R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 969 80 EA 001 056

MULTISTATE CONFERENCE, TO STRENGTHEN STATE-LOCAL RELATIONSHIPS IN URBAN EDUCATION (NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 27-30, 1966). PARTS I AND II.

BY- FIRMAN, WILLIAM D. AND OTHERS
NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPT., ALBANY

REPORT NUMBER ESEA-5 PUB DATE 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$6.96 172P.

DESCRIPTORS- *URBAN EDUCATION, *STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION, STATE LEGISLATION, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS, REGIONAL LABORATORIES, FINANCIAL SUPPORT, DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS, FEDERAL STATE RELATIONSHIP, *STATE SCHOOL DISTRICT RELATIONSHIP, *PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS, LEGAL PROBLEMS, ECOLOGICAL FACTORS, *CITY PROBLEMS, EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, ALBANY, NEW YORK CITY,

THIS DOCUMENT IS COMPRISED OF TEN PAPERS PRESENTED AT A MULTISTATE CONFERENCE ON THE STRENGTHENING OF STATE-LOCAL RELATIONSHIPS IN URBAN EDUCATION. PART I OF THE DOCUMENT SUMMARIZES THE TOPICS WHICH ARE PRESENTED VERBATIM IN PART II. TOPICS DISCUSSED INCLUDE--(1) URBAN EDUCATION AND THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES PROGRAM, (2) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT GROUPS AND THE STATE AND URBAN SITUATIONS, (3) INADEQUACIES OF PRESENT CITY AND STATE PROGRAMS FOR THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION IN URBAN AREAS, (4) LEGAL STRUCTURE OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS IN RELATION TO ASSISTING URBAN AREAS, (5) INCREASING INTERRELATIONSHIP OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER AGENCIES OF STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AND (6) EDUCATION IN THE LARGE CITIES IN THE FUTURE. (DG)

DOCUMENT FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED017969

MULTISTATE CONFERENCE

"TO STRENGTHEN STATE-LOCAL RELATIONSHIPS IN URBAN EDUCATION"

November 27-30, 1966

EA 001 056

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

MULTISTATE CONFERENCE

"TO STRENGTHEN STATE-LOCAL RELATIONSHIPS IN URBAN EDUCATION"

Sponsored by The
University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
With a Title V, ESEA Grant

Participating States and Cities

California: San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco - Illinois: Chicago, Peoria - Maryland: Baltimore - Michigan: Detroit - New York: Buffalo, New York - Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, Pittsburgh - Texas: Dallas

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University (with years when terms expire)

1968 Edgar W. Couper, A.B., LL.D., L.H.D., Chancellor -------- Binghamton

1970 Everett J. Penny, B.C.S., D.C.S., Vice Chancellor ------- White Plains

1978 Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D. ---------- Troy

1973 Charles W. Millard, Jr., A.B., LL.D. ---------- Buffalo

1972 Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S. ---------- Purchase

1975 Edward M. M. Warburg, B.S., L.H.D. ---------- New York

1969 Joseph W. McGovern, A.B., LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D. ---------- New York

1977 Joseph T. King, A.B., LL.B. ---------- Queens

1974 Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D. ---------- Brooklyn

1976 Mrs. Helen B. Power, A.B., Litt.D. ---------- Rochester

1979 Francis W. McGinley, B.S., LL.B. ---------- Glens Falls

1981 George D. Weinstein, LL.B. ---------- Hempstead

1980 Max J. Rubin, LL.B., L.H.D. ---------- New York

1971 Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D. ---------- Hastings on Hudson

1982 Stephen K. Bailey, A.B., B.A., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D. ------- Syracuse

President of the University and Commissioner of Education
James E. Allen, Jr.

Deputy Commissioner of Education
Ewald B. Nyquist

Associate Commissioner for Research and Evaluation
Lorne H. Woollatt

Assistant Commissioner for Research and Evaluation
William D. Firman

Foreword

If the tide of events in education can be likened to the motion of a pendulum, then it might be argued that the problems encountered in urban education are presently on an upward swing. Historically, state education departments nationwide have concerned themselves with the problems of rural education. There were good reasons for this concentration. The city schools had the financial resources to establish department heads, supervisory service and curriculum development to meet their needs. On the other hand, the rural schools were scattered, had difficulty attaining adequate fiscal support, and were confronted with such problems as transportation for pupils, available housing for the staff, and limited programs. It thus seemed reasonable for state education departments to concentrate their efforts on solving the myriad problems existing within their respective states in areas outside of the cities.

During this period of concentration on education in rural areas, serious problems were emerging in the cities. The tax limits which had been set proved to be insufficient, and fiscal support was dwindling. Vast sections of cities decayed as dwelling units were replaced by factories, auto junk yards, and the like, and the schools located within these areas were not replaced. State aid was not as favorable for large cities as it was for the rest of the state. As time went on, the problems of urban education increased to the point where quality fell off and segregation by default thrived.

The State of New York has been conscious of this situation for some time. In 1965, it presented to the Federal Government a plan which would contribute toward accelerating the improvement of urban education through Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The key theme of this plan was the coordinating of efforts in the area of urban education, both between a state's education department and other agencies within that state and from state to state. By coordinating this project with those of education departments of other states and with programs in the Nation's largest cities, the New York State Education Department hoped to demonstrate that state educational agencies could and should strengthen their services to the large city school districts.

Subsequently, representatives from this Department met with representatives from offices of commissioners of education and school superintendent's offices of the nation's largest cities and states, and a conference of these participants was planned for 1966 in New York City. Out of the conference, it was hoped, a permanent consortium would be initiated to give assistance to the Nation's state education departments in solving the problems of urban education in the Nation's largest cities.

This document offers summaries of the major presentations made at the 1966 Conference. The highlights of each speaker's address are contained in Part I. Part II contains the verbatim presentations.

William D. Firman
Assistant Commissioner for Research
and Evaluation

CONTENTS

"STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN RELATING EFFECTIVELY TO URBAN PROBLEMS"

by
Norton Beach

Dean of the School of Education
University of North Carolina

"Efforts to really change urban living," said Dr. Beach, "have been hampered less by intellectual failure to identify what needs to be done than by deep-rooted beliefs and experiences that cause educators and other institutional leaders to be less than wholehearted about the effort."

Urban communities are plagued by a multiplicity of interrelated problems that affect education, he said. "Yet you hear again and again on every scene that the job of education is to deal with education in the school, that the problems of race or housing or employment or a score of other community and societal problems should be left to other people.

"I don't believe that the work of the states and the large city communities represented in this conference will move very far until there is a strong willingness, particularly in public school leadership, to tackle these multiple interrelated problems even though seemingly they are not educational issues."

Dr. Beach also cited other deterrents to effective action:

1. A lack of mutual respect and confidence between state education departments and local school systems--a relationship that should be intimate and mutually supportive.

2. The attitude of teachers that some children are incapable of learning. During a visit to British schools in 1964, Dr. Beach was impressed by the confidence of most teachers he met that "all children can learn." "In contrast," said Dr. Beach, "wherever teachers congregate in this country of ours, almost the first conversation has to do with the fact that Jimmy or Johnny or Mary or Susie is just impossible to

teach, cannot possibly learn...If there is that kind of feeling in your professional staff, and especially in the classroom, you've got a lot to overcome."

Dr. Beach noted emerging strengths in state education departments in their willingness to make changes, particularly in their dealings with urban problems; in their "rather amazingly positive" response to Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which provides the first substantial funding to strengthen state staffs and promote long-range planning; in their initiation and bolstering of research programs; and--as demonstrated by this conference--in their increased initiative in interstate cooperation.

There is, he added, a general expansion of program, staff, and services throughout the state education departments. "And when you expand in this way, you can expect some returns in urban education."

On the other hand, Dr. Beach sees limitations in state and local attitudes toward each other and in "the fact that state departments are weakly oriented--philosophically, structurally, administratively, and procedurally--to deal with emerging problems of education in an increasingly urbanized culture."

State departments, he finds, tend to be overcautious about taking the initiative in public policy. Structurally, they are rigid rather than flexible; administratively, they are defensive rather than self-confident.

"Procedurally," he said, "there are questions to be asked about working relationships all the way down from the state department's work with school systems to the building principal's work with the classroom teacher. And I have to say that by far the majority of principals in this country don't know very well how to work with their professional staffs...The single most

important reason why we're having trouble in relationships between boards and superintendents and teachers is the behavior of principals in the individual buildings. If this is a problem in one building, what does it say about how the state department works with school systems?"

State departments need better training and better selection of staff, seeking top people who are equipped with a broader experience and background. "I was always amazed," said Dr. Beach, "that in my 25 years at Teachers College, Columbia, we never spent any time working with people who would go into state department positions. We might have made a far better contibution to American education had we worked intensively on this problem."

Dr. Beach called for the same kind of long-range planning in education that is already done in the U.S. Defense Department and other Federal agencies, as well as in major corporations. This is essential in providing directions for effort.

"We need better research programs that harness the resources of the city and the state--of not just the school of education but the total university...We have yet to fully utilize the great universities in this country.

"We may make one of the real beginning differences if we not only strengthen the state education departments but strenghten them in relation to urban education problems. This is what you have developed in this conference, and I can think of no more effective way of beginning this effort."

"URBAN EDUCATION AND THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES PROGRAM--RELATIONSHIP AND PROBLEMS"

by
Robert Wood

Under Secretary,
U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Any program that undertakes to be helpful to American urban problems today must combine social, educational, and physical planning, said Dr. Wood, who headed the task force that developed the Demonstration Cities Program. It must also be carried out on a scale that assures a real impact.

In previous efforts, projects have been scattered among too many of our large urban complexes, "so they did not add up to a critical mass, to a combination that would turn a corner." "Besides," Dr. Wood said, "these individual project-by-project approaches led to awesome dilemmas at the operating level. If one tried to restore housing without the complementary services, something was lacking in the response of the public. If one moved to solve some of the school problems--to put in extra courses, to enrich curricula, and so on--these efforts were impaired by shortcomings in housing."

In 20 years of experience with housing renewal, we have learned that the potential of urban living is not developed simply by the physical rebuilding of central cities and by public housing projects.

"Shot through the legislation that is about to go into execution," said Dr. Wood, "is the concept that one has to move at the point of impact on a scale that will make a difference. So the law provides for the restoration of entire neighborhoods within the central cities or suburban areas. Beyond the concept of combined aids and grants and resources, is the concept of applying it on a scale and at a point of impact so as to make a considerable difference within a specified period of time.

"We have only about 3 or 4 years to fashion these programs and carry out these experiments. In about 1964, we completed the housing of the postwar baby crop; beginning about 1970, the baby crop of that baby crop will be coming. By the year 2000, we will have put in place physical structures equal to whatever we have built before in this country.

"So in these years from 1966 to 1970, we must begin--by example, by experiments scaled to critical mass, by new patterns and paths of collaboration--to see what we can do for the cities. The program of model neighborhoods for older cities is designed essentially to see if residential components can be restored, with a multiplier effect added."

The city demonstrations are aimed at progress in mixing income levels within a neighborhood, at innovations in housing construction, at the provision of neighborhood employment opportunity, and toward a reexamination of building codes and assessment policies.

"Our effort does not call for providing model neighborhoods in every American community all at once," said Dr. Wood. "Instead, it provides that the communities that want to try should move ahead first, using their own techniques in meeting some 14 performance criteria broadly outlined in the law.

"The community does its own planning, mobilizes its own resources, establishes a scheduled plan. The Federal Government will provide, first, a planning grant, and, second, in the execution phase, a supplemental grant equal to 80 percent of the local community's contributions from all sources. The locality can use this grant as it sees fit: to improve the quality of existing programs; to provide added safety; to raise school teachers' salaries; to experiment with programs never authorized or tried before."

The law also provides $250 million in mortgage money for developers who want to experiment with "entirely new forms of communities, new technology, and new architecture."

"We're not trying to determine for the Nation what the good city is and what it looks like," Dr. Wood said. "We do think we ought to try to restore the classic function of cities and to provide optionsas to where people live,

work, and find their recreation. To the degree that we can demonstrate the vitality of residential neighborhoods by good planning and new opportunities, in older cities and elsewhere, we think we are enhancing that freedom of choice."

The effort involves state participation, certainly that of education departments, Dr. Wood said, and also of agencies that apply other Federal funds that flow through the states, particularly in education, health, and welfare.

"I cannot conceive that this program will work," he said, "without the deep involvement of the educational program and the education profession. With sole reliance on housing and physical rebuilding, we cannot really restore neighborhoods, cannot change the kind of lives we know we have to change. We are indeed embarked under common partnership. That time is past when any agency or program can go it alone and expect to succeed in its mission.

"The next 4 or 5 years will spell the difference between whether we have effective common programs or whether we don't."

a. "HOW DOES THE LEGAL STRUCTURE OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS HELP OR HINDER THEIR ABILITY TO GIVE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE TO URBAN AREAS?"

b. "HOW CAN STATE AND CITY EFFECTIVELY RELATE TO THE LEGISLATURE OF EACH STATE?"

by
Edmund Reutter

Professor of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

"I believe that, properly developed, the relationships between the big city school systems and the state departments of education can lead to a marked renaissance in public education. This may sound very naive. I hope it sounds idealistic, and I also hope it will be realistic. This conference can be a step toward the common purpose: the best education possible for urban children."

With these words, Dr.Reutter led up to a reappraisal of state-city relationships in the light of history. Legal obstacles to more effective cooperation, he noted, can be removed by changing the law to reflect new insights. The position of the State versus the big city in the educational area has changed sharply since World War II, breaking a pattern that had existed since the Republic was founded.

"We all know that education is a function of the state," Dr. Reutter observed. "But if we look at the history of the Tenth Amendment of 175 years ago, I think we must recognize that in making education a state function the Constitution was really saying 'not a Federal function.' At that time, public education was basically being developed on the local rather than the state level. And it was, of course, in the larger cities that early progress in public education was being made.

"Even though education thus by default became a state function, the state departments were not strong in the early days, and there also were problems of transportation and communication. So actually the large cities were treated like city-states, with much of their educational machinery self-contained. Until after World War II, the big cities were in fact the pearls of the educational oyster. They had the financial resources; they had a substantial, educated middle class that supported the schools; they were the focus of the educational action.

"State departments tended to concentrate on rural schools, and a live-and-let-live relationship developed with the large city systems--differently in different states, of course."

Then came the exodus of the middle class to the suburbs after World War II, Dr. Reutter noted, followed by pressures to rejuvenate all the Nation's schools, including those of the now hard-pressed cities. "So now both the state departments and the urban areas are faced with tremendous challenges."

"The state," he said, "has two basic functions regarding education. One is to set and enforce minimum standards; the other is to encourage and help the local districts to exceed these standards. Obviously the urban areas have special problems and need special help, and it is their moral right to expect state department help. Concurrently, it is the moral right of the state to expect urban cooperation.

"Since the state has the legal power, and a state department is closer to the legislature than are the big cities, probably the state department is in a better position to initiate certain changes. But without the cooperation of the cities, the state department will be impeded--and probably even more so when reapportionment gets underway. In some respects, history may show that the reapportionment decision of the Supreme Court had a more profound effect on public education than either the desegregation or the Bible-reading cases."

Dr. Reutter remarked that legally the state has only four possible ways to handle any problem: (1) it can require that something be done; (2) it can require that something not be done; (3) it can expressly permit something to be done at another party's option; (4) it can just say nothing on the subject.

"Actually," he commented, "in many instances no action is the best course of action--not when it comes simply by default or lack of leadership but when it is decided that at the moment it is best for the state not to require something, not to forbid it, or not expressly to give permission for it."

The realm of teacher and school board relationships is one such area, he suggested, "for the very simple reason that we don't have enough experience to know what to legislate."

"Thus we find a continuum in the state's relation to the larger cities. At one end is the fact that the state can, by legal force, require that something be done. At the other end is persuasion, leadership, whatever you want to call it. Inbetween is a middle ground that involves such things as financial incentives."

Dr. Reutter cited many questions--curriculum, who is to be educated, class sizes, required courses, textbooks, accreditation of schools, pupil personnel, compulsory attendance, transportation, racial balance within schools--that state departments might not be able to take care of, by themselves, even if the large cities wanted them to. Other questions, too, can lead to friction if cooperation is lacking; teacher certification in city systems, or recruitment of teachers.

"Some suggest that state departments should be of more help to local districts and the cities in the professional development of teachers, in salary policies and minimum salary schedules. Actually, the large urban centers in most states are not affected by state minimum salary schedules. Normally the urban centers are already above these schedules. But New York State, for example, has a provision that, no matter what you pay, the master's-level teachers must be X dollars more than those at the bachelor's

level. This is an example--good, bad, or indifferent--of a state's taking some kind of action regarding salary policies in the large cities. The actual training of teachers is one of the areas in which the states can also do more in cooperation with large cities."

Dr. Reutter noted that in some city experiments with new categories of teaching work, state departments have been helpful while others have hampered the projects.

"Of course," he concluded, "as I have said, the large cities have most of the problems, but they also have most of the promise. I do hope that out of this conference can come other kinds of conferences on a voluntary basis in which relationships between the state level and the large cities can be worked out. Then the state can better carry out its responsibility for education in the large cities, and officials in the cities can better carry out their job on the spot."

"HOW CAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT GROUPS RELATE MOST EFFECTIVELY TO THE STATE AND URBAN SITUATION? -- A SUPPLY OF IDEAS ON ONE HAND AND DISTRIBUTION AND CONSUMPTION ON THE OTHER"

by
Robert Dentler

Director of Center for Urban Education
New York City

The capability that a regional educational laboratory brings to problem-solving is quite different from those that are rooted in either the university or the public school administration tradition, Dr. Dentler pointed out. He discussed this capability on the basis of experience with the Center for Urban Education, established just 2 years ago.

A regional laboratory is, first, accountable to its own board, to the state that charters it, and to the Office of Education as prime fiscal sponsor for projects. This is one phase of the laboratory's combination of independence and interdependence.

"When I first heard the idea of being accountable for /specific regional/ needs," said Dr. Dentler, "I resented it deeply because it violates certain canons that are built up in a researcher. What is relevant to a researcher has to do with the questions he didn't manage to answer in the last piece of research he did.

"We have surmounted this feeling in part by achieving a deliberate mix of professional educators with behavioral scientists from universities and colleges. These experienced, professional educators are people who were used to this notion of accountability, perhaps overconditioned to it... We have intriguing conflicts between our ex-school superintendents and principals and our ex-university social scientists.

"These strains are the most intense experiences that we undergo from day to day, but the resulting combination has oriented the laboratory in a way I think no other has been oriented in educational development on the American scene."

Another mark of interdependence, said Dr. Dentler, is that the laboratory works in the school districts by invitation only and in contact with practitioners and decision-makers.

"This way to work has its limitations," he observed, "but it can be distinguished immediately from what I call the elitist approach to educational innovation--the approach that looks for the most talented individual scientist or humanist, or other gifted intellectual, and asks him to develop a new curricular offering or new program. That approach asks him to solve a problem somewhat in abstract. He may have temporary exposures to children, to school men, but it's clear that he is not to be immersed too deeply. Then his solutions are passed along a belt that, hopefully, ends up at a point where a consumer sees the power and excitement of it and puts it to work voluntarily.

"We work in contrast to this--and I make no invidious distinction. When we work on development questions, when we engineer solutions to pressing problems, we do so by request. We work out an arrangement under which a collaboration and partnership is built into the activity from the very beginning. And if school men in the district are not interested in this type of parallel activity, we drop the work at the outset."

Dr. Dentler referred to the way the Center planned a desegregation program for Buffalo last year and to the route by which its findings reached that city's superintendent and board of education.

"I won't bore you with the mechanics in every illustration," he said, "but I wanted to emphasize at the outset that I believe these mechanics are essential to the realization of educational change. Unless you take pains to set them up carefully and trustfully in the first place, very little change is likely to occur. For example, had the Buffalo superintendent decided that our planning work was not in his best interest, he could have prevented our access to the data necessary for the planning.

"So we were under dual constraint. We had to satisfy the State as a client, but we also had to satisfy the requirement of mutually trusting relations between the city superintendent, his board, and our organization."

A regional laboratory also differs in scale of staff and budget from the conventional university or school planning agency. Instead of being budgeted for no more than $100,000 a year, it is working with anywhere between $1 million and $4 million.

"Without such an increase in scale," said Dr. Dentler, "no group can really begin to address any of the pressing questions that face our large central-city school districts. Within a year and a half of its chartering, for example, the Center for Urban Education grew from the original staff of 10 to a full-time staff of 65 and a part-time staff of 100.

"Before such a headquarters group was brought together, no one in the university community was able to do more than speculate about some of the enormous questions that are characteristic of not only New York City but also the surrounding suburban communities. As an illustration of this regional scope, the outreach that money and mass manpower can make possible, I would mention a reading experiment we are in the midst of conducting.

"This is the same as a classic university study in the sense that it carefully varies the type of instruction given in early reading, varies the age at which the initial reading instruction begins, and varies the type of school in which the teaching is carried out. But it differs in one crucial respect, and that is scale.

"We are able to carry out this design simultaneously in 52 schools, using 150 teachers and 7,600 children. We don't have to call for a model school. We're not interested in controlling all of the conditions--we are operating in schools as they are found in the city. And this is deliberate. In 3 years we hope to be able to close out rather authoritatively the question of whether

differences in types of instruction in beginning reading really make any difference in the quality of the learning."

Dr. Dentler also discussed the difference in situation and attitude among staff of a regional laboratory, independent and interdependent. He said:

"Unlike the university--where the allegiance of the faculty must be to teaching on the one hand and to scholarly production on the other--or school administration, with its hurly-burly of day-to-day contingencies, a laboratory offers its staff a continuity of focus. We have created at the center a new cadre of skilled manpower--a peculiar blend of the engineering laboratory and the research corporation tradition, plus other influences from the State.

"These men may also be attached to a university; they may teach a course here or there. But they are not teaching at the center, nor are they meeting payrolls in the school district. They are not directly concerned with increasing their personal record of scholarly monographic production.

"Moreover, we are free to hire according to new criteria--our own. We don't have to ask a research assistant if he has an M.A. or what his graduate degree program may be. We don't have to ask about licenses or about university faculty congeniality. In fact, we have many people who thoroughly dislike one another and are free, in our context, to show it. We hire exclusively according to a man's skills and his most distinctive intellectual competencies."

The center's main limitations, Dr. Dentler concluded, are the inability to serve all the thousands of educators who come to its door and the same problem that faces all efforts to change education--the question of how the recommendations are received.

"We have discovered," said Dr. Dentler, "that even the people who invite us to invent the solutions to problems in education don't always want the answers."

"HOW CAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT GROUPS RELATE MOST EFFECTIVELY TO THE STATE AND URBAN SITUATIONS?"

by
Richard Schutz

Director of Southwest Regional Laboratory
Inglewood, California

"Regional laboratories are basically R & D Centers for the schools, in contrast to R & D Centers at universities that primarily serve the universities," said Dr. Schutz, "and this is something of a novelty."

"We're new, and we're trying to get off the ground," he said. "We're going to need a little time, a little help. But I think we could agree that traditional research has been of dubious value. When you look at other patterns, at demonstrations of things that should be great, you find very fine ideas dying on the vine for lack of development in terms of carrying them through."

Many people would like "to get into the act" in education, he added, "but they are totally ignorant of educational requirements."

"I think that what we are hoping to put together is the mechanics for getting real improvement," Dr. Schutz concluded. "Exploiting the resources within a region requires very careful planning and engineering. But we hope to produce products that eventually will be usable to you people in the schools."

"THE INADEQUACIES OF PRESENT CITY AND STATE PROGRAMS FOR THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION IN URBAN AREAS: IS THERE A SOLUTION?"

by
James Kelly

Professor of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

"City schools today face the double tension of dramatically increasing demands for services and steadily dwindling financial and human resources," Dr. Kelly told his audience.

"Big city education is a major issue today simply because the predominant values in American society are changing. The traditional, indeed hallowed, educational goal of 'equality of educational opportunity' is being redefined as the provision of sufficiently unequal educational services so that the achievement of all children can be maximized.

"I know of no more telling evidence...than findings from many recent studies that variations in pupil achievement are primarily associated with home and community factors, not with school factors. Our society, or at least powerful elements in it, plainly is telling its public educators to reduce the opportunity gap between social ideals and social reality for a large segment of our population.

"Can urban schools meet the new performance standards? Can the traditionally equal allocation of resources give way to a differential allocation of resources geared to the needs of children as modern psychology understands those needs?

"I must confess that I am pessimistic. Public policy for education is determined primarily by taxpaying ability, and the quality of education in a particular area depends much more on what is demanded and what can be afforded than on what is needed or is ideally desired. The possibility that substantial Federal funds might by themselves redress the situation seems unlikely today, though Title I of ESEA is an effort to shake off certain traditional shackles. The overall prognosis for the fiscal condition of big city schools will remain pessimistic until education policy in our states and cities is determined on grounds other than the availability of resources under tax structures designed decades ago."

Dr. Kelly cited statistics that illustrate an apparent decline in urban ability to support education, relative to statewide trends.

Between 1930 and 1960, average per-pupil expenditure for education in the United States quadrupled, from $87 to $375. In the same period, full market value of taxable property increased only 15 percent in New York City, 37 percent in Buffalo, a mere 6 percent in Philadelphia. Even in Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Baltimore, growth of 100 percent to 200 percent was nowhere nearly enough to keep pace with the rise in costs per pupil.

This lag in ability to finance urban education is reflected in expenditure trends. In Chicago, for example, city school expenditure was about 20 percent above the statewide average in 1930; it was slightly below the state average in 1960.

Dr. Kelly attributes this decline partly to a tendency to allow the ratio of assessed values to full market values to sag, reducing the city's ability to tap local funds. "This reduction," he said, "is particularly restrictive in the many states that define local school taxing authority in terms of tax rates...and is even more restictive on cities, whose taxing authority is limited even more stringently than for other school districts in the same state."

He also questioned the practice in many cities of underassessing residential property and overassessing commercial or industrial property. "Factories don't vote," he said. "But if this practice is common, it implies tax overloads on the commercial and industrial properties that make up the backbone of assessed value in cities. Taxing arrangements that drive industries out of cities in a time when cities need every tax dollar they can get is surely less than wise public policy."

As the principal local source of revenue for all local government, not only the schools, the property tax suffers from two crucial administrative problems: unequal assessment and underassessment. In more than two-thirds of the assessment units studied in the 1962 Census of Governments, parcels in the top quarter averaged an assessment ratio more than twice that of parcels in the lowest quarter.

Included in a package act suggested by a legislation committee of the Council of State Governments, Dr. Kelly noted, is a provision for state divisions to supervise and regulate--in effect, audit--local assessment, to make assessments directly on certain categories of property, and to supersede local administration where unfair practices are found.

"If equitable and reliable assessments are to be achieved," he said, "the auditing function is needed. We may even have to use private, state-certified appraisers to audit local assessments. It's technically feasible, it's not economically out of the question; it's a question of politics. We wouldn't think of letting a public agency expend millions of dollars without requiring an outside audit, yet we do not audit assessments. As a matter of fact, it's difficult to find out what they are in many places."

With all their problems, Dr. Kelly said, cities still have higher assessed valuations per pupil than other school districts enjoy. In 1960, assessed valuation per pupil in 14 large cities, including nine of the twelve cities represented at this conference, averaged $19,000 while the national average was only $10,000. However, in five recent years these valuations declined in eleven of those fourteen cities while it increased in eight of the eleven states in which those cities are situated.

"One other factor is the subject of fiscal ability," Dr. Kelly said. "Thirty years ago, city populations were among our most affluent, and were correctly regarded by many in state capitals as being able to stand alone

without substantial state fiscal support. Each decade since the depression, the median level of personal income in cities has declined relative to the country as a whole.

"In a current study of state school finance in Rhode Island, we have found that Rhode Island cities were almost universally high on equalized property valuations but almost universally low in median personal income relative to other districts. States and cities anxious to improve the financing of urban schools might well examine the use of personal income data as a measure of local fiscal ability.

"There are at least three reasons for this suggestion: First, research clearly indicates that property and income represent different dimensions of taxpaying ability. Second, taxes, whether property or other, are paid out of current income, so income is an important indicator of taxpaying ability. Third, many cities would benefit directly in state aid payments if income were used in determining local fiscal ability.

"Another disturbing trend in urban population characteristics," Dr. Kelly continued, "is the decline in what we can call the human resources. The number of cities below the median for their states in years of education obtained by the adult population has increased from 39 of the 130 largest cities in 1940 to 58 in 1960. When educated people leave the city for the suburbs, removing their productive skills and incomes from the city's resources, the city is weakened. When the city must accept an uneducated person in exchange for each suburban emigrant, the city will decline as long as that pattern of exchange persists.

"Because efforts in compensatory education have not yet succeeded, despite the best intentions, the level of pupil achievement in most cities is significantly below state averages. The proportion of handicapped children and pupils in vocational education, both requiring expensive educational

services, compounds the high expenditure requirements created by low achievers. The price of racial integration in cities, if indeed it is ever to be achieved, is considerably higher than, say, in Evanston or Berkeley, simply because of the numbers and distances involved.

"States should take these factors into account in shaping their grants in a program. Achievement test scores are one measure available to states in this connection, though I recognize that there are strong sentiments in the profession not to use achievement test data this way. Or, if you prefer, personal income levels could be useful, since this variable is so closely related to pupil achievement. The point is compensatory fiscal aid for compensatory school programs.

"One promising fiscal contribution to improvement of urban education that I see on the horizon is the cost-benefit approach to school budgets and accounts. This approach requires the linking of plans, stated in terms of goals, with continuous analysis of actual costs. Then the public and the educators can begin to find out what they are getting for what they are putting in, measured in terms of the benefits that children receive from educational programs.

"I find it very difficult to believe that a $50-billion-a-year enterprise with all the built-in insularities of the Defense Department can succumb to cost-benefit analysis if it is inherently impossible for the public schools to do this. Cities uniquely have the scale of operation, the skill of manpower, and, I must say, the need for this kind of analysis."

"THE INCREASING INTERRELATIONSHIP OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER AGENCIES OF STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT--THE INCREASING INTERRELATIONSHIP OF CITY ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS OF GOVERNMENT--ALL INTERTWINED"

by
Stephen K. Bailey
Dean

Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs
Syracuse University

"The shame of American education is its disparity--its massive inequity, its violation of the fundamental postulates of our political, religious, and ethical heritage," said Dr. Bailey. "Educational disparity is the root of most social tension and comes far closer than the love of money to being the root of all social evil."

With statements like these, Dean Bailey described what is happening in the 1960's, a decade that historians may designate "the era of the Great Awakening," the time when Americans "suddenly discovered the primacy of education."

Public support for education will rise from less than $30 billion a year in 1960 to more than $50 billion in 1970.

"It may be cold comfort to those who are struggling with next year's budget, or licking wounds over a recent school bond defeat, to know that education is on an escalator to affluence and that the button is 'go.' But forces seem to be in motion which will bring unprecedented private, local, state, and Federal--especially Federal--funds to bear upon our educational systems in the near future...Even our relatively inelastic property tax has proved capable of being stretched beyond anticipation at the local level.

"I hope I am not being unduly upsetting when I suggest that there will be times in the next few years when many of you will wish for the good old days when you were poor but happy. For there is a disturbing corollary to affluence in education: that increased wealth will be accompanied by increased administrative complexity and diminishing independence...The effective universe of educational discourse and operations is being enormously extended and complicated by recent events."

Dean Bailey spoke of the horizontal spread of responsibility for education at each level of government. "At the Federal level, Edith Green tells us, there are 42 separate departments, agencies, bureaus, and units

presently engaged in education," he said. "At the state level, the picture is in some ways less confusing but in other ways more disturbing..."

"And interlarding all of these levels," he said, "are forces and influences from professional associations, teachers' unions, textbook houses, hardware salesmen, John Birch Societies, patriotic and veterans' associations, taxpayers' leagues, Parent Teachers Association's, local newspaper editors, and a wide assortment of professional politicians who have vested and often hoary and rural interests to protect. As Robin might say, 'Holy Kaleidoscope!'

"Now, if this crazy-quilt of interdependence and jurisdictional overlap were being superimposed upon a society which had already licked its major educational problems, we might sit back and relax. But the organizational dilemma is part and parcel of a series of policy--even ethical--dilemmas within education itself.

"Educational disparity...in essence...means that the benefits of American education have been, still are, and (unless we do something about it) will continue to be distributed with such gross inequity as to be morally reprehensible and socially and economically tragic.

"Better than 10 million adult Americans are at this moment functionally illiterate.

"A public school education in the generality of school districts in Mississippi is worth a fraction of a public school education in Connecticut or California.

"The discrepancies between the quality of education in wealthy suburbia and consolidated rural areas on the one hand and in poor central cities and scattered rural slums on the other are patent and tragic...In spite of ESEA and of Operation Head Start, the culturally deprived...are years away from true equality of educational opportunity. De facto

segregation means precisely what de jure segregation meant before Brown vs. Topeka--separate and unequal.

"And,of course, there are special problems and categories of disparity: the physically and emotionally handicapped, the American Indian, the dyslectic, the unchallenged gifted.

"The social consequences of these disparities are horrendous, and they surround us: dropouts, delinquency, crime, unemployment, poverty, civic disorder, discrimination, inadequate skills for our burgeoning economy, unsolved problems of social policy and political accommodation in both domestic and international affairs, and--above all--a countless number of hopeless and wasted lives."

Dean Bailey acknowledged the complexity of the problem, the lack of an easy answer for educational disparity.

"How can we concentrate on the exception without shortchanging the rule? How can we promote the advantages of neighborhood schools without penalizing the larger community? How can we level up without leveling down? How can schools get enmeshed in problems of social amelioration without doing violence to their primary responsibilities of classroom teaching? Now that the Federal Government has pushed civil rights and church-state conflicts down to states and localities for solution, how can these explosive social and constitutional issues be handled without doubling the staffs and the hours in the day of harried state and local school officers?

"How, in short, can the school system by itself put together what generations of apathy, callousness, preoccupation, and bigotry in the society at large have put a under?

"The answer, of course, is that the school system cannot possibly do these things by itself. And this brings me back to the issue we have already belabored: the communications gap in intergovernmental and intereducational relations.

"If anything is clear from a review of educational disparity, it is that the total value system of the national political community is involved. Educational practice is substantially conditioned by ecological realities: economic, political, cultural, religious, and social. This has always been true, and yet until recently the public education fraternity has done everything in its power to shield itself from the environmental context within which it operates."

An ingrown public education system has allowed itself to become preoccupied with petty internal squabbles rather than with "over-arching" questions of educational and social policy, Dr. Bailey said.

"And because education has basked in isolation," he added, "it is now dismayed to find that a lot of noneducators are suddenly messing around in education's business."

Outlining the demands that are being made on education from various quarters, Dr. Bailey asked: "Are professional educators and educational officials prepared by skill, temperament, and attitude for reacting and relating to these larger community issues? I am more sanguine about skills and temperament than I am about attitude. For the traditional asceticism of public educators has too frequently produced a paranoid mentality.

"Teachers fear principals; superintendents fear school boards; all together they fear city hall and the county court house. Collectively, these in turn fear the state department of education, the governor, and the state legislature, who fear each other. And, of course, the over-arching neuroticism has been the fear of Federal control...

"Walls of protection have been erected. They are now crumbling, but their legacy has been to unnerve public schoolmen for those explorations, those probings of possibility, which are the prerequisites of solving

education's problems in the context of the emerging needs of the total community.

"Schoolmen...are being forced back into the wider political community. Unless they change their viewpoints and attitudes, they will find themselves in a coliseum of combat in which experienced gladiators or even--from their point of view--wild beasts from myriad agencies of government and politics and from private and parochial interests will outsmart and outfight them. It does not have to be this way, but if the outward reach of schoolmen is timid, defensive, reluctant, fearful, protective, indecisive, and scattered, they face infinite frustration and enmity--and in some cases disaster."

In this unfamiliar political environment, Dr. Bailey said, educators can protect their own valid interests and exercise true community leadership only if they face up to a key issue: "Put starkly, the public school system and the Federal, state, and local educational bureaucracies which support it suffer today from a massive dose of anti-intellectualism--and consequently of intellectual insecurity."

All sorts of special pleaders have swayed and distorted educational policy-making, he said, partly because of "the timidity of school boards and of docile superintendents and principals." But, he added, "The key reason for the anti-intellectual triumphs of external groups has been a more subtle and pervasive anti-intellectualism within the school system itself."

In general, schoolmen and state education departments "have neither welcomed nor initiated the types of critical introspection...which alone can produce a sustained intellectual manhood for the educational enterprise."

"Why should the public not defer to outsiders in the making of educational policy," Dean Bailey asked, "if after more than a century of

public education, schoolmen and their colleagues in university research are incapable of answering basic questions about education's own trade?"

Today's "interdependent, rapidly changing, technological, paradoxical" world, he said, "cries out for hard heads and more understanding hearts." Yet schoolmen have not yet even agreed on forms of aid or appropriate interaction in policy-making.

"They have not identified the chains of interdependence which logically relate the educational enterprise to the more general problems of our urban society: poverty, crime, ill health, discrimination, welfare, squalor, and boredom.

"Perhaps educators have concluded that they cannot examine the roots of their own professional tree without killing it. But if they will not conduct, or induce, sophisticated and valid analytical and normative research about what they are up to, they are naked in the face of their well-tutored enemies and their mis-tutored friends. Specious professionalism will not protect them. In the **marketplace** of community opinion and action which they have now entered, either they know what they are talking about, and can prove it, or they don't.

"In sum, schoolmen must cultivate and support intellectualism inside and about school systems in order to combat anti-intellectualism and unwholesome political pressures from within and without, and in order to help lead the total political community toward a new day. They must enter inter-governmental and intereducational relations in a new spirit of trust and cooperation--at the very least as happy and confident warriors in a jungle about which they must become increasingly sophisticated if they are to survive.

"Nothing short of the total resources of society will be adequate for the task ahead. That is why your highest task is essentially political,

and why you must nerve yourselves to enter the larger political arena where society's political resources are available for your use--if you have the wisdom and courage to exploit them in the broader community's interest."

"WHAT EDUCATION IN THE LARGE CITIES WILL LOOK LIKE IN THE FUTURE: SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND BIG CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS"

by
Milton A. Young

Institute for Public Administration

"It is a matter of record that educational institutions have changed less than most other social institutions in recent years," said Dr. Young. "In the present crisis, they should be changing the most."

Our major efforts in mass education, he said, still are authoritarian and coercive, as they were in medieval days. "Teaching is telling, and mastery is regurgitation in response to closed-end questions." Schools operate to produce "an individual with skills which are the antithesis of those he will need as an adult of the future."

Dr. Young ticked off items in the bill of indictment against the continued influence of 13th century scholasticism:

*Rather than independent behavior, it fosters conformity.

*Rather than stressing the unity of knowledge, it arbitrarily divides and fragments content.

*Rather than use new and creative approaches to teaching children who are not quick and facile in learning, it continues to fail and perhaps injure a significant portion of these students.

*Rather than create a stimulating learning environment which confronts children with opportunities for critical thinking, problem-solving, and creative behavior, it provides readymade solutions to problems.

*Rather than facing the reality of the uniqueness of children who need programs geared to their individual differences, it is usually organized in a lock-step, graded system that compares and views them as if they were alike.

*Rather than use modern technology, it builds the same fixed-wall classrooms that have existed for 100 years, effectively inhibiting even minor organizational changes.

"The resistance to change is monumental," Dr. Young declared. "In addition, the bureaucracy in a large school system makes major change almost impossible... At the present time, there is probably every conceivable type of experimental program going on in the big city. The evidence is that this will not lead to any dramatic change in the entire system...

"Administrators have trouble keeping up with day-to-day problems and do not have the time to work on major changes. One superintendent described it as trying to repair a bicycle while he was riding it. Another said: 'If the Edsel Division which was part of Ford Motor Company was part of the big city school system, it would be around for the next hundred years even if everyone agreed it must go.'"

Dr. Young called for a totally integrated new education system that "not only utilizes all the knowledge we can bring to bear but also creates an organizational structure which will be responsive to changes which will be demanded of it tomorrow."

"It must be showcase education," he said,"and capture the imagination of the public, and deal with the real issues."

He termed such a system "a multiple individualized education program," including among its features:

1. A greater commitment to education, and continuous education for everyone--no grade levels or distinctions among school and college levels. "Myths concerning 1 year's learning during 1 year, that children must be coerced to learn, that subjects should be taught separately, will have been discarded. The students will be able to move in and out of the educational programs as they need and want to. The problem of the dropout will not occur... Educational programs will be continuous throughout the day and throughout the year..."

2. Each individual will have his own track through the system. "Education will begin as early as we feel it is necessary and will continue throughout his entire life... Failure will be regarded as an error in the system, not a dysfunction of the individual learner."

3. Education will be planned so that it deals with the student's total environment. "Buildings that house educational programs will function something like libraries and settlement houses today, totally open and involving all the members of the community."

4. School buildings will be only one center for learning, serving as headquarters and communications and data centers. "Educational programs will operate in other appropriate places--in libraries, in storefronts, in fire stations, in parks, in museums, in airports, etc."

5. Machines and clerks will take over the clerical function of teachers, and the imparting of knowledge will take new forms. "The pupil studying the problems will use the teacher as a consultant, and para-professionals, the library, the computer, and other materials as resources when he needs them." This would free the teacher for more management of resources, more consultation with pupils, better interpersonal relationships. Pupils following their own tracks would be grouped only as individual needs dictated. "There will be instances of one learner working alone with no adult, of a thousand learners working together with one adult, of individual tutoring and small group discussions. The nonsensical problem of homogeneous versus heterogeneous grouping will not exist, because each youngster will be in a multiple individualized educational program."

Dr. Young foresees reliance on a systems approach to run our big school districts. "A systems approach," he pointed out, "is simply a method of organizing a process so it can be studied," and it has been used successfully by major industries, the Federal Government, and the armed forces. Several advanced educational systems have experimented with its use.

Specifically, Dr. Young suggested seven efforts for change:

1. Organization for change, at state and city administrative levels. More time spent on planning change.

2. A planning and implementation unit of outside people hired solely on their ability to solve problems creatively. These noneducators would have no certification or tenure and might well be rotated out every 2 or 3 years.

3. Changes in organization of city school systems to create smaller, more manageable units, each headed by a manager-superintendent responsible overall to central authority but with autonomy in decisions that implement his statement of goals. State funds could be channeled to encourage this decentralization.

4. Changes in organization at the state level to break down compartmentation of specialties and stress general approaches.

5. National and state programs in which each urban university takes direct responsibility for a slum area, aided by a task force from the state agency.

6. A nationwide 3- to 5-year moratorium on achievement testing. "Recognizing that their students will be measured with these achievement tests, teachers tend to skew their entire program toward just these areas. Skills such as ability to cope with new situations, creativity, problem-solving are neglected... We must first have measures to determine the success of our schools in teaching for the other goals in education before we reinstate achievement testing."

7. Alternative educational systems, "not in competition with one another...but encouraged to experiment with broad new programs." In an urban community, these might include the educational park, a school district run by a college or university, an educational unit run by a major industry,

a program run by the whole community, multiservice family and early childhood centers using Title I and Head Start funds and separate from the existing school system, conversion of a school to something more like a "Y" or a settlement house to serve entire families, and the utilization of upper-grade students to teach younger children.

"Great problems call for great vision," Dr. Young concluded. "The programs we mount must be bold and aim high. While the large cities have the greatest problems, they also have vast educational resources that can be made available for educating our young people...At one time, many cities have successfully coped with a tremendous variety of problems. With the help of the state departments of education, they can regain this vitality and combine it with the tools of tomorrow in a new effort. Either we find a way to make the necessary change or it will happen without us."

"WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?"

by
William D. Firman

Assistant Commissioner of Education
State of New York

"The purpose of this Multi-State Conference," said Dr. Firman, "was to assess together, explore together the desirability and/or feasibility of a more permanent kind of arrangement for exchange of information in research and the like that might prove to be of mutual benefit.

"We didn't come here particularly to solve the problems of urban education, although this has been one of the more important considerations with which we have dealt. We came here to explore the nature of the problems of state education departments in relating themselves more effectively to the problems of big city education.

"What are the resources that we might apply to finding solutions to these problems?

"One is the laboratory. The educational laboratory and the Research and Development centers under Title IV have a potential for pulling in intellectual resources of a magnitude that no single state education department nor any single large city could muster for itself. For example, as Dr. Dentler indicated to you last night, in one educational laboratory working directly in this field of solving problems of big city education, there is a staff of about 165 highly trained professional people doing practical work in this area.

"We have, of course, the Southwestern Laboratory that Dr. Schutz described to you. We have the ERIE Laboratory. We may need to develop additional ones geared particularly to helping state departments and big cities. We discussed this as part of our program because we're concerned with the resources.

"Another resource that we discussed is in the area of Federal legislation: the demonstration cities that Dr. Wood described yesterday; Title V, which we have been discussing this afternoon; the Educational Commission of the States, with Wendell Pierce here yesterday; the Research Council of the Great Cities.

"The rest of the conference has directed its attention to the processes or areas in which we might facilitate change--through research, planning, and implementation. We said yesterday in the law conference that there probably wasn't anything restrictive in the law, except portions having to do with fiscal matters. I don't quite believe that. I think that there are variations among the states in terms of legal structure that present real impediments to the strengthening of relationships between state education departments and big city problems. This is an area of process in which we ought to concern ourselves. How do we bring about change in the legal structure to facilitate this thing?

"We talked about finance. This morning Professor Kelly and others on the panel discussed real, practical things that might be done. Program budgeting was only one. There seems to be a real need for intensification, on a cooperative basis, in this area of finance.

"Our program tonight is another k[illegible] in this whole business, because it has to do with intergovernmental cooperation and coordination. As we have gone around to the states and talked with you about it, it has become quite clear to us that, while we might create in an education department an office of urban education, it probably wouldn't accomplish the things that need to be accomplished.

"The problems of big cities are so interrelated, involving intergovernmental structures and coordination and cooperation, that this may be the key element in providing the political power to bring about changes needed in the legal structure, in finance, and in the whole area.

"Where do we go from here? This was to be an exploratory type of conference. We have been exploring the issue. Now we have to make a decision, or at least tentative decisions,within the next hour or hour and a half as to where this project ought to go from here.

"Dr. Woollatt, the ranking person in our office, has already begun to think in this direction. So, before we go back to discussion at the table, I am going to ask him what, at this point, he sees as possible avenues for us to pursue profitably together."

"WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?"

by
Lorne H. Woollatt

Associate Commissioner of Education
State of New York

"I have played this by ear to begin with and, since Sunday evening, have been trying to see the threads that would lead us either to washing out further events of this kind or to developing them in a meaningful and practical way.

"What I have as a proposal can be amended by you people here, or you can come up with a brand new one and we can see what to do about it.

"In a sense, my proposal is developed on machinery that is working very well with what is known as the Committee on Educational Data Systems of the Council of Chief State School Officers, which collaborates with the Office of Education in the development of a federated system of gathering information--a basic educational data system, and one in which we have a direct contact. The U. S. Office of Education provides the Federal resources, and there are funds in the Federal budget that pay the expenses of subcommittees coming together as task forces or working groups.

"I would see the next step here as being probably one or more of the half-dozen task forces for various areas. Now I'll give you some idea of these areas and who would be involved, Dr. Woollatt said.

"Number One has to do with city planning, school organization, the idea of schools, health, welfare, and urban development, establishing given facilities within the city on a mutual income basis.

"Number Two is the area of financial support, primarily working on state aid and aid formulas as these relate to the great cities of the Nation. This would be an area where eventually the cost-benefit-analysis idea would apply. But first would come a study of state aid and of getting the message across to the people so they will understand the changed orientation of the big city in the realm of financial support from the state.

"Number Three would be geared to Federal legislation, this afternoon's topic--Office of Economic Opportunity, Title I, new kinds of bills in process, the Demonstration Cities Act, and the like.

"Number Four would investigate the multidepartment approach at the Federal, state, and local levels, trying to coordinate the elements of health, education, welfare, and housing in Washington, the respective state capitals, and the cities represented here. This would be different from Number One, which would be local city planning, though they would be related.

"Number Five, I tentatively call research and evaluation--ways of involving the R&D centers and the laboratories of which we have heard, and the Great Cities Council and other related groups that may be interested.

"Finally, Number Six--something that does not appear in this conference, that hasn't been part of the input. I think it is probably a serious omission from the program. That is the matter of state policy in regard to the big cities in terms of curriculum materials, development of supervision, supervisory forces of the education department as related to the big city. Instruction and teaching are part of this; licensing might be.

"Now to look at the numbers of people who would be involved.

"On this first matter of city planning related to school organization, the community plaza, the campus, elementary school campuses, and other things of this nature, I would see this as involving a task force of 21 people. If we work on the present basis, we have seven states. We would have the appropriate person for the state level who has to do with the planning activities--not just physical building but the total area--and we would have the school representative at the local level, and the representative of the city planning office.

"This group could begin to turn ideas over, especially for those cities that have decaying plants and sizable building programs coming up. Or, in some cases, the schools may be well developed but recreation, health, and welfare facilities are coming along that ought to be coordinated so the same physical layout can serve the people of the community within a huge city.

"Under the item of financial support, state aid, budget analysis, and related activities, I would see a group of 14--from each of the seven states, a representative of the education department, plus the local deputy or assistant superintendent for finance. In some cases you might also want to involve a comptroller where the school is closely coordinated with the citywide function of budgeting.

"Under Federal legislation and programs, I see this as a group that would meet once or twice, probably at the time legislation was warm or, at Washington, during the planning stages, to make sure the states and large cities agree in giving evidence before Congressional committees.

"The multidepartment approach would take a rather huge group to get underway. If you had from each of the seven states, from the seven cities, and from Washington the heads of various departments of health, education, welfare, and development--by the time you multiply that out, you get about 90 people. This would take a little more doing than the others.

"To the research and development task force would be assigned the person in the education department whose responsibility lay in this field, his counterpart in the great city of his state, and representativesof R&D centers or universities that do not yet have a Federal project.

"Finally, the task force on supervision and instruction would include the deputy or associate commissioner or assistant at the state level whose responsibility lies in the supervision of instruction, meeting with his local counterpart from a great city within his state. Together, as a group, they would try to develop modern relationships through which the supervision of instruction and curriculum could be assisted and coordinated.

"I can see that this may conflict--although I hope it rather would coordinate--with existing activities, with the Great Cities Council, with various groups who have a part in urban education. But sometimes we have to shift an existing organization to meet new needs, and this is the possibility I would see in that kind of plan."

ED017969

MULTISTATE CONFERENCE

"TO STRENGTHEN STATE-LOCAL RELATIONSHIPS IN URBAN EDUCATION"

Part II

November 27-30, 1966

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

EA 001 056

MULTISTATE CONFERENCE

"TO STRENGTHEN STATE-LOCAL RELATIONSHIPS IN URBAN EDUCATION"

Part II

Sponsored by The
University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
With a Title V, ESEA Grant

Participating States and Cities

California: San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco - Illinois: Chicago, Peoria - Maryland: Baltimore - Michigan: Detroit - New York: Buffalo, New York - Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, Pittsburgh - Texas: Dallas

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University (with years when terms expire)

1968 Edgar W. Couper, A.B., LL.D., L.H.D., Chancellor -------- Binghamton

1970 Everett J. Penny, B.C.S., D.C.S., Vice Chancellor ------- White Plains

1978 Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D. ---------- Troy

1973 Charles W. Millard, Jr., A.B., LL.D. ---------- Buffalo

1972 Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S. ---------- Purchase

1975 Edward M. M. Warburg, B.S., L.H.D. ---------- New York

1969 Joseph W. McGovern, A.B., LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D. ---------- New York

1977 Joseph T. King, A.B., LL.B. ---------- Queens

1974 Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D. ---------- Brooklyn

1976 Mrs. Helen B. Power, A.B., Litt.D. ---------- Rochester

1979 Francis W. McGinley, B.S., LL.B. ---------- Glens Falls

1981 George D. Weinstein, LL.B. ---------- Hempstead

1980 Max J. Rubin, LL.B., L.H.D. ---------- New York

1971 Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D. ---------- Hastings on Hudson

1982 Stephen K. Bailey, A.B., B.A., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D. ------- Syracuse

President of the University and Commissioner of Education
James E. Allen, Jr.

Deputy Commissioner of Education
Ewald B. Nyquist

Associate Commissioner for Research and Evaluation
Lorne H. Woollatt

Assistant Commissioner for Research and Evaluation
William D. Firman

FOREWORD

The Commissioners of Education from the seven states of California, Texas, Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Maryland and New York together with the city school superintendents from their largest cities met in New York in November, 1966 to discuss alternative procedures for relating state resources more effectively to the problems of urban education.

The conference, financed in part through a Title V, ESEA grant was reported in summary to all of the State Education Departments and to all of the city school superintendents (above 100,000 population) of the Nation in June, 1967.

This report, Part II, has been prepared at the request of the recipients of the summary report. It contains the verbatim presentations of the principal speakers.

William D. Firman
Assistant Commissioner for
Research and Evaluation

August 1967

CONTENTS

"STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN RELATING EFFECTIVELY TO URBAN PROBLEMS"

by
Norton Beach

Dean of the School of Education
University of North Carolina

As you can tell from your program, there are a whole series of specialized topics that will be discussed during the course of this conference. These topics cover a series of areas and will be dealt with in specialized fashion by experts in such a way that it leaves me relatively little to say, unless I treat this evening's topic quite differently than you might expect. Starting with the topic tomorrow morning on demonstration cities, which gives a flavor and a picture of the way in which cities and states might work cooperatively together, and moving from there to look at the legal structure of state departments and the impingement of legal structure on urban affairs, and then the relationship between the states and cities as they have to deal with legislative matters in regard to urban affairs, and going on through a list of another half dozen or so topics, you can begin to see that the strenths and weaknesses of present state departments of education as they deal with the problems of urban affairs in the states represented here, as well as others, are pretty well covered by those specialized topics. I am, therefore, not going to take very much time to talk this evening about any of those particular points, because I feel that people who know far more than I about each of those specialized areas will cover them.

I have organized my remarks, therefore, around five questions. These five questions are as follows: the first one has to do with the questions of the setting of the purposes of this project and has already been discussed. The second question has to do with how we, as educators, think about urban education. How do we think about urban education? I'll try to develop that by looking at a number of statements which illustrate a few, only a few, of what I believe are critical philosophic beliefs or attitudinal positions or value

judgements which seem to be pretty essential to the strengthening of state and local relationships in urban education. The third question asks, "What are the emerging strengths of state education departments in relating effectively to urban education;" the fourth, "What are the present limitations of state education departments in relating effectively to urban education?" and the fifth question is, "What are some immediate areas for action for state education departments?"

May I say, however, one thing in regard to the purposes of this project. When one reads the summary of the minutes of all of the sessions throughout the states, it would occur to one almost immediately, I think, that there is pretty general agreement that the purpose before us for these three days is pretty critical to the essentialness of improving urban education. As a matter of fact I was somewhat startled to find the amount of agreement on the part of representatives both from the large cities and the states as to the need for the strengthening of the state education department in regard to the inherent weaknesses of that structure.

The first question I want to talk about is, "How do we think about education for the urban community?" As I started to do a little homework in regard to this three-day conference, not just this evening, but the three day conference, I couldn't help but see a thread as I look at writings on urban life, not by people in professional education but by people outside of professional education who are keen students and observers of the urban scene. The thread, it was almost a thread of pessimism in a sense, indicated that one of the reasons that the present development studies and efforts to really change urban living have basically failed has been due to the attitudes and philosophic beliefs that people have had who have found themselves in a position where they were inclined either to want to cooperate or not to cooperate as the case may

be. In other words, it wasn't due to any doubt that they may have had in their minds that they did not want to cooperate or did want to cooperate. Rather it was that there were some deep rooted beliefs back in their lives and experiences as people, both as educators and other kinds of institutional leaders, that caused them to not give support to the types of urban projects that we now have going on in this country.

So I have selected just four illustrative statements that I would like to have you test in your own mind a little bit tonight as to how you think about the urban community, how you think about education for the urban community. The first one is this: "Unique to the growth of our urban communities is a multiplicity of inter-related problems which affect education and must be resolved by responsible educational leadership working with other community leaders." Now I suppose that if you were asked personally or you were asked to write on this topic, all of you would agree to this particular statement, that there are a multiplicity of inter-related problems.

If you begin to pursue this, and you begin to look at the behavior of school administrators at all levels in America, you would soon discover, for example, that this is not a belief held by a large number of school administrators in this country, even among large school districts. At least their behavior doesn't indicate such a belief, because you hear again and again on every scene that the job of education is to deal with education in the school. It is not to be concerned, really with the problems of race or housing or employment or most of the other score of community and societal problems that we have in our country. This is not our job, our job is to leave those questions to other people. This, in spite of the fact that I suspect that most of you would be now saying to yourself, "Well, how can that be true when we're having to deal with these problems all the time?"

I can only say to you on that point that if you think back over your conversation with yourself and others, you find very often that this is not something that you think is really fundamentally your job, that your job is to run schools; it is not to deal with the problems of the community even when they impinge on education. I don't believe that the work of these seven states represented in this conference and the large city communities represented, and the state departments therein, will move very far until there is a strong willingness on the part of those people who have leadership roles, and particularly those in the public schools, to agree that the job of education is a job in which these multiple interrelated problems have to be tackled by school leadership even though, seemingly, they are not educational problems or issues. Now it may be that among the present group represented here what I have been saying doesn't quite apply. If it doesn't, then you know the answer to that.

The second kind of statement that is related to how you think about education is as follows. "In a democratic society, the relationship between the state and its system of schools is necessarily intimate." This goes back to the work of Paul Mort who, as most of you know, took a very strong leadership role in working with large cities throughout this country and who spent a great deal of his time working with state departments of education in this country, although many state superintendents of schools thought he was highly critical of the things they were doing. I'll say more about that from another viewpoint a little later.

But as you listen, as I listen, in state after state across this country to groups of superintendents talking about the state department, you would have to say that it is not a very intimate relationship because they cuss, they bawl out, they make fun of, they do everything under the sun with respect to the state department. And as you listen, on the other hand, you hear just

about the reverse, that the incompetency at the local school level is really just impossible to tolerate. How can it be like that? Maybe this is too strong a statement. Maybe things have changed in the last six months to a year. If they have, I would be delighted to hear about them. But, it seems to me that this doesn't buttress the consideration that in a democratic society the relationship between a state and its system of schools must necessarily be intimate and must necessarily be supported by each other. How often have we heard in all of the states represented here, and I've heard it personally in all of them, when there is a question of incompetency, if that is the word to use, the state department of education and people in the local superintendency say, "Well, if they just had better people up there, things would be better." How many of the local superintendents, how many of the school leadership in the local community have ever gone to the legislature and said, "There should be more money for state department officials." Again, maybe this has been done; I don't know. If it has been done, I have missed it somewhere along the line.

The third statement is that the school (and you can talk about the school as a system or you can talk about it in relation to the state department of education) has a reciprocal relationship with society as a whole. It not only exerts influence itself, but it is influenced in many ways. And in many instances, of course, the school is influenced by what takes place in society. In other words, this reciprocal relationship says that the school influences society and society influences the school. This is not a new concept as are none of these. And yet, if you really were figuratively to take a vote among the people of this country today, both in the profession and outside the profession, I think you would discover that the job of the school really ought to be education and ought to stay within that framework. And it ought not to be

a job where the school is concerned with influencing the community. As a matter of fact, on many faculties where we train educational administrators, if you talk with the professors of educational administration, you would find more division than you would expect on this particular point.

You can begin to see, if you'd think about this in relation to the kinds of urban problems with which you are dealing and are having to face, that, if there is any division in your ranks, it doesn't necessarily have to be in the mind of the leaders and planners and doesn't have to be in your particular minds in this room. That is one of the little points that sometimes we may overlook. We may be clear in our minds about all of these questions, but, if you consider the people who have to operate in your school districts, and I suppose primarily at the principal level in the local school areas, and I would be a little less sure of all of the operational aspects of state departments, it would be at these places that you would have to think of what the story is in the minds of these people on these particular concepts. In other words, it is not my point here to say that your behavior and your thinking may not be representative of a point of view. You may be quite clear. You may have the so-called right viewpoint, the so-called point of view that will make a difference in urban education, but what of all the rest who are involved at other levels?

The last point came to mind because of doing a little reading in the course of the last three or four weeks, and because this last week one of the British educators in teacher education was in my home. Perhaps one of the most difficult problems facing us in urban education, as I view it as a pretty rank amatuer, is a difference between one thing that I noticed in the spring of 1964 in Great Britain and something that I so often see in this country, throughout our whole education system, not just in the major urban centers. It is the fact that in most of the schools that I visited in Great Britain, the teachers had a feeling that all children can learn.

I don't know how much time you spend in the teachers' room, in committee meetings, wherever other teachers congregate in this country of ours, but almost the first kind of conversation that opens up those meetings has to do with the fact that Jimmy or Johnny or Mary or Suzie is just impossible to teach, or can't possibly learn. This is pretty current. I never once heard that expression in spending literally hundreds of hours with British teachers. It must have been there somewhere, I just didn't happen to find it, even though I spent some weeks visiting schools every day, but that was only a small sample of British schools. But, if there is a feeling that some can't learn among parts of your professional staff, here again, even if all of the administrators and supervisors have a feeling that all can learn and this belief doesn't really basically get down into the individual teacher's activities in the classroom, you've got a lot to overcome.

Those are samples of thoughts about education for the urban community in respect to the kind of thinking you and the members of your professional staff have to do. It may make a difference to the state department of education's strengths and weaknesses in relating effectively to urban problems, because I suppose that one of the questions that the state department of education may have to ask itself in any of these four areas is, "What is our responsibility to see that these concepts or ideas have so gripped the profession that there is a greater unifying feeling about them than I am afraid currently exists?"

Let's look at the third question, "What are the emerging strengths of the state education departments?" Here again I'm going to sample both from the strengths and the limitations and in some instances I'm going to talk about some things that are part strength and part limitation. I think one of the real emerging strengths that I see in state education departments, that certainly gives me a great feeling of warmth, is the increasing desire to act and

to make changes both internally and in their relationships with school systems thrcughout the state. And this is particularly true, I think, as the state department looks at the urban problems with which they deal. I think that this increasing desire to act and make changes is pretty basic in terms of whatever it is during these three days on which you may decide to base a next step.

A second emerging strength is the rather amazingly positive response to Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I have spent time going over all of the proposals of all of the 50 states, and particularly the seven states represented in this conference, in terms of what they propose to do in order to strengthen the state department of education. This is an amazing tale. If you haven't looked at these proposals, I suggest you do, remembering that this was the first wide-spread use of fair-sized sums of money to strengthen state departments of education. What the picture would look like with that same money or additional money available five years from now is very difficult to tell, but it is a very impressive first story.

I'm not going to relate all of that story but I think there are three pieces of it that are, to me at least, more critical than others and particularly critical with respect to the tremendous strengths that will be given to the state departments of education and their relationships to the large cities of the seven states.

In all of the seven state pictures as well as most of the 50, extensive proposals regarding strengthening the competencies of the staff members of the state education department have been made. Interestingly enough, this is almost the first time any effort has been made in most state education departments to do anything about this, but it is interesting to see that an intensive effort is being made here at this conference.

Second, as a part of the response to Title V, for the first time in most of these seven states as well as the 50, there is the beginning, the beginnings, of long range-planning programs. One or two states have pushed in this area before. Something over 21 months ago, I began a national study on long-range planning in regard to the public schools in America. At the beginning of this period, it was almost impossible to find in public schools in America any long-range planning program, and clearly just as impossible to find this as a part of state departments of education. However, in the course of that 21 months, many, many school systems have begun intensive effort and Title V, through the state department of education, certainly is emphasizing that kind of plan.

Third, out of this positive response comes, perhaps, one of the most critical of all the things that need to be done to strengthen the state department and this is the beginning in some cases, and the strengthening in others, of research programs.

Before coming to this meeting, I wrote a group of state superintendents and superintendents of schools in large cities throughout the country, and I think in almost every instance more research was the thing that the large city superintendents wanted to see in the state departments of education. Title V apparently is helping state departments to move in that direction.

One of the other elements of strength has to do with increasing the initiative in interstate cooperation. There are a series of projects which received Federal grants. Five of the seven states here are administering some of these projects and they involve anywhere from five or six states up to eight or ten others that are working with the administrating state. This, in itself, gives some buttressing to the kind of project that you are contemplating and working on during this three-day period. It is also interesting that all

seven of the states represented here are participating in these inter-state cooperative projects, some of them in more than one, but all of them in at least one.

One other strength that I think is current and important with regard to state education departments is that on examination not only of present projects but other things that are taking place, you do discover that there is an expansion of program, staff and services throughout.state education departments in this country. And particularly is that true, as you might expect, in the seven represented here. And when you expand program, services and staff, you will expect some returns from them as they affect urban education.

Let's look a little at the limitations. In spite of what I said about the state department having a desire to act, as I mentioned earlier, we still have the kind of feeling that exists between local school officials and the state departments regarding their outlook on the state department as an agency. I won't say more about that, but certainly I would think that one of the things that as a group of seven states and X number of cities you might do is to begin to work on and deal with that problem. There is a basic weakness written up in the proposal for this report on which I would like to comment. State departments are weakly oriented philosophically, structurally, and procedurally to deal with emerging problems of education and an increasingly urbanized culture. That is taken as a quotation from the proposal itself. I'd like to talk a little about the four pieces; philosophically, structurally, administratively, and procedurally in just a few brief strokes.

I think philosophically, as we look at public policy in America, public policy as it relates to our society, it rarely seems to be the initiating force whether we're dealing with economic growth, population betterment or educational change and improvement. It would be my feeling in education, and this comes I

suppose from the teaching of Mort, because he enunciated this very clearly and strongly, that public policy really is a major purpose of the state education department--enunciation of public policy for education within the states. Or if you were to look at what you're concerned with during these three days, public policy might well be a concern of these seven state departments of education acting in concert. Philosophically, it seems to me that this is crucial to the picture of urban education and is at present, in most of these states, a very serious limitation as it is in all states.

Structurally what do we have? I think it would not be unfair, although this is obviously open for argument, to state that the organizational structure of most state departments is inclined to be rigid rather than flexible. One of the weaknesses that is emerging out of this Federal Title V money is the fact that again and again you see a quantitative expansion of supervisory staff. There was a great fuss made in a report in the State Department about the fact that they added a whole score, several guidance staff, in the state education department. I mention this because I think this is found often enough to cause me, maybe you, but to cause me to ask if you are really sure about some of the kinds of programs you now have and what they are doing for urban communities when you decide that you're going to make an addition which becomes purely a massive, additive function?

In other words, pure expansion quantitatively had better be examined. One of the things that is so pertinent to what you're trying to do in this three-day period in the assessment of relationships between the state departments and the large cities in regard to urban education may call for a re-looking at and a re-thinking about this kind of state department activity--the question of the rigid framework of staffing or the expansion quantitatively. One of the tests with regard to structure is going to come when we consider how state

departments of education are going to work with regional laboratories, how they are going to work with the state commission, how they're going to work with other groups of this kind.

What do we have when we look at the question of weakness administratively? I think that one of the critical weaknesses has to do with attitude. Then if we are to say, as we do on occasion, whether we're talking about the School of Education at the University of North Carolina or the State Department of Education or the Department of Educational Administration in Teachers College, Columbia, or the administration of a large city, if we were to say that present performance is unsatisfactory due to severe structural deficiencies in the present organization, you can imagine what the reaction would be. This is a pretty normal kind of reaction, but what happens out of that reaction is that not much change takes place. We don't really begin to see the creation of new arrangements that make a difference. We see a continuance of the same kinds of arrangements. Somewhere along the line as a part of administrative weakness it seems to me that constructive criticism is one of the most difficult things to do in our society. Whenever we're critical of the performance in a situation, if we can make it possible for human beings who are in that situation to feel less defensive about the situation personally, it seems to me that it will make for a better kind of administrative structure.

Procedurally, I suppose in regard to the State Department you might ask the questions, "How does the staff work with school systems?" "How does the state education department work with school systems?" But I'll take you from that point for a minute down to the individual faculty of the building. How does the principal work with the faculty of his school? There are all kinds of exceptions to this of course, and there are all kinds of normal situations as well as the exceptions, normal ways of working. You have to look at thousands

of principals to get a feeling about this, and it has been my privilege to do this over a period of time. But, I have to say to you that the great majority of principals in this country, by far the great majority, do not know very well how to work with their professional staffs. As a matter of fact, the single most important reason why we're presently having trouble with teachers in the relationship between boards and superintendents and teachers is because of the behavior of principals in the individual buildings. Teachers themselves will tell you this if you explore the topic a great length with them. So, if in the building unit there is a question of how the principal works with the staff, clearly you have some of this same problem in the school system. What does this say, therefore, about how the state department of education works with staff?

If there's any truth in what I have said, and you can be a good judge of this in your own school system, but if there is any truth in my remarks as applied to the local school district, what have they been doing during this time in the state department of education to modify or change some of these relationships? Maybe attitude is part of the answer to how the state department of education staffs work with school systems in terms of one aspect, one kind of question, procedurally.

There are three other weaknesses which I will mention. First, before Title V, the training of top staff people was almost absent from state departments of education; second, research, as many of you know, has been weak; and third,--and it seems to me as one talks about this with the people in the field as well as with state department superintendents themselves--the selection of top staff leaves much to be desired.

In conclusion, I would like to mention some immediate areas for action. I would suggest three that may not quite get into the picture during the other

sessions. Let me start out with the concern that I had at one time as to why the French government always seemed to remain stable. This was pre--DeGaulle. Why did the French government always seem to remain stable in spite of the fact that they were constantly changing the government almost every five or six months? How could a government really stay intact on that basis? In the spring of 1964, I found the answer. I suppose I should have known before, but at that time I visited a school in France which is probably one of the finest schools for executives in the world. This gave me some indication as to why the French government was able to continue to function when it had no leadership. The people who ran the provinces in France started out with a Ph.D. from a French university. After the degree, they moved on to take a three year program at this school for governmental executives which I visited, one year of which was spent in working in a provincial office under the guidance of a highly competent person.

Now, when you multiply that in terms of a civil service throughout all of the provinces of France, and you consider whether education has any meaning in regard to what it is possible for people to do, you can begin to see that we have some shortages in our own areas here. And so, one of the areas, it seems to me, for action has to do with providing a different kind of leadership and providing a different kind of training. I think part of this is that we need a different process of selection of people with a variety of pretraining backgrounds.

I was always amazed in my 25 years at Teachers College, Columbia, that we spent no time ever on working with people who would go into state department positions. But we might have made a far better contribution to American education had we worked intensively on this problem, and I would hope that as you look at this problem in the days ahead that you would see ways in which the

state departments, the large cities, and the universities would begin both, in pretraining and in-service training, to do something with the personnel that find themselves interested in going into state department positions.

The second consideration for action has to do with providing directions. And here, again, regarding long-range planning in the state department, it seems to me that with what is now available in American life, what is now known about long-range planning, that it ought to be possible for the state departments of education in these seven states, the cities in these seven states, in cooperation with the other kinds of agencies with whom they would work, to make real progress in the area of planning. Looking at what is now known from the studies of the Stanford Research Institute, from some of the quite unusual, long-range planning going on in government today both from the Defense Department and transportation and in almost every single department of the United States government, the quality of long-range planning is of a high order. Major corporations of America are achieving the same high quality in this area.

The third point or action has to do with providing informed assistance for fine research programs which harness the resources of the city, the state, and not just the school of education in the university, but the total university. If you limit yourselves to the schools of education, with all due respect to them, you're limiting yourselves in terms of research background in ways that you can't possibly compensate for. We have yet to fully utilize the great universities in this country as represented by your states. I mentioned earlier the question of the regional laboratories in the Education Commissions of the states in regard to this, but in this whole area it seems to me that there is a point of action that is available to us that we have not begun to touch.

As I read some of the letters that came to me, as I talked to people about this whole question before you in these three days, I couldn't but think

as I looked at the program of this conference when it was first sent to me, that it pinpointed the areas that may make one of the really beginning differences in not only strengthening the state department of education, but also in strengthening the state department of education in relation to the urban education problems of the city. This is what you have developed in this conference. I can think of no more effective way of beginning and as I look at the kind of people that are on this program beginning tomorrow morning, you ought to have a panorama of potential ways of working that should make a real difference in the way in which urban problems in American education are tackled, are dealt with, and are solved.

"URBAN EDUCATION AND THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES PROGRAM--RELATIONSHIP AND PROBLEMS"

by
Robert Wood

Under Secretary,
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

I welcome this opportunity to meet with you today and to talk informally and directly as public servant to public servant about some of the on-going programs of this department and about what I think and hope will be a mutually collaborative effort which involves centrally your concerns and your programs and our responsibilities in housing and urban development. There has been in years past a common theme, which is familiar to us all, that good schools make good communities. This was, in fact, based on a mutually independent need. Good communities and good schools made their contributions one to the other almost without cooperative planning. We knew they co-existed, but our theme at that time went back to the years when very often people involved in housing went different paths than people involved in education, and people involved in planning went different paths from those involved in welfare. This was a kind of separate ethic to attack common problems that suffered by lack of coordination, by lack of collaboration and by lack of understanding.

I'm here this morning, in what I think is a fairly critical period of the turnabout in these relations and in the problems of urban development of city school systems and city development in general, to talk about the Demonstration Cities and the Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 just passed, and in particular about the Model Cities Program of that Act. I will try to outline for you briefly the major underlying assumptions of the Act and its major provisions at this time, to outline some of the problems and perplexities that will face us in this undertaking.

Let me begin simply by giving you a little bit of the background of the Model Cities Program, and the Act, and of some of its assumptions. It came upon the federal scene as a result of the task force that I was privileged to chair last fall. The task force was formed to consider the problems of urban development and was not, except for two of us, an academic task force. The assignment at that time was to look at and review the programs for urban development that then were under way, to evaluate them and then to see what might go forward under the determination of a president who had made as his crucial concern in domestic legislation the conditions and the problems of the American city. That task force deliberated and made its report to the President. From that came the President's message of January 26 outlining the so-called Demonstration City or Model City Program and Metropolitan Development Program which was considered by the Congress in a long and lengthy set of dialogues and then enacted, first overwhelmingly by the Senate in August, and then in October during the closing days of the session by the House, and it is now law. Its first planning provisions have been funded. We are now at the time of beginning the execution of this program, beginning its planning, beginning to make our developments with local governments and state agencies and we are, in effect, at the take-off point.

The three assumptions that underlay this program were, first of all, that we had learned enough from 20 years of experience from the Housing Renewal Project to know that the simple physical rebuilding of central cities, renewal programs for downtown areas, public housing as public housing projects per se, werenot enough, essentially, to provide the kind of potential for American urban

life that we felt this country was capable of; and that, therefore, any program that undertook to be helpful to American urban problems at this time had in effect to be a combination of social, educational and physical planning. Components of the process of the urban growth were such that one hand washed another, and we could no longer go along, on the basis of the years of experience we had, purporting to say that cities would be restored without bricks and water being intimately connected with the human needs of the city.

The second assumption to be made was that one of our problems, in education, health, welfare, urban development, was that our efforts were project by project, were scattered across the landscape to many of our large urban complexes and did not add up to critical mass, did not add up to a combination that would turn a corner. These individual project by project approaches, in effect, led to a series of awesome dilemmas at the operating level, at your level, from which it was difficult to escape. If one made the choice between trying to restore housing without the complimentary services, one found that there was something lacking in the response of the population itself; and, if one moved to build as rapidly as possible on the restoration and renewal project, one found citizen participation and civic understanding lacking. When one moved to solve some of the school problems in the neighborhood, if one put in extra courses, enrichment of curricula, one found that without some backstopping in terms of housing conditions that the results were impaired. Therefore, shot through the legislation that is now about to go into execution is the concept that one has to move at the point of impact on a scale that would make a difference. So the law provides for the restoration of entire neighborhoods within the central cities or suburban areas. But the concept is that one has to tackle at least ten percent of the population or 30 percent of the substandard areas, if one is going to change the environment of a neighborhood,

or start a turnabout in terms of the sound development of the city itself. So, beyond the concept of combination of aids and grants and resources, was the concept of a scale where it was applied at a point of impact large enough to make a considerable difference within a specified period of time.

And finally, the program, though it is often criticized as being too big or too small, which is frequently natural at this stage of development, tried to approach the problem of urban America with some humility, with saying in effect that the systems by which people come together in crowded urban space are far more complicated and complex that are the systems we need to get a couple of astronauts into outer space and ultimately to the moon. But, we need to know a great deal about this system before we're sure of how it can be guided, and that, most of all, we can not make the assumption made by so many of the old national programs, particularly in the New Deal days, that one could apply across a continental democracy the same procedures and the same programs and the same package mix, and, in effect, expect the same results in all cases. One had to have a due respect for the situation as it was.

Therefore, our effort called not for providing these model neighborhoods, the metropolitan development aspect of the program, in every American community all at once. It provided that those communities that wanted to, that had the get up and gumption to want to try, to want to meet some 14 performance criteria that were broadly outlined in the law, to want to use their own techniques, were the ones that first should move ahead in the eligibility process. But we were not, in a time of constraints on manpower and know-how, prepared to say that this ought to go everywhere at once and be forced into the point of view of the Federal Government, into a sort of lower common denominator proposition.

So on these three assumptions, a program was fashioned to meet the first assumption, to try to bring coordination of all resources. If a community will

combine its own resources and its own plans and its own component parts in terms of what it would like to do with housing that neighborhood, with its social welfare services, with its education, its parks, and its playgrounds, and present us a scheduled plan through what is called in the law a demonstration city agency, but which in effect in our expectations can be a variety of things, I can outline for that quasi-public, quasi-private, designated agency, a particular combination of agencies. If the communities will then establish administrative machinery to plan and carry out this program, meeting the standards of scheduling and the broad components, the Federal Government will respond in two ways.

It will, first of all, provide a planning grant for this activity which is the process we are now about to move toward in some 80 percent of the areas where this has been done. Then in the execution phase, the local community would add up all the regular grant and aid assistance that might be available to each of the component parts of this program, add up the battery of educational aids or health aids or welfare aids or renewal aids for public housing assistance, and, on the basis of that addition, calculate its total local share of those programs. On that basis, the Federal Government or our department would then provide another supplemental grant equal to 80 percent of the total local share, and this grant would be in effect undesignated. It has its precedents in some ways in the advances you made in school legislation in the minimum foundation programs some years ago, but its essential basis is to provide to the locality, to the demonstration city agency, an unrestricted grant which the locality can use as it sees fit. It can, if it wants to, embark on innovative enterprises within this Model City Program that have no foundation or counterpart in federal assistance legislation. It can shift salary schedules for the school teachers in the area if that is appropriate. It can provide

additional safety if that is appropriate. It can experiment with kinds of programs which may or may not ever have been tried or ever have been authorized in state or federal law before, but the basis of the grant is to provide supplemental funds for community innovations. The community can also, if it desires, use the funds to increase quality standards on regular programs. It can also use this money to increase local funds if it wants to go beyond what is currently available. It becomes what we call it in the department now, essentially "blue money," to take care of the different problems of scheduling, priority, and local aids, to take care of slippages, to remove some of the frustrations of federal grants in aid that limit possibilities just when a good idea is about to get off the ground and there is no pidgeon hole in which to apply to the appropriate state, and local, or federal agency for further aid.

The basis of this, then, is to say that the planning process is the area in which one cooperates best and early. Coordination is a more appropriate and feasible exercise these days in consolidation on the federal and the local level, and, in effect, the effort and the need to show visible tangible results in a scheduled period of time is very important at this stage of our urban history.

Now the program at this point also has one other proposition underlying it, and that is the proposition that we have about three or four years in which to fashion these programs and to carry out these experiments because we are in a peculiarly right time in the process of American urban development. In about 1964, we completed the housing of the post war baby crop. Beginning about 1970, the baby crop of that baby crop will be coming. By the year 2000, we will have put in place physical structures equal to whatever we have built before in this country. So, in these years from 1966-70 we begin by example, by experiments of critical mass, by new patterns and paths of collaboration to see

what we can do for the cities. The program of model neighborhoods for older cities is designed essentially to see if residential components can be restored, with a multiplier effect put it.

There are two other parts of the Act that I would like to mention just briefly. We provided for metropolitan regions as a whole where for ten years or more we have been engaged in various forms of metropolitan planning efforts, a similar kind of demonstration program. We said that for those that not only planned on a regional basis but wanted to act in accordance to the plan, wanted really to put in region-wide facilities according to a plan--sewers, waters, airports and hospitals, schools, what have you, we would respond with another 20 percent supplemental grant. For those communities that would come together in this planning effort, that would be equal to 20 percent of the total cost for these projects and we would try to put in place the community facilities, investments that are so expensive in the development of the spread city.

And finally we said that, with four to five million Americans appearing on the scene every year, we ought to have the opportunity not only to try to restore residential components of older cities, to make a metropolitan region more coherent and developed, but we ought to finally see if people wanted to experiment with entirely new forms of communities, new technology, and new architecture. So we provided $200,000,000 in the present law for mortgage money for development of this type. We are not trying to determine for the nation, however, what the good city is and what it looks like. We do think that we ought to try to restore the classic function of cities and to provide options as to where people want to live, work, and find their recreation. To the degree we can demonstrate the vitality of residential neighborhoods by good planning, and new opportunities in older cities and elsewhere, we think we are enhancing that freedom of choice.

A final word about two aspects of the program. One is that it involves in its mechanics and in its program a heavy degree of participation by state government and certainly by state departments of education, because it involves the application of those grants in federal government that flow through the states, particularly in health and welfare and education, as components of these programs.

When a task force was put in operation in New Jersey, we were delighted because it means that this axis has to be built and it involves as well the performance standards that I mentioned briefly. In the law, not only in the designation of the size of a neighborhood area, but also in developing the plan, the city demonstration would try to make some substantial progress toward mixed income levels within that neighborhood, toward innovations in housing construction and cost, toward the involvement of neighborhood employment where that was feasible in the construction size, toward a re-examination of codes and assessment policies in the cities. What was involved here was the providing for the first time of incentives to city officials and to city administrations to take a new look at revising whatever practices they found frustrating and perhaps obsolete and moving forward on the grounds of the Model Neighborhood Program.

This has always had a particular appeal to me. I spent five years on a revision of the technical building codes and standards for large northeastern cities. The technical revision was not difficult. What was difficult was showing the elected official what it was necessary to do in taking on groups that didn't want to revise the building code. It is in this effort of some new incentive and some new possibilities of development that the performance standards are outlined. This can be regarded as an opportunity, first of all, to bring together the important relationships and common programs that are

necessary. It does this without violence to agencies or boundary jurisdictions, or massive reorganizations, and it does it in a way that provides some incentives for every participant to see his own program strengthened. It is an opportunity for those of us who have been predominantly concerned in urban development to begin to work fruitfully with those concerned with the human needs of urban populations and particularly with education.

I cannot conceive that this program will work without the deep involvement of the educational program and the education profession. With sole reliance on housing and physical rebuilding, we cannot really restore neighborhoods, cannot change the kind of lives we know we have to change. We are indeed embarked under common partnership. That time is past when any agency or program can go it alone and expect to succeed in its mission. The next four or five years will spell the difference between whether we have common effective programs or whether we do not.

a. "HOW DOES THE LEGAL STRUCTURE OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS HELP OR HINDER THEIR ABILITY TO GIVE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE TO URBAN AREAS?"

b. "HOW CAN STATE AND CITY EFFECTIVELY RELATE TO THE LEGISLATURE OF EACH STATE?"

by
Edmund Reutter

Professor of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

I want to begin by saying and actually meaning that its quite an honor and a privilege to be with you this afternoon because I believe that this particular topic is one that brings together two of the key issues in American public education today. By the two key issues, or two of the key issues in American education, I refer to the big-city school systems and their roles, and to the state departments of education. Each is faced with its own problems, but certainly a major problem for each is its relationship with the other. If properly developed, I believe that these relationships can lead to a marked renaissance in public education. This may sound very naive. I hope that it sounds idealistic and I also hope that it will be realistic in that this conference can be a step toward more efficient relationships for the common purpose of both urban school systems and state departments of education; namely, the best education possible for urban children. Of course you wouldn't be here if you didn't share the feeling that administration at the State level and administration in large urban schools together can do much and should do much, much more than heretofore has been possible.

Part of the problem of coordinated action lies in legal arrangements. But if in fact, and I emphasize the "in fact", if in fact the law is a hinderance to more effective relationships, I would suggest that the fault is not that of the law but of the men who failed to change the law to reflect new insights. The law can, and I would say should, be a positive force in achieving educational goals. Often it is not. Thus, in today's discussion, I hope the group can pinpoint some specifics and get the ball rolling to correct the deficiencies which may have hindered the most effective relationships.

In setting the background for the discussion, I thought that it might be helpful to take a little look at the history of the law in public education

that has led to the kinds of problems we'll be facing today. Of course, we all know and have heard of and have answered multiple choice questions at some times in our careers about what level of government education is a function of. It is a function of the state, but if we stop to look at history at the time of the tenth amendment of 1 3/4 centuries ago, I think we have to recognize that in making education a state function what was really being said was that it was not a federal function. Also, at that time, public education was being developed basically on the local level. It hadn't been developed very far, but "de facto" education, "de facto" public education, was taking place on the local level to a large extent, not on the state level. So the federal constitution was saying, "We're not going to make this a federal governmental function; we're leaving it out."

Meanwhile, forerunners of the public schools were operating on the local level. It was in the larger cities that early starts in public education were being made. Even though education thus by default became a state function, the state departments were not strong in the early days, and there were also problems of transportation and communication. So actually, the large cities were treated like city-states with much of their educational machinery self-contained. In fact, until after World War II, the big cities were the pearls of the educational oyster. They had the financial resources; they had a substantial and educated middle class which supported the schools; they were the focus of the educational action. State departments tended to concentrate more on smaller rural schools, and a live-and-let-live relationship developed, differently in different states of course, but basically it was a co-existence between state departments and large city systems rather than a really active cooperative arrangement.

To the extent that this was error, both the cities and the state departments would have to share blame. But our purpose here is not to place blame;

in fact, perhaps the blame can be placed on the universities and then that would keep both sides happy. One measure of the lack of attention given on the university level to state educational administration is simply the fact that in the last 40 years, only two books have been written on state school administration--Coverly's book back in 1927 and one other. So you can say that since 1927 there has been only that one book with the title State School Administration where there have been scores and scores dealing with local school administration and hundreds dealing with buildings and other aspects. State school administration has largely been neglected by the college level.

At the end of World War II, urban problems began to burgeon. There was a loss to the suburbs of the middle class, reduced tax base, old buildings, and many other educational problems concurrant with problems of urbanism not directly in the province of school officials--costly problems like welfare, delinquency, traffic, smog, etc. Furthermore, international events and advances in technology were pointing out that the nation's schools as a whole needed rejuvenating. Many pressures were mounting and questions were raised about why the states had not allowed their legal authority in responsibility for education to thrive, or to put it negatively, why they had allowed it to become stunted in growth. And of course the biggest visible problem areas in education were the very large cities.

So now both state departments and urban areas are faced with tremendous challenges, and of course, it is the purpose of this conference to take a look at these. The possible silver lining, I would suggest, is that these criticisms and pressures from without plus more insights from within and better leadership from within may mean that at last there is a way afoot toward working jointly and more effectively on educational problems.

If we ask the abstract question prior to our discussion "What is the role of the state regarding education?", I think we could agree that there probably are two basic functions. One is to set and enforce minimum standards; the other is to encourage and help the local districts to exceed these standards, these minima. Obviously, the urban areas have special problems and need special help. It is my feeling that it is the moral right of urban areas to expect state department help, and, concurrently, it's the moral right of the state to expect urban cooperation.

Since the state has the legal power and a state department is closer to the legislature than are the big cities, probably the state department is in a better position to initiate certain changes than are the cities. But without the cooperation of the cities, the state department will be impeded and probably will be even more so when reapportionment gets under way. In some respects history may show that the reapportionment decision of the United States Supreme Court had a more profound effect on public education than either the desegregation or the Bible-reading cases. But, anyway, without city cooperation the state department will be impeded.

It is necessary, I believe, to keep in mind that both the state department and the school authorities in large cities must contend with other agencies of government on their respective levels. I think we cannot over-emphasize that point. We're talking about the state department and talking about the city school administrations. In the very large cities, the ones represented here, there is the problem of cooperating with, contending with, coordinating with other agencies of government on the respective levels, other agencies of state government and other agencies of municipal government.

What, then, are some of the areas of legal structure that can serve as examples of what you, who made up the program, may want to discuss this afternoon?

Legally, let me remind you that there are only four possible ways to handle the problem of how the state should operate in the legal realm. The law, I want to insist, is a servant of organized society, not its master. Legally then, there are four basic ways of handling a problem. One is, and the State has the power to do any of these, to require that something be done. The State can require that something be done. This is one way. The second way is to require that something not be done. The third is to expressly permit something to be done at another party's option. And the fourth is to just keep quiet. Now, actually the fourth is a sort of ringer because, theoretically, there is always a legal answer, provided the question is properly posed and carried to the court of highest jurisdiction. So from a legal point of view, if the question is properly phrased and pursued, the fourth category would have to drop into one of the first three: namely, it must be done, it must not be done, or it can be done. However, as we look at these problems this afternoon, educational problems with legal implications and legal problems with educational implications, what we have to try to decide is when is it best for the State to do number one, when is it best for it to do number two, number three, or number four.

Actually, in many instances, no action is the best course of action. Not when it comes simply by default, of course; this is indefensible lack of leadership. But when it is decided that at the moment it is best for the state not to require large cities to do something, not to prohibit them from doing it, or not expressly to give them permission to do it, then this becomes a viable, defensible and morally responsible position for the state to take. For example, I personally believe that the area of relationships between teachers and boards of education is an area that the states should stay out of in so far as legislation is concerned for the very simple reason that we don't have enough experience to know what to legislate. So, therefore, I would use this as an

example of method number four, that right now the best thing for a state to do would be not to legislate. Local boards must negotiate.

Operationally we have a continuum, as far as the state is concerned in its relation to the larger cities. At one end is the fact that the state could require that something be done by legal force. At the other end is persuasion, leadership, whatever you want to call it. Spread out between requirement by force and persuasion that urban school districts should do certain things is a middle ground which involves such things as financial incentives, and guidelines. So we have the broad continuum between the state being able to require something absolutely by statute or trying to persuade local districts psychologically through leadership, and then in between is the financial incentive and guidelines which are suggested and which have a certain persuasive influence if they make any sense whatsoever.

I have listed just a few areas here which I want to mention in closing, playing down the area of finance. Now obviously everything in education has a price tag and finance is perhaps the key problem, yet many of your subsequent sessions and some of your prior ones have touched on this. There will be plenty of opportunity to look at the details, the very important details, of how the State level money should be distributed and at other kinds of financial problems. But there are a number of other problems that create animosities between state departments and large urban school districts that I think we could well give some attention to on points of principal.

For example, in the area of curriculum, of who is to be educated, there are very important questions to consider. I'm not referring only to what you might call pupil personnel and compulsory attendance laws, but also to handicapped children. It is the state that determines whether education must be provided for children who fall beyond the range of centrality and the big cities

have numbers of these children and numbers of problems of children who have handicaps of various sorts, mental, physical, emotional, and what have you. Also in the area of curriculum, state actions regarding class size have become very important. Required courses, textbooks, accreditation of schools, these are kinds of things that some of you have mentioned in your preliminary reports, and are some of the areas in which policy, as between the states and the large cities, could well be examined. I have already alluded to the general area of pupil personnel and compulsory attendance, the questions of transporting children to school, questions of racial balance within the schools. There are questions of pupil personnel in which the state has to take one of the four stands that I mentioned earlier. And I should stop to emphasize that this might not necessarily be the state department.

When we talk about the state, we of course mean the entire state legal authority starting with the state constitution, state legislature, the state boards in 48 of the 50 states, the state commissioner, and state department. We're just setting a background here, but I wanted to indicate that state departments may not be able, themselves, to take care of these problems even if the large cities wanted them to; but cooperation between state departments and the large cities would seem to be very important in dealing with questions of racial balance, for example. As far as teaching personnel is concerned, many frictions develop between the large cities and the State Departments. Take certification, for example. There are reasons pro and con for giving the very large cities authority to certify, to license their own teachers. I won't get into the pro's and con's here. Obviously they wouldn't be issues if there weren't arguments on both sides. But a great number of misunderstandings and controversies arise in terms of this question of certification, that is, who will be allowed to teach and who should determine it.

Then there is the question of recruitment. Recently, at a meeting of the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, there was an effort to see how school personnel administrators felt the state departments could be of help to them. Among the things that were suggested were giving more attention to some of the items to which state departments have generally not given too much concern--things like recruitment of teachers to the state and possibly even helping in terms of the cities' in-service education, or should I call it the continued professional development of teachers, salary policies, and minimum salary schedules.

Now, actually, the large urban centers in most states are not effected by state minimum salary schedules. Normally the urban centers are above them. But New York, for example, has a provision that no matter what you pay the teachers, at the master's level, teachers salaries have to be X dollars, I think X is now $300, more than the bachelor's level. Whether this is good, bad, or indifferent is a matter of value judgement. But this is an example of the State taking some kind of action regarding salary policies in the large cities, although these cities are normally above the minimum standards. I have already alluded to the area of teacher-board relations. Furthermore, the states have the authority to accredit teacher-training institutions within the states, and also they have relationships with other states in terms of reciprocity, so that the actual training of the teachers is one of the areas in which the states can do more in cooperation with the large cicies.

We recognize that very little is done in training institutions and we can blame the colleges again for not readying teachers to teach in some of the situations that exist in the large cities. It would seem that this is something that could be worked out, that should be worked out between the states and the large cities so that we have a supply of people properly trained to do

the job that needs to be done in the cities. This might mean a complete breakdown in the category of teachers with such things as teacher aidesor assistants, or other kinds of experiments that some large cities have tried. Some have been helped, some have been hampered, by state departments.

Of course within all of this, we come down to the question of the people that actually do the operating. I have spoken about this in a structural aspect, but of course how a structure actually operates depends a great deal on those who are carrying out the work. On paper two states may be very similar, two departments within a given state may be very similar, but that which the English Department on the state level does in helping improve the English curriculum may be markedly different from that which, let's say, the Math Department does, simply because of the individuals who are in the jobs.

Another reason that the big cities and state departments have almost a built-in cat and dog relationship, is the fact that there is often competition for the same people. The staffing of state departments and the staffing of the central offices of large cities are very similar problems. The same kinds of people are being sought. Of course, both the large cities and the state departments have a unity in defensiveness against intrusions by the federal government and non-educational agencies on the educational preserve--the areas in which the federal government becomes involved in the state activities, areas that are of primary concern to the big cities, and those areas where non-educational agencies are getting into education. The Office of Economic Opportunity and other kinds of agencies are not educational agencies, but the areas in which they are involved are also areas primarily found in the large cities. And of course, the large cities, as I said, have most of the problems, but they also have most of the promise.

I do hope that out of this conference can come other conferences on a voluntary basis in which relationships between the state and the large cities can be worked out so that the state can carry out better its responsibility for education within the large city and officials within the large cities can better carry out the job on the spot. Thank you very much.

"HOW CAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT GROUPS RELATE MOST EFFECTIVELY TO THE STATE AND URBAN SITUATION? -- A SUPPLY OF IDEAS ON ONE HAND AND DISTRIBUTION AND CONSUMPTION ON THE OTHER"

by
Robert Dentler

Director of Center for Urban Education
New York City

As I talk this evening about the significant, peculiar, and in some ways still significantly limited capability of regional educational laboratories, I want to stress the point of interdependence with school men.

What I want to outline this evening is a statement of the kinds of problems that an educational laboratory presumes to work on, and to outline, in the course of these illustrations, the capability that a laboratory brings to the solution of these problems which must be distinguished from the capability that resides in the university tradition on the one hand, and the public school administration tradition on the other. I want to serve polite warning in advance that most of my remarks derive from our experience over the last two years in operating but one of these organizations. The number of laboratories varies from day to day, but the warning I wish to advance here is not unlike the one Dr. Shutz just mentioned, namely, that there are uniquenesses here and one can't generalize as yet from one model. So I am not speaking about the laboratory program from the federal perspective.

My remarks concern our experiences in this one laboratory which began exactly two years ago. Now, what are some of the peculiar yet still limited advantages in resources that are involved in the mission capability of a regional educational lab? I want first to stress the notion of combined interdependence with independence. By interdependence, I mean something that is best understood from the state university tradition, but which is, even in that instance, not completely pertinent to the needs and requirements of state education departments and big city school systems. I mean that a regional educational laboratory is in a position, is designed, is mandated, in a distinctive way to become accountable for the relevance of its research and development activities. Now, a state university or even a private college or university may not be accountable for anything. In fact, I think that this is part of the

special design of higher education, its unaccountability. And I am not an anti-university speaker; I just think that this is the peculiar genius of Academe.

If there is accountability in higher education, it is for the relevance of the instructional offerings and the scholarly production of the faculty. Only in the instance of some of the land grant colleges, do we see the tradition of extension in service unfold. But in the instance of a regional education laboratory, we have discovered in these first two years that, whether we want it this way or not, there are powerful constraints that obligate the headquarters staff to be accountable to its own board of trustees, to be accountable to the state which issues the charter of incorporation and, probably most crucially, to be accountable under the terms of contract to the U.S. Office of Education as the prime fiscal sponsor for the way in which the activities that the regional lab carries on are relevant to the educational needs of the region in question.

Now when I first heard this idea of being accountable for these needs, I resented it deeply because it violates certain cannons that are built up in a researcher. What is relevant to a researcher has to do with the questions he didn't manage to answer in the last piece of research that he did. The idea that somebody might have something that was a pressing requirement that I ought to accomodate to or that our staff ought to bend to was a deep contradiction to the university identity. We surmounted this in the period of our first two years and we have surmounted it in part by achieving a deliberate mix of experienced professional educators with behaviorial scientists from the universities and colleges in our region and from without.

These experienced, professional educators are people who were used to this notion of accountability, perhaps overconditioned to it. Perhaps having served it so long, they had what Merton would call a trained incapacity to move beyond what somebody else said was his need. And we have intriguing conflicts

between our educators, our ex-school superintendents and principals, and our ex-university social scientists. These strains are the most intense experiences that we undergo from day to day on the inside, but the resulting combination is one which has oriented the laboratory in a way that I think no other group has been oriented in educational development on the American scene.

Another sense in which we are interdependent is that, unlike the educational development work stimulated enormously by Zacharius and the Cambridge-Harvard orbit, the laboratories work by invitation in school districts and in parallel consort with practitioners and decision-makers. Now this is one model. It has its limitations. But it is a model to be distinguished immediately from the model that I call the elitist approach to educational innovation. The elitist approach, and I don't mean by that term anything again antagonistic or derogatory, elitism has benefits as well as costs, but the elitist approach is one which looks for the most talented individual scientist or humanist or other gifted intellectual, and asks him to develop a new curricular offering or a new program of instruction or asks him to solve a problem somewhat in abstract. He may have temporary exposures to children. He may have temporary exposures to school men. But it is clear that he's not to be immersed too deeply. Then his new solutions are passed along a belt which hopefully ends up at a point where a consumer sees the power and excitement of the new solution and puts it to work voluntarily.

We work in contrast to this, and I make no invidious distinction. There are many costs in our schemes as there are in the elitist model, but we work by invitation and by contract or other legal arrangement only. We are supplying some research notes on the behavior of school men in our region which we have not been invited to supply. Some of them will prove upsetting to some of the school men. But when we work on development questions, when we engineer solutions to pressing problems, we do so by request, we do so by inquiry, and then

we work out an arrangement by which a collaboration and partnership is built into the activity from the very beginning. And if school men in the district are not interested in this type of parallel activity, we don't go on with the work, we don't pick it up from the outset.

Now I'd like to illustrate this very quickly in the case of two of our projects. First, Dr. Donovan mentioned our agreement to conduct evaluations of all Title I projects carried out in New York City. In this instance, we would not have elected to evaluate these projects, even though they represent a very substantial federal investment in a local district. What's more, by agreeing to evaluate, we have agreed at the same time not to do the designing of future Title I projects in the conviction that its not possible for the same agency to both create the programs and to assess their operation.

But we would not, I believe, have been asked to undertake these evaluations, which have already shown in the first publications that they stimulate considerable controversy from all quarters and add new heat when what the superintendent needs is extra light, we would not have been able to undertake these evaluations if a certain position of trust had not already sprung up between the New York City Board of Education and the Laboratory. And this depended on the fact that we have working in the center people with long experience, long familiarity and attachment to this Board of Education. However, when we do the evaluating, we do it with people from the outside. In this sense, we begin with interdependence, but the evaluating itself is not conducted by people who are partial to this system or who have any allegiance to it.

I'd like to give another illustration. The New York State Education Department arranged for our existence in the first place. We have worked to cooperate with the Department and they have cooperated closely with us over these first two years. They have chartered us rapidly; they submitted our

first application; they have sent officers to attend our board meetings; and, when we had built up some staff capability, they began to request that we do certain planning research. So early last year we undertook the planning of a desegregation program for the city of Buffalo, under a contract, not with that city, but with the New York State Education Department. Again, we submitted our work, our findings, our solutions to problems in the abstract, after empirical work on the Buffalo scene, to the State Education Department which in turn submitted them to a Buffalo Citizens Advisory Committee which in turn, with the Commissioner, submitted them to the Superintendent and his Board. I won't bore you with these mechanics in every illustration, but I wanted to emphasize at the outset, that I believe these mechanics are essential to the realization of educational change, that unless you take pains to set them up carefully and trustfully in the first place, very little change is likely to occur.

In the instance of the Buffalo Study, I would say as a test case, had the Buffalo Superintendent decided that our planning work was not in his best interest, he would have been able to prevent our access to the data necessary for the planning. And so we were under dual constraint. We had to satisfy the State as a client, but we also had to satisfy the requirement of mutually trustworthy relations between the City Superintendent, his Board, and our organization.

Another thing that makes a laboratory different from a university or from a public school planning agency is a difference in scale. I came to the center from the experience of operating a small university research organization, The Institute of Urban Studies at Teachers College, and I had been in similar outfits at other colleges and universities. Now, by a difference in scale, I mean a difference in an annual operating budget, between a college research group and a regional laboratory, of $100,000 maximum on the one hand, and something between one and four million dollars a year for a regional educational laboratory on the other.

Without such an increase in scale, no regional laboratory, no university research group, can really begin to address any of the pressing questions that are before our large central-city school districts, and this change in scale has meant several things. For example, the Institute of Urban Studies had a staff of 10. The Center for Urban Education, within a year and a half of its chartering, grew from that original 10 which were absorbed from Teachers College to a full time staff of 65 and an additional part time staff of 100. Before such a headquarters group was brought together, no one within the university community was able to do more than speculate about some of the enormous questions characteristic of not only New York City but the surrounding suburban communities.

As an illustration of this regional scope, the outreach that money and mass manpower can make, I would mention a reading experiment which we are in the midst of conducting at this time. We have a study of reading, I would call it study number 4,167 in the reading-research tradition, and I would ask what's the difference? Is this another reading research? How many do we need? Why did we pick this up? What is peculiar about it? Well, it is the same as a university study of early reading behavior in the sense of having a rigorous design for comparisons, for controls, and so forth. And it is the same as a classic university study in the sense that it carefully varies the type of instruction given in early reading; it varies the age at which the initial reading instruction begins; and it varies the type of school in which the teaching is carried out. But it differs in one crucial respect, and that is scale. Because of interdependence with the New York City Board of Education and the access supplied there, and because we could afford to do this work, we were able to carry out this design simultaneously in 52 schools using 150 teachers and 7,600 children. We don't have to call for a model school. We're not interested in controlling

all of the conditions. We are operating in schools as they are found in the city. And this is deliberate.

In three years we hope to be able to close out rather authoritatively the question of whether differences in types of instruction in beginning reading really make any difference in the quality of the learning. We will have some explanations which we will be able to bring to bear and we'll be able then to carry out a development operation which will emphasize those features in the teaching style which we believe do make the crucial difference.

If you want other illustrations, it has been mentioned several times at this meeting that there are a few difficulties in negotiating with teachers associations or with the United Federation of Teachers. We have been able to launch in New York City a large scale study of the way in which these negotiations are carried out and to emphasize the part played by the principal, which is the first level, just the elementary stage, in the union negotiating process. We think the scale of this study will enable us to reach conclusions about guidelines for negotiations which will have wide applicability and wide interest value among principals and superintendents throughout the urban north, and we think New York City is a nice place to carry out this large scale study because what's happening here will be happening next year in the mid west and the year after in the northwest.

I would also suggest that, unlike the university where the main allegiance of the faculty must be to teaching on the one hand and to scholarly production or the other, and unlike the hurly burly day-to-day contingincies of school administration, a laboratory offers its staff continuity of focus. We have created at the Center, for better or worse, a new cadre of skilled manpower. As I mentioned, it is a peculiar blend of the engineering laboratory tradition on the one hand, with the research corporation tradition on the other, and with the State University Extension Service and the State Department Extension Service tradition in some third corner in the arrangement.

Now these people may also be attached, they may be jointly appointed to a university, they may teach a course here or there, but these men are not teaching at the Center. They are not meeting payrolls in the school district. They are not concerned directly with increasing their personal record of scholarly monographic production which is the central reward scheme of the college or the university.

By continuity of focus I mean that, for example, we have been carrying out school desegregation plans and evaluations of these desegregation efforts over a series of cities and suburbs. We have had experience in Hackensack, New Jersey, in Glen Cove, Long Island, in New York City, in Buffalo, in Rochester, in Bridgeport, Connecticut, in Stamford, Connecticut, and we've just been at this a little while. And we're beginning to ask questions which allow us to make comparisons, which allow us to standardize the procedure and to design and to exhaust designs for desegregation operations. More importantly, in several of these communities we pay our own way, and we are in these communities under legal agreement for a period of years which will enable us to answer the question, "What difference does the desegregation operation make to the well-being and growth of the children who have undergone it?" So we are positioned by virtue of the protective status of the laboratory and by trust in the school district to carry out studies of change which are, we believe, the missing elements in desegregation experiments thus far.

As a final statement of our peculiar capability I would mention again this matter of talent, individual talent. We do not accept the public school definition of talent or the university definition of talent. We are free to hire on new criteria. We do not have to ask whether a research assistant has an M.A. or what his graduate degree program may be, although many of our research assistants are graduate students and interested in that point. We don't

have to ask about licenses and we don't have to ask about university faculty congeniality. In fact, we have many people who dislike one another thoroughly and are free in our context to show it. By this, I mean that we do not have the same requirements for meeting groups of young people or meeting groups in a professional school. We are asking in the best urban tradition, what are a man's skills, what are his most distinctive intellectual competencies, and we hire exclusively against that question.

As a result, by way of illustration, we have a very odd mix. We have a man who was a vice president in a very large market research firm whose disciplinary speciality is the psychology of family behavior and who hasn't studied a public school system for the last 15 years. We happen to find this a refreshing combination. He's presently concerned with planning the desegregation of a near-by large city school district.

We have an attorney who is also a survey analyst. We never refer to him as an attorney except that it is helpful now and again to design questions so that they fit the state education laws. It is also important, when political conflicts ensue in a desegregation process, to have a person who is on the one hand a survey analyst and on the other an attorney. We have employed school superintendents and principals who, however, have peculiar or special development for innovation experiences that they have worked out in their own schools which we believe deserve cultivation in consort with social scientists. We also employ architects, artists, accountants, computer analysts, and so forth.

Now, so much for capability. The main limitation is the same limitation that faces all efforts to make changes or to solve problems in education, namely, the question of reception. Even though we begin with the premise of interdependence and cooperation and parallel activity, we don't know how our solutions to certain big city problems, desegregation, early educational disadvantage, to

name our two preoccupations, will be received by others than those who work with us in the first place. I think that's a grave limitation. I don't believe that our publications series which has just begun to be voluminous will make any difference because educators live, they emphasize reading for the pupils, but they live in an oral tradition themselves, and I don't believe that our monographs will make any impact or dent anymore than the Cooperative Research Program did five years ago. We don't know yet who wants our solutions to these problems. We have discovered that even the people who invite us to invent the solutions don't always want the answers and we assume that there will be a narrowing range of invitations as some of the answers prove problematical or inapplicable or disturbing.

There is also a limitation in our resources. Already thousands of educators have reached us and hundreds come to the door every month asking for this or that, presenting these needs that we are supposed to be conversant with. We don't find that we have the fiscal ability or the ingenuity to know how to respond to these inquiries. In other words, the vessel will fill up after a certain point and one will be cooperating with certain places and will be saying I'm sorry to the others. At that moment an important limitation will be neared.

One fantasy I have is that educators themselves might get so intrigued by this idea that there is a place that works on certain problems, that they might arrange to retrieve at their own convenience. I've not seen any such impulse within our region yet, but it might occur in just such an assembly as this. There might be a mechanism that would evolve which would enable us to transmit these alleged solutions more profitably, more directly, and in language which fit the requirements of the interest of the client. I don't think we have solved this. I don't think that loose organizations, that is compacts or programs, in the foundation tradition are the answer to this. I think that the

development worker, the researcher has to go out to the client. But the client has to be asking in the first place and this request, is not yet organized, not very coherently voiced, as far as we can tell. Nevertheless, we are hopeful that a meeting like this might stimulate such a mechanism.

"HOW CAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT GROUPS RELATE MOST EFFECTIVELY TO THE STATE AND URBAN SITUATION?"

by
Richard Schutz

Director of Southwest Regional Laboratory
Inglewood, California

There is some difficulty in explaining what we're up to in the Research and Development program because while we do have some new aspects, we keep trying to explain with old terms. People feel that they know what these old terms mean and we are not using them in the same way. We have a number of new agencies in the country and these are very confusing. We have R & D Centers and we have regional laboratories. The R & D Centers are located at universities and they are R & D Centers for universities. Also, it seems to me that what we have in the regional laboratories are R & D Centers for the schools. And this is somewhat of a novelty.

I don't know how long you people have had long-range planning. In the schools in our area, we do have agencies that are involved in long-range planning, but as we look at their functions, they seem to be planning for the use of federal funds on a pretty immediate basis. Now this means that we feel there is a need for an agency that is concerned with a longer range.

What people in Washington tell us is the same sort of story that we heard this morning: you better be very sure that you have a short term payoff. This creates a good deal of anxiety because for the first time we've got our necks out on the line. This is something I don't think we have had in terms of the state departments of education nor of the large cities with their tremendous problems. In the state department you can say, "I've got my minimum standards and these I can stand on." In the regional labs we don't have any minimum standard and we don't have overwhelming problems. We're new and we're trying to get off the ground. We're going to need a little time, a little help.

I think we could agree that traditional research has been of dubious value. Take the matter of class size, for instance, which is an old one. Nobody is looking at the research on class size, so traditional hypothesis testing is something we have thrown out. When you look at other patterns, such as the Ford Foundation pattern where there have been demonstrations of things that should be great, this hasn't worked. So you find very fine ideas dying on the vine for lack of development in terms of carrying them through.

We find that a lot of people want to get into the act in education, but they are totally ignorant of educational requirements. The school people are nice people. They don't complain when the manufacturers don't build material that is usable. They just don't buy again. So, I think what we're hoping to put together is the mechanics for getting the improvement, exploiting the resources within the region, and this requires very careful planning and engineering. I guess that what we have is a plan for doing this and we hope to produce products that eventually will be usable for you people in the school.

"THE INADEQUACIES OF PRESENT CITY AND STATE PROGRAMS FOR THE FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION IN URBAN AREAS: IS THERE A SOLUTION?"

by

James Kelly

Professor of Edu tion
Teachers College
Columbia University

My assignment this morning is to discuss inadequacies in present state and local programs in financing urban education, and to propose regulations presumably capable of correcting the inadequacies. At the risk of losing my audience now, I want to say that I don't have any magic cures to propose, but what follows is merely designed to place in perspective some of the reasons why the big city school systems have fiscal problems. This perspective may help us decide whether the patient merely needs first aid, strong but temporary medication, or surgery.

At the outset it should be emphasized that basic responsibility for financing public education in each of the 50 states rests not with local school boards or with city councils but with the state legislatures whose power over education is limited only by constitutional restrictions at the federal and state level. You're familiar with the two major ways that states have treated, have worked on these problems. I mentioned them only to indicate again that they are both state efforts. One, states have established and authorized ways to tax property for school purposes. Second, states have supplemented local fiscal efforts through foundation programs designed to equalize educational benefits. I want to select for discussion certain aspects of the problem of school finance in this context which I think are relevant to the problems this morning.

Examining the fiscal needs of urban schools is like shooting at a moving target because of constant changes in city population, wealth, governmental arrangements, demands for services, and the social and economic values that shape those demands. Let's consider a few recent changes briefly. Significant shifts in city characteristics have occurred and are particularly striking when stated in terms relative to the states in which the cities are located. For example, the average expenditures per pupil for education in the United States increased by over 300 percent, that's four times, between 1930 and 1960 from $87 per pupil to $375 per pupil. The increase in property values in cities during that same period, fell far short of matching that dramatic growth in expenditures. In New York City, for instance, the full market value of taxable property increased only 15 percent in those 30 years. That's the best estimate I can make of the full market value. For Buffalo the increase was 37 percent, Philadelphia, 6 percent, even for Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Baltimore where the growth in property values was between 100 percent and 200 percent, it still lagged far behind the average increase in expenditures.

This reduced ability to finance urban education has resulted in relatively lower city expenditures for education compared to state average expenditure levels. Expenditures in Chicago in 1930, to pick a typical case, were about 20 percent above the average for Illinois. But in 1960, Chicago's expenditures had slipped slightly below the state average. These data support the widely held perception that revenues of big city schools have been inadequate in the past decade. If we analyze why city schools have suffered financially, directions may be suggested from which help can be sought.

Part, if not all, of this apparent decrease in ability to support education in big cities is due to a tendency in many cities to allow the ratio of assessed values to full market values of property to decline, thus reducing the capacity of the school district to tap local funds. This reduction is particularly restrictive in the many states which define local school taxing authority in terms of tax rates. We have a tax rate phobia in this country and we don't give nearly as much attention to the other side of the equation. You have to add rates and assessments before you get a clear picture. Reductions become severe when a state has made its statements in terms of tax rates which represent a greatly uneven delegation of taxing authority. The ratio of a wealthy to a poor school district is one to three thousand in California. It is even more restrictive on cities for which taxing authority is limited more stringently than for other school districts in the same state, and state restriction on big city schools are more stringent in about half of our cities than for smaller school districts. One possible explanation for this decline in fiscal ability is the practice of many city assessors of underassessing residential property and overassessing commercial or industrial properties relative to residential. Factories don't vote.

I say this is a possible explanation because the secrecy surrounding most assessment activities makes research in this area difficult. Assessment practices in many areas, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, are a mystery, a cloak and a riddle, inside an enigma. But if this practice is common, it

implies tax overloads on the commercial and industrial properties making up the backbone of assessed value in cities. My brother-in-law is a management consultant specializing in the location of large industries and he admits frankly that such practices are a major reason he is most reluctant to recommend a core city location to an industrial or commercial plant, despite the many business advantages inherent in an urban setting, such as proximity to market and transportation facilities. Retaining existing industrial wealth and attracting new industries are a very fast superhighway to the great society, and you continue to permit taxing arrangements to drive industry out of cities at a time when cities need every tax dollar they can get. This is surely something less than wise public policy.

Cities and their state government should cooperatively and publicly develop tax incentives to attract new industries to the core cities, and existing assessments and assessing procedures should be publicly reviewed to increase the liklihood of equitable assessments. This is no new proposal in the sense that many states do this kind of thing. Many states in the south have done it. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico runs an ad about every month in most of the major magazines of the country trying to attract new industry to it. Cities might try it.

Property taxes, of course, are the principal local source of revenue for all local government, not just the schools. Generally speaking, it has been a more elastic revenue source than is usually thought, since its yield has doubled in the past ten years and every available indicator suggests that it will continue to be the major, local revenue for schools in the foreseeable future.

But in spite of its durability, for which it is not always given credit, the property tax suffers from two critical administration problems: unequal

assessment and underassessment. Almost two-thirds of the states require, on paper, assessment at full value. Yet, locally assessed real property averages less than 30 percent of the market value according to the 1962 Census of Governments. It is even more astounding to note that assessment variations within assessment units are even larger than those typically found among units. For instance, the 1962 Census of Governments disclosed that in over two-thirds of the assessment units studied, not cities and townships and so forth, the top quarter of parcels in assessment ratio were assessed on the average at more than twice the ratio for the lowest quarter. No state can be proud of its record in property tax administration and no other activity of government in this country is more in need of fundamental reform.

A legislative committee of the Council of State Governments has suggested a package act on four aspects of property tax administration. First, creation of state study commissions was recommended to review practices and recommend changes. The second and third parts of the recommendations called for the establishment of property tax divisions, which many of the states have, to supervise and regulate local assessments, to collect and publish equalization information and to assess directly certain categories of property. Such state property tax divisions should have power to act directly and supersede local administration where the locality fails to administer the law fairly. Finally, the council recommended a proposal that special state tax courts be established to provide an initial avenue for review and appeal.

If equitable and reliable assessments are to be achieved, then an auditing function is needed. Perhaps state agencies can perform such a function adequately, as many are attempting to do, but it is possible that the same vested interests and political influences, and I mean those terms in a realistic and not an invidious sense, it is possible that these same influences that shape

some local assessments or cause competitive underassessment to occur may ensnare some state agencies as well. Use of private state certified appraisers to audit local assessments may be needed. It's technically feasible; it's not economically out of the question; it's a question of politics. We wouldn't think of letting a public agency expend millions of dollars without requiring an outside audit of their financial transactions, but we do not audit their assessments. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to find out what they are in many places. I had the interesting experience a couple of years ago in a number of big cities, several of them represented here, of entering the assessor's office and trying to find out how property was assessed. If you think that what I'm talking about is an overstressing of the hocus-pocus that goes on, just try that, in some city other than your own.

Despite these problems, property valuation remains the principal indication of local tax paying ability that states use now in setting up their state aid plans, and, on the average, cities today have higher assessed valuations per pupil than other school districts. In 1960, for instance, in a sample of 14 large cities, the Research Council of the Great Cities Program, including nine of these twelve cities here, the assessed valuation per pupil averaged $19,000, while for the United States as a whole for that year, the average per pupil was only $10,000. Lest we take too much comfort from those facts, assessed valuations per pupil declined during five recent years in 11 of those 14 cities while this ratio was increasing in 8 of the 11 states in which those cities are located.

There is one other factor we should mention before leaving the subject of fiscal ability. Thirty years ago, city populations were among our most affluent in terms of personal income and were correctly regarded by many in state capitols as being able to stand alone without substantial state fiscal support.

Professor Sacks from Syracuse University was just mentioning to me this morning, that he was interested in how this perception got started, that cities were rich and didn't need help from the states. He found it in Elwood P. Coverly's book in 1905 calling for the equalization of state funds for education where he just said very frankly that the cities were wealthy and the problem the states had to address themselves to, lay in rural areas.

In each decade since the depression of the '30's, the median level of personal income in cities has declined relative to the country as a whole. Charles Benson and I are currently engaged in a study of state school finance in Rhode Island. We have compared property values and personal incomes as alternative measures of fiscal ability for local school districts in that state. I'm talking now about how the state determines how much money a school district is going to get on the state aid distribution plan. At the present time, property values are the primary determinate of that equalization formula distribution in most states. We found that Rhode Island cities were almost universally high on equalized property valuations, thus showing as relatively wealthy districts in the state school aid formula and, thus, not receiving as much state aid proportionately as districts with higher property valuations.

But when we rank the same districts by median personal income, the cities which were high on property were almost universally or uniformly low in relation to other districts on income. Most state school aid plans utilize only property values, although several do build income in, I'll mention Maryland and Colorado as two, perhaps Rhode Island soon, but it's not at all certain. States and cities anxious to improve the financing of urban schools might carefully examine the use of personal income data as a measure of local fiscal ability. There are at least three reasons for this suggestion. First, research clearly indicates that property and income represent different dimensions of taxpaying

ability. The correlation between them, if you run on rank order or regular correlation may run in the order of magnitude of .6 or .7 which is far from a one to one relationship, and places high on one are frequently low on the other. Second, taxes whether property or other, are paid out of current income and therefore income is an important indicator of taxpaying ability. Third, and I have not ranked these reasons in the order of their importance or interest, many cities would benefit directly in state aid payments if income were used in determining local fiscal ability. It is not a great exercise to pick out this kind of thing. It can be done, it doesn't require any great study to look at this.

Another disturbing trend in urban population characteristics is the decline in what we can call the human resources of the setting. The number of cities below the median for their state in years of education obtained by the adult population, has increased from 39 of the largest 130 cities in 1940 to 58 of the 130 in 1960. Again we see trends not beginning in 1960, or 1955, when we discovered that cities had problems, but trends 20, 30, 40 or 50 years old, and if you want to trace back in the census data to discover when populations of cities started to change or when the so-called culturally deprived people with the adults in the families uneducated, started coming into cities, you can trace this back into 1920 and 1910, 50 and 60 year old trends that you are facing, not recent ones.

When educated people leave the city for suburbs removing their productive skill and income from the city's resources, the city is weakened. When the city must accept an uneducated person in exchange for each suburban emigrant, then, as long as that pattern of exchange persists, the city will decline. It is ironic but not comforting to note that your graduates from previous years are numerous among suburban emigrants. They're only rarely found among the

unemployed living in today's slums. Thus, city schools today face the double tension of dramatically increasing demands for services when factually it can be established that financial and human resources are steadily dwindling. Because city populations have changed, and efforts in compensatory education have not yet succeeded in spite of the best intentions, the level of pupil achievement in most cities is significantly below state averages. The proportion of handicapped children and pupils in vocational education, both requiring expensive educational services, compound high expenditure requirements created by low achievers. The price of racial integration in cities, if indeed it is ever to be achieved, is considerably higher than say in Evanston or Berkeley, simply because of the numbers and distances involved. States should take these factors into account in shaping their grants-in-aid program.

Achievement test scores are one measure available to states in this connection. I recognize that there are strong sentiments in this profession not to use achievement test data in this way. I do not personally subscribe to it, and that is all I am going to make of the suggestion. Professor Allen Thomas at the University of Chicago in a report to the State Legislature sponsored by the Academy for Educational Development recently proposed in Missouri that a district with 70 percent of its students below the 50th percentile, on certain tests, would receive $20 additional state aid per pupil. If 70 percent were below the 40th percentile, additional aid would be $30 and so on.

Or, if you prefer, personal income levels could be useful since this variable is so closely related to pupil achievement. Connecticut has recently followed this approach with a 10 million dollar appropriation to be distributed among local school districts in a manner similar to Title I except that they use $4,000 as the cut off. It is a sort of piggy-back on top of Title I approach, and they appropriated $10,000,000 for it. The point is, compensatory

fiscal aid is required for compensatory school programs. I hope this principal and that of state fiscal incentives for excellence will dominate state school finance plans of the future as much as the illusive and illusory equalization principal of the past.

In a study of financing education in big cities recently completed at Stanford University, we studied in some detail the budget process and other governmental arrangements in a number of large city school systems. We found that more than two-thirds of the variation in expenditures per pupil among 107 of the nation's largest districts was accounted for by the wealth of the district, and the socioeconomic level of the population. This means that local decision-making about big city school budgets must be viewed in the context of the number of de facto limitations on the decision-makers' autonomy. We found that more than two-thirds of the variation in expenditures per pupil, was based on six or seven factors having to do with the community, like personal income or median family income, the value of property, the level of education of adults, unemployment, racial composition, and so on--six or seven of those, without using a single variable describing the school teacher, the school administration, the school board, fiscal independence, and when we plugged in 10 or 12 of those variables we got almost nothing. Almost no school administration variable that we used (we used most of the ones that we spend our lives fighting about) appear to make any difference consistently across a large number of school systems in how much money the school systems got.

Our interpretation of this is that the running room, the maneuver room, of the large city school administrator is limited, very limited, and that if we approach today's structure to try to determine the money the cities are going to get, we have to recognize a number of "de facto" limitations on the autonomy of decision-makers. Working within these limitations, we observed that school

administrators and school boards tend to assume that existing programs will continue and focus their budget analysis, meager though it is in some cities, upon proposed changes in or additions to the existing programs. To simplify the budget process further, cities utilize formulas to determine how much will be required for particular categories of expenditure. The formulas act to centralize decision-making within the school system and tend to create internally inflexible patterns for allocating school resources both human and material, since the basic assumption underlying use of formulas is that educational services should be distributed equally. Further, we found that much of the detailed administrative procedures observed during a typical budget process had little substance in fact, since formulas largely determine the internal allocation of resources and since major decision-makers were aware at a very early stage in most budget processes approximately what the total available revenues would be.

"I'm trying to get some issues out of the way that we always fight about, which I don't think are pertinent and at the heart of the matter. We observed that school boards face three principal reference groups during the budget processes: the clientele pressing for additional services; the school staff pressing primarily for staff benefits; and economy or efficiency groups pressing for tax relief. The principal function of big city boards is apparently to balance these conflicting demands upon it in some way, and then the typical board may become partially immobilized by these three kinds of groups, by state regulations, state mandated services, the petty limitations in cities, and salary schedules, and will usually attempt only minor changes in a school budget during the brief time it is before the board.

I have reviewed these findings about the budget process because I believe they are relevant to the major reason we are together today, which is to consider how big city schools can respond to a new set of demands from society.

The reason that so much fuss is being given to big city education or the lack of it today, I think, is that societal standards for education are changing, the standards by which your performance is judged. Let's be frank. The incidence of poverty, racial discrimination in schools or industry, school dropouts, and other portents of social malaise is no greater today than at other times in American history, probably is less. Big city education is a major issue today simply because the predominant values in American society are changing.

Conditions of relative poverty and discrimination which were tolerated in an era of social unawareness during the 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th century are regarded by a growing proportion of Americans, in and out of Congress, as unacceptable and as a legitimate object for corrective action by government. The traditional, indeed hallowed, educational goal of "equality of educational opportunity" is being redefined as the provision of sufficiently unequal educational services that the achievement of all children can be maximized. Incidentally, I know of no more telling evidence of the effectiveness of the doctrine of equal educational services than findings from many recent studies showing that variations in pupil achievement are primarily associated with home and community factors, not with school factors. Our society, or at least powerful elements in it, is plainly telling its public educators to reduce the opportunity gap between social ideals and social reality for a large segment of our population.

But the question is, "Can urban schools meet the new performance standards?" Can the traditionally equal allocation of resources, the product of two generations of battles by us, and buttressed by professional insulation from political whims, can this give way to a differential allocation of resources geared to the needs of children as modern psychology understands those needs? I must confess that I am pessimistic. The most important policy conclusion

from our Stanford Study was that public policy for education is primarily determined by taxpaying ability, and that the quality of education in a particular area depends much more on what is demanded and what can be afforded than on what is needed or ideally desired. We have also concluded that budget procedures were not as responsive to policy requirements and changes as one might reasonably hope. The possibility that substantial federal funds might, by themselves, redress the situation seems unlikely today although Title I of ESEA is currently a pregnant effort to shake off certain traditional shackles. The possibility, proposed by Walter Heller and now the primary congressional goal of the republican party next year in Congress, that federal income tax collections may partially be rebated to the states should be a spur to political action for every educator concerned about financing schools. Nevertheless, the overall prognosis for the fiscal condition of big city schools will remain pessimistic until education policy in our states and cities is determined on grounds other than the availability of resources, under tax structures designed decades ago.

What steps can be taken to prove my pessimism unjustified? That's the question. I've tried to identify a few areas in which hard decisions are ahead if we are to achieve the radical improvements required. A complete overhauling of property taxation arrangements is indicated. That is not within the province of school administrators, it is true, but it is relevant to the interest of school administrators, and I believe it is a proper issue on which school administration as a profession should begin to take some stands and some action. Income can be usefully and equitably combined with property valuations as indicators of local fiscal ability. State compensatory fiscal aid for compensatory school programs is urgently required in large quantities over and above efforts now funded through Title I of ESEA. State restrictions on tax rates of urban

school districts are relics of an archaic Jeffersonian distrust of industrialized cities, and as such have little validity today.

Recently in New York State, although I was disenfranchised from voting because I moved in from California, I was interested to note that the voters in Tibuktu help the voters in Buffalo decide whether they were going to have, I don't remember the details, but fiscal independence.--some kind of fiscal independence arrangements for the schools. I think it had already passed some local governmental agencies or maybe even by a referendum in Buffalo. Then they had to petition statewide, in order to get it on the state ballot. Then they were turned down. These things, I think, should be discarded in favor of state incentives for cities and other local districts to exceed minimum programs so they can reach for the excellence that today may be beyond their grasp.

Finally, the policy making processes by which local districts and states allocate resources also need considerable streamlining. One of the most promising fiscal contributions to improving urban education that I see on the horizon that is feasible is the program budget cost-benefit approach to school budgets and accounts. This approach requires the linking of goal-oriented operations plans, plans stated in terms of your goals. By goals here I don't mean to educate the whole child either. I mean teach science in the seventh grade or some other practical thing that we can chew on. If you link these kinds of goal plans to budget and accounting classifications, make multi-year projections of your anticipated program costs, and continuously analyze your existing costs, your actual costs, it is then possible to relate these to many measureable benefits which children receive from educational programs, and the public and the educators can begin to find out for a change, what they are getting for what they are putting in.

It is true that difficulties face the educator who tries to implement program budgeting, and it is a fact that only a few have even tried, yet much can be accomplished with existing knowledge if only we're willing to make the effort. I find it very difficult to believe that a fifty billion dollar a year enterprise with all the built-in insularities of the defense department can succumb to cost-benefit analysis where it is just inherently impossible for the public schools to do this. Perhaps less than five school districts in the country, of which one or two are large cities, are now making, or will make in the immediate future, the kind of substantial initial effort required to restructure existing budgets. No agency is, at the present time, monitoring these efforts to increase the rate of adaptation generally. Cities uniquely have the scale of operation, the skill of manpower, and I must say the need, for this kind of analysis. Considerable competence in this area already exists in industrial educational programs, and in federal experience in the past few years. The cost-benefit approach while surely not a panacea offers one viable technique for improving administration, and fiscal decision-making in city schools and, therefore, for improving the efficiency with which we attack the staggering problems facing city schools today.

I salute the enlightened efforts of this audience to achieve closer relationships between state governments and large city school systems. About a year ago, in commenting on big city school systems, I wrote "In most cities the shoe has been too small for the foot for many years. It is not surprising to find that the owner of the foot, perhaps unconciously has stopped wanting a new pair of shoes that fit properly and instead has learned to live with cramped feet and a good shoe horn." If I interpret this Multi-State Conference accurately, you not only want the new shoes, you aim to get them. I wish you well.

"WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?"

by
William D. Firman

Assistant Commissioner of Education
State of New York

Yesterday we began some exploration of the question, "Where Do We Go From Here?" So that we won't be repetitious about the whole thing let me simply say to you that the purpose of this Multi-State Conference involving the seven states and the seven large cities, plus a few other cities, was to assess together, explore together, the desirability and/or feasibility of a more permanent arrangement for exchange of information in research and the like, which might prove to be of mutual benefit to the seven states, but more than that, to other states and other large cities as well. We didn't come here particularly to solve the problems of urban education, although this has been one of the important considerations with which we have dealt. We came here to explore the nature of the problems of state education departments in relating themselves more effectively to the problems of education in the big cities.

Now, it may seem a little subtle to you, at least I'm going to assume, for the moment, that the conference format is a little subtle to the purpose which we have here, but let me then say to you that everything we've done thus far has been directly related to the exploration of the problem before us. Is there a problem in the states, in state education departments, in relating themselves effectively to the problems of big cities? As Mr. MacCalman and I traveled among you in your respective states, there was a general consensus that this is a major problem and that we ought to give some attention to it. The very first evening we met here, Norton Beach explored for you and you explored with each other the nature of the problem, and I think that it can be said almost without question that there is a problem in this area.

During the course of our discussions we really dealt with, of course, the problem, and with other concerns. What are the resources that we might apply to finding solutions to this problem? We mentioned really three major

resources and one of them can be divided into two areas. One of the resources is a laboratory. That is the reason that that was on the program. You see, the educational laboratory and the R & D Centers under Title IV have a potential for pooling intellectual resources in a magnitude that no single state education department could probably do efficiently for itself, nor could any single large city. Dr. Dentler, for example, spoke about the one educational laboratory that is working directly in this field of solving problems of big city education. He indicated to you last night that he has a staff of about 165 highly trained professional people to whom he can turn in a very practical way for doing practical work in this area. Now, we have, of course, the Southwestern Laboratory that Dr. Shutz described to you. This could be a potential resource. We have the Erie Laboratory. We may need to develop additional ones geared particularly to helping state departments and big cities in a very practical way for the pooling of resources. I am saying that these laboratories are a resource and we discussed this as part of our program because we're concerned with resources and with how we go about dealing with them.

Another resource that we described is in the area of federal legislation. The demonstration cities of which Dr. Wood presented a description yesterday are a potential resource. Title V, which we have been discussing this afternoon, is another potential resource. The Educational Commission of the States could relate itself to this problem of improving the effective relationship of state departments of education to big city problems. Then, of course, in addition to that, the Research Council to the Large Cities again presents a potential resource for getting a hold on this kind of a problem.

We have talked about the problem and we know we have a problem. We have resources with which to deal with it and the rest of the conference has directed its attention to processes or the areas in which we might facilitate

change through research, planning and implementation. We said yesterday in the law conference that there probably wasn't anything in the law which was restrictive except that having to do with fiscal things. I don't quite believe that. I think that there are variations among the states in terms of legal structure which present real impediments to strengthening the relationships of state departments of education to big city problems and the reverse. This is an area of process in which we ought to concern ourselves. How do we bring about change in the legal structure to facilitate this thing?

We talked about finance because this again is a process kind of thing. This morning, Professor Kelly and the others on the panel discussed real practical things that might be done. Program budgeting was only one, but there seems to be a real need for an intensification on a cooperative basis in this area of finance.

And then, our program tonight is another key program in this whole business of process because it has to do with intergovernmental cooperation and coordination. As Dr. MacCalman and I have gone around to the states and have talked with you people about it, it has become quite clear to us that while we might create in an education department an office of urban education, it probably wouldn't accomplish the things that need to be accomplished because the problems of big cities are so interrelated, involving intergovernmental structures and coordination and cooperation. In fact, this may be the key element to providing the political power to bring about the changes that are needed in legal structure, finance and the whole business of process.

Now, we turn our attention to the next question and it has to do with "Where Do We Go From Here?" This was to be an exploratory type of conference. We have been exploring the issues; we dealt with the resources and the process; now we have to make a decision some time within this afternoon or at least

tentative decisions within the next hour or hour and a half, as to where this project ought to go from here. The whole question of whether or not it is desirable and feasible, whether we get anything worthwhile out of the continuation of the kinds of activities that we've had thus far, and whether the suggestions for other kinds of activities that we might undertake leading to the strengthening of state education departments and their ability to deal with big city problems should be at least tentatively answered.

My boss, Lorne Woollatt, has already begun to think in this direction and so, before we go back to conference discussion at the table, I am going to ask Dr. Woollatt what he sees at this point as possible avenues for us to pursue profitably together in the next period of time.

"WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?"

by
Lorne H. Woollatt

Associate Commissioner of Education
State of New York

I have played this by ear to begin with and, since Sunday evening, I have been trying to see the threads that would lead us either to washing out further events of this kind or to developing them in a meaningful way, and as Dr. Firman says, in a feasible and practical way.

What I have as a proposal can be amended by you people here or you can come up with a brand new one and we can see what to do about it. In a sense, this is developed on a machinery that's working very well with what's known as the Committee on Educational Data Systems of the Council of Chief State School Officers which collaborates with the Office of Education in the development of a federated system of gathering information, a basic educational data system. And this is one in which we have a direct contact. Alexander Mood of the U.S. Office of Education provides the federal resources, or his office does. There are funds in the federal budget which pay the expenses of subcommittees to come together on task forces with working groups.

I would see the next step here as being probably one or more of a half dozen task forces in various areas. I'll give you some idea of what the areas are and then who would be involved in them. So far, I have seven; I condensed to six. Number one really has to do with city planning, school organization, the idea of the community plaza, the idea of schools, health, education, welfare, and urban development establishing given facilities within the city on a mutual income basis.

Number two, is in the area of financial support primarily working on state aid and state aid formulas as these relate to the great cities of the nation. This would be a place where eventually the cost-benefit analysis idea would lie, but first would come the idea of state aid and getting the message across to the people so they will understand the changed orientation of the big city in the program of state financial support.

Number three would be a task force which would be geared to federal legislation, this afternoon's topic, OEO, Title I, new kinds of bills in process, and we would also get into the Cities Demonstration Act and the like.

Number four would investigate the multi-departmental approach at the state and federal and local levels. In other words, this would try to coordinate the elements of health, education, and welfare and housing in Washington, in the respective state capitols, and in the cities represented here. This effort would be different from number one which would be local city planning, though they would be related.

Number five I call tentatively Research and Evaluation--ways of involving the R & D Centers and the laboratories of which we've heard and the Great Cities Council and such related groups as may be interested.

And sixth and finally, something which does not appear on this conference agenda. It hasn't been any part of the input. I think it is probably a serious omission on the program. It is the matter of state policy in regard to the big cities in terms of curriculum materials and development of supervision, supervisory forces of the education department related to the big city, construction and teaching is part of this, licensing might be some part of it.

Now, going back over this list again, I'll give you a few more details. I would see it in the numbers of people who would be involved. On this matter of the first item of city planning related to school organization, the community plaza, the campus, elementary school campuses, and others of this nature, I would see this involving a task force of 21 people. If we work on the basis of the present group, we've got seven states. We would have the appropriate person from the state level having to do with the planning activities, not just physical building but that total area, a representative at the state level, of

the school department at the local level, and of the city planning office at the local level as beginning and turning ideas roundabout, especially for those cities which have decaying plants and have sizeable building programs coming up. Or it may be that in some cases the schools are well developed, and recreation, health and welfare facilities are coming along and could be coordinated with the same physical layout serving the people of a community within a huge city.

Under the financial support of state aid, of analysis and related activities, I would see here a group of 14, seven states, and from each a representative of the education department and probably the local deputy or assistant superintendent for finance. In some cases you might want also to involve a comptroller where there is close coordination of the school with the citywide function of budgeting. That might make it more than 14.

Under the federal legislation and programs, I see this as a group that would meet once or twice. Probably at the time legislation was warm, or at Washington during the planning stages to make sure that when evidence is given before congressional committees that the state and the large cities have coordinated with each other, that all of the great cities and their state education departments can get together on the kind of a procedure that they would want.

Number four, the multi-department approach, and this would be a rather huge group to get under way, for, if you had from each of the seven states and from the seven cities and from Washington, the heads of various departments of health, education, welfare, and development, by the time you multiply that out I think you get about ninety people. This requires a lot of involvement, a very complex area of trying to get these people together, and that would take a little more doing than the others.

For research and development, I see a task force to which would be assigned the person in the education department who's responsibilities lay with research and development, his counterpart in the great city of his state along with representatives of R & D Centers or universities which do not yet have a federal project. Many that do have resources of their own and federal or rather foundation grants would begin getting in the background of reasoning and study under a joint counterplan program for the benefit of our urban communities.

And finally, the task force on supervision and instruction, I would see, for instance, the deputy or associate commissioner or assistant at the state level whose responsibility lies in the supervision of instruction meeting with his local counterpart from a great city within his state. Together, as a group, they would try to develop modern relationships through which the supervision of instruction and curriculum could be assisted and coordinated by the state working with the cities themselves.

So, this is a possibility. I can see it may conflict, although I hope it would rather coordinate, with existing activities, with the Great Cities Council, with various groups who have a part in urban education. Sometimes we have to shift an existing organization to meet new needs and this is the possibility I would see in this kind of plan.

"THE INCREASING INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER AGENCIES OF STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT--THE INCREASING INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF CITY ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS OF GOVERNMENT--ALL INTERTWINED"

by
Stephen K. Bailey
Dean

Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs
Syracuse University

When historians of the future reflect upon the decade of the 1960's in the United States, it is conceivable that they will designate it the era of the "Great Awakening." If so, they will be referring not to some new awareness about foreign affairs, or the exploration of space, or a regenerative economy, or even the dawn of conscience about human rights and domestic poverty. They will be acknowledging the fact that in the 1960's Americans suddenly discovered the primacy of education.

In his State of the Union Message of January 4, 1965, President Johnson spoke for this decade and this generation when he said about education:

> Nothing matters more to the state of our country;
> not our military preparedness -- for armed might
> is worthless if we lack the brain power to build
> a world of peace; not our productive economy -- for
> we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower;
> not our democratic system of government -- for freedom
> is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

It is probable that this great awakening, which is occurring in every nook and cranny of our society will move public support for education in the single decade 1960-1970 from less than 30 billion dollars to over 50 billion dollars per annum. According to present estimates, by 1975 this support will have passed the 60 billion dollar mark. And if one adds the total non-school investments in what Bertram Gross has called "the learning force" that figure will be closer to $80 or $90 than $60 billion.

It may be cold comfort to those who are struggling with next year's budget, or licking wounds over a recent school bond defeat to know that education is on an escalator to affluence, and that the button is "go." But forces seem to be in motion which will bring unprecedented private, local, state, and federal -- especially federal -- funds to bear upon our educational systems in the near future.

The fiscal implications of this great awakening would seem to suggest that our major worries are over -- that adequate resources at long last are to be available to the educational enterprise. Recent federal legislation such as NDEA, ESEA, the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Vocational Education Act, the new GI Bill, the International Education Act -- all of these suggest dramatic if not revolutionary break-throughs in Federal support. State aid - general and categorical - grows every year. Even our relatively inelastic property tax has proved capable of being stretched beyond anticipation at the local level.

I hope I am not being unduly upsetting when I suggest that there will be times in the next few years when many of you will wish for the good old days when you were poor but happy. For there is a disturbing corollary to affluence in education; that corollary is that increased wealth will be accompanied by increased administrative complexity and diminishing independence. Areas of relative autonomy enjoyed in the past by Federal, state, and local educational agencies are becoming increasingly compromised. Many of the assumed autonomies of the past have, of course, been more apparent than real. But even so, the effective universe of educational discourse and operations is being enormously extended and complicated by recent events.

These complexities are both horizontal and vertical. They involve both interagency and interlevel contacts, and a bizarre tapestry woven from the warp and woof of these interrelationships. The pattern is further confounded by diagonal threads of public-private and inter-private educational associations and conflicts which infuse educational planning and programs.

I cannot hope in the few minutes available this evening to describe the details of the tapestry presently being woven. In fact, tapestry is far too neat a term; for it connotes an over-arching design into which various threads are harmoniously woven. Such a design does not exist. If the present weavers

(and I exempt the distinguished Secretary of HUD) - are not induced to weave a more coherent design than the one presently evolving, the result will be grotesque.

Let me begin with some horizontal strands at each level of government. At the Federal level, Edith Green tells us that there are 42 separate departments, agencies, bureaus, and units presently engaged in education. These include the Department of Defense, AID, AEC, the Peace Corps, the Veterans Administration, NASA, The National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the United States Office of Education, the Department of Interior, the Smithsonian Institute -- and I could go on and on. A short time ago, the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education was given the responsibility for making sense out of this jungle. He was appointed chairman of what is known as FICE - the Federal Interagency Committee on Education. This committee has met a few times, but Paul Miller would be the first to admit that it has not come within sniffing distance of coordinating the $6 billion dollars worth of educational activities presently being carried out by the Federal government. And as though this were not enough of an agenda, who is trying to relate education to such umbilically-related Federal activities as health, welfare, civil rights, poverty, urban renewal, Appalachia mass transit, recreation, manpower utilization, technical assistance, crime and delinquincy control, and community arts? The Congress is too fragmented among committees and subcommittees to view these activities as a single problem of rational human resource development. Intra-and inter-departmental committees are cumbersome at best, and they have been singularly ineffective in the areas under consideration. The Executive Office of the President is swamped and pre-occupied. The Bureau of the Budget strikes an occasional glancing blow at macro-management problems of this kind, but it is understaffed in its M & O division, and it lacks

a management theory and strucutre of its own adequate for the task.

At the state level, the picture is in some ways less confusing but in other ways more disturbing. For example, it takes a greater mind than mine to sort out the respective prerogatives of the State University of New York and the University of the State of New York. In many states, teacher education is in a sullen limbo between boards of education and boards of higher education. Coordinate planning among agencies concerned with human resource development (state departments of education, health, welfare, mental health, employment services, regional planning, recreation, urban affairs, and so on) is effectively non-existent or meager. And within state departments of education, it has even been known to happen that vocational educational divisions do not speak to divisions for the education of the handicapped or divisions of higher or adult education.

Of course, at the local level we know that the superintendent is king, so that there are no coordination problems at all. No coordination problems at all -- except of course with OEO on Title I funds; with parochical schools on TitlesI, II, and III funds; with a bevy of cultural and university interests on Title III funds; and with the local health department on problems of epidemic disease and school nursing services (unless, of course, the District Nurses Association rather than the health department is relevant on the latter). No problem of coordination -- except that Operation Head Start is under the local CAP; the Park Department is involved in recreational facilities for school age youngsters; the Urban Renewal director is about to wipe out a neighborhood school's neighborhood; the triple A wants a drivers' education program, but the Department of Motor Vehicles wants jurisdiction. No problems of coordination, except that there are five public and two parochial school districts in a single metropolitan area which are going their own ways with consequent losses in

efficiency of scale and effective area wide resource allocation. No problems in coordination, expect the local common council and board of finance for general government happen to have the authority to approve large parts of the budget drawn up by the Board of Education.

And shot through these horizontal connections are vertical connections: categorical and general aid from the Federal government to the states; categorical and general aids from the states to local educational agencies; loans and services from county and local educational agencies to parochial schools.

And interlarding all of these levels, programs, and agencies, are forces and influences from professional associations, teachers' unions, text book houses, hardware salesmen, John Birch Societies, patriotic and veterans associations, tax-payers leagues, PTA's, local newspaper editors, and a wide assortment of professional politicians who have vested and often hoary and rural interests to protect.

As Robin might say, "Holy Kaleidoscope!"

Now, if this crazy-quilt of interdependence and jurisdictional overlap were being superimposed upon a society which had already licked its major educational problems, we might sit back and relax. But the organizational dilemma is part and parcel of a series of policy -- even ethical - dilemmas within education itself. For the shame of American education is its disparity -- its massive inequity; its violation of the fundamental postulates of our political, religious, and ethical heritage.

Educational disparity is a complex issue with a number of facets. But in essence it means that the benefits of American education have been, still are, (and unless we do something about it, will continue to be) distributed with such gross inequity as to be morally reprehensible and socially and economically tragic.

--Better than 10 million adult Americans are at this moment functionally illiterate.

--A public school education in the generality of school districts in Mississippi is worth a fraction of a public school education in Connecticut or California.

--Catholic schools are by and large educationally inferior to public schools.

--The discrepancies between the quality of education in wealthy suburbia and consolidated rural areas on the one hand and in poor central cities and scattered rural slums on the other are patent and tragic. The middle-class rural and suburban biases of state departments of education, state legislatures, and state and national educational associations are still marked, and threaten their relevance to the pressing needs of urban schools and of the schools in the rural backwashes of America. This default is a major cause of recent federal infusions of educational money into these neglected areas. And yet in spite of ESEA and of Operation Head Start, the culturally-deprived -- often suffering from the negative psychological re-enforcements of prejudice -- are years away from true equality of educational opportunity. De-facto segregation means precisely what de jure segregation meant before Brown vs. Topeka -- separate and unequal.

--And, of course, there are special problems and categories of disparity: the physically and emotionally handicapped; the American Indian; the dyslectic; the unchallenged gifted.

The social consequences of these disparities are horrendous, and they surround us: drop-outs, delinquency, crime, unemployment, poverty, civic disorder, discrimination, inadequate skills for our burgeoning economy, unsolved

problems of social policy and political accommodation in both domestic and international affairs; and above all, a countless number of hopeless and wasted lives. Education, to use Professor Schultz' formulation, is more than an "investment function" for the economy; it is an "investment function" for civilized relationships and the pursuit of happiness across the spectrum of human activity. Educational disparity is the root of most social tension and comes far closer than the love of money to being the root of all social evil.

One of the early exercises in the elementary classes is (or at least once was) the memorization of the first part of the Declaration of Independence. Suppose we took the passages about equality seriously -- not genetic equality -- but the cultural equality of a truly open society. Would we really operate our school system as we presently do?

No one will deny that the problems of educational disparity are complex. How can we concentrate on the exception without short-charging the rule? How can we promote the advantages of neighborhood schools without penalizing the larger community? How can we level up without levelling down? How can schools get enmeshed in problems of social amelioration without doing violence to their primary responsibilities of classroom teaching? Now that the federal government has pushed civil rights and church-state conflicts down to states and localities for solution, how can these explosvie social and constitutional issues be handled without doubling the staffs and the hours in the day of harried state and local school officers? How, in short, can the school system by itself put together what generations of apathy, callousness, pre-occupation, and bigotry in the society-at-large have put asunder.

The answer is, of course, that the school system cannot possibly do these things by itself. And this brings me back to the issue we have already belabored:

the communications gap in intergovernmental and intereducational relations.

If anything is clear from a review of educational disparity, it is that the total value system of the national political community is involved. Educational practice is substantially conditioned by ecological realities: economic, political, cultural, religious, and social. This has always been true, and yet until recently the public education fraternity has done everything in its power to shield itself from the environmental context within which it operates. Aside from intermittent arrangements with district nurses and public health officials, public education -- by and large -- has opted out of the larger community of which it is an integral part. The rationale has been fear of political or religious contamination, or of distraction from pressing educational objectives. But the price has been catastrophic. As a result of ingrownness, the public educational enterprise has become preoccupied with petty internal squabbles rather than with over-arching questions of educational and social policy. We all know the traditional preoccupations:

"In the next round, how shall the pie be sliced as between teacher's salaries and new equipment?"

"How can the NEA beat the teachers' unions?"

"Should administrators be present at teacher caucuses?"

"How can the inroads on teacher certification be blocked?"

"Is Spanish a frill?"

"How about drivers' education and home economics?"

These family squabbles are so petty as to be comfortable for school boards, superintendents, principals, and teachers alike. They are in-house, circumscribed, routine. Their virtue is that they involve few if any references to the broader community and the broader community's problems. And because education has basked in isolation, it is now dismayed to find that a lot of non-educators are suddenly messing around in education's business. Federal,

state, local, and private programs in such disparate fields as welfare, health, poverty, unemployment, space science, recreation, police, and civil rights are camped on the school steps -- or are running schools of their own. City Hall has suddenly demanded the active participation of schoolmen in human resource planning -- and on City Hall's terms. As we have already noted, new federal legislation is demanding state and local consultation with OEO community action groups and with Catholic educators as a condition of federal educational grants. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act imposes an unprecedented series of conditions on the public school system and plunges education willy-nilly into the maelstrom of community conflict.

Are professional educators and educational officials prepared by skill, temperament and attitude for reacting and relating to these larger community issues? I am more sanguine about skills and temperament than I am about attitude. For the traditional asceticism of public educators has too frequently produced a paranoid mentality. Teachers fear principals; superintendents fear school boards; all together they fear city hall and the country court house. Collectively, these, in turn, fear the state department of education, the governor, and the state legislature, who fear each other. And, of course, the over-arching neuroticism has been the fear of federal control -- a strange fear in view of the historic and atomzied weakness of the U.S. Office of Education and until very recently, its own pathological fear of H.E.W., the Congress, the President, the Public Health Service, the Veterans Administration, the Labor Department, and the national educational lobbies -- to say nothing of its own shadow. Beyond government, public educators have feared parochial and private schools, universities, John Birch societies, and taxpayers' leagues -- for a start. In short, the paranoia has been almost universal. The notion of cooperation, of a free trade in ideas for the purpose of problem-solving, has been an anathema. So walls of protection

have been erected. They are now crumbling, but their legacy has been to unnerve public schoolmen for those explorations, those probings of possibility, which are the prerequisities of solving education's problems in the context of the emerging needs of the total community.

Schoolmen -- and by schoolmen I mean particularly teachers, state and local administrators, school-board members, and the staffs of the various professional associations of education -- are being forced back into the wider political community. Unless they change their viewpoints and attitudes, they will find themselves in a coliseum of combat in which experienced gladiators or even, from their point of view, wild beasts from myriad agencies of government and politics and from private and parochial interests will outsmart and outfight them. It does not have to be this way; but if the outward reach of schoolmen is timid, defensive, reluctant, fearful, protective, indecisive, and scattered, they face infinite frustration and enmity - and in some cases disaster.

If, on the other hand, schoolmen can enter the broader political community in a spirit of cooperation, concern, dignified compromise, and political reciprocity, they can establish a role of significant and valued leadership across the spectrum of things educational and beyond.

If, for example, they can look at local, state, and federal agencies as potential partners in a common undertaking rather than as a potential threat to professional integrity, or to state or local control; if they can look at parochial schools, not as willful destroyers of public education, but as insecure partners hungry for understanding and assistance in a largely common and interdependent enterprise; if they can look at civil rights and poverty programs, not as competitive or disruptive functions, but as programs fraught with educational consequence; if they can view universities not as centers of academic hubris and condescension, but as centers of growing awareness with an eagerness

to develop creative linkages with the public schools in matters of common concern; if they can view politicians -- not as corrupt self-seekers -- but as public servants capable of serving the public interest on the path to the responsible test of democratic election; if schoolmen can, in fact, assume these positive attitudes, and can at the same time develop the arts and skills of political negotiation in their best and highest sense, the intergovernmental and intereducational gap can be closed -- to the benefit of the entire society, including education.

But I submit that educators in this new political environment can protect their own valid interests and can exercise true leadership throughout the larger community, only if they squarely face a final issue. I must be particularly careful of my use of l nguage here, for I can so easily be misunderstood. Put starkly, the public school system, and the federal, state, and local educational bureaucracies which support it suffer today from a massive dose of anti-intellectualism -- and consequently of intellectual insecurity. This is caused by both external and internal factors. Externally, all too many school systems are operating in community environments of conformity, of chauvinism, of bigotry, and of special pleading. John Birchities, legionnaires, patriotic societies, business pressures, well-meaning but misguided curriculum-builders in state legislatures, religious zealots, textbook and educational-hardware salesmen -- all these and more, at various times and in various places, have swayed and distorted educational policy-making. In part, their success has been due to the exercise of concentrated and egregious political pressures; in part, to the timidity of school boards and of docile superintendents and principals. But I submit that the key reason for the anti-intellectual triumphs of external groups has been a more subtle and pervasive anti-intellectualism within the school system itself.

School systems -- federal, state, local and private -- lack the intellectual, and consequently, the political muscle to control anti-intellectual pressures from the outside. With few exceptions, public schoolmen, their state departments of education, and their professional associations have neither welcomed nor initiated the types of critical introspection about educational ends and means which alone can produce a sustained intellectual manhood for the educational enterprise. Why should the public not defer to outsiders in the making of educational policy, if after more than a century of public education, schoolmen and their colleagues in University research are incapable of answering basic questions about education's own trade? We still know pathetically little about the processes of learning; the problems of the very bright and the very dull; the nature of motivation; the optimum size of, and the appropriate mix of variant student talents in our classrooms; the most constructive relationship of mechanical and human pedagogy; the sequential development and conceptualization of subject matter; and, even more fundamentally, the desirable goals of a pluralistic educational enterprise in a democratic society, and the appropriate means for assessing progress toward such goals. We are still woefully unprepared in curricular content and method to introduce most of our pupils to the nature of the interdependent, rapidly-changing, technological, paradoxical world in which we live -- a world which cries out for hard heads and more understanding hearts to help it escape what Churchill called "the rim of hell."

And, in more prosaic, proximate, and pedestrian political terms, schoolmen have not sorted out the advantages and disadvantages of general vs. categorical aid -- or even the appropriate levels and partners of interaction for educational policy-making. They have not identified the chains of interdependence which logically relate the educational enterprise to the more general problems of our urban society: poverty, crime, ill-health, discrimination, welfare, squalor, and boredom.

Perhaps educators have concluded that they cannot examine the roots of their own professional tree without killing it. But if they will not conduct, or induce, sophisticated and valid analytical and normative research about what they are up to, they are naked in the face of their well-tutored enemies and their mistutored friends. Specious professionalism will not protect them. In the market-place of community opinion and action which they have now entered, either they know what they are talking about, and can prove it, or they don't. Empirical research, logical thought, and normative and analytic insight are the hall-marks of intellectualism. Knowledge and wisdom, which derive from these three, are power -- political power. They are the schoolmen's ultimate spear and their ultimate shield. There are some "smithies" standing by: in graduate schools of education like Harvard, Columbia, Chicago and Stanford; in philanthropic houses like Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford; in various experimental centers, research institutes, and state departments of educations now being funded under Titles III, IV, and V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; in new business enterprises concerned with research which will help them capture part of the educational market. But these "smithies" cannot fashion education's spears and shields by themselves, nor should they. Schoolmen and educational officials at every level, have got to help. They have got to participate in the process, for ultimately they are the soldiers in the front lines who must wield the weapons created.

In sum, and reading backward, schoolmen must cultivate and support intellectualism inside and about school systems in order to combat anti-intellectualism and unwholesome political pressures from within and without, and in order to help lead the total political community towards a new day. They must enter intergovernmental and intereducational relations in a new spirit of trust and cooperation

-- at the very least as happy and confident warriors in a jungle about which they must become increasingly sophisticated if they are to survive. They must reaffirm their dedication to the central value of our open society: equality of educational opportunity -- and they must pursue this Holy Grail wherever it may lead through the wildernesses of the larger society. In all this they must search for friends -- new friends in new and unfamiliar places. For, ultimately, friends are the only political resource at anyone's disposal.

Let me say one final word. I feel secure in speaking frankly about these matters only because I am painfully aware that you can throw the book right back at me -- at -- in the social sciences at the university level. We have been of almost no use to you -- at least until recently. Much of modern social science is vastly irrelevant to the solutions of the major social problems of our age. We and our more esoteric students have suddenly become military and diplomatic experts on the subject of Southeast Asia; but we are largely silent on the more proximate issues of human resources planning and utilization -- in Watts, or Roxbury, or Lewiston. We have learned to analyze voting behavior, to predict by computer Supreme Court decisions, to apply multi-variate, in-put--out-put analysis to those petty phenomena which hold still long enough to be analyzed. But too often we have eschewed middle-level scientific generalizations which could help you and others with intractable problems of human engineering.

If I chide you, I chide myself as well. And I am fully aware that some of you do not deserve any chiding at all. Some educational leadership is already miles ahead of my own poor prose. But I still have the temerity to contend that the majority of school officials have a long way to go -- just as we in the universities have.

Without recrimination perhaps together we can make a fresh start. What is essential to keep in mind is that if I am right about the new dimensions to

educational leadership and the unfinished agenda of educational theory and practice, nothing short of the total resources of the society will be adequate for the task ahead. That is why your highest task is essentially political, and why you must nerve yourselves to enter the larger political arena where society's political resources are available for your use -- if you have the wisdom and courage to exploit them in the broader community's interest.

This past spring I spent a month in an old manor house on the stormy but exquisite southwestern cost of Ireland. In the musty bookshelves I came across a forgotten novel by H. G. Wells called The New Machiavelli, published in 1911. At one point, the leading character comments:

> "If humanity cannot develop an education far beyond anything that is now provided, if it cannot collectively invent devices and solve problems on a much richer, broader scale than it does at the present time, it cannot hope to achieve any very much finer order or any more general happiness than it now enjoys."

Surely this is a definition of where we are and what we are about. I only wish I could point to some legislative leap, some administrative gimmick, some single political resource which could move us dramatically ahead. Unfortunately, the task is too attenuated, too subtle, too intractable, too pervasive to be handled solely by the blunt instruments of the state. H. G. Wells saw this, for in a later passage, he wrote:

> ". . . Most of the good men we know are not really doing the very best work of their gifts; nearly all are a little adapted, most are shockingly adapted to some second best use. Now, I take it (he continued) this is the very center and origin of the muddle, futility, and unhappiness that distresses us. It is the cardinal problem of the state to discover, develop and use the special gifts of men. And I see that best done -- (not by) the common stuff of legislative and administrative acitivity -- (but) by a quite revolutionary development of the educational machinery; by a still more unprecedented attempt to keep science going, to keep literature going, and to keep what is the necessary spur of science and literature -- an independent and appreciative criticism going . . . for (he concludes) civilization is not a matter of concrete grouping; it is a matter of prevailing ideals. The problem is how to make bold, clear ideas prevail."

I wish I could shift the burden out of this room. I cannot. To be sure, secondary political resources for education abound across the landscape, but the primary and ultimate resource is us. It is our creative notions, our acts of imagination and will, our art of using the political and educational resources of our society in order to make the bold, clear idea of quality education equally distributed prevail, which will matter -- not the resources themselves. They are largely inert or irrelevant, unless sparked by our individual initiative and leadership. The jungle of interlevel and inter-agency relationships is dense -- but it is not impenetrable. Organizational reform is patently needed, but in the meantime much can be accomplished by those who would take the pains to understand the techniques of survival and of trail-blazing. This is our fundamental responsibility.

Many years ago in college, I entered into a discussion of personal philosophies with a dedicated and civic minded professor of Chemistry, Paul H. Fall. When he was not in his laboratory, he was mayor of his village. For him it was a long week. I asked why? What kepthim going? What turned his outward to the plight and promise of his fellow men? I shall never forget his answer. Perhaps it will be of help to you, as it has been to me. For he replied:

> "I once had a dream of a vast and endless see-saw; the forces of good and evil in the universe were precariously balanced on a cosmic fulcrum. I suddenly realized that in such a precarious state of equilibrium even a single person might tip the scale for the good. When I awoke, I decided I would try."

"WHAT EDUCATION IN THE LARGE CITIES WILL LOOK LIKE IN THE FUTURE: SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND BIG CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS"

by
Milton A. Young

Institute for Public Administration

General Introduction

I have been asked to speak with you about what education in the large cities will look like in the future and to be provocative. When contrasting current educational practice with our future needs, a rather bleak picture emerges, and I am certain we all realize the tremendous effort that is needed. The question is: Do we have the creativity to decide on what changes to make; do we have the tools we need and the courage to make them?

While our educational system undeniably is the best in the world, it faces a crisis on many fronts today. It must effect a revolution to prepare today's youth for the unknown world of the 21st Century. It must also contend with a second revolution requiring that educational programs be adapted to meet the special needs of children with special problems, children whom the school has failed. To add to our burden, we face the awesome problems of an increasing number of children requiring additional staff, new buildings, etc., the geometrically increasing explosion of knowledge, and the need for a longer period of education. I am aware of the major efforts presently being made by school administrators with federal, state and local school funds. But we all agree they are grossly insufficient. The order of the day is change, swiftly and fearlessly.

To quote Russell, writing in "Change in American Education":

> My early experiences in education led me to think that the process of education was one of the constant things in life. Surrounded by change, I felt that we educators would continue to do the same job and be the same kind of force in the lives of our pupils. Oh yes, we would use new tools, change our methods. But history would be history until earth's foundations crumbled. I no longer think so. The world is now changing in such radical fashion as even to challenge our concept of what education is.

Any discussion of education in the future can only be seen in relation to the posture of education today. In striving to improve his material environment,

western man has been able to change the industrial institutions and make major scientific gains. Yet he has been unable to match this revolution in the material world with one in his most vital social institution, education.

Mass education emerged in western Europe at a time when medievalism flourished with a concept of closed authoritarian social institutions and a closed concept of knowledge. While some changes have been made, we still focus most of our teaching on mastery of information, endlessly discussing what students should learn, at what part in life and in which sequence. Our major efforts are still authoritarian and coercive. Teaching is telling and mastery is regurgitation in response to closed end questions. The concepts of thirteenth century scholasticism still permeate much of the high school and college education today. The results of the continued influence of the past have produced schools which operate to produce an individual with skills which are the antithesis of of those he will need as an adult of the future.

- Rather than independent behavior, it fosters conformity.

- Rather than stressing the unity of knowledge, it arbitrarily divides and fragments content.

- Rather than use new and creative approaches to teaching children who are not quick and facile in learning, it continues to fail and perhaps injure a significant portion of these students.

- Rather than create a stimulating learning environment which confronts children with opportunities for critical thinking, problem solving and creative behavior, it provides ready-made solutions to problems.

- Rather than facing the reality of the uniqueness of children who need programs geared to their individual differences, it is usually organized in a lock-step, graded system comparing and viewing them as if they were alike.

- Rather than use modern technology it builds the same fixed-walled classrooms that have existed for 100 years, effectively inhibiting even minor

organizational changes.

The school of the future requires gross functional changes. Instead, across the nation Title I ESEA funds have been used primarily for add-on services such as remedial reading, afternoon and Saturday morning programs, pre-kindergarten classes, etc., rather than being utilized to make necessary changes in program and organization.

The resistance to change is monumental. Miles lists the following as barriers to change: School goal ambiguity, input variability (e.g., differences among teachers, schools, children's achievement), invisibility of the teacher, low interdependence of staff, vulnerability of the system to outside veto, and low technological investment. In addition, the bureaucracy in a large school system makes major change almost impossible. Perhaps Hechinger, writing in the New York Times, is too harsh but his point is well made. He says:

> "The (New York City School) system has been reorganized countless times. But reorganizations have failed to bring about fundamental change because they never have reformed the center of operational gravity. Thus, for example, operations remain basically unaffected by the recent decentralization which proclaimed that the thirty district superintendents would be given greater independence ....
>
> "But the district superintendents are not operational executives. They do not preside directly over schools, teachers, classrooms, day-to-day action. They are, in fact, inspectors, and to call them agents of decentralization is a form of play-acting. They know that their bread is buttered by the central headquarters, and an inspector for the central power cannot be an agent of decentralization."

In a book called "The Bureaucratic Phenomenon," Crozier says:

> ". . . a bureaucratic system will resist change as long as it can; it will move only when serious dysfunctions develop and no other alternatives remain . . . . Change in a bureaucratic organization must come from the top down and must be universalistic, i.e., encompass the whole organization en bloc. Change will not come gradually on a piecemeal basis . . . . The essential rhythm prevalent in such organizations is, therefore, an alternation of long periods of stability with very short periods of crisis and change."

At the present time, there is probably every conceivable type of experimental program going on in the big city. The evidence is that this will not lead to any

dramatic change in the entire system. It is a matter of record that educational institutions have changed less than most other social institutions in recent years; in the present crisi , they should be changing the most.

Even with the impact of additional federal and state resources, we have been unable to change sufficiently. The program for youngsters from poverty areas still appears to be unrelated to their needs.

Administrators have trouble keeping up with day-to-day problems and do not have the time to work on major changes. One superintendent described it as trying to repair a bicycle while he was riding it. Another said, "If the Edsel Division which was part of Ford Motor Company was part of the big city school system, it would be around for the next hundred years even if everyone agreed it must go."

What is needed to move education into Century 21 is a concerted bold attack with strategies which will help us create a <u>new totally integrated education system</u> which not only utilizes all the knowledge we can bring to bear but also creates an organizational structure which will be responsive to changes which will be demanded of it tomorrow. It must be showcase education and capture the imagination of the public and deal with the real issues. In Russell's words:

> "The great change of the modern age is precisely in the expansion it accords to the rational. <u>This expansion is not a repetition of an earlier phenomenon.</u> <u>It is novel</u>. And it has brought in its train novel ways of living and thinking. As a consequence, part of the past can no longer be said to be prologue in any meaningful sense. Irrelevant is a better word. The impact of these concepts in education bids fair to effect a reorientation of the school away from the past and toward the future.

Education in the Future

In a recent speech the former Director of HAR-YOU in N.Y.C. said integration is a long range goal; what we need now is excellent education. In this short paper I can give you only a brief outline of what a multiple individualized education program will look like.

1. There will be a geater commitment to education, and it will be continuous for everyone. There will be no lock-step systems, grade levels, differentiation between pre-school, elementary, junior, senior high and college. The entire community educational system will be seen as a single entity. Myths concerning one year's learning during one year, that children must be coerced to learn, that subjects should be taught separately, will have been discarded. The students will be able to move in and out of the educational programs as they need and want to. The problem of the dropout will not occur, since the individual who is not profiting in the program he is in will be assisted in finding another. He may return to a previous pattern when it is deemed appropriate for him.

Educational programs will be continuous throughout the day and throughout the year. The schedule of the various elements of the program will be determined by the needs of the learners and society. Computers will assist us in keeping track of students and their programs.

2. Although there are obviously major roadways, each individual will have to have his own track or path through the educational system, a multiple individualized educational program. Note the beginnings in "Individually Prescribed Instruction and the Brigham Young High School Programs." Education will begin as early as we feel it is necessary for the individual and continue throughout his entire life. The programs will be part of a cybernetic or self-correcting system. First, we assess the needs of the individual, making tentative decisions about his needs; secondly, we create the environments and elements of his program; then we evaluate our success and finally redesign programs, both to take care of our failures and to move towards new learnings. Failure will be regarded as an error in the system, not a dysfunction of the individual learner.

3. Since the general health of the community has more to do with the

success of the individual than today's schools, rather than being isolated, education in the future will be planned so that it deals with the student's total environment. Buildings housing educational programs will function something like libraries and settlement houses do today, totally open and involving all of the members of the community. No institution can survive very long when it fails to produce an acceptable product more than 25 percent of the time. If educational institutions cannot become more responsive, they will be by-passed by a federal-industrial partnership which is already in the process of being formed.

4. School buildings as they now operate will be only one of the major centers for learning. These may serve as headquarters, communication and data centers. Educational programs will operate in other appropriate places, in libraries, in storefronts, in fire stations, in parks, in musuems, in airports, etc. Information regarding the learners will be centralized and available to the individuals guiding students through the educational program.

5. If we are just to continue as we are today, by 1975 we would need to have one college graduate in four become a teacher. Since this is impossible because of the growing needs in other areas, in ten years the staff of the educational system will have to be different. Today the teacher is the central member in our educational system. In general the teacher has four functions: interpersonal relationships, environment management, information giving, and clerical. The clerical function will be taken over by machines and clerks. Since knowledge is multiplying at a geometric rate, it is inconceivable that students of the future will be fed this information on the same basis they are today. Instead, it will be available when needed. The teacher will not stand in front of a group and lecture, giving information or checking the children's production. The pupil studying the problems will use the teacher as a consultant, and paraprofessionals, the library, the computer, and other materials as

resources when he needs them. Since today's teachers spend a considerable portion of their time in information giving, their function will be changed considerably if this and the clerical aspect are removed from their day-to-day operation. Instead, they will spend their time as managers of learning resources and in consulting with students. With more flexible arrangement, there would be increased opportunity for interpersonal relationships.

Grouping in the schools will be based on individual needs. There will be instances of one learner working alone with no adult, of a thousand learners working together with one adult, individual tutoring and small group discussions. The nonsensical problem of homogeneous versus heterogeneous grouping will not exist because each youngster will be in a multiple individualized educational program.

The role of the members of the pupil personnel and special education services will also change. While they will continue to act as consultants to the staff and students in special instances, their major responsibility will be as part of the team planning and managing the learning environments with the students. Their major functions will be collaborative and preventive rather than remedial or ameliorative.

All of the staff members will also be in new types of continuous training programs, such as those now being developed in the R & D centers in Texas and California under Title IV, ESEA. Professional and paraprofessional members will be part of the educational mainstream in the sense that they will also be participating in educational programs throughout their entire lives. In this way, they will be constantly exposed to and involved in new research in the behavioral sciences and educational technology.

Education in the future will be more effective in helping students cope with new and unknown problems, make their own observations, find and collect facts,

compare and judge information, test ideas and draw conclusions. They will learn all this in an action program rather than sitting in a classroom in a passive sense. I am not suggesting that the computer, programmed instruction or any other subsystem is a panacea. On the contrary, it should be clear to those who have been exposed to the research in education that there is no one solution that will solve the problems for each child. We now have the skills and the technology to use a multiple individualized educational program which takes the best of each subsystem and matches it to each individual's needs. We need not wait for more research to begin to do this with children first on our priority list, those with deprived backgrounds.

We will use a systems approach to help us determine the alternatives available in planning programs for children, utilizing staff, purchasing equipment, and building facilities. Major industries, the federal government, and the armed forces have all used this approach in their attempts to cope with programs of great magnitude, and a number of advanced educational systems have experimented with its use. A systems approach is simply a method of organizing a process so it can be studied. Heinich describes it as " . . . a methodology that enables us to analyze a complex problem and then synthesize a solution."

While in the past the use of instructional subsystems could be planned and controlled by the school staff after the school was built, new subsystems such as those in programmed instruction, the media fields, will require that we do most of our planning before we build a facility.

Some Suggestions

In order to move from where we are to where we should be, substantial efforts must be made. The following represents a few possibilities. I am aware that some of these are presently being practiced by school administrators.

1. Organization for change. The state department of education and the city school administration must organize themselves for change, eventually developing a change mechanism which challenges the rigid bureaucratic system. This may take the form of a special division for planning change, with broad authority to encourage and support new programs developed by superintendents, principals, and teachers in every school. They may train entire school staffs, employ outside resources, etc. Although change for its own sake is obviously worthless, it does create excitement and motivation among the participants which will improve the educational program. It may also help us overcome the disastrous results of self-fulfilling prophesies currently operating to insure the failure of many children from poverty homes. Change must become the norm.

School management must devote a considerable portion of their time to planning change. This means that the commissioner of education and superintendent must set more severe priorities on their time, for they are the major change agents. One often wonders if the system runs the administration or vice versa. Ralph Tyler tells of the cartoon showing a group of rats. One is saying to the others, "Boy, have we got those psychologists trained. Every time we press the bar they feed us." Changes create considerable stress and the superintendent must be willing to take reasonable risks while encouraging other members of his staff to do the same. This process requires collaboration with management teams from industries and universities on a continuous basis.

2. Planning and Implementation Unit. I see this as an arm of the Commissioner's or superintendent's office which could help him keep in touch with every level and every section of the system. I am thinking of a group of 20 or more non-system people appointed solely by the chief administrator. The positions created would have no tenure and no certification would be required. The staff members would be simply hired on their ability to tackle and solve problems

creatively and need not be educators. With the authority of the commissioner or superintendent behind them they could plan and implement new programs on a broad basis, cut across the bureaucracy, create parallel organizational structures or temporary systems to solve specific problems. They might be thought of as vice presidents in charge of heresy. They could be on the deputy level with salaries substantial enough to attract the most creative individuals. Turnover in these positions on a two or three year basis would add to the ability of this group to continue to function in a creative manner.

3. Changes in the Organization for the City. The large city school system as it exists today is probably incapable of making the radical changes necessary for its improvement, not that bigness is inherently bad but because it has become inflexible. I am suggesting that unless the large system changes its organization into smaller, more manageable units, it will continue to resist any major innovations, no matter how much effort and funds are expended by the administrators and local, state and federal governments. The operational manager-superintendent of the new educational units, while responsible for his over-all funds to the central authority, must have autonomy in making decisions concerning finance, priorities, program, staffing patterns, materials, etc. He will submit a plan describing his immediate goals and how he will utilize his funds to achieve them.

Having smaller units doesn't guarantee that change and improvement will occur. However, the evidence is quite clear that the large school system as it exists today presents an overwhelming obstacle to change. A number of problems relating to a change in organization must be overcome. Teachers' group, for instance, may view decentralization as a threat to their bargaining power. They must be guaranteed that they will continue to bargain with the central authority. The creation of small units can also assist in bringing about the reintegration of the educational establishment into the local community, openly involving their

citizens.

There is a note of caution, however, in a report on "Desegregating the Public Schools of New York City" by the State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions in 1964; it was pointed out that, "Decentralization should not, however, become the means to erect regional barriers separating segments of the city. It should not, for example, be used as an excuse to keep children in one administrative unit from entering another if there are good educational and social reasons to warrant such transfers."

In order to encourage decentralization I am recommending that state funds be made available to accelerate this movement by providing additional resources to urban school systems. This could be done in much the same way as they provide additional funds to encourage small school systems to centralize. This incentive could assist in making a major breakthrough in this area.

4. Changes in Organization of the State Education Agency. State organization agencies have historically been structured so that they have specialists in subject or special areas, administration and research. Staff members usually conceive of themselves as working only in their narrow specialties. I would recommend that the departments change their requirements and employ people who have both a general and special background so that they can function in either area. Half of their time might be given over to current general problems.

In order to deal with making major current policies, and solving current problems, I would recommend a broad task force approach cutting across bureau and division lines, and including educators and non-educators from outside the department. The task force with a short term staff must be set up with a specific responsibility and a time limit. Local superintendents would be invited to suggest problems for investigation.

I would also recommend a study to reorganize the department to separate funding and regulatory functions from the role of leadership, creating clearly delineated separate units.

5. Set up national and state programs where each urban university takes direct responsibility for a slum area. A model that might be used is the teaching hospital taking over a slum hospital. A state agency task force would assist each urban center.

Presently the university plays a number of roles within the urban community. It may have an extension program and serve as consultant, administrator, clearinghouse, etc. What we need is a relationship of wider context based upon responsible interaction. Quoting Hechinger again, he provides us with McGeorge Bundy's open invitation to a university with his statement:

> "The great university on Morningside Heights (in New York City) is a neighbor to one of the greatest problems and opportunities in American life, the problems and opportunities of Harlem."

Since it is not presently in a university's self-interest to take on such a tremendous task, state and federal funds would have to be allocated to encourage this movement. This would involve the university's using itself as a resource for breaking the poverty cycle. Students would become community helpers, teachers, and leaders. Buildings would house elementary educational programs along with university programs, poor families and college students.

6. In a study of the New York State Department of Education, Brickell suggested that achievement tests, regents and college entrance examinations were one of the greatest inhibitors of innovation in education. Recognizing that their students will be measured with these achievement tests, teachers tend to skew their entire program toward just these areas. Skills such as ability to cope with new situations, creativity and problem solving are neglected. In order to change this pattern I would recommend a nationwide three to five-year moratorium

on such testing. We must first have measures to determine the success of our schools in teaching for the other goals in education before we reinstate achievement testing.

7. Alternative Educational Systems. Systems tend to become rigid and routinized, soon operating as if their major goal were to perpetuate themselves. One need only ask whether failure to send in a report on time or failing to teach a child will cause the teacher the most trouble. In order to create a climate of continuous self examination, I suggest that we create a number of alternative educational systems. While they would not be in competition with one another, they would be encouraged to experiment with broad new programs. Parents should be permitted to choose between alternative school systems. The following are a number of strategies which can be used as alternative systems in an urban community:

(a) The educational park. The educational park or plaza, says Dr. Fischer, President of Teachers College, Columbia, "is by far the most promising and perhaps the boldest plan that has been proposed for achieving lasting integration." Yet I feel that it could also be a gigantic trap in that it can be turned into another vehicle for continued segregation, and the antiquated lock-step system. If we permit homogeneous grouping within the park, we continue segregation. I recently looked at some plans for what was called an educational plaza and they do nothing better than concentrate a large number of traditional buildings, which do not even represent the best thinking in school architecture, into one location. Staffing patterns were similar to those that exist today, and experimentation will be held to a minimum. I believe we must have a bold new program to go with the new concept. It certainly represents a creative alternative to the

present system.

(b) I would like to recommend the establishment of a school district which is run by a college or university. The operating manager-superintendent could be a member of the college administration, who would have the power to call the resources of the faculty into play. Students could be employed by the school system. It is obvious that training teachers would become an integral part of this program.

(c) In the same fashion I would like to see the central administration contract with a major industry having an education division so that they operate a local educational unit. They would have the authority within the limits set by the budget to create and run programs.

(d) In another school district, I would like to involve the entire community in the educational program, utilizing the resources of community development teams to train indigenous leaders. I would coordinate all educational programs, those in industry, in "Y," etc., and encourage the involvement of all of the children and adults in that community in all types of educational programs. Working with the school people they would plan educational programs based upon the analysis of the needs of that community by the indigenous leadership. The object would be to re-educate the citizens of that community towards the new possibilities in educational programming, utilizing the major media available today, closed circuit TV, advertising, etc.

(e) In another community I would recommend the establishment of multi-service family and early childhood centers, under the supervision of the local operating manager-superintendent utilizing Title I and Head Start funds, but separated from the existing school system. That is, he would create a separate early childhood education system in the

community, out of the schools, involving community agencies and indigenous workers. First priority for these centers would be given to poverty areas. No curriculum would be set. The staffs of these centers would be asked to develop their own curriculum based on the needs of the children in that program. A structured communication system between these centers and the schools would enable each of the institutions to learn from one another.

(f) In one operating district, I would recommend that the schools convert themselves to establishements which are similar to present Y's and settlement houses. The school would then become a central point for programs and for the entire family, offering all types of services needed.

(g) As a final alternative system, I would utilize one of the ideas suggested in a number of recent experiments. These show that upper grade students do an excellent job teaching younger children. All of the students involved appeared to profit. In the Spring-Summer, 1966,"Quarterly Report of Educational Services Incorporated," Zacharias describes "Learning by Teaching" as having exciting possibilities. The local system chosen would have a college or university located in its midst and utilize older students to work with their younger peers including college, senior and junior high and elementary age youngsters. This notion has tremendous potential.

Conclusion

Great problems call for great vision. The programs we mount must be bold and aim high. While the large cities have the greatest problems they also have vast educational resources that can be made available for educating

EA
30 1967

our young people. While education in the big city has improved the lives of millions, it has failed countless others. At one time, many cities successfully coped with a tremendous variety of problems. With the help of the state departments of education, it can again regain this vitality and combine it with the tools of tomorrow in a new effort. Frankly, I feel there is little choice. Either we find a way to make the necessary changes or it will happen without us.