SECTION V. ANALYSIS OF DATA IMPACT OF ENVIRONMENT ON PROJECT PERFORMANCE

5.1 SUPPORT/OPPOSITION, DEGREE OF ORGANIZATION, COHESIVENESS OF POVERTY COMMUNITY

The most significant environmental factor in terms of impact on project performance is the degree of support or opposition toward the project from the poverty community. The significance of poverty community impact increases in proportion to the degree of organization, cohesiveness, and aggressive leadership among the poor. The most vital interaction between projects and poverty community was found where there were clear poverty group issues having a major effect on large numbers of poor people and where poverty community leaders were operating from recognized organizational bases. The bases most often found were: anti-poverty programs such as Community Action Agencies and Model Cities Programs; civil rights or established minority group organization such as the NAACP, Urban League, CORE, MAPA; broad based special interest groups such as Welfare Rights Organizations, tenants councils, black students unions, Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund groups, black caucuses, and environmental protection groups.
Such recognized organizational bases, however, were generally found only in the large cities. In most instances, poverty communities were without sufficient economic resources, organizational sophistication, or political strength to spawn such power groups and leaders. Even official anti-poverty programs like the CAAs have been largely ineffective in developing strong community organization due to controls and constraints imposed by local political establishments. As a result, most of the cities visited during this evaluation had poverty communities characterized by little or no organization, fear, even among leaders, of "rocking the boat," or immobilizing fragmentation due to inter-group bickering and rivalries. Where such poverty community weaknesses existed, LSPs frequently tended to lack clear-cut priorities or vigorous community involvement, willing to drift along under the increasing inundation of routine individual services. The few project directors who attempted significant law reform or community representation in these settings found themselves with little or no outside support and vulnerable to attack from the establishment as well as rival factions or self-seeking individuals in the poverty community.

For regardless of the source of an LSP law reform activity, whether it be generated by project staff or someone in the poverty community, the success of that activity depends on the ability of significant segments of the poverty community effectively to support it. Most LSPs have not developed or been provided with adequate staff resources and know-how to generate effective poverty community organization where it is lacking.

Even where a poverty community is well-organized behind strong leaders, it was found that hostility between that community and an LSP may arise for a number of reasons. For example, in some cities a weak project director was looked on with scorn or mistrusted as a mouthpiece of the establishment. In other instances a strong but inexperienced director with a genuine desire to serve the poverty community made the mistake of not respecting the prerogatives of key poverty leaders -- by impatiently acting before they were ready, or without consulting them, or in breach of a previously made promise. Project directors have also made the mistake of backing the losing side in a fight within the poverty community, or of failing to discipline a staff attorney who offended a key leader.
However generated, the impact on an LSP of hostility from strong poverty community leaders or organizations was in most cases not critical to ultimate project success. It did, however, create troublesome pressures on projects such as problems in getting budget approvals, delays in getting disbursements (particularly where hostile poverty community leaders were influential in the CAA), and attacks on the project director or staff members in community meetings, LSP board meetings (through poverty community representatives), and the local press. In some cases poverty community hostility toward a project director or staff attorneys took the form of allegations against the LSP of failing to take important cases, poor handling of cases, violation of guidelines, conflict of interest, or nepotism. Such hostility, however, was generally resolved eventually by continuing effort at renewed contact by the project director or by continuing close contact with hostile community leaders by individual, trusted members of the project staff. In some instances where poverty community hostility appeared justifiable, it was relieved by removing the project director or offending staff attorneys.

On the other hand, where the project director (or staff attorneys) have the support of respected poverty leaders: (a) the project has a basis for developing non-individual service activities, (b) the project is supported in law reform cases, (c) community workers are made available for outreach and community education, and (d) a favorable image of the project is projected to the community at large.

5.2 SUPPORT/HOSTILITY OF THE LEGAL COMMUNITY

In all but small cities (generally those of less than 25,000 population) it was found that (regardless of actual project output) some private attorneys will praise the project because it relieves them of pro bono work they did before it came into operation, while others will allege that the project steals clients who could pay fees. However, significant legal community opinion was generally formulated by an elite group of leaders reacting to some particular controversial issues. Normally, these leading
lawyers are members of large law firms which represent important political and business institutions. They are leaders of significant legal community groups, such as the bar association. Their status in the community is evidenced by their membership on the boards of other civic groups, charitable institutions, and governmental authorities.

Legal community leaders tended to oppose any law reform and other non-individual services action; they tended to interpret legal services for the poor as providing individual legal services to deserving and appreciative poor. To them, group representation is often viewed by the attorney elite as especially reprehensible if one or more members of the group have incomes in excess of the project's income guidelines (allegedly they could afford legal services as individuals) or if the members could conceivably pool their resources to hire an attorney.

Except for support from an occasional progressive lawyer, the typical project director is constantly trying to get the lawyers on his board to officially sanction law reform and other non-individual services activities. In most cases he tires of trying to convince them, makes the appropriate poverty community contacts, and goes ahead with the action he desires. Occasionally, when a project is commended by OEO officials or in national legal periodicals, the lawyer elite will swing around to praise the work of "our local boys." Similarly, a prominent judge or senior attorney who praises the professional work of the project's attorneys can help to build legal community support (e.g., White Plains LSP law reform briefs are kept on file with judges as examples of excellent research). Generally, however, an effective project is operating in the face of some legal community hostility.

Legal community hostility usually cannot close a project. It can, however, make it difficult for the project to raise its local funding share. It also can mean that aggressive LSP lawyers are confronted by extreme advocacy (no settlement, fight all the way) by their opponents and the social ostracism of their peers. In extreme instances, where the project director has made a few serious mistakes (including failure to develop poverty community support), legal community opposition may be able to force his resignation.
Passive legal community support means that in-kind attorney services are technically volunteered (but restrictions may inhibit their use), occasional cases are referred to the project, and project attorneys are respected as worthy advocates and defended from attack. In the case of active support by the bench and bar, help will be provided by experienced lawyers in bringing law reform cases and in obtaining funding for poverty community projects. Project lawyers also will be praised as respected members of the legal community.

Fortunately for the Legal Services Program, at the state and national level progressive lawyers have banded together and made known through appropriate committees their support for OLS. State-wide leadership has tended to be more supportive than local leadership. The National Legal Aid and Defenders Association (NLADA) also has been a powerful sponsor of aggressive Legal Services activity, as has the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).

Two LSPs serve to illustrate the importance of higher level legal community support: CRLA and the Rhode Island LSP. CRLA is vehemently opposed by the conservative local bar associations in the California counties where it operates. It survives largely because of state and national legal community support. The Rhode Island LSP is also opposed by a strong body of conservative bar members who want judicare, but the project is maintained by a progressive governor and legislature.

5.3 SUPPORT/HOSTILITY OF POLITICAL COMMUNITY

Unless a project has directly challenged municipal government on a critical local issue, mayors and city councils tend to remain neutral toward LSPs. Actions against welfare departments, boards of education, housing authorities, and other administrative agencies are annoying, but unlikely to provoke the ire of city hall. However, when a project ties up all urban renewal projects, as has the Camden, N.J. project, political officials become hostile.
Like other detractors, a hostile municipal government will try to have the project defunded or the director replaced. Such efforts usually are unsuccessful. When a project strikes at a truly vital political issue, the poverty community is likely to come out in strong support of the project. Consequently, the project's board then tends to hesitate to take punitive action against the legal staff. Local government can cause difficulties for a project (which usually are ultimately overcome) where it controls the CAP and the project is a CAP delegate agency. The most serious threats to a project by a governmental unit were Governor Reagan's attempt to bury CRLA, the judicare challenge in Providence, the imposition of strict limitations on the Legal Aid Bureau in Chicago through the Mayor Daley-controlled CAA, and attempts to rigidly control or do away with a Navajo Indian LSP by the ruling faction of the Tribal Council. Strong support from progressive legal community elements (as mentioned above) plus extremely diplomatic action by national OEO and OLS officials were able to neutralize each of these threats.

The Legal Services Program also has been able to develop Congressional and state legislative support powerful enough to assure renewed funding for OLS in the face of local pressures.

Aside from moral support (and an occasional contribution to the local funding share) little significant impact on a project is generated by a favorable attitude of local government. A progressive mayor may exert some third party pressure on administrative agencies which a project is trying to reform (e.g., Denver's environment protection efforts). Often such pressure has little real effect because many agencies -- state agencies and public corporations -- are beyond his authority.

5.4 SUPPORT/HOSTILITY OF SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES

Most projects have neutral relationships with their local welfare departments, school systems, public housing authorities, and other social service agencies. Even the weakest project handles an occasional welfare or other social service case on an individual services basis. Frequently,
mutual respect is developed over time between those agencies and the project, and agency personnel refer disgruntled clients to the LSP. They realize that time is saved for everyone if a controversial matter is appropriately adjudicated as soon as possible.

Friendly caseworkers use the project to challenge rules and procedures which they have been unable to overturn through normal administrative channels. Furthermore, practically all (friendly and unfriendly) social service line personnel make regular referrals to LSPs when their clients have housing, consumer, domestic relations and other problems not involving their agencies. Usually welfare departments account for more LSP referrals than any other agency or organization, in some instances referring as much as 60 percent of a project's caseload.

Hostile social service agencies look for an occasional over-income case or other means of formally complaining to OEO about a troublesome project. Agencies also frequently try to enlist local government support to fight such a project. But just as local government itself is never successful in getting a project defunded and rarely successful in getting a project director removed, so social service agencies can do little to curtail an aggressive project's activities. In a few instances, where it can be clearly demonstrated that a staff attorney has violated professional ethics, that attorney will be reprimanded by the board. In several cities such as Seattle and Chicago, welfare administrators, concerned primarily with conserving dwindling resources, were angry with the persistent legal challenge to their policies and procedures by Legal Services attorneys. Such challenges were generally successful and often costly to the welfare department. Invariably the anger of the administrators was vented, not by opposing the Legal Services Program (which had already proven to be a formidable opponent), but by refusing to cooperate with the offending attorneys. As a result LSP attorneys were unable to obtain required procedural information, copies of regulations, or client information. In Chicago, for example, Legal Aid Bureau attorneys finally brought an action against the Cook County Department of Public Assistance, forcing the DPA to provide them with complete, up-to-date information.
SECTION VI. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

6.1 PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

When dealing with human institutions, the whole at times may prove greater than the sum of its aggregate parts. The Legal Service Program is a case in point. The mean overall rating assigned the 201 Legal Services projects evaluated was only 6.1, "fair" on a 12-point scale. But it does not necessarily follow that the Legal Services Program is only a fair program. Each LSP was rated against the optimum level of performance which might be achieved by a project with its resources and in its environment. That most projects do not live up to an ideal does not negate the fact that they are providing important services to the poor. Nor does it gainsay the often telling impact of the overall program in attacking the causes as well as the effects of poverty.
Exhibit 6.1

Strengths of the Legal Services Programs, listed in order of frequency or occurrence in responses of 26 program analysts:

1. Provided legal services in all 5 guidelines areas to people who otherwise could not afford them - 22.

2. Through law reform cases changed laws relevant to many of the poor; without OLS these cases would never have been litigated - 18.

3. Legal staff generally of high quality, dedicated - 12.

4. Legal education for poor as well as non-poor - 6.

   Poor coming to believe there are agencies which will intervene on their behalf - 6.

5. Develops community organization - 5.


7. Increases awareness of problems of poor - 3.


   Backup centers - 2.


   Imagination used in supplementing resources - 1.

   Respect of bench and bar gained - 1.

   Defender of scapegoat welfare recipient - 1.

   Gets along with other consumer groups - 1.
Exhibit 6.2

Weaknesses of the Legal Services Program, listed in order of frequency of occurrence in responses of 26 program analysts:

1. Poor management and guidelines from National - 14.
2. T.A. and training needed - 11.
3. Most programs under-funded - 8.
4. Inadequate management controls and reporting at project level - 7.
5. Training and administrative ability of many PD's weak; hard to remove them if inadequate.
   Board participation poor - 6.
   Inability of rural programs to attract good staff - 6.
7. Over-emphasis on individual services - 4.
   Few paraprofessional jobs available and those which exist offer no training mobility - 4.
   Often CAP-controlled - 4.
8. Project-community relations not close enough - 3.
   Too much political control - 3.
   Restraint on criminal practice - 3.
   Inadequate inter-project communication - 3.
   Non-competitive salaries - 3.
   Designated areas too large to enable clients to be reached - 3.
10. Intake not used to spot law reform cases - 1
    Community development neglected - 1
    Restraint on lobbying - 1
Too stringent income cutoff - 1
Inadequate contact and related program fragmentation services - 1
Lack of familiarity with backup centers - 1
Regional offices under-staffed and inefficient - 1
Inexperience and high turnover among much of attorney staff - 1
Timidity of many programs - 1
Need legislative reform effort on national level - 1
Need community education - 1
Absence of minority group legal staff - 1
Economic development - a waste of time - 1
Much of staff lacks sensitivity - 1
b.1.1 Delivery of Individual Services

The most fundamental strength of the Legal Services Program is that it has helped thousands of poor people, often in important ways. Twenty-two of 26 program analysts pointed to provision of individual services to people who would not otherwise have had access to them as a significant accomplishment of the program. Even poor projects offer improvements in this area over the type of services provided the indigent by under-staffed, part-time legal aid societies. The required participation of the poor in Legal Services projects in itself enhances both the actual and the perceived quality of individual services. In addition, the Legal Services client is served in areas which were not previously considered a lawyer's province: dealing with the welfare department, the housing authority, and other institutions with which the poor commonly have contact. Finally, the LSPs use of paraprofessionals, outside resources (e.g., backup centers), and improved case handling procedures (e.g., computerized records, special typewriters, and standardized forms) result in a capacity to handle far larger caseloads than the old legal aid societies did.

Delivery of individual services has had the obvious consequence of solving clients' immediate problems. But it also has had a more subtle long-term effect of making slow but permanent improvements in the quality of life of the poor. Such changes have been wrought by:

(a) Persistent use by LSP attorneys of law suits and negotiations on behalf of clients with consumer problems (e.g., improper sales contracts, harassment for payment in installment contracts, purchase of defective or inferior products, reprisals for default in payments, coercive sales practices, fraudulent or illegal credit charges and practices), forcing companies that do business with the poor to halt or modify practices from which these problems stem;

(b) Representation of welfare clients at fair hearings, gradually inducing state and local welfare departments to change policies and procedures to the benefit of recipients;
(c) Representation of clients with housing problems (e.g., evictions, code violations, inadequate services and utilities, lock-outs, or seizure of possessions), forcing housing authorities and slum landlords to eliminate offensive practices;

(d) Use of court actions and negotiations on behalf of clients with employment problems (e.g., reduction or withholding of promised wages to migrant laborers, inadequate living facilities for migrants, discriminatory hiring practices, denial of unemployment or disability benefits), forcing employers and employment services to adopt more ethical business standards;

(e) Use of divorce and bankruptcy litigation to make available for the first time to large numbers of poor people legal remedies heretofore reserved for the middle and upper classes. Availability of divorces has in some instances made mothers and children eligible for badly needed welfare, unemployment compensation, and social security benefits.

6.1.2 Non-Individual Services

6.1.2.1 Law Reform

Although individual services absorb the greatest portion of Legal Services' time, law reform activity gets the most public attention. Law reform, which existed only by chance in the legal aid societies (i.e., when an individual attorney became very interested in a case) has been the area of most dramatic accomplishment among Legal Services projects. After provision of individual services, it was named most frequently by program analysts as a strength of the Legal Services Program. Admittedly, the majority of LSNPs do little or no law reform. And what some projects have called law reform has not been especially relevant to the needs of the poor (e.g., Hartford, Conn. represented an anti-war group in its suit for permission to use a city park for a rally; Lowell, Massachusetts, represented a mother whose religious convictions prohibited her allowing her child a required immunization). On the other hand, most significant legal changes and innovations that have been accomplished for the poor during the last five years have been primarily the results of Legal Services projects' efforts.

Those projects specially organized and funded to pursue law reform (e.g., New Haven, Conn.; Western Center on Law and Poverty; Chicago Community Legal Counsel; San Francisco Youth Law Center) have been responsible for a
disproportionate amount of the law reform output of the Legal Services Program. However, it is noteworthy that at least one far-reaching decision, Tate vs. Short (which forbade jailing people too poor to pay fines levied on them), emanated from the Houston, Tex. LSP, an otherwise mediocre project.

The array of significant law reform cases brought by Legal Services is impressive. These include Shapiro vs. Thompson, which struck down residency requirements for welfare recipients; Hodges vs. Connecticut, which allowed poor people to sue for divorce without paying court costs; Dandridge vs. Williams, which challenged family maximum welfare grants; Edwards vs. Habib, which forbade retaliatory evictions by landlords of tenants who reported housing code violation; and Williams vs. White Plains Housing Authority, which required a due process hearing prior to eviction from a public housing project.

6.1.2.2 Community Representation/Involvement, Economic Development, Community Education

Activity in the remaining three OLS goal areas has been concentrated in community or group representation. Only a few projects have had effective community education or economic development activities.

Community representation/involvement has consisted primarily of organization and incorporation of community groups and secondarily of the provision of "house counsel" services. By assisting community organizations in defining and advocating the rights of their constituents, LSP attorneys have helped to build these groups into "counter-institutions." A counter-institution in this sense means that the community organization forces agencies dealing with the poor to change the ways they function--changes which are responsive to the requests of their clienteles. Florida Rural Legal Services is an example of a project which has been especially successful in this area.

An outstanding example of effective economic development activity is the Cleveland, Ohio LSP. The project formed a system of community development corporations. But it did not stop here. By assisting them in planning activities, drafting grant applications, drawing up work plans, and training
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staff, the Cleveland LSP has been instrumental in the development of several economic development projects, including a shopping center and a low-income housing complex. However, most LSPs have neither the staff nor the expertise to pursue such projects. The more conscientious economic development activities of other LSPs often amount only to organizing craft or food-buying cooperatives (e.g., Vermont) or incorporating economic development corporations (e.g., Redding, Calif.).

Community education has been perhaps the most neglected of the five goal areas. Many projects are restricted in their activities by the local bar association or operate under the assumption that community education is not as important as other service areas (e.g., Hartford, Conn.). Moreover, since most projects already have more cases than they can adequately handle, they are reluctant to generate still more by informing people of legal rights and remedies of which they were not previously aware. The community education activity of those projects which had it most often consisted of distributing leaflets and posters and giving talks at civic groups' meetings.

One of the few examples of a well planned and effective LSP community education program was developed on the initiative of a supervisory attorney in the Chicago Legal Aid Bureau. The attorney conducted a weekly program on a local radio and television station in Spanish. During the opening portion of the program he discussed a particular legal problem prevalent in the Spanish-speaking client community, then he responded to telephone calls from people in the community. It was estimated that the LAB attorney reached from 200,000 to 300,000 people a week through this program. Much of the effectiveness of this program was due to the dynamic personality, sensitivity and honesty of the attorney conducting it. Moreover, he had previously earned widespread trust and respect in the client community as a result of extensive involvement with community organizations.

Another example of a well planned community education program was observed in Memphis, Tenn, where the project director was strongly committed to community education as the top Legal Services priority. Highly effective public service announcements focusing on legal problems and solutions were developed by the Memphis LSP, with the assistance of the Memphis State College School of
Communications. These were broadcast regularly on some 20 radio and TV stations. One LSP staff member surveyed the poverty community and compiled a list of some 300 community organizations, clubs, fraternities, and churches. Educational materials were regularly distributed to organizations on the list, and educational forums were carried out with many of these groups.

In the Florida Rural Legal Service Program project staff, including clerical and administrative personnel, were assigned to assist in the preparing and distributing educational materials. They then organized and participated in educational discussions with poverty community groups.

The above examples were rare, however. In the overwhelming majority of projects visited, community education was half-hearted, ill-planned, and without sufficient staff or resource commitment. In many cases attempts at community education programs such as consumer education classes had been ineffectual due to an inability to attract and interest significant numbers of poor people. TV and radio programs were dull and unable to compete with standard commercial fare. The most effective community education usually proved to be a by-product of extensive staff attorney involvement with and representation of poverty community organizations. It has been difficult for projects to gauge the effectiveness of community education techniques because there has been no program-wide comparison and evaluation of them.

6.1.3 Program Administration: Regional and National

The major weakness of the Legal Services Program, as seen by the program analysts, is the lack of supervision and assistance given individual projects by the Regional and National Offices. Some project directors have never seen a copy of the OEO guidelines for Legal Services, nor have they received any other statement of policy or description of service areas. Some directors told evaluation teams that their projects had never before been evaluated and/or the only contact they have had with the Regional and National Offices has been over their budgets. Other project directors complained that they had been evaluated several times but had never received any feedback on the findings.
Those project directors who know they have not adhered to the guidelines are not worried about being punished by National or Regional. They know that LSPs have not been defunded and that special conditions compliance and statistical reporting are not generally checked. They also know that programs which have been evaluated repeatedly as poor have not always had their budgets cut (e.g., Houston, Texas), while projects which have been evaluated as outstanding have not necessarily received the increases they have requested (e.g., Sacramento, Calif.). In short, National and Regional administration has been so lax as to provide inadequate assistance to projects seeking it and little incentive to mediocre or recalcitrant projects to alter their operation.

6.2 EFFECTIVENESS OUTSIDE THE PROGRAM

6.2.1 The Legal Profession

A significant achievement of the Legal Services Program is the development of poverty law as a distinct subject of legal study, like criminal law, family law, and administrative law. Poverty law grew out of the program’s attracting a group of lawyers intent upon making the law a more effective instrument for social justice and allowing them to be aggressive in shaping the law to that end. It could be argued, in fact, that the law seldom served poor people until OLS attorneys came to their aid. Thus, OLS has created poverty law as a specialty in two important senses: (a) as a body of law defining the rights of the poor, and (b) as a group of attorneys who will develop that body of law through regular practice and research. Moreover, its legitimization, with its incorporation into law school curricula and discussion in law reviews, means that being a lawyer for the poor is no longer looked upon as a refuge for the less competent, but as a challenge worthy of the elite of the legal profession.

6.2.2 The Poverty Community

By providing a few of the individual poor and some poverty leaders with a feeling that justice can be obtained under law, Legal Services projects tend to reduce the likelihood of resort to violence and other extra-legal means of adjusting grievances. On several occasions, analysts were told by
community leaders that the fact that they could trust a project's lawyers to effectively represent their interests dissuaded them from taking to the streets (most notably in San Francisco as a result of the Youth Law Center's Neighborhood Alternatives Program and in Seattle through the work of the Jackson Street Neighborhood Office with a large, vocal and aggressive tenants' organization). Unfortunately, the limited effectiveness of community education has minimized this possible impact of the program. Projects have rarely reached the disillusioned high school dropout who is most likely to be motivated toward violent action against the system.
SECTION VII. SUPPLEMENTAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The contract requires the contractor to "recommend a typology of projects, and describe the assess impacts of programs within each type."

The "Typology Generator" included in the Data System and separately described enables OLS to categorize and classify all projects on the basis of any available element of data maintained in the file.

The "Critical Factor Generator," another component of the Data System, provides a relevant classification among 18 categories, and gives a continuing capability of identifying other significant types as new data becomes available.

The Data System, further, enables cross-correlation between any impact and type for which a specific data element exists. For example, the correlation of economic development (impact) with project of fewer than six lawyers (type) can readily be determined using the required software.
In addition to the requirements of the contract as noted, the evaluations, as set forth in the individual site reports and as summarized herein, present a number of recurring themes that should be specifically noted in any study of project effectiveness. The balance of this section will give suggestions and conclusions in the areas of:

- Policy
- Operations and Administration
- Evaluation Methodology

7.2 POLICY

7.2.1 Goals

The analysis indicates that, on the project level, those projects and, more particularly, those project directors with a clearly stated and accepted set of goals tend to be more effective than those that do not clearly define goals or accept them grudgingly. This would suggest that informative guidelines for interpreting national goals, and for the defining and implementing goals at the project level, would enhance project effectiveness.

7.2.2 Criminal Representation

The statutory authorization and the national policy limit the types of coverage that a project may provide. Without questioning such limitations, it should be noted that many of the individual project evaluations show that prohibition of criminal representation inhibits project effectiveness. Here, the community, and, in some cases, even the clerical and para-professional staff of the project, give diminished credibility to the program because of the artificial distinction, to the lay eye, between civil and criminal matters. If wholehearted support and acceptance by the target community is to be a goal or a measure of effectiveness, then in many cases this will be inhibited by the restriction on criminal representation. A corollary of this is found in the effect on the professional staff, who have, at times, shown frustration
at being deprived of a group of tools usually available to a lawyer representing a client. These are elements to be considered in any future analysis of the ban on criminal representation.

7.3 OPERATIONS/ADMINISTRATION

7.3.1 Review and "Feed-Back"

In many projects there is little or no review of work done by or interchange of information among members of the technical staff. It would seem that more supervision by project directors or senior attorneys, in the form of case reviews, office meetings and exchange of information, would help eliminate many of the quality problems noted by the evaluators. Contact between the back-up centers and the project may be enhanced if the centers supported the project director in his case review effort by developing check-lists and current-awareness devices for the director's use.

7.3.2 Administrative Support and Simplification

Throughout the site evaluation reports, the evaluators note administrative and record keeping problems of projects. The problems have been ascribed to reasons ranging from the lawyer's supposed distaste of routine to lack of funding, but it has been assumed that a substantial portion of a project's resources should or could be devoted to gathering and passing on all sorts of data. It would, in the opinion of the evaluation staff, bear further and prompt investigation to determine how much of this burden can be lifted from the professional staffs of the project and whether costs might not be reduced, as well. A possible approach would be to impose one, and only one, data recording responsibility on the project professional staff: preparation and filing of a daily time card. This one document, which many lawyers are used to preparing, can then serve as input at, say, the Regional level for staff statistics, etc. By a one-time effort in the design of the input form, sufficient data would be made available to identifying each client, each matter, the work done, the time spent and many other bits of information that go to managing for effectiveness. Displays of the assembled
data, or analyses of such displays, could be fed-back by Regional offices to the Project Director; without comment or with guidance, as may be appropriate. Several presently existing ambiguities in the data would be eliminated. For example, the definition of a "case" varies from project to project. With the suggested time reporting system a project's definition of a case would be irrelevant; the Regional office could set up a uniform definition and monitor it.

7.3.3 Funding

Delays and complications in receiving funds have been cited by many projects. Here, too, a more direct disbursement system may improve staff efficiency and, with it, project effectiveness.

7.3.4 Staff Turnover

It is clear from the site evaluation reports that staff acquisition and turnover are major problems, caused in large part by the lower-than-market salaries paid by most LSP's. The problem of acquiring competent professional staff has been partially overcome by an appeal to the service orientation of many recent graduates, and by the opportunity to gain valuable experience. These incentives have been less effective, however, in keeping lawyers past a year or two. A recommendation to increasing program funding (or reducing the number of projects) to allow higher salaries, would be beyond our scope, but there are ways of easing the problem:

- Provide some permanent career professional staff paid by the national office and resident at the Regional or National Office, who are available to give continuity and to staff projects as positions temporarily become vacant.

- Provide upward job mobility within the program, recruiting for higher-paying positions from among lawyers within the program, and discourage lateral entry.
Develop in each project a cadre of lay administrators and paraprofessionals, who can be paid competitively, and who would lessen dependence on professional staff by requiring fewer professionals for a given volume of activity.

7.3.5 Paraprofessionals

The evaluation teams found one or both of two types of paraprofessionals in many of the LSP's.

- The "inside" paraprofessional, either skilled in office administration, or in routine aspect of office practice such as preparation of divorce pleadings.

- The "outside" paraprofessional who might be an investigator, social worker, or an advocate representing clients of the LSP in dealing with public agencies and before administrative boards.

Not only are paraprofessionals important in backing-up and giving continuity to rapidly changing professional staffs, but they have a number of positive features that impact on the community:

- Paraprofessionals, when indigenous, can often identify with and understand the community better than a professional from outside.

- The community may find it easier to identify with an indigenous paraprofessional than with a "strange" professional.

- Paraprofessionalism is a means for obtaining a prestigious occupation for members of the target community.

- Paraprofessionals do their job well and without conflict with attorneys when the limit of their activity is clearly defined.

- Where paraprofessionals are available and trained, they can enhance both the acceptance and the cost/effectiveness of the LSP.
- It may be possible for the LSP's to spin-off independently practicing paraprofessionals who can handle certain types of matters on their own and on an economically viable basis. This would require considerable further study.

7.4 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

7.4.1 Frequency

The evaluations found, on many occasions that they were hard on the heels of the previous evaluation team, even though they had departed a year before. It was often difficult to implement, let alone evaluate, the recommendations of an evaluation within one year's time. On the other hand, acute situations may be found which require prompt action and which may call for evaluation of that action in a matter of months after the recommendation. For these reasons, it is suggested that evaluations not be scheduled on some largely irrelevant basis, such as project-year-end date, but rather on the need for the evaluation. A major "check-up" is called for every several years, perhaps triennially. Specific action items resulting from a triennial evaluation or interim regional office action can be followed-up at more frequent intervals.

7.4.2 Staffing

The analysts were of the opinion that much of the field work could have been done by lawyers alone, without "community representatives" or even analysts, in most cases, provided that the lawyers were familiar with the instruments, LSP operations, and the content of the site report. If frequency and scope of evaluations are both reduced as suggested in 7.4.1 at least interim evaluations could be by attorney only. The only support required would be in the areas of logistics and report writing; these could be handled by the equivalent of the present project analyst, but remotely rather than on-site. The analyst would function as a combination travel agency and copy editor, setting up the site visit, writing the report on
the information submitted, and delivering it to OLS. This mode of operation would result in considerable savings over that required by the present method of evaluating projects yearly.

7.4.3 Scope

The extent of coverage of the evaluation data may be reducible. Much operational data collected in the evaluations under this contract could have been obtained from processing of the suggested data input form described in 7.3.2. A good part of the environmental data could have been obtained from other sources (e.g., census, MIS files) rather than in the field. Further, since the critical factor identifier indicates that environment has little correlation with overall effectiveness, the amount of anecdotal data on the environment can be substantially reduced.

7.5 SUMMARY

The Office of Legal Services now has in the Data System a capability by which the results of evaluations can be made accessible by OLS management and the relationships of various elements of the data made evident. From these relationships, areas for management examination and effort that will most likely prove fruitful can be and were identified. The Data System also indicated that savings are possible in the evaluation process itself.
APPENDIX I. INTERVIEW GUIDE
# LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM
## INTERVIEW GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWEE (Check)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MANAGEMENT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1 History</td>
<td>P L S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case Generation and Handling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Case Disposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Personnel Administration</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Office Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Board Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Special Grant Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td><strong>GOALS AND ACTIVITIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Individual Client Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Law Reform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Community Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Community Representation/Involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td><strong>RESOURCES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Outside Support</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Project Service Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 Poverty Community Image of LSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Political Legal Economic and Social Service Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Poverty Community Organizational Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Political Climate</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 Legal Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Economic Development Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Social Service Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Major Impressions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REFERENCE ABBREVIATION KEY
- **R** - Summary Rating Page No. (OLS 4, 5 & 6)
- Numbers in ( ) are rating factor numbers
- **DB** - Rating in Debriefing Notes (OLS 3)
- **LS** - Lawyer Supplement Rating (OLS 2)
- **IG** - Interview Guild rating (OLS 1)
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LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM
INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTERVIEWEE INFORMATION

Name: __________________________ Race: W B SS/Other Sex: M F

Title (if any): __________________________ Approx. Age: 20-30 30-40 40-50 >50

Length of Time in This Position: ________(Yr.) Supervisor: ________

Education: <12 High School College: 1 2 3 4 Advanced Deg: Law, MA/S

IN ________ From: _____________

Previous Experience: Last Position: __________________________

Type of Work: __________________________ Title: _____________

Duration: _____________

Position in Other Community Organization:

Office Held (if any): _____________ Duration of Involvement: ______

Relationship or Involvement with LSP: __________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

NOTE: If other interviewees present, repeat above information for each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Components:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who organized project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to established legal aid and public defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which services added, which replaced, which no longer available. (Since change from Legal Aid to LSP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Ref.: 3.1
Rating Ref.: None
TOPIC AREA: PROJECT MANAGEMENT - CASE GENERATION AND HANDLING

OBJECTIVE: To describe the steps that a client takes from his first contact with LSP until his case is complete.

NOTE: When asking client, probe for his impression of service on each topic covered.

TOPIC COMPONENTS: (Obtain copies of forms used in process.)
Source of clients (referrals, walk-ins, other)

Special efforts to obtain cases. (Outreach into community). Intake process description (staff responsible, waiting time to see lawyer)

Assignment procedures (eligibility criteria, eligibility check, person making checks, staff assignment to case)

What is the LSP's definition of a case? When and how is case file started?

Attorney/client communication (method, procedures of frequency)

Client responses or feedback about service.

Report Ref.: 3.4.1
Rating Ref.: R11 (440-444); R22 (322);
DB-362,206
**TOPIC AREA:** PROJECT MANAGEMENT - CASE DISPOSITION

**OBJECTIVE:** To determine the steps and alternatives of case disposition used by project. To determine adequacy and thoroughness of operating procedures.

**TOPIC COMPONENTS:**

- **Type of activities available (counseling, litigation etc.)**
- **Criteria for referral to other legal agencies**
- **Criteria for referral to other social agencies**
- **Case closing criteria, procedure-steps in processes, client communication**
- **Follow-up Procedures**

**Report Ref.:** 3.4.2
OBJECTIVE: To describe the procedures and policies governing the selection, training, assignment, salary, etc., of LSP personnel. To assess adequacy and relevance of procedures used.

TOPIC COMPONENTS:
Attorney hiring procedures, selection criteria, training, salary level

Hiring procedures - (clerical & paraprofessional. Selection criteria, training)

Staff communication procedures. (e.g. meeting, memo, etc. (Obtain copy of staff meeting minutes))

Personnel evaluation (cycle, type)

Staff morale, commitment.

Report Ref.: 3.4.3-3.4.32
Rating Ref.: R39 (448-451); R22 (323). DB-362,206
TOPIC AREA: PROJECT MANAGEMENT - OFFICE ADMINISTRATION

OBJECTIVE: To describe the office procedures and determine their adequacy.

TOPIC COMPONENTS: (Obtain copies of applicable written procedures where possible)

Procedures for starting, maintenance, and filing case records (examine the file system)

Procedures for statistical reporting

Procedures for bill paying, salary administration, checks and balances

Personnel policies

Personnel responsibilities in above procedures (who writes, changes, or enforces them?)

Adequacy of office procedures

Report Ref: 3.5 - 3.5.3
Rating Ref: R14 (452-454); R22 (324). DB-362,206
TOPIC AREA: BOARD RELATIONSHIPS

OBJECTIVE: To describe the LSP Board, its role in LSP Policy and Operations and the major effect on the LSP.

TOPIC COMPONENTS: (Obtain copy of by-laws or charter. Obtain copy of Board Meeting Minutes)
Composition (List): How appointed, turnover, major conflicts, issues, factions; Representativeness of Poverty and Community at large. Dominant person or group.

Attitude toward LSP goals. Major restrictions on case types. Support for controversial activities.

Relationship with PD. Role in staff selection. Policy direction. Business procedures.

Assessment of effect on LSP.

Sensitivity to planning. Sensitivity to poverty community.

Characterization (Liberal, Conservative)

Report Ref.: 3.6-3.6.3
Rating Ref.: R10 (437). DB-361, 362, 206
TOPIC AREA: SPECIAL GRANT CONDITIONS MONITORING

OBJECTIVE: To check on compliance of grant conditions as required.

INSTRUCTIONS:
1. Fill in grant conditions prior to interview. (Obtain list from Grant Document)

2. Place OK to indicate that project is complying satisfactorily with grant condition, guideline or policy. Place NO to indicate non-compliance and attach a narrative explanation and recommendation.

3. Identify needs for technical assistance.

Were changes recommended during last evaluation made?

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

Are special grant conditions being complied with?

Special Condition #1

2

3

4

Written personnel policies established in accordance with OLS Guidelines.

No criminal representation except as allowed by OEO guidelines.

Report Ref.: 3.4.4
Rating Ref.: None
**TOPIC AREA: GOALS**

**OBJECTIVE:** To identify and analyze project goals.

**TOPIC COMPONENTS:**

- Identify goals
- Understanding and interpretation of project goals
- How and who makes them (Role of Board, Poverty Community)
- Relevance of goals to needs of community
- Relevance of project goals to LSP goals
TCPIC AREA: PROJECT ACTIVITIES - INDIVIDUAL CLIENT SERVICES

OBJECTIVE: To provide a detailed picture of the character of the individual legal services.

TOPIC COMPONENTS:
Types of individual cases (domestic, landlord/tenant, bankruptcies, types prohibited)

% of each type

Staff time on each type

Outstanding accomplishments, assessment

Impact, effectiveness of individual case services (upon individuals or groups)

Any negative results from individual services (upon community, public agencies)

Report Ref.: 4.2
Rating Ref.: R24 (221)
DB-205
TOPIC AREA: PROJECT ACTIVITIES - LAW REFORM

OBJECTIVE: To provide a picture of the project's activities in the area of law reform. To determine the PD's commitment and knowledge of law reform. To determine the relevancy of law reform to poverty community needs.

TOPIC COMPONENTS:

Description of law reform projects

Staff responsible

Result or status

Expected or desired effect on poor; actual effect

Any planning done by LSP in this area (long range, short term strategy)

Attitude of poverty community to LSP Law Reform activities (or lack of)

Report Ref.: 4.3 - 4.3.3
Rating Ref.: R24 (223)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC AREA: PROJECT ACTIVITIES - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE:** To provide a detailed picture of project's economic development activities. To determine project's ability to provide economic development assistance and its relevancy to needs of poverty community.

**TOPIC COMPONENTS:**

- Description of economic development activities.

- Responsible staff and % of time on this activity

- Status or results

- Type of involvement (generation, promotion, advise, representation)

- Desired or expected results; actual results.

- Planning done by LSP in this area (long range, short-term strategy)

- Attitude of poverty community and of economic groups to LSP economic development activities (or lack of)

*Report Ref.: 4.4.-4.4.3*
*Rating Ref.: R24 (223)*
**TOPIC AREA:** PROJECT ACTIVITIES - COMMUNITY EDUCATION

**OBJECTIVE:** To provide a detailed picture of activities planned to make poverty community aware of legal rights and alternatives. To determine degree of project commitment toward legal education in poverty community.

**TOPIC COMPONENTS:**

- Description of education publications (collect samples) and activities (including forums, meetings, etc.)

- Responsible staff and (%) of time on this activity

- Assessment of results (desired and expected; actually achieved)

- Planning done by LSP in this area (long range, short term strategy)

- Attitude of poverty community and community groups to LSP community education activities (or lack of)

---

Report Ref.: 4.5-4.5.3
Rating Ref.: R24 (223)
TOPIC AREA: PROJECT ACTIVITIES - COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION/INVOLVEMENT

OBJECTIVE: To provide a detailed picture of project/poverty community involvement and group representation. To determine P.D. commitment to and understanding of poverty community needs and issues.

TOPIC COMPONENTS:
- Groups represented by LSP.
- Type of representation (group representation, advocacy, community action)
- Assessment of staff competency and results in this area
- Relevancy of activities to poverty community needs
- How has poverty community participated in LSP? How is LSP known in community?
- Planning done in this area
- Attitude of poverty community and community groups to LSP activities in this area (or lack of)

Report Ref.: 4.6-4.6.2
Rating Ref.: R24 (223)
**TOPIC AREA:** PROJECT RESOURCES - STAFFING

**OBJECTIVE:** To describe staff functions, staff interaction, salary distribution.

**TOPIC COMPONENTS:**
- Obtain list of Personnel by office. (name, position title, salary, length of time with project)

Turnover of attorneys and non-legal staff. Average tenure - attorneys/other.

Support staff (number, type, volume, full time equivalents)

Efforts made to obtain staff from poverty population (legal, non-legal)

Interoffice Communication and Liaison.

Organization and task responsibility chart.

---

Report Ref: 3.3 - 3.3.4
Rating Ref: R17 (460-464)
R23 (333). DB-363, 364, 206
TOPIC AREA: PROJECT RESOURCES - FACILITIES

OBJECTIVE: To determine the adequacy of the LSP facilities.

TOPIC COMPONENTS:

Location and visibility of offices

Accessibility to clients, transportation facilities

Appointment hours for clients, how are appointments made, time between appointment and first consultation

Privacy, adequacy of space

Availability of office equipment, library (inspect)

Report Ref: 3.3.1
Rating Ref: R16 (455-459); R13 (331); DB-363, 364, 206
TOPIC AREA: PROJECT RESOURCES - FUNDING

OBJECTIVE: To describe funding sources and procedures including non-federal share.

TOPIC COMPONENTS:

Obtain copy of budget status report.

Amounts of funding.

Funding procedures.

Funding agency relationships and procedure.

In-kind resources and accounting.

In-kind contributions (adequacy, achievement, timeliness)

Report Ref: 3.3.3
Rating Ref: R12 (465-466);
R23 (332), DB-363, 364, 206
**TOPIC AREA: PROJECT RESOURCES - OUTSIDE SUPPORT**

**OBJECTIVE:** To determine utilization of available outside resources and assistance to LSP project.

**TOPIC COMPONENTS:**
- Availability of other legal aid to poor - identify, describe adequacy how long available
- LSP relationship to other groups
- RHSS Fellows or Vista (utilization, no, tenure)
- CAP resources (use, efficacy)
- Volunteers (paraprofessional, clerical)
- Technical resources (Back-Up Centers, State Library, Law School) NOTE: List Back-Up Centers Used and, area of and frequency of use, adequacy of center’s assistance to LSP.

Report Ref: 3.3.4
Rating Ref: R19 (467-471); R23 (334)
TOPIC AREA: PROJECT SERVICE AREA

OBJECTIVE: Obtain description and needs of poverty population. (Obtain census or Department of Labor Data, GAP forms).

TOPIC COMPONENTS:
Service Area - city and county - Population % by breakdown by race, income

Number and % of population meeting poverty eligibility criteria.

Med. areas of concentration in LSP Service Area - Census, Neighborhoods, municipalities, Model Cities area

Percent poverty population served. Reasons for differences between poverty population and percent served.

Minority unemployment; median income.

Report Ref.: 1.1.1, 2.2, 2.2.1
Rating Ref.: None
**TOPIC AREA:** POVERTY COMMUNITY - IMAGE OF LSP

**OBJECTIVE:** To identify the major attitudes of the poverty community toward the LSP and to determine the image of the LSP.

**TOPIC COMPONENTS:**

- Groups in Poverty Community who use LSP service (what type, adequacy, effectiveness results)
- Major issues for poverty
- LSP relevancy (goals, achievement, relevant to poverty community issues and needs)
- LSP staff (commitment, competence)
- LSP Results (overall assessment of activities)

Report Ref: 2.2.2,2.2.3
Rating Ref: 16-210-214
TOPIC AREA: POLITICAL, LEGAL, ECONOMIC, & SOCIAL SERVICE STRUCTURE

OBJECTIVE: Identify and describe the major agencies and organizations that interact with the LSP. Note their activity area, if they have facilities in the poverty community and indicate the effectiveness of their activity.

TOPIC COMPONENTS:

Public agencies serving health, education, welfare, economic, political and social needs of the target community.

Major private agencies serving target community, source of funds for agencies, types of services rendered, groups of people served.

Political affiliations of elected officials of city government.

Special programs for poverty community (Model Cities, health clinics, CAP)

List and describe organized legal groups, courts, court structure, law enforcement units.

List and describe economic development groups, lending institutions, government resources (SBA, MESBIR EDA), special training programs.

Report Ref. 2.1.1.7, 2.1.2.1, 2.1.3.1, 2.1.4.1
Rating Ref. None
TOPIC AREA: POVERTY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES

OBJECTIVE: To identify and describe available poverty community organizational resources that interact with LSP

TOPIC COMPONENTS:

Name, type and role of political, civic, social or educational groups in target community.

With which groups does LSP interact? Type of relationship (advice, advocates, etc.)

Names of key people in these organizations

Activity level of established groups. (Media views on activities degree of influence in community)

What needs are these groups satisfying?

Report Ref.: 2.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2
Rating Ref.: R2 (472-475)
TOPIC AREA: POLITICAL CLIMATE

OBJECTIVE: To identify and describe the relationship between the Poverty Community, the LSP, and the Political Environment and prevailing attitudes.

TOPIC COMPONENTS:
- Attitudes - local government and poverty community toward CAA, LSP.

Poverty and minority group representation and participation in local government (appointments, hirings, elected persons, group influence)

Major problems of minority representation and support in political area for poverty programs.

Community racial tensions.

Characterization of news media re: poverty community, LSP

Report Ref: 2.1.1.2.1.1.2
Rating Ref: R3 (401-405)
R21 (310)
**TOPIC AREA: LEGAL CLIMATE**

**OBJECTIVE:** To describe relationships and attitudes re: the legal community, the LSP and the Poverty Community.

**TOPIC COMPONENTS:**
- Attitudes courts, Bar, law enforcement units, toward poor and LSP.
- Type of contacts and problems between courts, Bar and law enforcement units and poor, and LSP.
- Attitude Judges toward LSP staff and activities.
- Degree of support for aggressive law reform from Bar or courts, other groups.

Report Ref: 2.1.2, 2.1.2.2
Rating Ref: R5 (420-423); R6 (424-427), R7 (428-430), R21 (312)
**TOPIC AREA: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CLIMATE**

**OBJECTIVE:** To describe the availability of resources and degree of involvement of poverty community in economic development. And, to identify role of LSP with these activities.

**TOPIC COMPONENTS:**
- Identify economic development groups, describe their activities and their attitude toward the poverty community (including racial discrimination) (List)

Describe the attitude including racial discrimination of financial and credit granting institutions

- Describe major economic development opportunities which should be investigated.

---

Report Ref.: 2.1.3, 2.1.3.2
Rating Ref.: R4 (410,411); R21 (311)
TOPIC AREA: SOCIAL SERVICE CLIMATE

OBJECTIVE: To describe relationships and attitudes re: social service agencies and poverty community and LSP.

TOPIC COMPONENTS:
- List major social service agencies.
- Attitude toward the poverty community and its needs.
- Attitude toward and Interaction with the LSP (including referrals and provision of services).
- Adequacy of resources and reasonableness of grant and administrative procedures.

Report Ref.: 2.1.4, 2.1.4.2
Rating Ref.: R8 (431-435)
R21 (333)
TOPIC AREA: MAJOR IMPRESSIONS

OBJECTIVE: Obtain interviewee's overall view of LSP including accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses, and/or efficacy and problems.

TOPIC COMPONENTS: LSP strengths, weaknesses, problems, community constraints.
In general, any topic the interviewee wishes to address. Key into operations or self-analysis data.

Report Ref.: 1.2, 1.3, 1.4
Rating Ref.: None
After the interview (and out of the interview situation) complete the Rating page (or pages) following these instructions:

1. Note the RATING AREA title.

2. Read each Rating FACTOR TITLE and its associated FACTOR DESCRIPTORS.

3. Review the notes taken on pages of the interview Guide related to the Factor (INT: GUIDE REF (Ex. CI-8 means Core Interview Guide, page 8; S-6 means Staff Lawyer Supplement Interview Guide, page 6)).

4. Make the choice of the descriptive you think best describes the interviewee's opinion about the LSP. Place a check to the right of the chosen descriptor.

NOTE: If you feel you cannot make a rating the reason must be explained in the provided space on the rating sheet. That space also can be used to note any special circumstances affecting the rating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Ref.</th>
<th>Eval. Guide Ref.</th>
<th>Factor Title</th>
<th>Factor Descriptors</th>
<th>Check</th>
<th>Notes or Reason If Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLS1-19 2</td>
<td>RELEVANCE OF LSP ACTIVITIES TO POVERTY COMMUNITY NEEDS</td>
<td>LSP activities seen as mostly ignoring needs of the poverty community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some LSP activities meeting individual needs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SP activities mostly in areas of high priority needs of poverty community.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASSESSMENT OF LSP RESULTS</td>
<td>LSP has had very little success in its activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSP had had mixed results from its activities.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSP seems to be quite successful in the activities in which it is involved.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLS1-19 2</td>
<td>LSP STAFF COMPETENCE</td>
<td>Most LSP staff seen as inexperienced and/or unable to provide good legal services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSP staff generally seen as adequate; or some staff are poor, others good.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSP staff considered competent and knowledgeable. All staff seen as good lawyers (some outstanding).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEETING OF LSP GOALS</td>
<td>LSP has little commitment or ability to meet program goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSP meets individual service goals but has done little in other goal area.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSP has activities in most of program goals area and had some success in each.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OPINION VALIDITY</td>
<td>Interviewee has little or no knowledge of LSP.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee fairly knowledgeable about LSP, has some experience with project.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee has intimate knowledge of LSP through prolonged contact.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OLS-4
ATTORNEY SUMMARY REPORT

The team attorney will use this booklet to write-up the results of his evaluation of the project. All headings are self explanatory. The attorney should provide: 1) a readable, complete and well documented analysis of project performance (qualitative and quantitative) in the 5 OLS goal areas; 2) conclusions on the factors influencing project performance (e.g., environmental, personnel training, Board); and 3) recommendations which are both realistic and supported by documented strengths and weaknesses.

This booklet serves two purposes. First, it enables the Team Lawyer to fully communicate the results of his evaluation to Auerbach for use by the Project Analyst in preparing the formal project report to OLS. Second, it also is filed, exactly as prepared by the attorney, with the Chief of Evaluations, Office of Legal Services to further document the evaluation effort.

Numbers in parenthesis (OLS 1-26) refer to interview guide and page number where information is found for summarizing. Please complete Sections II - V before preparing Section I - Conclusions.
SECTION I. EVALUATION SUMMARY (OLS 1-26)

1.2 CONCLUSIONS AND OVERVIEW (Present overall numerical project rating. Then, provide the following: a) Your overall assessment of the projects performance in terms of quality of work, effectiveness, management, responsiveness to client needs and responsiveness to OLS's five goal areas. b) Summary paragraphs describing and evaluating major project factors and features which affect the project. This should also support your overall conclusions about the project. c) Any other summary remarks you wish to make about the project.

GUIDE

For your guidance, the below list of key project factors is presented to assist you in noting significant project strengths and weaknesses and the factors effecting project operations.

PROJECT FACTORS

I. Activities
   A. Individual Legal Services
   B. Law Reform
   C. Community Representation-Involvement
   D. Community Education
   E. Economic Development

II. Personnel Effectiveness
   A. Director
   B. Attorneys
   C. Clerical
   D. Para-Professional

III. Board Effectiveness
   A. Structure
   B. Role

IV. Management Efficiency
   A. Case Generation & Handling
   B. Personnel Administration

V. Resources
   A. Funding
   B. Personnel
   C. Facilities
   D. Use of Backup Centers and Other Outside Resources

VI. Community Image
   A. Awareness
   B. Services Rendered
   C. Effectiveness
1.3 PROJECT STRENGTHS (Identify, describe, document and evaluate in detail all project factors (see guide) which are, in your judgement, superior and are strong points.) (OLS 1-26)
PROJECT WEAKNESSES (Identify, describe, document and evaluate in detail all project factors (see guide) which are, in your judgement less than adequate and/or are project weaknesses.) (OLS 1-26)
1.5 RECOMMENDATIONS (Primary emphasis should be given to factors wherein the project is weak or inadequate. The recommendations must be detailed, well formulated, feasible, implementable and supported by your discussion of weaknesses, your conclusions and Sections II, III and IV of this booklet.)
SECTION II. PROJECT ENVIRONMENT

Provide a brief analytical description -- relate to impacts upon project's operation and provide documentation.

2.1.1.2 Political Climate (Attitudes toward LSP, influences on LSP activities) (OLS1-22)

2.1.2 Legal Structure (Briefly describe, identify relationships with and attitudes toward LSP/Poverty Community, influence on LSP activities.) (OLS1-20)

2.2.2 Poverty Community Needs (which can be subject of legal redress by LSP but have not) (OLS1-19, 21)

2.2.3 Poverty Community -- LSP Relations (LSP awareness of community needs, LSP staff attitudes to poverty community, poverty community's awareness, opinion of LSP.) (OLS1-21)
SECTION III. PROJECT OPERATIONS

Provide brief analytical description -- relate to impacts upon project's operations and provide documentation.

3.2 Project Goals (Relevance of activities to stated goals, staff understanding of goals, roles in project goal setting) (OLS1-8)

3.3.1 Facilities (Adequacy of office space, location, hours of business, support facilities such as library) (OLS1-15)

3.3.2 Staff (Legal Staff responsibilities, e.g., separate units for law reform, community education.)

3.3.4 Availability/Utilization of Outside Resources (Identify specific resources used such as local Bar, Law Schools, Back-Up Centers, and how, discuss failure to use available resources and effect) (OLS1-17)
3.4.1 Case Generation and Handling (Describe main points, identify inadequate and/or superior features) (OLS1-2)

3.4.2 Case Disposition (Fully describe and identify inadequate and/or superior features) (OLS1-3)

3.4.3.1 Personnel Selection/Evaluation (Comment on assignment/evaluation of Legal Staff) (OLS1-4)

3.4.3.2 Personnel Training/Communication (Comment on training/development of Legal Staff and communication among Legal Staff) (OLS1-4)
3.5.1 Filing (Fully describe and comment on adequacy or inadequacy of case record handling) (OLS1-2)

3.6.1 Board of Directors (Composition, participation in Board activities) (OLS1-6)

3.6.2 Board of Directors (Activities and role in project, effect upon project activities and staff) (OLS1-6)
SECTION IV. PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Fully identify, describe and evaluate activities in the five OLS goal areas. Discuss quantity and quality of activity, impact and effectiveness of activities and relevance to needs of client population. (OLSI-11; OLS2-8, 11)

4.2 Individual Legal Services (Type, level of effort, quality) (OLSI-9; OLS2-2, 9)

4.3 Law Reform (Activity, accomplishments, quality) (OLSI-10; OLS2-6, 10)
4.4 Economic Development (Activity, level of effort, accomplishments) (OLSI-11; OLS2-8, II)

4.5 Community Education (Description, Quality) (OLSI-12; OLS2-9, II)

4.6 Group Representation and Community Involvement (Description, accomplishments) (OLSI-13; OLS2-10, II)
SECTION V. EVALUATION OF PROJECT STAFF

The evaluation team lawyer(s) will use this page and the following one to write up their evaluation of the Project Director, all project case-handling lawyers and other project personnel (Reggies, VISTA's, paraprofessionals, clerical) who make a significant contribution, positive or negative, to the project. For each individual evaluated, provide the following identification: Name, position, length of time with project, nature of general activity, noteworthy accomplishments. Then, provide a narrative evaluation with respect to the following factors:

A. Competence - Knowledge of relevant law, ability to research the law, ability to effectively handle a reasonable/appropriate caseload, ability to relate to clients, ability to deal with the courts, the Bar and public agencies.

B. Versatility - Interest/effectiveness in engaging in community education, law reform, economic development and group representation.

C. Commitment - Dedication to OLS program goals, understanding of OLS program goals, perception of client population needs.
Having written your summary narrative you have examined the scope of the LSP Project through information obtained in your interviews during the course of the evaluation.

Using those summary insights and reviewing any interview results (denoted as appropriate) complete the rating of various project factors as follows:

1. Note the Rating Area at the top of the page.

2. For each factor read the FACTOR TITLE and associated FACTOR DESCRIPTORS.

3. Note the EVAL. GUIDE REF. - These numbers denote the Interview Guide (OLSI) page(s) or Supplement page(s) where information you have collected will relate to the FACTOR TITLE. Review interview you have conducted (as necessary) to recall your, or the interviewees, opinions of the topic.

4. Choose the description of the FACTOR you feel best describes the condition of this project. Check the box to the right of the choice.

5. Level I and II ratings (series 100 and 200) are made by reviewing the related Level IV ratings and choosing the summary statement you feel bests describes the situation. Again choices are made by placing a checkmark in the box to the right of the chosen descriptor.

6. When you have completed all ratings (that you can) with the knowledge of the project you have, choose the numerical rating for the project.

NOTE: When you cannot make a rating, the reason must be explained in the notes column beside the rating. This space should be used to describe any peculiar circumstances affecting the rating or other notes you wish to make.
ENVIRONMENTAL CLIMATE RATINGS

POVERTY COMMUNITY
POLITICAL CLIMATE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CLIMATE
LEGAL CLIMATE
SOCIAL SERVICE CLIMATE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>OLS1-21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ATTITUDE TOWARD POVERTY CONDITIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>OLS1-21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>Few or no organized groups. Several leaders in poverty issue organization. Strong organizations and leadership evident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLS1-21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>COMMUNITY-GW PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>Programs severely restricted through outside control or internal bickering. Some areas of effective service delivery or community organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLS1-21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>COMMUNITY MODEL CITIES PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>Programs severely restricted through outside control or internal bickering. Programs ineffective. Some areas of effective service delivery or community organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OFFICIALS’ ATTITUDE TOWARD POOR</td>
<td>Political officials express open hostility toward poor.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PROVISION FOR POVERTY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>Political officials mostly apathetic toward poor.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RACIAL ATTITUDES</td>
<td>Sincere interest and efforts to solve problems of poor.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PROVISION FOR POVERTY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>Few or no programs sought in existence aimed at solving poverty problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PROVISION FOR POVERTY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>Poverty programs (CAP, PN, etc.) supported, token representation of poverty community interest.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PROVISION FOR POVERTY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>Poverty programs exist with major influence belonging to poverty community representative.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RACIAL ATTITUDES</td>
<td>Community has experienced major disunities with racial overtones.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RACIAL ATTITUDES</td>
<td>Race relations characterized as tense but some areas of communication exist.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RACIAL ATTITUDES</td>
<td>Community relatively free from racial tension; attention being given to race relations.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP WITH LSP</td>
<td>Political officials express hostility toward LSP and activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP WITH LSP</td>
<td>Officials appear to be neutral toward LSP activities.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP WITH LSP</td>
<td>A cooperative and supportive attitude is demonstrated by political officials.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POLITICIANS’ EFFECT ON SUBSTANTIVE LSP ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Public officials have ways by which they have curtailed LSP Activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>POLITICIANS’ EFFECT ON SUBSTANTIVE LSP ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Politics and LSP activities generally non-interesting.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2 LSL1-22</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>POLITICIANS’ EFFECT ON SUBSTANTIVE LSP ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Public officials have generally supported LSP Activities in a seeking or responding to LSP.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.ZOL51-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ATTITUDE OF ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS (PUBLIC, PRIVATE) TOWARD PMG.</td>
<td>No interest and/or concern in economic development in and/or for poverty community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some development activity in but not primarily for poverty community.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutions actively support and promote economic development and for poverty community. Ventures initiated by groups.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.ZOL51-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>REACTION TO LSP ACTIVITIES IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.</td>
<td>Economic development institutions resent LSP involvement in public or private poverty community development activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutions neutral to LSP involvement in economic development activities in poverty community.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutions cooperate with LSP in economic development involvement.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Ref.</td>
<td>Eval. Guide Ref.</td>
<td>Factor Title</td>
<td>Factor Descriptors</td>
<td>Check Rat.</td>
<td>Notes or Reason If Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2 OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>COURT ATTITUDES TOWARD LITIGATION OF POVERTY ISSUES</td>
<td>Tend to see representation and court actions on behalf of poor as unnecessary burden on courts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generally neutral to court involvement in poverty connected issues.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expects and supports court involvement in poverty issues of interest and understanding of need for class action type cases.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2 OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DISPOSITIONS OF CASES INVOLVING POOR</td>
<td>Courts generally rule against poor persons or minority groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courts have mixed record regarding poverty issues and/or poor. Some courts biased in either direction.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courts have reputation for fairness, resulting in favorable disposition of case on behalf of poor.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2 OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>COURT ATTITUDES TOWARD LSP ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Courts openly hostile to LSP activities on behalf of the poor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courts neutral toward individual representation of poor by LSP but resist law reform activities.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courts see necessity of and support LSP involvement in most actions in behalf of poor.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2 OLS1-22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DISPOSITION OF CASES INVOLVING LSP</td>
<td>Courts seem to more often rule against LSP presented cases than privately presented cases.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courts seem to react neutrally toward LSP cases. Some courts tend to rule in favorable direction while some tend to rule against LSP.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courts seem to rule on LSP cases in the same manner that they do on cases presented by private attorneys.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ATTITUDE OF BAR TOWARD POVERTY COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Bar generally reactive, takes position opposing change in conditions related to poverty. Bar has little involvement with poor or poverty issues, or has few factions strongly favorable to change. Bar is generally active and supports changes in community favorable to poverty community.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EXTENSION OF LEGAL ALTERNATIVES TO POVERTY COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Bar uncooperative with or resists legal alternatives for poor. Bar does not block but does not initiate legal alternatives for poor. Bar supports and initiates legal alternatives for poor.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EFFECT OF BAR ATTITUDES ON LSP ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Bar has curtailed LSP activities in some or all LSP goal areas. No major influence on LSP operations. Bar has provided some support via volunteer time and/or other resources to LSP. Bar has little or no effect on LSP activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EFFECT OF OTHER LEGAL ORGANIZATIONS ON LSP ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Other legal organizations (ACL, P. Def., etc.) tend to curtail LSP activities. Other legal organizations not operating or have little contact with LSP. Other legal organizations have working cooperative arrangement with LSP (i.e., mutual referral of clients, etc.).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EFFECT OF OTHER LEGAL ORGANIZATIONS ON LSP ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Other legal organizations not operating or have little contact with LSP. Other legal organizations have working cooperative arrangement with LSP (i.e., mutual referral of clients, etc.).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2</td>
<td>OLS1-23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS TO POVERTY COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Law enforcement agencies are generally hostile to poverty community residents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law enforcement agencies have no particularly negative or positive image in poverty community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law enforcement agencies are supportive of poverty community efforts for equal services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2</td>
<td>OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS WITH MINORITY GROUPS</td>
<td>Generally hostile to and abusive of minority groups persons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>No significant minority population or neutral disposition toward minorities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generally supportive of efforts to increase cooperation with minority groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.2</td>
<td>OLS1-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EFFECT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY IN LSP ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Tend to bring pressure on LSP to curtail activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral or no interactions with LSP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative relationships have been established with LSP in some areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4.1</td>
<td>OLS1-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY SERVICE GOALS</td>
<td>Most agencies tend to view goals in terms of minimizing expenditures; little understanding of poverty issues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed trends to addressing poverty community needs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most agencies directly address conditions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4.1</td>
<td>OLS1-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EXTENSION OF WELFARE SERVICES TO POVERTY COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Few public or private welfare agencies dealing with poverty community needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some welfare service agencies serving poverty community needs but limited in resources</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most welfare services aimed at poverty community needs, some have appropriate resources for activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4.1</td>
<td>OLS1-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PROVISION FOR POVERTY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN LOW INCOME HOUSING ISSUES</td>
<td>No tenant involvement and/or little or no public or private low income housing available</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public housing efforts dominated by institutions or authorities; little tenant involvement allowed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public housing efforts include provisions for poverty community involvement in planning and operation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4.2</td>
<td>OLS1-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>COORDINATION OF SOCIAL AGENCIES WITH LSP</td>
<td>Most encounters with LSP are hostile and negative; Agencies view LSP as out of their rightful area of activity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no contact between Social Service agencies and LSP, or mixed levels or types of coordination with various agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Service agencies have positive working relationship with LSP; Referrals made in both directions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4.2</td>
<td>OLS1-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ATTITUDES OF SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES TOWARD LSP</td>
<td>Hostile, see no need for LSP activities, and feel they are causing disoriented disruption among poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral, see LSP as needed for individual problems of poor, but not necessary in relation to their service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sees need for LSP and supports its efforts on behalf of poor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT OPERATIONS RATINGS

GOALS

CASE GENERATION AND HANDLING

CASE DISPOSITION

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE ADMINISTRATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>OLS1-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PROCESS</td>
<td>Goals determined ad hoc from case activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some attempt to define goals to guide activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable effort to define goals to guide activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>OLS1-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PERSONNEL INVOLVED</td>
<td>Goals totally established by Board.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal established by Board at Project Director's lead.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals established by staff, Project Director and Board interchanges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>OLS1-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP TO POVERTY COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Goals reflect little relationship to poverty community needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals reflect some relationship to needs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals reflect thorough identification of priority needs of community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>OLS1-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP TO GUIDELINES</td>
<td>Goals inconsistent with OLS guidelines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals partially reflect OLS guidelines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals consistent with OLS guidelines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Ref.</td>
<td>Eval. Guide Ref.</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Factor Title</td>
<td>Factor Descriptors</td>
<td>Check Rat.</td>
<td>Notes or Reason If Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>OLS1-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 40 PRIORITY OF CASES</td>
<td>No established criteria for case priorities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>OLS1-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 41 CASE HANDLING</td>
<td>Lack of appropriate procedures, use of legal, clerical and para-professional personnel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>OLS1-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 42 ELIGIBILITY</td>
<td>The methods used to verify eligibility is degrading, and is a source of embarrassment to the client.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>OLS1-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 43 ASSIGNMENT</td>
<td>There are no established policies for special project and case assignment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>OLS1-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 44 CASELOAD CONTROL</td>
<td>No system for controlling caseload; cases assigned arbitrarily.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Reproduced from best available copy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Ref.</th>
<th>Eval. Guide Ref.</th>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>Factor Title</th>
<th>Factor Descriptors</th>
<th>Check Data</th>
<th>Notes or Reason If Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3</td>
<td>OLS1-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STAFF RECRUITING</td>
<td>The project does not represent the poverty community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>The poverty community is poorly represented (less than 25 percent of total staff) even at lower level positions.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>The composition of the staff approximates the community at both upper and lower level positions.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3.2</td>
<td>OLS1-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STAFF COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>Lack of communication between staff and administration.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication is evident but improvement appears necessary.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent rapport between staff and administration - flow of information is constant.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3.1</td>
<td>OLS1-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STAFF PERFORMANCE REVIEW</td>
<td>No established regular procedure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review used to justify crisis action.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular schedule for review not strictly adhered to.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3.2</td>
<td>OLS1-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STAFF MORALE</td>
<td>Low morale.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morale needs bolstering.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morale high, enthusiasm evident.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>