Model Cities Educational Impact Study was conducted under the auspices of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota. It is an attitudinal survey which attempted to ascertain the degree of impact which various educational programs funded by the Model Cities Program had upon the residents of the Summit-University area. The study was not designed as an evaluative report of these programs or of Model Cities interests in them. The word "Impact" as used in this context refers to community cognizance of educational programs funded by Model Cities, community participation in them, and community attitudes concerning them. In addition to the above, this survey attempted to ascertain the role played by the Model Cities Community Advisory Boards to various educational agencies and programs and how the Advisory Board's role was perceived by community residents and program administrators.

METHODOLOGY

Two questionnaires designed to elicit attitudinal responses about Model Cities funded educational programs and Community Advisory Boards were employed in this survey. Instrument A (see appendix I) consisting of 41 questions was given to supervisors, directors, coordinators and administrative assistants of the following programs; Amherst H. Wilder Foundation (Day Care Center), Ramsey County Headstart Program, Montessori School, Ramsey County Action Programs, Senior Citizen Center, and Saint Paul School Board. Instrument B (see appendix II) consisting of 20 questions was administered to the community residents at random. In both cases area college and university students were employed to conduct personal interviews. The survey was conducted during the month of July, 1973.
Schedule 'A' of the Saint Paul Model Cities Educational Impact Study was designed for administrators of Model Cities funded agencies. Originally forty administrators were to be interviewed. Due to the fact that many administrators were vacationing and/or away on business at the time only thirteen interviews were obtained. Although this sample is admittedly small and perhaps not totally representative, the decision was made to process the data for analysis. It was felt that in spite of the size of the sample, important insights might be gained from the materials at hand.

Schedule 'B' of the Saint Paul Model Cities Educational Impact Study was to ascertain the attitudes of the community residents toward Model Cities educational programs. A sample of 141 respondents was obtained randomly from the Summit-University community. While this is not a particularly large sample we felt that the results obtained were significant. Upon completion of the interview schedules the questionnaires (Schedule B) were key punched and processed at the University of Minnesota (St. Paul campus) Computer Center. During the processing of the data, tabulations were kept on the responses of minority and non-minority respondents to see if there was any appreciable differences between the two groups. In addition a program was developed to indicate any bias that might have been introduced inadvertently by the interviewers.
Part I
Summary of Statistical Data
Instrument A

Using Schedule 'A' the following agencies were visited; Montessori School, Ramsey County Headstart Program, Ramsey County Action Program, Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, Senior Citizen Center, and the Saint Paul School Board. Of the administrators interviewed six (46.1%) were minority persons and six (46.1%) were non-minority persons. One questionnaire recorded no racial or ethnic background. The following job descriptions were listed; Secretary to the Director, Coordinator, Assistant Director, (2) Supervisors, Parent Volunteer, Social Welfare Supervisor, Administrative Assistant, Director of General Community Service Department, Executive, Director and Educational Consultant.

Of those individuals listed as minority administrators 33.3% had occupied their respective positions for only one year, 50% for more than two years, and 16.6% for less than three months. Of the non-minority administrators all of them had held their positions for longer than two years.

I. Section One:

A. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if they were aware of other Model Cities Programs, 92.3% indicated such an awareness while 7.6% did not.

B. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if they were aware of the existence of the Community Advisory Boards all indicated that they were so informed.

C. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if their agency had a functioning Community Advisory Board, 84.6% indicated that they had while 15.4% did not.

D. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked what the role of the Community Advisory Boards ought to be, 53.8% felt that the Board ought to have decision making role, while 46.1% indicated an advisory capacity only.
On this particular question attitudes concerning the function of the Advisory Boards varied. Of the seven favoring decision making capacity, two administrators qualified their statements relegating the decision making to "matters of policy only" and with the approval of the program's Board of Directors. Of those administrators favoring advisory capacity only one indicated that "decision making boards (causes) too many problems".

E. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked what they felt were the motivational factors of individuals serving on Community Advisory Boards, 46.1% felt that the individuals were providing legitimate community impute, 15.3% believed that Board members were attempting to enhance their posture as community leaders, 7.6% felt it a combination of legitimate impute and promoting personal programs, 15.3% felt it to be a combination of legitimate impute, enhancing posture of leadership, and promotion of personal programs and 7.6% felt it was a combination of the above plus financial gain.

A closer examination of this question indicates that in spite of whatever motives one has for involving himself in Community Advisory Board activity, financial gain is the motive least likely suspected. Although providing valuable community impute, many Board members are viewed by 30.7% of the administrators as using Board positions to enhance their posture as community leaders and/or promoting personal programs.

F. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if they felt that the Community Advisory Boards can be an effective vehicle by which the community's will can be ascertained and implemented in a crucial decision-making capacity, 100% responded affirmatively. The consensus of the administrators was that the Community Advisory Boards can be of great assistance if (1) they are made up of "grass-roots" community members who (2) represent different backgrounds and different experiences and (3) can act as a pressure group based upon true community representation. Some administrators admitted having difficulty with Community Advisory Boards which were "unbalanced in representation" and whose members had little experience. One administrator indicated that (his board) did not recognize (their) limits. Another still felt that the community ought to make final decisions.
G. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if they felt that community participation in Model Cities programs has been effective, 69.2% answered affirmatively, 23% negatively, and 7.6% had no response.

Those answering affirmatively gave the following reasons: (1) the community administration became overwhelming, (2) through these programs many needs of the community has come to light and many changes have been made, (3) many community designed programs were implemented, (4) if the community didn't participate then model cities would not be functionable, (5) seemed to have accomplished something vital and important for the community.

Although answering in the affirmative some administrators offered the following criticism; (1) community participation in Model Cities programs has not been effective because of "lack of communication with other agencies and the community at large", (2) "they could not understand the political ball game they were in", (3) "they were locked into the politics of the local government and no one beats city hall", (4) "the Model Cities concept could have been the first step in the right direction for the disadvantaged if the guidelines would have excluded the city or local government".

Those answering negatively gave the following reasons; (1) existence has been too short to execute an effective program, (2) do not feel they were as affective as they could have been...constant changes of staff, unclear directives, lack of adequate communication, too many committees and double staffing until persons were competent, (3) total community or grass-roots did not participate in the program as they should, only certain people benefited from funds.

II. Section Two:

A. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked how has the policy of the Community Advisory Boards affected the administration of that agency, 30.7% indicated a negative impact, 53.8% indicated a positive impact and 15.3% offered no response.

Those indicating a negative experience cite the lack of meaningful achievement, failure of communication and cooperation between Board and agency, policies hav-
ing no real affect on agency, and that the model cities involvement has meant more work without appreciable change.

Those indicating a positive experience indicated mild degrees of success obtained within the limits of what the Board could actually do. Some of the respondents indicated both negative and positive results without further explanation.

B. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked, as the result of Community Advisory Board suggestions were there any policy changes made in the agency, 46.1% indicated yes, 23% indicated no, with 30.7% offering no response.

Of the thirteen respondents, when asked, as the result of Community Advisory Board suggestion were any curriculum changes made in the agency, 53.8% indicated yes, 23% no, with 23% not responding to the question.

Of the thirteen respondents, when asked, as the result of Community Advisory Board suggestions were any personnel changes made in the agency, the following responses were recorded: 7.6% indicated an increase in general staff, 23.07% cited both an increase in general staff and minority personnel, 15.3% indicated unspecified personnel changes, 15.3% indicated an increase of only minority personnel, 15.3% did not respond to the question and 23.0% had no increase in staff.

Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if there were any administrative structural changes, 30.7% indicated yes, 30.7% indicated no, while 38.4% did not respond to the question.

The explanation of administrative structural changes ranged from the hiring of more para-professionals to transfer of responsibilities and expanded specialized programs.

C. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked how frequently did their Community Advisory Board meet, 7.6% indicated weekly meetings, 46.1% indicated monthly meetings, 30.7% indicated bi-monthly meetings, 7.6% indicated other arrangements and 7.6% did not respond.

D. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked how effective was their Community Advisory Boards, one indicated 100% effective, seven indicated 75%, two indicated 50%, and two indicated only 25% effective. One person did not respond.

E. The following were listed as reasons for shortcomings of Community Advisory Boards:
   1. Did not help community organizations to the fullest
   2. Not a shortcoming - Advisory Boards need longer than three years to be effective. . .need change in personnel
   3. Did what they could the way the program was set up, not enough input
F. When asked if these deficiencies were worth correcting, 46.1% indicated yes, 53.8% did not respond.

G. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if the Community Advisory Boards helped or hindered the operation of their agency, 92.3% indicated that the Boards were of some assistance, 7.6% indicated mixed emotions about the Boards.

H. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if they felt that the Community Advisory Boards represented an effective instrument of change by introducing to the administration new and challenging ideas, 84.6% indicated yes, 15.3% indicated no.

III. Section Three:

A. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked that after the Model Cities Program has been phased out, would you be willing to incorporate the Community Advisory Board into the administrative structure of their agency as a permanent feature, 53.8% indicated yes, 30.7% no, with 15.3% not responding.

When asked if upon retention would these Boards possess decision-making power or just an advisory capacity, the respondents were equally divided on the issue.

B. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if they would be willing to continue incentive pay out of agency funds for Community Advisory personnel, 61.5% indicated yes, 15.3% no, 7.6% did not respond, 15.3% answered with mixed emotions.

Some of the comments to the above are listed as follows: (1) only for baby sitting expenses, transportation and/or just low income persons, (2) the best service comes from people when they serve as volunteers, (3) to some extent for community need and circumstances, (4) not necessary.

C. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked to list, in their estimation, the three most impressive achievements of their Community Advisory Boards, the following were listed:

1. Sent community person to act as liason
2. An employment office was started
3. Helped in identifying community feelings
4. Developed work proposals
5. Motivating persons to participate
6. Understanding their role
7. Their insistence to set policy only
8. Working together on Community issues
9. Presentation of new ideas
10. Increasing levels of awareness
11. Spotting areas where additional funds could be obtained federally
12. Redirecting programs to meet the needs of the participants
13. The advocacy role
ing no real affect on agency, and that the model cities involvement has meant more work without appreciable change.

Those indicating a positive experience indicated mild degrees of success obtained within the limits of what the Board could actually do. Some of the respondents indicated both negative and positive results without further explanation.

B. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked, as the result of Community Advisory Board suggestions were there any policy changes made in the agency, 46.1% indicated yes, 23% indicated no, with 30.7% offering no response.

Of the thirteen respondents, when asked, as the result of Community Advisory Board suggestion were any curriculum changes made in the agency, 53.8% indicated yes, 23% no, with 23% not responding to the question.

Of the thirteen respondents, when asked, as the result of Community Advisory Board suggestions were any personnel changes made in the agency, the following responses were recorded; 7.6% indicated an increase in general staff, 23.07% cited both an increase in general staff and minority personnel, 15.3% indicated unspecified personnel changes, 15.3% indicated an increase of only minority personnel, 15.3% did not respond to the question and 23.0% had no increase in staff.

Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if there were any administrative structural changes, 30.7% indicated yes, 30.7% indicated no, while 38.4% did not respond to the question.

The explanation of administrative structural changes ranged from the hiring of more para-professionals to transfer of responsibilities and expanded specialized programs.

C. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked how frequently did their Community Advisory Board meet, 7.6% indicated weekly meetings, 46.1% indicated monthly meetings, 30.7% indicated bi-monthly meetings, 7.6% indicated other arrangements and 7.6% did not respond.

D. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked how effective was their Community Advisory Boards, one indicated 100% effective, seven indicated 75%, two indicated 50%, and two indicated only 25% effective. One person did not respond.

E. The following were listed as reasons for shortcomings of Community Advisory Boards:

1. Did not help community organizations to the fullest
2. Not a shortcoming - Advisory Boards need longer than three years to be effective. . . need change in personnel
3. Did what they could the way the program was set up, not enough input
F. When asked if these deficiencies were worth correcting, 46.1% indicated yes, 53.8% did not respond.

G. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if the Community Advisory Boards helped or hindered the operation of their agency, 92.3% indicated that the Boards were of some assistance, 7.6% indicated mixed emotions about the Boards.

H. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if they felt that the Community Advisory Boards represented an effective instrument of change by introducing to the administration new and challenging ideas, 84.6% indicated yes, 15.3% indicated no.

III. Section Three:

A. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked that after the Model Cities Program has been phased out, would you be willing to incorporate the Community Advisory Board into the administrative structure of their agency as a permanent feature, 53.8% indicated yes, 30.7% no, with 15.3% not responding.

When asked if upon retention would these Boards possess decision-making power or just an advisory capacity, the respondents were equally divided on the issue.

B. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if they would be willing to continue incentive pay out of agency funds for Community Advisory personnel, 61.5% indicated yes, 15.3% no, 7.6% did not respond, 15.3% answered with mixed emotions.

Some of the comments to the above are listed as follows: (1) only for baby sitting expenses, transportation and/or just low income persons, (2) the best service comes from people when they serve as volunteers, (3) to some extent for community need and circumstances, (4) not necessary.

C. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked to list, in their estimation, the three most impressive achievements of their Community Advisory Boards, the following were listed:

1. Sent community person to act as liason
2. An employment office was started
3. Helped in identifying community feelings
4. Developed work proposals
5. Motivating persons to participate
6. Understanding their role
7. Their insistence to set policy only
8. Working together on Community issues
9. Presentation of new ideas
10. Increasing levels of awareness
11. Spotting areas where additional funds could be obtained federally
12. Redirecting programs to meet the needs of the participants
13. The advocacy role
14. The advisory role, past and present living experience
15. Making us aware of community agency's usage
16. Support for the administration in relation to foundation
17. Guidance on programs
18. Motivation to improve educational programs
19. General respect for education

D. Of the respondents, when asked to name three policy changes that have resulted from Community Advisory Board initiative, the following were listed:

1. Staff rules regarding child interaction
2. Rules for accepting children into Montessori School
3. Community guidelines
4. An activated career development ladder
5. Hiring of more para-professionals
6. Better and more staff training
7. Administrative policy
8. Financial policy
9. Physical policy dealing with personnel
10. Experimental School Age - Day Care Program for Lock Key Children
11. Broaden the program for Senior Citizens
12. Broaden the program for school age day care program
13. Personnel practices
14. Employment policies and characteristics of person you plan to employ
15. Home School Liaison in the Central City
16. Demonstrated the value of having para-professional aides for more opportunities for individualized instruction

E. No response

IV. Section Four:

A. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked were the meetings at which the Community Advisory Board participated more productive or less productive than the meetings at which they did not participate, 53.8% indicated more productive, 30.7% indicated less productive and 15.3% chose not to respond.

B. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked what was the average length of those meetings at which the Community Advisory Board participated, 46.1% indicated approximately 1-2 hours, 46.1% approximately 2-4 hours, and 7.6% indicated 4-5 hours.

C. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked were the Advisory Board members well informed or prepared for the business to be transacted at the administrative meetings, 61.5% indicated yes, 30.7% no, 7.6% not always.

D. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if the Community Advisory Board's members were punctual, 15.3% indicated yes, 69.2% no, 15.3% offered no response.

E. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if they felt that the Advisory Board members communicated the concerns of their constituency affectively, 46.1% indicated most of the time, 23.07% indicated some of the time, 7.6% indicated seldom while 7.6% offered no response.
F. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked if the administrative meetings at which the Community Advisory Board participated were open to the participation of non-board members from the community, 76.9% indicated yes, 15.3% indicated no, while 7.6% offered no response.

G. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked approximately how many non-board community citizens attended these meetings, 61.5% indicated from 1-5 persons, 15.3% indicated 6-10 persons, while 7.6% indicated more than 10 persons.

H. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked do you feel that the length of the meetings when non-board community citizens participated were lengthier than those meetings where only Advisory Board members participated, 61.5% indicated yes, 38.4% no.

I. Of the thirteen respondents, when asked do you feel that community participation in the affairs of this agency should be limited to the participation of Community Advisory Board personnel only, 7.6% indicated yes, 76.9% no, 15.3% offered no response.
Almost all of the administrators interviewed were aware of other Model Cities programs. All of the agencies contacted knew of the existence of Model Cities Community Advisory Boards and most had functioning advisory boards aiding their agencies. Generally, most of the administrators felt that the Community Advisory Boards were a positive asset to the agency. Most of them felt that the Community Advisory Boards represented the concerns of their constituency and were effective vehicles by which to ascertain the community's will. Many felt that community participation in Model Cities programs had been effective. According to these administrators, most of the agency's administrative meetings were open to the community and community participation in them was encouraged.

When asked if they were willing to incorporate the Community Advisory Boards into their administrative structure after the termination of Model Cities funding, more than half expressed approval. Moreover, the majority was willing to continue the incentive pay. However, when these administrators were queried as to the proper role of the Community Advisory Boards, the sample was evenly divided. The majority of minority administrators favored "decision making capacity" while the majority of non-minority administrators favored "advisory capacity only".

The impact of the Community Advisory Boards on the administration of the agencies involved was difficult to assess. Apparently, there was no appreciative administrative structural change as the result of Community Advisory Board input. While every administrator indicated that there were personnel changes, these changes usually included the hiring of more minority staff, general staff increase, and reassignment of existing staff resources. The sample was equally divided over whether any actual "policy changes" or "curriculum changes" occurred
as the result of Community Advisory Board suggestions. Nevertheless, most
administrators felt that the Community Advisory Boards did have a positive
impact and very few expressed criticism and/or listed shortcomings.

DISTILLATION:

The administrators are convinced that the Community Advisory Boards are
playing a valuable role as a vehicle by which the community's needs are dis-
cerned. The problems lie in the relationship of the Community Advisory Board
to the administrative structure of these agencies and the extent of its in-
fluence and/or power in determining agency programs and policies. The demo-
ocratic principles of community participation seemed to be lauded but at the
same time community control of agency programs proved less than desirable.

One must keep in mind that the sample employed is exceedingly small and
may not be totally representative of actual sentiment.
Part II
Summary of Statistical Data
Instrument "B"

I. Section One:

Section one was designed to ascertain the degree of community familiarity with Model Cities Programs.

A. Of the 140 respondents, when asked if they were familiar with some of the Model Cities Programs, 85.10% indicated that they were while 14.89% of the sample indicated an unfamiliarity with such programs. Of the respondents who were minorities, 87.50% were familiar as opposed to 80.77% of the non-minority.

B. Of the 139 respondents, when asked if they had at one time participated in a Model Cities Program, 41% of the sample indicated that they had while 58.99% indicated non-participation. Of the minority respondents, 40% indicated participation in contrast to 50% of the non-minority respondents.

C. Of the 141 respondents, when asked if they had friends or relatives that at one time participated in Model Cities Programs, 71.63% indicated that they had while 28.36% answered negatively. Of the minority respondents, 74.11% acknowledged such acquaintances in comparison to 65.38% for the non-minority respondents.

D. Of the 140, when asked if they were recipients of the St. Paul Model Cities Newsletter, "Together", 58.57% of the sample indicated that they did not receive the publication. Of the minority respondents 41.07% acknowledged receiving the publication as compared to 48% of non-minority respondents.

II. Section Two:

Section two was designed to ascertain which of the educational programs were most extensively utilized by the community, the community's attitude about these programs, and their awareness of Community Advisory Boards which were supposed to give legitimate community input into the operation of these programs.

A. Of the 133 respondents, the following either participated or had a child participating in these programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilder Day Care Center</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Headstart</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montessori School</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home School Liaison</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Counseling</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red School House</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>60.90</td>
<td>58.10</td>
<td>76.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Of the 140 respondents, when asked if the programs lived up to their expectations, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>52.14</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>61.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Of the 141 respondents, when asked if the exposure that their child received in this program was comparable or better than similar types of programs offered by the Public School System, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree very much</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree very much</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>57.44</td>
<td>55.36</td>
<td>73.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Of the 141 respondents, when asked if the quality of the Model Cities funded educational programs were strengthened because of community interest and input into their development, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>43.97</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>26.24</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>42.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Of the 141 respondents, when asked if they were aware of Model Cities Community Advisory Boards, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.31</td>
<td>57.66</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>42.34</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Of the 140 respondents, when asked if they were aware of the fact that each Model Cities funded educational program had a Community Advisory Board, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>44.14</td>
<td>42.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>55.86</td>
<td>57.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Section Three:

Section three was designed to survey community attitudes about the purpose and functioning of the Community Advisory Board.
A. Of the 140 respondents, when asked if in their estimation the Community Advisory Boards were legitimate vehicles by which the concerns of the community are communicated to Model Cities funded agencies and programs, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>45.05</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Of the 139 respondents, when asked if they felt that the Community Advisory Boards effectively represented their interests, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>44.60</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Of the 135 respondents, when asked if the Community Advisory Boards should continue to represent the community's interests to community agencies and programs after the termination of Model Cities funding, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>41.48</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>41.48</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>54.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Of the 141 respondents, when asked if they felt that the representatives serving on the Community Advisory Boards to Model Cities funded agencies and programs have been effective, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>51.77</td>
<td>52.68</td>
<td>53.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Of the 141 respondents, when asked if in their estimation some of the Community Advisory Board members have misused their positions or have attempted to use their positions to enhance their image as community leaders, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not true</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom true</td>
<td>21.27</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly true</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Of the 140 respondents, when asked if they felt that the Community Advisory Board members ought to be compensated financially for their time and energy, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>65.77</td>
<td>57.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Of the 141 respondents, when asked if they personally knew any individual serving as Community Advisory Board members, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81.56</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>88.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Of the 135 respondents, when asked if they have had the opportunity to express their interests in Model Cities funded educational programs to Community Advisory Board members, the following responses were recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>% of Minority</th>
<th>% of Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>30.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>41.48</td>
<td>44.95</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Summary Data
Instrument B

Section One:

Although the majority of the respondents indicated a familiarity with the Model Cities Program, and may have had friends or relatives participating in Model Cities funded programs, approximately 59% of the respondents indicated the lack of personal involvement. Moreover, 58% of the respondents were not recipients of the Model Cities Newsletter.

Section Two:

Over 60% of the respondents had not utilized any of the educational programs indicated. Of those programs listed Operation Headstart, Montessori School, and Wilder Day Care Center were utilized by over one-third of the respondents. Many of the respondents, over 50% in both instances, held no opinion when asked if these programs lived up to their expectations or compared favorably with similar programs offered by the Public School System. Of those respondents holding opinions concerning the above, more than one-third responded favorably (yes).

Approximately 70% of the respondents felt that these programs were strengthened because of community interest and input into them. Over 50% were aware of the existence of Community Advisory Boards although less than 50% were aware that each educational program was supposed to consult with one.

Section Three:

Although 63% of the respondents indicated infrequent and/or no exchange with Community Advisory Boards, 68% never participating in Community Advisory Board elections and 81% claiming not to personally know any Community Advisory Board member, approximately 64% were satisfied with allowing the Community Ad-
visory Boards to represent their interests. More importantly, apart from those respondents which did not express an opinion, the remainder seemed favorably disposed towards the role and functioning of the Community Advisory Boards.

INTERVIEWER BIAS

1. Out of the 36 cases submitted by Dexter Henderson (Interviewer A), 29 cases were recorded with over 50% of his questions answered favorably. In other words, 80.6% of his cases had over 50% of his answers answered favorably.

2. Out of the 35 cases submitted by Brucie Wright (Interviewer B), 7 cases were recorded with over 50% of his questions answered favorably. In other words 20% of his cases had over 50% of his answers answered favorably.

3. Out of the 37 cases submitted by Tommy McClaney (Interviewer C), 13 cases were recorded with over 50% of his questions answered favorably. In other words 35.1% of his cases had over 50% of his answers answered favorably.

4. Out of the 33 cases submitted by Lucille Cooper (Interviewer D), 18 cases were recorded with over 50% of her questions answered favorably. In other words 54.5% of her cases had over 50% of her answers answered favorably.

MINORITY/NON-MINORITY BIAS

1. Out of the 112 minority cases observed, 55 cases were recorded with at least 50% of the questions answered favorably for 49.1%.

2. Out of the 26 non-minority cases observed, cases were recorded in which at least 50% of the questions were answered favorably for 46.2%.
Summary Conclusion

Although the administrators of the agencies consulted supported the concept of the Community Advisory Boards and felt that they did provide legitimate community input, this study raises questions about the representative nature of these advisory boards. According to the "Analysis of Summary Data Instrument B", 59% of the community persons interviewed lacked personal involvement in Model Cities programs. Moreover, 60% had not utilized any of the educational programs surveyed, 50% did not know of the Community Advisory Board's existence, 63% indicated infrequent and/or no exchange with Community Advisory Boards, 68% never participated in Community Advisory Board elections and 81% did not know any Community Advisory Board member personally. Ironically, 70% of the sample felt these programs were strengthened somehow because of community participation.

The following conclusion can be drawn from existing data. Firstly, there is a low level of community participation in Community Advisory Board elections. Secondly, the community is being virtually represented by individuals interested enough to pursue these positions and thirdly, these individuals are acting upon the perceived needs of the community in absence of proper dialogue with their constituency.

A little more than one-third of the community members interviewed have children or are personally involved with educational programs canvassed. Of those members, over 50% held no opinion when asked if these programs lived up to their expectations.
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Interview Schedule A
INTerview Schedule A

Interviewer

Interview Number

Saint Paul Model Cities
Educational Impact Study

Date:

Time of Interview:

Agency:

Person Interviewed:

Position held:

___ Supervisor
___ Coordinator
___ Director
___ Administrative Assistant
___ Other. Explain:

Length of time in present position:

___ less than 3 months
___ less than 6 months
___ 1 year
___ 2 years or more

Past position held in same agency (if applicable):
SECTION I

A. Are you aware of other Model Cities Programs? Yes____ No____

B. Are you aware of the existence of Community Advisory Boards? Yes____ No____

C. Does your agency have a functioning Advisory Board? Yes____ No____

D. What ought the role of the Community Advisory Board be?

    ______ Advisory only
    ______ Decision-making capacity

E. What do you feel are the motivational factors of individuals serving on Community Advisory Boards?

    ______ To provide legitimate community input.
    ______ To enhance their position as community leaders.
    ______ To promote personal programs.
    ______ For financial gains.
    ______ Other. Explain:

F. Do you feel that the Community Advisory Boards can be an effective vehicle by which the community's will can be ascertained and implemented in a crucial decision-making capacity?

    Yes______ No______

    Explain:

G. Do you feel that community participation in Model Cities Programs has been effective? Yes______ No______

    Why?
    Why not?
SECTION II

A. How has the policy of the Community Advisory Boards to your agency affected the administration of your agency?

1. Positive

2. Negative

Explain:

B. As the result of Community Advisory suggestions, were there any changes made in the agency under the following categories?

1. Policy changes

   Yes   No

2. Curriculum changes

   Yes   No

Explain:

3. Personnel changes

   Increase in staff

   Increase in Minority staff

   Other

4. Administrative structural change

Explain:

5. None of the above

C. How often did your Community Advisory Board meet?

   Weekly

   Monthly

   Bi-monthly

   Quarterly

   Other

D. How effective was your Community Advisory Board:

   100% effective

   25% effective

   75% effective

   Ineffectual

   50% effective

   Other

E. If the Community Advisory Board was less than 50% effective, what were its shortcomings?

F. Are these deficiencies correctable or worth correcting? Yes   No
G. Has the Community Advisory Board helped or hindered the operation of your agency?
   _____ Helped
   _____ Hindered
   Explain:

H. Do you feel that your Community Advisory Board represented an effective instrument of change by introducing to the administrative structure new and challenging ideas?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   Explain:

SECTION III

A. After the Model Cities Program has been phased out, would you be willing to incorporate the Community Advisory Board into the administration of this agency as a permanent feature? _____ Yes _____ No
   If yes, would it possess decision-making power or just an advisory role?

B. In the past, individuals serving on the Advisory Board have been financially compensated for their time and energy. Would you be willing to continue incentive pay out of agency funds for Community Advisory personnel? _____ Yes _____ No
   If no, why not?

C. In your estimation, what were the three most impressive achievements of your Community Advisory Board?
   1. _____________________________________________
   2. _____________________________________________
   3. _____________________________________________

D. Name three policy changes that have resulted from the Community Advisory Board's initiation.
   1. _____________________________________________
   2. _____________________________________________
   3. _____________________________________________

E. Which of the three policies named above would you be willing to continue?
SECTION IV

A. Were the meetings at which the Community Advisory Board participated ___ More productive or ___ less productive than the meetings at which they did not participate?

B. What was the average length of those meetings in which the Community Advisory Board participated?

1. 1-2 hours ___ 3. 4-5 hours ___
2. 2-4 hours ___ 4. 5-6 hours ___

C. Were the Advisory Board members well informed or prepared for the business to be transacted at the administrative meetings? Yes___ No___

D. Were the Community Advisory Board members punctual? Yes___ No___

E. Do you feel that the Advisory Board members communicated the concerns of their constituency effectively?

___ All of the time
___ Most of the time
___ Some of the time
___ Seldom
___ Never

F. Were the administrative meetings at which the Community Advisory Board participated open to the participation of non-board community members?___ Yes ___ No ___

G. How many non-board community citizens attended these meetings?

___ 1-5
___ 6-10
___ More than 10

H. Do you feel that the length of meetings when non-board community citizens participated were lengthier than those meetings where only Community Advisory Board members participated?

___ Yes ___ No ___

Other:
I. Do you feel that community participation in the affairs of this agency should be limited to the participation of Community Advisory Board personnel?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Other:

REMARKS:
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Interview Schedule B
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE B

Interviewer

Instrument Number

SAINT PAUL MODEL CITIES EDUCATIONAL IMPACT STUDY

Date:

Time of Interview:

Person Interviewed:

Address:

 Minority ____________ Non-Minority ____________

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Section I.

A. Are you familiar with any Model Cities Program?
   Yes ___ No ___

B. Have you at any time participated in any Model Cities Program?
   Yes ___ No ___

C. Do you have any friends or relatives that have at any time participated in Model Cities Programs?
   Yes ___ No ___

D. Do you receive the St. Paul Model Cities Newsletter "Together''?
   Yes ___ No ___
Section II.

A. Have you and/or a child of yours participated in the following Model Cities Educational Programs?

- Wilder Day Care
- Operation Head Start
- Montessori School
- Home School Liaison
- Experimental Counseling in Secondary Schools
- Red School House
- None of the above

B. Has this program lived up to your expectations?

- Definitely yes
- Probably yes
- Probably not
- Definitely not
- No opinion

C. Do you feel that the exposure your child received in this program was comparable or better than similar type programs offered by the Public School System?

- Agree very much
- Agree
- Disagree
- Disagree very much
- Do not know

D. Do you feel that the quality of the Model Cities Educational Programs were strengthened because of community interest and input in their development?

- Strongly agree
- Moderately agree
- Moderately disagree
- Strongly disagree
E. Are you aware of Model Cities Community Advisory Board?

Yes_____ No_____

F. Are you aware of the fact that each Model Cities Educational Program has a Community Advisory Board?

Yes_____ No_____

Section III.

A. In your estimation, are the Community Advisory Boards a legitimate vehicle by which the concerns of the community are communicated to Model Cities agencies and programs?

[ ] Definitely yes
[ ] Probably yes
[ ] Probably not
[ ] Definitely not
[ ] Do not know

B. Do you feel that the Community Advisory Boards effectively represent your interests?

[ ] Definitely yes
[ ] Probably yes
[ ] Probably not
[ ] Definitely not
[ ] Do not know

C. Do you feel that the Community Advisory Boards should continue to represent the community's interest to community agencies and programs after the termination of Model Cities funding?

[ ] Strongly agree
[ ] Moderately agree
[ ] Moderately disagree
[ ] Strongly disagree
D. Do you feel that representatives serving on the Community Advisory Boards to Model Cities agencies and programs have been effective?
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   

E. In your estimation have some of the Community Advisory Board members misused their positions or have they attempted to use their positions to enhance their image as community leaders?
   
   
   True
   
   Mostly true
   
   Seldom true
   
   Not true

F. Do you feel that Community Advisory Board members ought to be compensated financially for their time and energy?
   
   
   Yes____   No____

G. Do you personally know any individual serving as a Community Advisory Board member?
   
   
   Yes____   No____

H. Do you feel that you have had the opportunity to express your interests in Model Cities Educational Programs to Community Advisory Board members?
   
   
   Most of the time
   
   Some of the time
   
   Infrequently
   
   Not at all

I. Did you participate in the Model Cities district elections for Community Advisory Board representation?
   
   
   Yes____   No____

J. If you had the choice of allowing the Community Advisory Board to represent your interests or the option of representing yourself, which would you choose?
   
   
   A. Community Board representation
   
   B. Self-representation
APPENDIX III

Comments and Interview Remarks
Interview Schedule "A"

A/A/1/6 Explain: boards formed to implement the will of community.
A/A/1/7 Why: seemed to have accomplished something vital and important for the community.
A/A/1/8 Explain: Didn't see many accomplishments - not enough communication and cooperation between the board and agency.
A/A/1/19 Explain: Make rules in the interest of the organization.
A/A/1/22 Not necessary
A/A/1/23 1) gained the true opinions of community grass-roots.
2) implementing community projects that community wanted.
3) created more community jobs.
A/A/1/24 1) Staff rules regarding child interaction.
2) Rules for accepting children into Montessori School.
3) community guidelines.
A/A/1/25 #2 of the above (rules for accepting children into Montessori School) which is closely related to #3 is perhaps the most necessary one to continue.

Remarks: feels that advisory board did a very good service to this agency. However, it was very unfortunate for the funds to be discontinued.

A= Interviewer (Dexter (A), Brucie (B), Tommy (C), Lucille (D))
A= Instrument (A) = A/A/1/6
1= Number of Personal Interview
6= Variable (question number)
Interview Schedule "A"

A/A/2/4 Comment: decision making board causes too many problems.

A/A/2/6 Explain: If total community is involved (grass-roots involvement).

A/A/2/7 total community or grass-roots did not participate in the program as they should, only certain people benefited from funds.

A/A/2/8 Explain: Policy had no real affect.

A/A/2/18 Explain: helped because of the money given and hindered because money taken away. (Indicates that they didn't have a community board).

A/A/2/19 Explain: Didn't introduce anything for the overall structure.

A/A/2/23 1) Packed Scope of services "or action contacts".
2) figured out bills.
3) Sent community person to act as liason.

Remarks: Overall operations were helpful yet not enough.
Interview Schedule "A"

A/A/3/6 Explain: Board is made up of community members who know best or what is best for the community - more so than city hall.

A/A/3/7 If community didn't participate, then model cities couldn't be functional.

A/A/3/8 Didn't fight to keep program from closing.

A/A/3/16 Did not help community organizations to the fullest.

A/A/3/19 Provided suggestions which were helpful and caused some operations to be better.

A/A/3/23 1) Employment office was started.
           2) Helpful in identifying community feelings.

A/A/3/24 Did little in the way of policy changes.

Remarks: Advertisement was lacking. Information concerning model cities was not easily available. Literature was oftentimes non-affecting.
Interview Schedule "A"

B/A/1/6 Explain: Pressure groups

B/A/1/7 Many community designed programs were implemented.

B/A/1/10 1) changed from advisory to decision making
          2) Multi-Cultural program curriculum

B/A/1/12 more para-professionals hired

B/A/1/19 Degrees are not necessary

B/A/1/22 Only for baby sitting, transportation for just the low income person.

B/A/1/23 1) Developing its own work proposal
          2) Implementing the proposal
          3) Motivating increased number of persons to participate.

B/A/1/24 1) An activated career development ladder
          2) Hiring of more para-professionals
          3) better and more staff training

B/A/1/25 all three of the above

B/A/1/28 not always

B/A/1/29 not always
Interview Schedule "A"

B/A/2/4 policy only

B/A/2/6 If the board has true community representation

B/A/2/7 Why: they have developed some outstanding programs.

B/A/2/7 Why not:
1) they could not understand the political ball game they were in.
2) they were locked into the politics of the local government and no
   one beats city hall.
3) the model cities concept could have been the first step in the right
   direction for the disadvantaged if the guide lines would have ex-
   cluded the city or local government.

B/A/2/8 Explain: They set the policy . . . . . the directive and establish
   objectives.

B/A/2/21 decision making

B/A/2/22 if the money er (sic)

B/A/2/23 1) understanding their role
2) their insistence to set policy only
3) working together on common community issues

B/A/2/24 1) Administrative policy
2) Financial policy
3) Physical policy dealing with personal

B/A/2/25 all

*B/A/2/18 helped most of the time
   Explain: They seemed to be parochial (sic)

B/A/2/31 some of the time
Interview Schedule "A"

B/A/3/6  Explain: The advisory board, in my opinion, is to advise or recommend. The community makes the final decision.

B/A/3/7  somewhat
Why not: Lack of communication with other agencies and the community at large.

B/A/3/8  no comment at this time.

B/A/3/21  I would suggest an advisory role.

B/A/3/23  1) community input
          2) presentation of new ideas

B/A/24  not aware of any at present
Interview Schedule "A"

B/A/4/6 The Board can reach more people, help people to unite (there is power in numbers).

B/A/4/7 Through these programs, many needs of the community has come to light and many changes have been made.

B/A/4/22 I don't think we have enough funds.
Interview Schedule "A"

D/A/1/8 presently its positive
Explain: Both experiences (Influence by the previous topics above)

D/A/1/11 Child protection and area of child real increase for family, family
day care.

D/A/1/19 Explain: Satellite day care had a good input.

D/A/1/20 Poor Question - have own board

D/A/1/23 1) Day Care development - our level of awareness

D/A/1/24 1) Experimental School age - Latch Key Child Day Care Program
2) Their impact connected with child care area is limited and connected
with committee on problem. A different attitude exists now.

Remarks: Mr. Gartner, very cooperative. More involved with Child care or Day care
program.
Interview Schedule "A"

D/A/2/8  Presently positive
          Explain: Both experiences: It fell on its face in its newness and its
          shifted from that on its feet now. Have had 3 different bds (sic).

D/A/2/11  Child protection and area of child, family day care

D/A/2/20  Poor Question - have own board

D/A/2/23  Day care development - ouw level of awareness

D/A/2/24  1) Experimental School Age - Latch Key Child Day Care Prog.
          2) Their input connected with child care area is limited.

Remarks: Robert Spelty, more directly involved with model cities. He and Gartner
          were interviewed at the same time. There were points where I felt, Spelty was re-
          served about answering. But yet he answered after thinking question over.
Interview Schedule "A"

D/A/3/6 Personal point of view can cause problems. The inability to recognize the limits of a board.

D/A/3/7 Do not feel they were as effective as they could have been. Constant change over of staff. Unclear directives. Lack of adequate communication. Too many committees. Double staffing until persons were competent.

D/A/3/8 Very positive

D/A/3/10 Program content - For equipment and Day Care programs - Programs - adults as well as children.

D/A/3/19 Yes - in an advocacy role. Some success of programs were done during crisis.

D/A/3/20 not the system they had

D/A/3/22 Best service comes from people when they serve as volunteers.

D/A/3/23 1) Keeping a program in a school building.
2) Finding other housing for program that has to move.
3) Spotting areas where additional funds could be obtained federally.

D/A/3/24 1) Broaden the program for Senior Citizens.
2) Broaden the program for the school age day care program.

Remarks: For the future, I should hope that the past mistakes of model cities programs are looked at and changed for the better.
Interview Schedule "A"

D/A/4/6 Providing the advisory bd, is made up of real-diff. backgrounds and different experiences. One of previous problems, people with little experience have been unbalanced.

D/A/4/7 Unbalanced boards not as affective as could have been. For two reasons. Existence has been to short to execute an effective program.

D/A/4/8 Model Cities has been more work. Has not had a large affect on Wikler Center.

D/A/4/16 Not shortcomings. Advisory boards need longer than three years to be effective. Change in personnel.

D/A/4/17 if there were some way to think of training for people before they come on the board!

D/A/4/21 In our agency - advisory role, for progress content and change only.

D/A/4/23 1) Redirecting a program - so that meets the needs of the participants.
2) The advocacy Role - Funding Boards is important
3) The Advisory Board, past and present living expenses.

D/A/4/24 1) Personnel Practices
2) Employment Policies - characteristics of person you plan to employ.
Interview Schedule "A"

D/A/5/6 There is a lot of personal attainment

D/A/5/7 cannot answer, have not been involved in Model Cities programs.

D/A/5/8 within limits of what they can do.

D/A/5/16 Did what they could the way program was set up. Not enough input.

D/A/5/18 In the beginning of program need people who are using the center to give input.

D/A/5/23 1) Making us aware of Community Agencies usage.
2) Support for the administration in relation to foundation.
3) Guidance on Programs.

D/A/5/30 can't answer in .... of the advisory board that we have. They do not represent a board.

Remarks: The advisory board has not reflected the majority feelings, there will be changes made to correct.
Interview Schedule "A"

D/A/6/3 when operating we had
D/A/6/4 Model Cities functioned in decision making.
D/A/6/6 advice of people can made a difference.
D/A/6/7 The community administration because overwhelming.
D/A/6/8 most of the time
D/A/6/12 changes were made immediately. positively.
D/A/6/18 In identifying needs and programs to meet the needs.
D/A/6/20 Advisory community groups are needed
D/A/6/22 to some extent for community need and circumstances.
D/A/6/23 1) Motivation to improve educational program
2) desire to change and improve certain programs for the young child.
3) General respect for education
D/A/6/24 1) Home School liason in central city
2) Value of having Para-professionals aides for more opportunity for
   individual instruction.

Remarks: Model Cities program was more than an advisory, a bureau was established.
Interview Schedule "A"

D/A/7/3 a parent committee
D/A/7/4 As far as what programs parents want for parent group activities.
D/A/7/6 Purchase of service agreement is done.
D/A/7/7 The families have been motivated and are making good use of the service.
D/A/7/19 nothing to do with administration
D/A/7/22 parent groups work on a volunteer basis.
D/A/7/23 1) family group involving parents.
           2) family group motivating parents.
           3) family group Planning Group mtgs.
D/A/7/24 There are no policy changes because do not have the authority.
D/A/7/34 Should be open to people within the area. Who ever is interested
           in the service.

Remarks: There is no advisory Board. The service of the Day Care Center is
          operated by the Wilder Foundation and the Model Cities Program which
          is part of the service.