DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 358 HE 000 052

Educational Opportunity Forum. Volume I, Number 2
New York State Education Dept., Albany. Div. of Higher Education.
Pub Date Aug 68
Note - 72p.
EDRS Price MF -$0.50 HC -$3.70
Descriptors - Admission Criteria, Black Community, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Opportunities, *Higher Education, *Opportunities, Selection, Social Change, Work Study Programs
Identifiers - *Upward Bound Program

In this second edition of a NY State Education Department publication devoted to higher educational opportunity, the title of the newsletter has changed from COLLEGIATE NEWSLETTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED to the EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FORUM. The change reflects more clearly the broader emphasis that should be placed on efforts to extend the reach of higher education to include those elements in American society, that have for varying reasons been unable to take advantage of it. Most of the articles in this issue are concerned with the Upward Bound program and the new educational techniques and ideas it is fostering within the universities that accommodate it. The newsletter also contains some more general articles on the disadvantaged, Black nationalism, and the federal work-study program. The problem of selecting disadvantaged college students is dealt with in both the 'News and Notes' and in articles. (JS)

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FORUM

Schools of Tomorrow ... Today

Crisis ... Man...

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
DIVISION OF HIGHER EDUCATION ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
Regents of the University (with years when terms expire)

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

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

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 Higher and Professional Education
Paul G. Bulger

Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education
Allan A. Kuusisto

Director, Division of Higher Education
Owen A. Knorr

Chief, Bureau of Special College Programs
Frank E. Hobson, Jr.

FOREWORD

This is the second edition of a New York State Education Department publication given over to higher educational opportunity. In transition from the first edition to the second, the name has changed from Collegiate Newsletter on the Disadvantaged to the Educational Opportunity Forum. This change reflects more clearly the broader emphasis that we in the Division of Higher Education and the Bureau of Special College Programs feel should be placed on efforts to extend the reach of higher education. It should include those elements in our society that have for varying reasons not been able to take advantage of it.

The first edition of our newsletter, modest in its objectives, struck a responsive chord. Under the impression that New York's colleges and universities were involved in some interesting and challenging activities in the realm of educational opportunity, but that information about these was sparse, we sought to publicize these programs, hoping thereby to generate added interest in new programs. Apparently, we filled a vacuum. Not only did New York colleges and universities respond but individuals and institutions, including newspapers, periodicals, and house organs of interest

groups all over the country, responded equally enthusiastically.

In the assumption that there remains a great and continuing need to know more about what is being done to enlarge educational opportunity in our higher educational community and what some of the issues and problems are, we bring you this second edition of our newsletter. We would be most pleased to have your reactions to this effort generally or to any specific item that you find contained herein.

Owen A. Knorr
Director
Division of Higher
Education

Allan A. Kuusisto
Assistant Commissioner for
Higher Education

CONTENTS

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FORUM

The Educational Opportunity Forum is issued periodically by the College Committee on Educational Opportunity and the Division of Higher Education of the New York State Education Department. Distribution is to collegiate opportunity programs, Upward Bound, educators, and legislators concerned with the educationally "disadvantaged."

The Forum welcomes notes and articles concerning ongoing projects, educational experimentation, and theoretical approaches to educational opportunity programs. Letters or brief articles supporting or rebutting ideas presented in EOF are welcome since this newsletter is meant to be a forum in every sense of the word.

The Forum expresses its appreciation to Cynthia W. Williams for the new cover design.

* * *

Address editorial correspondence to:

Editor, Educational Opportunity Forum
Bureau of Special College Programs
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

* * *

Volume 1 Number 2

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE DISADVANTAGED
DILEMMA OR CHALLENGE

Leonard T. Kreisman
Director of Institutional Research
State University College
Oneonta, New York

As one looks at the ongoing activities in the area of post-secondary educational opportunity for students labeled as "dis-advantaged," one is immediately struck by the enormous nature of the task and the minimal efforts that are currently being made. Certainly the single most substantial effort has been the Upward Bound program, which at this point has upwards of 20,000 high school youngsters involved in over 200 projects across the nation. While this may appear to be a substantial effort, and its usefulness as a model should not be underrated, still it is a woefully inadequate effort, when compared with the numbers that need to be served. The number of high school graduates, nationwide for 1967-1968 is estimated at 2.69 million. The number of first-time degree credit enrollees in all institutions of higher education in the United States for 1968 is estimated at 1.52 million, but in 1967 the actual figures were already better than 1.6 million. A gap of over a million is obvious . Furthermore, with the exception of a nationwide Upward Bound movement and such activities as the variety of discovery programs at the City University of New York, and the SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge) in Buffalo and New York City, as well as the variety of individual programs at places like Antioch, Manhattanville College, San Francisco State,

Berkeley, and others, there is no other large scale effort designed to make a substantial inroad on the more than 1 million youngsters graduating from high schools with at least a surface credential which might entitle them to work beyond the secondary school.

This point may be made still clearer by reference to some unsophisticated statistics from just one high school in New York City in the heart of the ghetto. Benjamin Franklin, at 116th Street just off the East River Drive, has an enrollment of approximately 3,000 students. Negro and Puerto Rican youngsters make up over 90 per cent of the school's population and, in 1967, 100 students were enrolled in a commercial program, 670 in the academic program, and almost 2,300 in the general program. The graduates of the June 1967 class were awarded 20 academic diplomas, 50 commercial diplomas and 130 were graduated from the general curriculum. The dropout rate at Franklin is over 40 percent.[1] The gloomy picture painted by the conditions in this one school can be replicated in ghetto schools all over the country, from Los Angeles to Chicago and from Newark or New York City to St. Louis.

One also needs to point out that even the present Federal emphasis, via Upward Bound, is focused primarily on the precollegiate population. Once a youngster gains admission, or if a youngster gains admission, the responsibility of Upward Bound, for all practical purposes, stops.

One may also point to a continuation of Federal pressure through the Economic Opportunity Grant program which encourages participating schools to involve themselves in fairly active recruitment of youngsters

---

[1] June Meyer. "You can't see the trees for the school." The Urban Review, II:3. pp. 11-15.

from disadvantaged backgrounds. It is still too early to make definitive judgments here but there are some indications that such recruitment has not been so vigorous as desired and some colleges have made awards to the financially poorest of their otherwise well-qualified applicants. Increasing pressure from Washington may reverse some of this tide over the next few years.

In an attempt to sum up, it would appear as though there were a reasonably massive problem and that the general efforts at resolution are indeed miniscule. If we assume that only 10 percent of the more than one million graduates of high schools who do not go on to college are of college calibre, then I think we can see that programs involving at least 100,000 youngsters are in order. As we tally up the efforts of Upward Bound, Project SEEK (New York State), Double Discovery (City University of New York), and the efforts at places such as Cornell, Antioch, and San Francisco State, we are speaking of 30,000 at best rather than the 100,000 that appears to be a necessary minimum. This calculation does not even take into account the fact that there are additional tens of thousands who fail to complete high school; witness the over 40 percent dropout rate at Benjamin Franklin High School in New York City. Logic leads us to the conclusion that some of these dropouts might also profit from postsecondary training but the high school diploma becomes the ticket of admission to almost any such possibilities.

It also seems obvious that if we wait for the announced impact of the millions and billions that are being poured into the preschool and elementary schools through programs such as Head Start, and those currently

being funded under the various titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it may well be a decade or more before we see any sizable dimunition of the dropout rate or the number of disadvantaged youngsters more adequately prepared for postsecondary training. During this lapse still more hundreds of thousands will be thrust, or perhaps "spewed" is a better word, onto a job market which is, with equal vigor, rejecting the ill-equipped and, in fact, making the well-equipped of yesteryear obsolete. We may even further compound the issue by pointing to the fact that a good deal of the training currently being provided in many of the vocationally or commercially oriented high schools is outdated before the student graduates because of an increased reliance on automation.

The enormity of the tasks, the limited imagination that has been brought to the solution, to say nothing of the dearth of financial resources, lead many to question whether or not in most of our lifetimes any kind of satisfactory solution to the task can be found. To the objective observer it seems obvious that the current efforts being made at the postsecondary level are too little if any substantial inroad is to be made on the number of students who are still being denied a chance to escape the tight little circle of poverty. What, then, is the answer?

Anyone who has had first-hand acquaintance with colleges vis-a-vis their attitude toward the disadvantaged quickly comes to realize that colleges and universities are faced with a number

of problems when they consider the possibilities of launching a program. Among the ones that come immediately to mind are:

1. inexperience in dealing with less than fully-qualified applicants
2. inability to provide substantial work in remediation
3. additional strain on inadequate guidance and counseling services
4. increased pressure on already burdened financial resources

I think that many of these problems are really associated with fear. It is my considered belief that colleges, or at least many of our colleges, are afraid to tackle this problem because they have had little experience in dealing with the kinds of deprivation that youngsters like this bring to a college campus. The economic poverty is not the frightening aspect, since colleges have always been able to assimilate the <u>bright</u> (as established on the basis of established test norms or high school records) poor youngster. This practice is the Horatio Alger myth and a part of the tradition of higher education in America. Colleges and universities, with very few exceptions, have had a traditional middle class or upper class orientation, and lower class youngsters, particularly those with nonestablished ability are, as a group, people with whom colleges find it hard to relate. A poor, bright youngster can get the same treatment and be handled in the same way as a rich bright youngster; but a poor <u>potentially</u> bright

youngster does not come with the same skills, the same social background, the same attitudes or values, or the same knowledge. Colleges are reluctant to undertake the remolding and the filling in that is necessary to establish whether or not there is real potential here which can be developed. The type of commitment that is required to do this task is one which many colleges find difficult. They find it particularly difficult when faced with a situation which causes them to select from a comfortable pool of very well-qualified (at least on paper) youngsters, and youngsters who will not cause waves or substantially increase the demand on faculty who already consider themselves overburdened.

To this we must also add the fact that very often funds to provide the kind of services and programs demanded are ringed with special conditions some of which may be basically incompatible with institutional desires or purpose. Even after we have said these things we have still not accounted for the lack of sophistication of colleges in their ability to successfully evaluate disadvantaged youngsters on the basis of the nonobjective evidence. This is a very <u>critical</u> part of the process of making judgments about a population which cannot in many cases provide the traditional kinds of evidence attesting to academic competence or potential.

What then is the immediate answer? Let me suggest something which appears to me to be feasible, and at the same time makes some considerable effort at reaching larger numbers of students. It seems to me

each college or university, community college, and public and private postsecondary technical institute, can best ascertain its own strength of commitment, and the quantity of resources it would be willing to contribute to the cause. If my assessment is a reasonable one, is it not also reasonable to assume that perhaps a more successful attack can be made on this problem by setting up a series of federal and/or state grants which would be openly competitive? What I am suggesting is a system whereby the various institutions would design their own programs, taking as many or as few students as they desire, and using the grant funds to support the kinds of programs the institutions believe they can best launch. In this way no outside specifications are written, institutions are not forced to participate, and any participation comes only on the basis of conditions drawn by the institutions involved. Those institutions which have had considerable experience will find it easier to enlarge the total number served, while those who want to begin to explore may decide to start with a very few students. In any case, the extent of the institutional commitment will be decided by the institution itself, and there will be no pressure to develop a program tailored to guidelines set by an outside agency.

With the over 2000 institutions of higher education in this country, it would seem that such a program might be able to make a sizable inroad upon the problem of servicing the many tens of thousands of disadvantaged who are annually put adrift on a sea of increasing occupational skill and professional training. Certainly

this kind of simple proposal, which will cut down on the enormous overhead which characterizes so many of the special compensatory type programs for the disadvantaged, is worth exploring in some detail. As I see it, the participating institutions will absorb these programs as a part of their regular activity.

While it seems obvious that this is only a partial solution, since, in essence, we are approaching the problem from the top, it is important for disadvantaged youngsters to really believe that opportunities exist. The strengthening of such a belief would be helped immeasurably by a nationwide participation, on the part of postsecondary institutions, in programs designed to offer the maximum opportunity for the disadvantaged. The impact of such projects would be enormous on those who hopelessly contemplate their place in a more and more complex world. Would not the motivational impact be substantial if every disadvantaged youngster knew that in every college and university and every postsecondary institution in the United States there were some youngsters just like him, and that an educational opportunity would be provided for him at the end of his secondary school career?

While, as has been indicated earlier, this is approaching the problem of education from the top, one can hope that the stirrings in the elementary and secondary schools throughout the nation are the signs of a real attempt to offer meaningful service to those too long deprived. The change which must come, must come not only in approach and content, but even more substantially in attitude. This is made apparent in Jonathan Kozol's article in the Harvard

Education Review of the summer of 1967. In talking about attitude he comments about the insidiousness of the prejudice and despair of even the well-meaning.

> In a way, I think, those gently smiling older ladies were even more dangerous and more self-compromising, for it is they, after all, who make up the backbone of almost any urban system: and it is they, in the long run, who are most responsible for the perpetuation of its styles and attitudes.

The changing of this style and attitude is indeed a difficult task, for we must transform the hopelessness of both teachers and students into hope. This is not easy and certainly not quick but we must in some dramatic way hold out a new torch to the oppressed of our own shores; perhaps a massive effort by the higher education community is the kind of dramatic effort that is needed. Is this not worth exploring?

---

2 Jonathan Kozol. "Halls of darkness: in the ghetto schools." Harvard Education Review. XXXVII:3. p. 381.

WORK-STUDY: PROS AND CONS

Aaron W. Godfrey
Director of Special Projects
SUNY-Stony Brook

The Federal Work-Study program had its origin in Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Originally the program was limited to college students who met poverty criteria and was designed to provide them with part-time employment which would enable them to pursue courses of study at institutions of higher learning. The original legislation, however, suggested that employment be related to the student's educational objective, or that the work be in the public interest and that such work would not result in the displacement of regularly employed workers. Ninety percent of the cost of the program was to be underwritten by the Federal government and 10 percent by the institution.

There were several implications to the original legislation. The first was the administration of the program by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The second was that, since only low-income students were eligible for employment, institutions which wished to participate in the program would realistically be compelled actively to recruit students from low-income families, if there were too few in attendance to mount a program at the participating institution. The third implication, that employment was to be related to the student's academic objective, might, at times, strain the ingenuity and creativity of the Financial Aid Officer or the Director of Placement.

The quandary, however, was speedily resolved by the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965 which removed the dilemma of college administrators and blunted the intent of the original act. First, the program was no longer to be administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity but by the Office of Education, an old-line agency with which college administrators had been dealing for many years. Then, the purpose of the program was amended to read "to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students, particularly students from low-income families." This extended the focus of the program from low-income students to those in need, although low-income students were to have first crack at the available jobs. The recruitment obligation implied in the original legislation was articulated and assumed by the Educational Opportunity Grant program. Finally, since in many institutions, it seemed likely that the majority of participants would be middle-income students, what need would there be for creativity in relating the job to the student's academic objective? It seemed rather more expedient to use the eligible students to beef up the departmental student aides so that that portion of the operating budget could be diverted to permanent staff salaries, equipment, etc. Thus a creative piece of legislation became bourgeois and joined the educational establishment, paying the merest lip service to the original intent of the law.

The foregoing is not to suggest that there cannot be imaginative application of the program. In reality, the Work-Study program should be central to the development of any special program for the disadvantaged. An effective program, however, will depend very much on the director of the program, and his rapport with both the academic

departments, and the students themselves. It is certainly recommended that any job assigned to a student be in the area of his academic major. Not only will this give the student a sense of involvement in his discipline, but, hopefully, it will put him in close contact with a faculty member who will take a personal interest in his progress. Through the development of a relationship, training can be initiated, the student's confidence increased, and, within a brief period of time, useful work can be completed. Since the work can be related to his courses of studies, his employment will not be "dead time" as so many student jobs are.

For example, if a student has social work as a goal, and wishes to major in sociology, there are a number of options for the program director. He can assign the student to that department as a departmental assistant or to one of its members whose focus is in the general area of the student's interest. Such an assignment can give the student an overview of the discipline and its relationship to the field of social work. The student's presence in the department ought to generate concern and interest on the part of some of its members which should help the student in his day-to-day academic difficulties. The experience will also enable him to make a balanced choice regarding his career. If, for example, his departmental assignment involves interviewing, and the collection of data, it will have a great permanent value for the student in his preparation for a social work career.

Another choice for such a student would be an off-campus position under contract with a welfare agency or a community action program. Such involvement would get the student "where the action is" and

would have a profound effect on his ultimate choice. It is hoped that social science departments have begun or will begin to develop working relationships with such agencies, so the experience is valuable to the student, the university, and the agency.

A possible variation would be to use Work-Study positions to provide tutoring services. Not only could remediation and enrichment be provided those students admitted under special criteria but these same students could earn money by tutoring younger students. This has been found especially beneficial to students in difficulty since it compels them to get down to first principles in order to transfer knowledge tc the younger student. The thorough understanding of fundamental principles in many cases is the crucial ingredient in the mastery of a subject in which a student has difficulty.

The foregoing were given only by way of example and could be duplicated in nearly every discipline. Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that anything significant will be developed since the Work-Study program now seems to have been fitted neatly into the academic establishment. In the first place, administrators will probably not be willing or able to take a great deal of time to interview, counsel, and supervise. Secondly, since the original legislation was enacted, the institutional contribution has been doubled and will probably be increased still further. Institutions, therefore, will be unwilling to create new opportunities or to fill jobs that do not visibly benefit the university in a traditional and measurable way. Therefore, the program is likely to degenerate into an inexpensive source of student assistance aides. Finally we must suppose that

the administrators of the program must yield to the pressures and needs of the academic sector, and we will probably be right back where we started 4 years ago.

STUDENT COURT: A DEMONSTRATION IN JUDICIARY PROCESSES

W. L. Haslam

During UPWARD BOUND'S first summer on the Southwest Texas State College campus, it became obvious that many of our students lacked knowledge about various democratic principles of our society. In order to remedy the situation, the staff decided to promote student participation in several activities. One of these pertained to the judiciary system.

Whenever a student disciplinary case arose, it was referred to the student-elected court consisting of a chief justice and 2 associates. The court appointed one or two officers to discreetly investigate the charges and report their findings back to the court. The court decided whether the evidence warranted additional action. If additional action was necessary, the court notified the defendant as to time and place for the hearing. The defendant presented his own case or appointed a fellow student as his attorney.

Upon hearing the case, the court had three alternatives: (1) not guilty; (2) guilty with extenuating circumstances; and (3) guilty. If either of the latter two verdicts was reached, the court advised the counseling staff about their verdict and their recommended punishment. The counseling staff and project director reviewed the verdict and recommendation and reported back to the court. The court then informed the defendant of the final decision.

The student court was successful in providing a fairly realistic

picture of our judiciary system. In addition, it demonstrated to our students the tremendous personal responsibility each citizen must fulfill for such a democratic function to succeed.

For further information contact: W. L. Haslam, Assistant Director, Upward Bound Program, Southwest Texas State College, San Marcos, Texas 78666.

NEWS AND NOTES

SELECTING TALENTED NEGRO STUDENTS

The following is an abstract of W. S. Blumenfeld's paper, "Selecting Talented Negro Students: Nominations vs. Test Performance," which was read at the Midwestern Psychological Association, May 1967. Dr. Blumenfeld is Research Psychologist, National Merit Scholarship Corporation. The abstract is reprinted from College Student Personnel Abstracts, III:1 (Fall 1967), 18.

"A study of the relative efficiency of high school nomination and performance on a screening test as qualifications for scholarship competition involved more than 5,500 Negro second semester high school juniors participating in the National Achievement Scholarship Program. The students were divided into groups including those nominated but not tested (19 percent) and those not nominated but who had qualifying scores on the screening test (20 percent). The remaining 61 percent had been both tested and nominated. The nominated nontested group showed a broader coverage of schools and personality characteristics, whereas the nonnominated high test performance group demonstrated a higher success rate in the competition. Although

both criteria might profitably be considered, where the goal is a higher success rate, the test performance strategy appears to be more efficient since it identifies talented students who, in the school context, are otherwise overlooked.

IN FUTURE ISSUES

The next issue of Educational Opportunity Forum will feature:

*A paper by Sue Alexander on techniques of choosing students for the Antioch College Interracial Education Program

*William J. Murphy's article on systematic remediation and intuitive remediation

*A description of the Connecticut Talent Assistance Cooperative

*James Shenton's article, "The Edge of Social Catastrophe"

*News and Notes

We should be especially happy to receive notes or short articles on collegiate level tutorial programs, counseling techniques, and the success or failure of methods of choosing students for opportunity programs.

AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

The National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) has commissioned an 18-month study of American Indian education which will be directed by Dr. Glen P. Nimnicht of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. The study will be financed by a Carnegie Corporation of New York grant of $95,000.

Ten schools for Indians from Alaska to New Mexico will be studied in detail in terms of administrative and decision-making processes, curricula and teaching methods, student achievement, the dropout problem, attitudes toward education and the school, and the relationship of Indian communities to the schools which serve them.

A second phase of the study will be the collection of data from the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, state departments of education, and other sources to provide an overview of the educational situation. The whole study will yield a comprehensive report on the current state of Indian education plus a series of recommendations for improvement.

For information contact: Dr. Glen P. Nimnicht, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Berkeley, California.

NEW YORK COLLEGE BOUND CORPORATION

Carnegie Corporation of New York has given the New York College Bound Corporation a grant of $100,000 to continue its efforts to counteract the forces that discourage so many able students from pursuing a higher education. (See Collegiate Newsletter on the Disadvantaged, I:1, for a description of the NYCBC program.)

College and university members of the NYCBC are:

Adelphi University
Bard College
Barnard College
Brooklyn College of Pharmacy
City University of New York
College of Mount St. Vincent
College of New Rochelle
Columbia College
Columbia University School of Engineering
Columbia College of Pharmacy
C. W. Post College
Fashion Institute of Technology
Fordham University
Good Counsel College
Hofstra University
Iona College
Long Island University
Manhattan College
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart
Marymount College
Marymount Manhattan College
Mills College of Education
New York University
Notre Dame College of Staten Island
Pace College
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Pratt Institute
St. Francis College
St. John's University
St. Joseph's College for Women
Sarah Lawrence College
Southampton College of L.I.U.
State University of New York Maritime College
Wagner College

NEW CAREERS

New Careers Newsletter contains short articles and notes about New Careers programs which are designed for the training of paraprofessionals and the upgrading of people so trained, to professional status. The current issue includes information about the development centers and training programs, private companies, and agencies participating in New Careers, and an educational model for teacher aides. The scope is international, although primary emphasis is on the United States. Subscriptions are $5 per year which includes the Newsletter and other publications of the Center.

For information contact: New Careers Development Center, New York University, Washington Square, New York, New York 10003.

IRCD BULLETIN BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The IRCD Bulletin III:4 (September 1967) of the ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged at Yeshiva University has published "A Bibliography on Disadvantaged Populations" which

will "serve as the introduction and general background to future bibliographies which will focus more sharply on the education of disadvantaged children and youth..." Subsequent bibliographies will cover: 1) educational programs, theory, and practice; 2) curriculum development; 3) individual development; 4) academic function and achievement; 5) linguistics and language development; and 6) ethnic segregation, desegregation, and integration in education.

For further information contact: Edmund W. Gordon, Director, IRCD Bulletin, Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University, 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BULLETIN

Education-Training Programs is the focus in the fourth issue of the Technical Assistance Bulletin. The Bulletin, published monthly, is designed "for the exchange of information and ideas among migrant and seasonal farm worker programs." Previous issues have covered teacher-aides, mobile units, GSA (General Services Administration) surplus, housing, training programs, employment opportunities, H-E-P programs (training for migrant workers and their families) and materials of interest.

The following rosters were included with two former publications: "Self-Help Housing Projects in the United States" and

"Projects Receiving Migrant Health Project Grant Assistance."

For further information, contact: Director of Publications, Educational Systems Corporation, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NSSFNS ANNUAL REPORT

In his annual report, NSSFNS (National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students) President Richard L. Plaut noted that in the past 3 years the Service has tripled the number of students counselled and amount of financial aid secured, and doubled the number of direct scholarship awards to students entering integrated colleges and universities.

For the past 19 years, NSSFNS has offered a broad range of programs designed to inform Negro children about educational opportunities, motivate and prepare them for these opportunities, and provide them with necessary monetary help. The organization has helped nearly 18,000 students to enroll in college; 3,800 of them freshmen entering 651 different institutions this fall, an increase of 50 percent over last year. Total financial aid secured or awarded since NSSFNS began amounts to nearly $11,000,000 with 1967-68 awards totaling $3,179,440 or 45 percent more than the year before. NSSFNS has awarded $112,675 worth of supplementary scholarship grants to 333 freshmen and upperclassmen this year.

This year, freshmen family income averaged $4,580 per annum with

53 percent having incomes of less than $4,000; 35 percent came from broken homes, many others from families requiring public assistance; 95 percent scored under 600 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test of the College Entrance Examination Board; 70 percent under 500, with the average score 465.

The achievement of last year's freshman class was outstanding. Forty percent were in the top 10 percent of their high school class; many held school and class offices; 27 students were members of the National Honor Society. Time will be the test of their performance in college, but the records of their predecessors are inspiring. A survey shows that 7 percent of NSSFNS counselees and scholarship holders maintained a college average of A or A-; 51.5 percent, B+, B, or B-; 41 percent, C+, C, or C-; and only .5 percent D or below. The withdrawal rate--for any reason--was less than 1 percent, as compared with a 40 percent national average.

With a grant from the Sears Roebuck Foundation, NSSFNS has sponsored interview sessions at which thousands of high school juniors and seniors have sat down with representatives of several hundred colleges to explore the possibilities for postsecondary education. In this way, many students with college potential have been reached who were not previously visible.

Other regular NSSFNS programs include the College Assistance Program (CAP) in which college admissions and financial aid officers visit inner city junior high and high schools to discuss college opportunities with those who may feel that higher education is not a possibility for them. The CAP program has been made possible by a grant from the Old Dominion Foundation.

Another program, GAP, (college advisory service for counseling, referral, and supplementary aid to Negro high school students who wish to attend college) funded by the Carnegie Corporation in 1965, beams the NSSFNS basic program to students enrolled in Upward Bound summer institutes, and helps them to select and enroll in colleges and to secure necessary financial aid.

For further information contact: Richard L. Plaut, President, National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 6 East 82nd Street, New York 28, New York.

UPWARD BOUND CONFERENCE

In October 1967, the Bureau of Special College Programs of the New York State Education Department sponsored a statewide meeting of directors and representative students from Upward Bound programs in the State. The meeting was notable for the honesty of discussion of the participants and for the willingness of those involved to search their own ideas as well as those of others.

The keynote address by Dr. Gloria Joseph with its thesis that Upward Bound is not meeting the needs of those who require educational opportunities, and Dr. James Spence's paper which contended that objective measurements are still the best means of determining the college capability of a disadvantaged student, were highly controversial. Indeed, they aroused such intensity of debate that we invite letters or short articles supporting or rebutting the two papers.

The day closed with a dialogue between project directors and Upward Bounders from the many programs throughout the State. This dialogue was the result of morning and early afternoon student seminars led by Mr. Hans Klint which were designed to enable students to criticize their programs and, in a free and open session, to offer suggestions for program improvement to the project directors. As you will read, this was an instructive period for us all.

THE UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM

Dr. Gloria I. Joseph
Director, Special Education Program
Cornell University

On October 19, 1967, I addressed a group composed largely of Upward Bound directors and college administrators. My topic was "Students in College Opportunity Programs," namely Upward Bound. At the completion of my talk there was a good deal of hostile reaction. Several persons seemed personally offended; many expressed strong disagreement. At the time of this publication, almost seven months after the talk, my opinion about the ineffectiveness of the Upward Bound Program is held even more strongly. The following article contains the major aspects of my speech in October, 1967. I have added a final paragraph concerning recent developments which bear upon my thinking about Upward Bound.

* * * * * *

My work with Cornell University's program for special educational opportunities and my association with various Upward Bound programs have provided me with insights appropriate to the total Upward Bound program. For the past two years I have been pondering and wrestling with the pro's and con's of the Upward Bound program and at this time I am quite clear on one thing. I feel a great

deal of dissatisfaction with the program at several levels, and the more I become involved in the question of poverty and poverty programs the more I question Upward Bound's ability to provide educational opportunities.

My talk was to center on college placement for the Upward Bound students and I was to speak on the following point: What should be done for and with students who are in the Upward Bound program? I cannot, however, stand here and calmly talk about the future of a program about which I have so many misgivings. I must devote some time to these misgivings. When I conclude I hope many of you will consider the question of whether or not Upward Bound should be discontinued as a poverty program so that the money can be put to other uses.

I know many of you consider your summer programs to be successful. That judgment, of course, depends on your goals, aims, and measures of success. I do not intend to condemn or criticize any particular program. That would be presumptuous of me since I am not sufficiently familiar with enough programs. But I do know enough about poverty in America and quite a bit about students who are categorized as academically, culturally, and economically deprived.

My initial criticism is one that is commonly heard: poverty programs do not really help the poor. By the poor I mean Harrington's poor; i.e., the invisible poor--those persons in the $2,000 to $4,000 annual income bracket.[1] The vast majority of high school

---

[1] Michael Harrington. "The other america." (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962).

age youth from this economic bracket are rarely found in schools. Not only do the children of poverty enter school knowing far less than middle-class children, they learn less and less as they move from grade to grade. Each year they fall further behind; eventually many stop trying and drop out. The ones who hang on will most likely not be recommended by teachers, counselors, or Upward Bound directors.

College or university guidance counselors and teachers are responsible for the ultimate selection of the students to be involved and of the curriculum to be undertaken. Although Upward Bound is designated as a Community Action Program (CAP), the Federal government dictates the guidelines, and the colleges determine the programs, with only minor assistance from the communities. Thus, decisions are made, in the main, by middle-class whites rather than by those in the poor communities. To be successful in the Upward Bound program a student needs a certain level of academic and cultural sophistication; in other words, he requires the possession of certain middle-class values which are not a part of the culture of the ghetto slums, American Indians, migrant laborers, Appalachian hillbillies, or sharecroppers. This is the hard-core poverty population. Yet, what percentage of the Upward Bound students come from this group? What percentage could reasonably come from this group? Two years would not be nearly enough time to motivate and train hard-core poverty students for entrance to colleges or universities or even to most technical schools. Upward Bound is, in a sense, stealing money from the poor and using it for a middle-class valued program.

A second criticism is related to the location of the programs on college campuses. Although there may be some educational value in

relocating students for a summer program, the efficiency of this move must be measured in terms of the educational impact of such a move versus the expense involved and the consequent limitation placed upon the number of students. Surely it does not require two or three summers to familiarize students with college campuses if this is the reason for locating them there.

The value of the existing curriculum is open to question. Many Upward Bound students are from minority groups and most are from economically disadvantaged homes. These facts should be of primary consideration in curriculum planning. Upward Bound programs can serve as an excellent medium for helping minority group youngsters overcome the inferior feelings usually associated with lower class status. For the black students this can be done by building social pride through the teaching of Afro-American history--discovering and attacking the racism in education, and evaluating and appreciating the concept of Black Power. For other minority groups analogous approaches should be employed. All students should discuss the question of why our society has allowed them to be among the nation's 50,000,000 poor.

Remedial work in the basic academic subject areas must be stressed. Cultural frills which now characterize many Upward Bound programs may be rewarding to the staff but will be little payoff for the students. Any cultural enrichment should generate a positive view of the student's ethnic heritage. This part of the program must be directed, planned, and carried out by members of the same ethnic group.

The Upward Bound program is an attempt to improve the academic ability of students and to encourage them to aspire to higher educational

goals. Rather than attacking the root of the problem, which stems from inferior and discriminating educational practices, Upward Bound rushes in with a program that reminds me of the adage, "Putting a bandaid on a cancer." Indeed, to a large extent Upward Bound is trying to do what the elementary and secondary schools should be doing. The money and effort which goes into this program could probably be more effectively spent through programs operated within the context of the local schools. If the Upward Bound program were to have an impact on the poor, if the participants in the program were actually students coming from hard-core poverty, there would have to be an entirely different structure. The effort of the program would have to be directed toward keeping students in high school rather than preparing them for post-secondary education.

We cannot begin to work with hard-core poverty youth during their high school years and expect to motivate and retrain them before their graduation from high school. Could such a transition take place it would increase the present need to persuade university admission officers to adjust their criteria to allow this type of student to enter into the university. To date, very few colleges or universities have made such significant changes.

Could this $25,000,000 per year now being spent on Upward Bound programs be better spent elsewhere? My answer is "Yes!" I feel that Upward Bound should be scrapped because it is neither reaching the students of hard-core poverty nor is it providing the most effective aid to prospective college students. For students coming out of hard-core poverty, a totally different structure would be appropriate. If the aim is to encourage the college enrollment of disad-

vantaged students, it is certainly secondary to the needs of thousands of students ready to go to college now, but unable to do so because of their lack of financial resources.

Because Upward Bound does not attack the real problem of the poor, and because of its stress on values not germane to present day minority group youth, I predict that in years to come it will be remembered as just another one of those poverty programs that failed.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS:

The recent report from the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders has reenforced the belief held by many that the poverty programs in general have done little to help the poor. Money has been misused and programs have been grossly mismanaged. I contend that the Upward Bound program fits this description. What has Upward Bound done to stem the tide of racism in America? What has Upward Bound done to help poverty in America when directors, staff members, and housing facilities have absorbed large portions of the money designated for their programs. I suggest that each Upward Bound director ask himself these questions: In view of the present racial crisis in America, and in view of the ominous shadows forecasting chaos and devastation, can you honestly justify your program? Is it proving to be a constructive means of dealing with the problem of inferior and inadequate education for minority groups and the poor in our country?

DISCUSSION OF ADMISSIONS PRACTICES AT THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

James R. Spence, Director
Office of Admissions Program
State University of New York

There have been great changes in admissions practices in higher education due to the increasing number of students. The shortage of places and the consequent need for selectivity has led to the utilization of developments in fields relevant to admissions, such as psychological and personality evaluation. These developments have meant that colleges have been able to identify the best predictors of success in college, and are now using relatively sophisticated devices which combine such factors as I.Q. tests, class rank, and academic average in high school with optimal weighting of each one. Grades, with some assistance from the other factors, enable the admissions officer to make the best selection for his institution. This is the plan followed by the State University of New York.

At this time there is little or no evidence that subjective judgments are more valid predictors for the academic success of disadvantaged students or any others than are objective factors. Indeed, most colleges have given up personal interviews as a basis for admission. Letters of recommendation may be useful but only to a limited extent. The disadvantaged students who are presently being served by conventional college programs are not enough different so that devices which apply to nondisadvantaged

people--high school grades, SAT and RSE scores, et al--can not be used for them. There is no indication that our evaluation devices do not predict success in college as well for these disadvantaged students as for others.

There is a need for careful and "hard-nosed" evaluation of admissions criteria. This means that admissions officers must work closely with the faculty and the dean of students to determine where problems exist--why students fail, the nature of financial aid difficulties, and so forth. Pointing to successful students who were admitted by subjective criteria is not sufficient evidence to assert that subjective judgment is superior to the best combination of objective factors. Much of the evidence we now have is based on opinion or unsubstantiated judgments; and as long as we are faced with opinion, rather than facts, we are not finding the firm road we can travel together.

Variations in admissions procedure will not solve the problems of college access for the disadvantaged. A deeper and more drastic approach must be taken in which there is recognition that admissions do not determine programs; programs determine admissions criteria. Thus, the admissions officer may be able to stimulate or encourage programs or academic adjustments, but he must know what program changes are being made available to disadvantaged students before he can change the admissions procedures.

There is much to be said for the "total program" approach for disadvantaged students. Many of the present programs are only "nibbling" at a small segment of the total population of disadvantaged students who can benefit by college study, and are not really

solving the problem. Programs are needed which will provide a greater period for transition and remediation, without reducing degree requirements and standards, than current academic standards and programs do.

The variety of higher educational institutions with different entrance threshholds should not be overlooked. For example, the two-year colleges, which are expanding much more rapidly than the four-year colleges, are accepting the greatest bulk of the students who graduate from high school. Those who counsel the disadvantaged student must be aware of where opportunities exist, and help the student to recognize and accept types of institutions different from those he may have originally preferred.

Not enough has been said about the "hidden curriculum" and the effect on students of the home environment with its attendant learning situation. The education establishment is not able to do the whole job of educating our youth, in the broadest sense, and it may be misleading to the public to imply that we can alone repair the damage done by the various types of social and cultural disadvantage. Indeed, assuming competence in academic areas, it will be extremely difficult for the educational establishment to appreciably affect the other facets of education; e.g., medical--improving the health of students--and domiciliary--improving the living and cultural surroundings.

In summary, the normal admissions standards presently used are almost equally applicable and are not significantly inferior for students entering existing special programs. We should not be overly concerned at the current use of objective criteria. It is more important for all of us to keep our eye on the development of sound programs for the disadvantaged. Before any significant changes in

the admissions criteria can be seen, we should expect to see drastically different programs, specifically tailored to the disadvantaged students' needs. When these exist, changes in admissions policies will occur.

* * *

Project Director's Comment: Marist Upward Bound bridge students who were attending the summer session at State University College at New Paltz were rejected because the Director of Admissions refused to waive the required scholastic average of 85. On this basis, admissions criteria could as well be evaluated by a computer.

Project Director's Comment: We must avoid the computerization of human beings and rely more on a person-oriented approach. Personal judgments based upon years of experience are more valid than figures fed into a machine.

Project Director's Comment: Most admissions criteria are very bad but no one has been able to come up with anything better. We are only able to base our judgment concerning a student's success on 25% of his total variance, thus leaving unaccounted for 75% of his variance. The Office of Admission thus becomes the Office of Exclusion.

Mr. Spence: Upward Bound students are being admitted to regular college programs with supportive services from the college on a trial basis. Evidence should now be collected on the success of these students. Many creative teachers can see the advantages and rewards of a greater spread of cultural backgrounds in their classes

and recognize a different kind of achievement for a different kind of student. This is not true of a large enough percentage of the faculty, however. Continuing efforts must be made to encourage the modification of curricular and academic standards during the first year or so of college to accommodate a broader segment of the disadvantaged student population.

ADMITTING UPWARD BOUND STUDENTS TO COLLEGE

Barry Zamoff
Project Director, Upward Bound
Queens College

Historically, American society has consistently stressed education as the primary vehicle by which people may rise above conditions of economic poverty. However, in the past decade we have come to see that our contemporary poor, particularly our urban poor, are not so adequately served by our educational system as their earlier counterparts. Why this is so is a complex and multi-faceted problem which this Upward Bound conference is not designed to confront but which, I may add, needs to be confronted. Historically, however, we do know that institutions of higher education have done very little to confront or remedy inequities in our public educational system.

Upward Bound is one response to the realities we now face in education. Upward Bound is a precollege program which is designed for high ability high school students, the great majority of whom would not go on to any form of higher education if not for the program's intervention. In this respect, the program is different from other programs for economically poor students who are doing well in school. We want to get students into higher

education who would not otherwise be going.

We note that, far from being alien to education, the great majority of the Upward Bound students and their families care a great deal about education. There may be some disenchantment with the school system as it is now structured, but, in my judgment, a grave error would be made in equating this disenchantment with a disinterest in education. Even before our students entered Upward Bound, over 60 percent of their parents indicated a desire for their children to go on to higher education. Our students indicated much the same aspirations. They did not, however, expect to go to college - and we must not confuse educational aspirations with educational expectations; our Upward Bound parents and students value education very much. Parenthetically, Elena Padilla's work, Up from Puerto Rico, and an article by Richard Cloward and James Jones in Education in Depressed Areas, "Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation," lend further empirical support to our findings.

Where some of our parents do not overtly support the goal of college attendance for their children, we have found the reason to be one of economics. That the average 1968 college graduate will earn $200,000 more in his lifetime than the average 1968 high school graduate may be a little too abstract to the family that needs the money today. The luxury of being able to afford four years of little or no real earning power in order to pursue higher education is a luxury which sadly is not always affordable.

Young people who enter the Queens College Upward Bound program have experienced minimal academic success. Over 80 percent of our

students enter the program as high school juniors and seniors with high school averages below 75 percent. This means in a very practical sense that there is not very much time for making overwhelming increases in academic averages in high school, especially since most decisions on college admissions are made on the basis of seven terms of high school work.

In short, the dilemma I am posing is a simple one. We are trying to salvage a generation of high ability students in a very limited time period. When we take them into our program there is an implicit promise that if they produce we will produce. We will help them gain admission into higher education. Now we at Queens College cannot, of course, guarantee college admission for our students. We cannot admit students to higher education--except those going on next year here at Queens College. We do not have the power to admit most of our students. But the assumption that most of our students make--expecting to go to college--is an assumption that I believe we should expect these students to make. Their expectations are raised by being with us and perhaps for the first time their expectations are more in line with their aspirations. The dangers of not fulfilling their expectations--if they have met their share of the bargain and started to produce as they are capable of producing--the sociological and psychological dangers should be obvious to all and need no further elaboration on my part.

It is interesting to note that the Queens College Upward Bound students have been identified by independent evaluation conducted by the Syracuse University Youth Development Center as achieving the greatest gains in academic achievement (of the participants in 21

target programs) during the 1966-1967 academic year. These gains were achieved while our students were living in their home environments with their attendant weaknesses and many often unrecognized strengths.

We know, of course, that our students' averages do not increase from 71 to 85 percent. The typical pattern is a very slight and probably statistically insignificant change and I think we may have to accept this as being close to what is realistically possible. There will be no fantastic jump in academic average for the great majority of our students. This is not the rule. We ask admissions people to realize this. After all, our students are returning to the same school systems in which they did not produce in the first place. Institutional change within urban school systems is a slow and tedious process.

We also know that our students will enrich many college campuses. They may be presidents of freshman classes, as is one of our students from last year. They may become disc jockeys and run campus radio programs, as is another of our students from last year. They may be evidencing their leadership and academic capabilities in a thousand different ways as we are sure our students will. And they may be giving our academic communities new evidence of what the culture of poverty does and does not mean.

At the risk of seeming somewhat exhortative, I would like to conclude my comments by citing some rather heartening remarks made last weekend by Dr. Samuel Gould, Chancellor of the State University of New York. Indicating, and here I'm quoting Dr. Gould directly, "That we have to do something besides standing on the sidelines and

commenting on the situation occasionally," Dr. Gould intimates that students of the Upward Bound variety can revitalize higher education. I agree.

We have used special acts of Congress in our society to admit veterans into our colleges and universities without particular regard to their high school averages. Some institutions have admitted Cuban and Hungarian refugees and other immigrant groups for political as much as educational reasons, and without particular regard for their high school averages. In my judgment, it remains for us to devote similar attention to Upward Bound students, of whom there are now 65 here at Queens College and 23,000 across the country.

TESTING PROGRAM AT UNION COLLEGE

John Terry
Project Director, Upward Bound
Union College

The Union College Upward Bound program was one of a 20 percent national sample of Upward Bound programs picked as a research project by Dr. David Hunt, director of Youth Development Center, Syracuse University. The goal of the research project was to try to ascertain, in terms of personality development, what types of youngsters Upward Bound is recruiting and to subsequently establish the kind of environment necessary for success.

Initial testing of the newly recruited Upward Bound youngsters, plus a control group, was conducted by the Syracuse team in each of our target high schools. The tests were designed to determine in which of three general categories of personality development our group belonged: Developmental stage one, where the youngster accepts without questioning the values and norms of his immediate environment; i.e., home and school; stage two, where the youngster generally accepts those values and norms but is beginning to question their validity; and, finally, stage three, where the youngster has developed a more universal set of norms, is not parochial in

his attitudes, and is accepting and understanding the differences in others.

During the first two stages of this developmental process the young person needs rational, clearly defined guide posts or structures. The controls, in short, have to be almost entirely external. Once he has entered the final stage, the need for external control is not to any large extent necessary, since the person has developed his own set of internal controls.

The results of the Syracuse testing clearly indicated that all our youngsters were in groups one and two, with the majority in the latter group. Further, these findings show that a laissez-faire, highly unstructured project would, for the average Upward Bounder, have dysfunctional results and that the best arrangement would be a rational structured project that would lead the child toward stage three. It should be further pointed out, in this regard, that while a child, who has reached or is close to reaching stage three, is quite able to cope with either a structured or nonstructured atmosphere, the child in stage one or two cannot successfully cope with a highly unstructured situation.

SCHOOL WITHIN A SCHOOL

M. F. Tidwell
Richmond College

Kingsborough Community College is one of the few junior colleges which has an Upward Bound program. The project is unusual, too, because it is nonresidential and improves the ghetto because it does not siphon off the educated people. Indeed, students who complete two or four years of college will then be in a position to assume responsibility in their own areas.

A mainstay of the project is the home visitation program. Generally, the Upward Bound staff have found that the parents are as enthusiastic about the College and the program as are the students.

During the academic year 1967-68 all of the Upward Bounders are attending a single high school--Franklin K. Lane. At Lane the students are placed in special classes, spend double periods in their major courses, and receive intensive tutoring and counseling. For all practical purposes this is a high school within a high school.

THE EFFECT OF BLACK NATIONALISM

Aaron W. Godfrey
Project Director, Upward Bound
State University at Stony Brook

Upward Bound programs vary considerably both with respect to the regions in which they take place and the universities which host them. In many ways, the most satisfactory aspect of the Upward Bound program has been the growth of black nationalism and the sense of pride which has developed among black youngsters in the program.

It is understandable that there is a tremendous resentment or hatred of the white man by black teachers who may be involved in Upward Bound. A serious difficulty in an integrated program is the development of a reverse racism. In the Stony Brook program, the black youngsters were about numerically equal to the other youngsters and tended to dominate the program since they were generally more mature and articulate. Consequently, the explosive potential of racism tended to have more complicated implications in an area where only 7 percent of the population is nonwhite. These implications, however, would be manifest not so much during the program as when the youngsters returned to their home districts where they represented a definite minority

of the population. In addition, since the conservatism of the region is well-known and effective, the tendency of the local citizenry is to bury or expel anyone whose behavior or ideas deviate markedly from "traditional" norms.

I am still not certain what effect the extreme nationalism of one of our teachers had on our program. Indeed, a great deal of tension was generated, which may have started some constructive thinking. Yet, at the moment of contact, many black youngsters were turned off by this hatred and many white youngsters were terrified, almost to the point of leaving. For the most part, however, the extreme tensions soon appeared in perspective and most of the acrimony was forgotten a month after the youngsters returned home. What remained may have been good and impelled a great many of the students (both black and white) to look into African and Afro-American history and got them thinking realistically about living together.

The feedback from the schools is mixed. I have received two complaints of "truculence" on the part of "nice kids" in school systems with a tradition of prejudice. Yet other schools have asked what happened to give certain youngsters a sense of pride in themselves and their work--youngsters who were very nearly written off by these very systems.

I suppose the lesson which emerged from the experience is that it is essential to give a youngster a sense of pride in what he is. To overdo it can do him and our society a lot of harm. Extreme nationalism or black racism need not be the alternative to the segregation we have seen in the past.

HOFSTRA'S UPWARD BOUND AND NOAH PROGRAMS

Charles J. Calitri
Coordinator, Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged
Hofstra University

I cannot see poverty as being something that is a oneness. I see a continuum running from people who are in total abject poverty, to those who are extremely wealthy. I can only see individuals along the line, suffering in one way or another, but these are not separate things; there is continuity here. I cannot see the separation of a child into prenursery, nursery, kindergarten, elementary school, junior high school, high school, college, university, etc. I can see only the human being in a continuum, and he is there at every juncture that man imposes as he poses this kind of time-space stop motion onto the realities of the world. If I can come to it this way, if I can say to myself that there is totality which is the entire universe of man, and there are these make-believe strata which have to be dealt with, and if I am involved with this business which has been called working with the disadvantaged, then I have to look at the disadvantaged at all levels, at all ages, and in all conditions. I cannot ignore one group in order to work with another. I cannot even say, for example, that we ought to begin much earlier. The process has to begin wherever

we are.

With such a philosophy in mind, I suppose, we have been able to attack this problem at many levels at Hofstra. We began with an institute for teachers of the disadvantaged, and we decided to start it on the junior high level, because these were the students and teachers who were crying for help the most.

From this institute developed an in-service workshop which we exported to school systems, asking them their problems and helping them to take a look at these problems in what we thought might be fresh ways. We had a college program called NOAH, originally Negro Opportunities at Hofstra, designed to take young people who would not ordinarily be able to get into Hofstra, bring them on campus for a summer experience and prepare them to succeed in the regular college classroom. That became part of the totality which was Programs for the Disadvantaged. We had a National Teacher Corps contingent, finally we got Upward Bound, and now we are moving forward into paraprofessional programs. In other words, we developed a unified attack on all levels of the problem, not ignoring one for another; and I think the divisive talk we have been hearing and that which we have been getting in the literature, disturbs these efforts that are being made.

I think there is a way, and perhaps, philosophically, this is where I stand, of pulling things together into a single effort. For example, my tutor counselors in the Upward Bound program this summer were students in the NOAH program. Some of the teachers were people who had come through the workshop for teachers of the disadvantaged, and had gone back to their schools. Teachers who selected the children who came into Upward Bound were part of the workshop and institute which

we conducted. Curriculum coordinators who were involved in helping us to find, isolate, perhaps identify some of the needs of the kids, were people involved with us on the NOAH program and in the institute and the workshop.

We took over a defunct Saint Anthony's Upward Bound program, so this was our first year with the Upward Bound kids. One student came to us who had applied to NOAH and had been tentatively rejected because there were a limited number of seats. We took a look at him, and within the first two days of the program, had him folded out of Upward Bound and into NOAH. We managed because we consulted with the admissions office, and we had the officers give us some of the criteria they thought would work. They were too sick and tired of sticking to the objective instruments and wanted to try something new.

They came up with a notion (which they originally fought) that you could tell, if you have had experience interviewing kids, if a kid was going to make it, all things being equal. And so, the seat-of-the-pants judgment was one of the criteria. This is not seat-of-the-pants judgment by just anybody, but by someone who has had experience with kids going through college. The other criterion with which we dealt and which we felt was important was that, in some way, a kid had to have exhibited ego success in some area. It need not be academic, but somewhere, he had to have, we thought, an outgoing personality, not necessarily blatant, but a sense of self that would make for success in college.

Now, in the Upward Bound program, we want to make that commitment for the child. In other words, let's take him and give him a sense of self, so that by the time he puts in an application for NOAH, he is ready to be accepted.

UPWARD BOUND IN TRANSITION

J. C. Doremus, Director
Project Upward Bound
Utica College of Syracuse University

"The major purpose of Upward Bound is to help the disadvantaged youth who has college potential, but a secondary objective may be even more important in the long run. This is the attempt to have some permanent effects on educational techniques and attitudes, both at the high school and college levels..."
(Economic Opportunity Report, Jan. 29, 1968)

The above statement requires critical review for it gives purpose and direction not only to Upward Bound but to other compensatory educational programs. This paper contends that, unless the "secondary" objective is realized, Upward Bound and other compensatory educational programs will have had little or no significance.

For the past several years a host of critics have declared the school System a failure, and have convincingly argued the need for reform. A plethora of compensatory programs, funded in large part by the Federal Government, have been created in an attempt to alleviate the crisis in education. But what are the prospects of such efforts? Have they made a difference? Have they had or can they have "permanent effects" on the System?

Nearly all special educational programs exist outside established educational institutions: they coexist with the System. Few, if

any, of these programs supplant the school or college. That is, the student must enter or return to the System; the Upward Bound student, for example, returns to school each September and his performance there determines his future. The essential fact is that the formal educational institutions must be reckoned with by the individual as well as any movement to reform education.

There is no evidence to indicate that the special programs have changed the System. For the most part the faculty, staff, and governing boards are unaware of, indifferent, or insensitive to such programs. The bastions of knowledge, secondary and higher, stand unscaled. The special programs, meanwhile, tend to be content outside the school, frequently not realizing that they are serving as a safety valve; they placate the critical condition as they handle the "difficult" cases.

Some have argued that the System is beyond redemption. Kenneth Clark, among others, has suggested that the only satisfactory answer to the present crisis is to create a completely new institution. In my more sane moments, I am inclined to agree with Dr. Clark's conclusion; but I think it unrealistic to expect that a new educational system to coexist with the present one will be established. Thus, if the crisis is to be alleviated and the needs of individuals and society served, the existing educational system must be changed, for only through such change can the lives of sufficient numbers of students be affected to result in a significant change in the total scheme of things.

The foregoing contentions can be illustrated by using Upward Bound as a case in point. Upward Bound has been a tremendous

success when measured by the "primary" objective: "to help disadvantaged youth who have college potential." It has served and is serving effectively the 23,000 students enrolled. However, there is no evidence to suggest that, through Upward Bound, the additional 600,000 who fit the eligibility requirements, but who are not enrolled, are in any way affected. It is a good thing that 23,000 students are receiving better educational opportunities than the System can provide, but ultimately they will make little or no difference in the movement of society. If the successful features of Upward Bound cannot be incorporated into the System, thus changing the System, then it will not make all that much difference ultimately.

Acting on these premises, the staff of Upward Bound at Utica College met with the Superintendent of Utica Public Schools and members of the Board of Education soon after the completion of our first summer program. We outlined our case for the development of a school-within-the-school. We were most fortunate to find open and receptive school officials. We then approached other colleges and universities in the immediate area. The people there also responded to the idea with enthusiasm. The result, after long months of conference, negotiation, and compromise, is known as the Consortium School. We feel it confronts some of the basic problems and deficiencies in the educational system--at least in Utica. By virtue of a substantial Title III (ESEA) grant of $235,000, OEO funds, and school taxes, two or three years hence we will know if the plan really works.

Several highlights of the plan of the Consortium School follow,

taken from the Title III (ESEA) proposal.

OBJECTIVES

The primary objective is to provide an educational program which improves the quality and relevance of secondary education in a way which enables all elements of an intellectually, economically, and culturally heterogeneous school population to attain their full educational potential within a single program. The means to realize this objective are the provision for flexibility in the educational program, for its adaptability to individual needs, and for utilization of the full range of educational and cultural resources of the region.

The plan, then, ha. .hree major dimensions: the organization and utilization of educational resources, the structure of the learning environment, and the process of learning.

ORGANIZATION AND UTILIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

The secondary school, as well as the college, stands relatively aloof from society and, for the most part, does not relate its curriculum to society at large. Moreover, the secondary school and institutions of higher education are in no way related, thus prohibiting communication and cooperation between the two. This condition results in a severe discontinuity in the education of the student, eliminating for both the high school and college student potentially meaningful and more diverse learning experiences which would enhance the breadth and depth of his education. The Consortium School overcomes this deficiency in two ways: first, through the formal administrative organization, and second, the active participation of the colleges in implementing the program.

The Consortium Board Agreement, signed by Colgate University, Hamilton, Kirkland, and Utica Colleges, and the State University Agricultural and Technical College at Morrisville, as well as the Utica Public Schools, represents a new relationship between secondary and higher education. The Consortium School Board Agreement is as follows:

I. The Consortium Board shall consist of one member from each participating institution as well as representation from the Utica Board of Education.

II. The Consortium Board shall have delegated to it by member institutions:
   A. Selection of professional staff, and their recommendation for appointment to the Utica Board of Education
   B. Determination of the organization, curriculum, and operating procedures of the program
   C. Fiscal control of funds not included in the regular budget of the Utica Board of Education

III. The Utica Board of Education shall:
   A. Formally appoint the professional staff
   B. Approve the budget
   C. Have legal control of local tax and ESEA funds . . .

IV. Each member institution which has a summer program shall:
   A. Select and appoint Counselor-Tutors from their student body
   B. Select and appoint a Campus Co-ordinator
   C. Plan and implement a program, such a program to be meaningfully related to the purposes and objectives of the Consortium School
   D. Select and appoint faculty to positions available for summer

V. Each member institution shall:
   A. Provide to Consortium School students the opportunity to attend the educational and cultural events sponsored by the institution
   B. Offer to Consortium School students who qualify the privilege of taking courses for college credit

STRUCTURE OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Individuals are conditioned to a large extent by the social structure in which they live and the roles they assume. Thus

the structure of the learning environment must be designed carefully if the stated objectives are to be achieved. There are six elements of structure which are particularly important:

1. Selection of Students

   The experimental population will consist of a heterogeneous group of students chosen to reflect the current composition of the Utica School system according to socioeconomic status, sex, race, and overall academic achievement typical of students enrolled in the "modified", "general", and "college preparatory" courses of study.

2. Flexible Grouping of Students

   The present step-by-step system (graded structure) is extremely rigid and based on the assumption that every child should or does learn at the same rate. Such an assumption is obviously fallacious, and there is really no evidence to substantiate the perpetuation of the current graded system. In this program students will be assigned to Divisions (Lower Division, grades 7-9, and Upper Division, grades 10-12) and will be grouped according to interests, maturity, ability, and rate of learning. In this fashion, curriculum and students can be matched for compatibility rather than the student having to fit himself in all cases to subject matter regardless of his background, level of maturation, and idiosyncrasies.

3. Identifiable Learning Group

   The learning groups established initially will remain intact for the duration of the program, permitting and encouraging a greater degree of interpersonal interaction between pupils over a long period of time. Random sampling will result in the establishment

of learning groups which are representative of the full range of abilities and handicaps present in a typical secondary population. Teachers will capitalize on this heterogeneity to permit a continuous kind of "pupil learning from pupil" situation. Moreover, the stigma attached to "special classes" will be eliminated.

4. Student-Staff Ratio

Each group of 80 students will be assigned to four instructors, one in each of the four major disciplines: science, social science, language arts, and mathematics. In addition, two college students serving as counselor-tutors will be assigned to each instructor, resulting in a total of 16 teachers and 32 counselor-tutors. Such a staff will permit the program to be responsive to the needs, interests, and abilities of the individual student by permitting faculty sufficient time for all essential tasks, including planning.

5. Use of Teacher Teams

There will be four teacher teams, each team consisting of one teacher in each of the four major disciplines. The intent of such a design is to encourage explicit recognition of the interrelationships of knowledge and to avoid the perpetuation of curricular proliferation and the resulting specialization and separation of disciplines. Moreover, such a teaching team will have a greater opportunity to communicate among themselves in regard to common teaching problems and pupil needs. Also, such a structure will facilitate the creation of interdisciplinary courses. At the same time, in that there will be a total of four instructors in each discipline, intradisciplinary

communication about problems peculiar to each discipline will be possible and encouraged. Thus, such a design provides for faculty growth both vertically and horizontally.

6. Development of Closer, More Functional Home-Student-School Relations

Parental attitudes towards education exert a significant influence on the student. Thus, it is important that parental attitudes be positive and supportive of the purposes of the program. To that end attention must be given to encouraging the parents' awareness of the nature of the program and to achieving their active participation in the program. At the same time the limitations of the effectiveness of such an effort must be acknowledged; that is, the school is only one of many social institutions at work in the society. For example, it is unrealistic to feel that the "disadvantaged" adult will substantially revise his attitudes toward society, including the school, as a result of this endeavor alone. Rather the school must cooperate with other social institutions in an effort to develop positive parental attitudes.

THE PROCESS OF LEARNING

The Process of Learning is treated quite differently in the Consortium School. There are five features which highlight this part of the plan:

1. Four Disciplines

Although there will be four areas of study--science, social science, language arts and mathematics--these areas will be more broadly conceived than is normally the case. Language arts, for example, will not be limited to the study of the mechanics of English and other

languages, but will be expanded to include such topics as artistic expression and its evaluation, and the development of philosophical and ethical theories. The Social Sciences will include sociology and psychology as well as government and history.

2. Diversity of Learning Experience

By far the most important technique for expanding the curriculum beyond the conventional classroom setting will be the utilization of the facilities, faculty, and students of the participating colleges. Activities such as lectures, debates, films and panels on a variety of subjects, together with the availability of laboratories, galleries, libraries, and many other resources unique to colleges and not normally available to secondary school students, will provide extensive opportunities for curricular enrichment. Students will observe classes and seminars and some will enroll in college courses when it is deemed appropriate.

Students in the program will also observe and study the workings of a variety of social, governmental, and political agencies and institutions as a further extension of the classroom.

This expansion of the curriculum outside the secondary classroom will introduce students to the broader theoretical and practical fields of knowledge which are related to the subjects they are studying in a manner that simply is not possible in the school at present. For example, they will have the opportunity to observe sophisticated biological experiments in college

laboratories and could also be shown how a discovery in this field is being applied by doctors in a hospital, thus enabling them to visualize the direction in which their study of biology is moving in a far more meaningful and exciting fashion.

3. Use of Counselor-Tutors

The involvement of students from the participating colleges in the program will add yet another dimension by providing students with a greater variety of teaching personalities, bringing new perspectives to subjects and greater opportunities for individual attention.

Moreover, the counselor-tutors will serve as role models in addition to the teachers and peer-group. Inasmuch as they will represent a wide variety of personalities and areas of interest, both academic and cocurricular, while pursuing an education in order to achieve certain career and personal goals, they should help the students to develop positive attitudes toward advanced education and serve as a sounding-board for the development of student interests and aspirations.

4. Peer Group Dynamics

There is ample research and experimental evidence to demonstrate that the dynamics of the peer group have a direct effect on learning, both implicitly--through the variety of opinions, attitudes, and values which students have as a result of differing economic backgrounds--and explicitly--through the competitive spirit which underlies the scholastic structure.

An intellectually, culturally, and socioeconomically heterogeneous

student population affords the best possibilities for students to know and appreciate the diversity and pluralism which is characteristic of American society.

5. Continuity in Learning

The program will be structured to provide continuity in learning by extending the period of learning, and at the same time providing diversity in the learning environment. This will be facilitated by a six-week summer residency on campus of one of the member colleges. The extended period of learning will enable teachers to better identify strengths and weaknesses of individual students and to prepare and implement individualized learning programs.

We have no illusions; the program is not a panacea, rather a plan that seems to have the potential to effect broad-scale, meaningful, permanent change. For us in the Consortium School it represents an acid test of whether the educational institution, secondary and higher, can itself implement reforms which alleviate the present crisis.

THE STUDENT MEETING

Hans Klint
Syracuse, New York

No critique of Upward Bound in New York State could be complete without the opinions and judgments of students enrolled in the projects. At the Albany meeting, student representatives discussed and evaluated their respective projects and, where possible, made recommendations which they felt would be meaningful for programs throughout the State.

Although I was moderator, my part in the conference was intentionally minimal and restricted to overcoming the reticence of individuals and to making our comments as honest and forthright as possible.

One of the areas in which the students were relatively satisfied was the breadth of the Upward Bound curricula. In the main, they found that the subjects offered were diverse, significant, and well taught. However, most of the students felt that the academic program could be improved if courses in study techniques were developed and instituted in all programs, especially for the benefit of new entrants to the programs. From another perspective, while some of the students complained of an excess of courses in some programs, others would have preferred a curriculum in which liberal arts courses were limited in number and were replaced by courses in, for example, business administration.

Students expressed concern that they were not usually consulted in the selection of cultural events they were asked to attend. Most felt that there were programs they would have preferred as alternatives to those selected. Some black students, for example, would have opted for a visit to the African Ballet as opposed to events completely indigenous to Western culture.

Of considerable importance to the student representatives was the matter of staffing. Many black students and the one Puerto Rican representative complained of a lack of racial balance on both the teaching and counselor-tutor staff. However, of those who lodged this complaint, the majority felt that the quality of neither of the two areas should be sacrificed to achieve a more balanced representation of black or Puerto Rican faculty members. The demands of the students were directed toward a more vigorous and dynamic effort by administrators to hire qualified staff who would insure a more equitable and effective racial distribution.

Another grievance dealt with the inaccessibility of teaching staff after classroom hours. The majority of students would have liked an arrangement in which instructors were scheduled to provide academic help in the dormitories during the evening rather than relying on tutor-counselors who, a minority of students complained, were frequently unavailable for tutoring as programmed or were not competent for the task.

The students fully appreciated the fact that the successful maintenance of Upward Bound programs required certain disciplinary

measures. Where disciplinary problems fell within the jurisdiction of student government, however, the judicial process failed because the members of that group were too responsive to the attitudes and criticisms of their fellow students. Those Upward Bounders who were concerned about this problem recommended a more extensive liaison between faculty and student government as a stabilizing influence upon the group.

Many students saw another disciplinary problem in the handling of chronically disruptive students. The consensus was that the Upward Bound administration was more lenient than was appropriate, and students who were disruptive were retained in programs longer than if the student group were to make that decision.

Two other aspects of the programs received moderate criticism: 1) The food offered at some institutions was substandard and included unpalatable items such as powdered eggs; 2) Students could not secure their belongings at some colleges because the doors to their rooms had no locks.

In a remarkable show of unity, and with reference to the pressure of the continuity of the species, <u>all</u> students felt that the hiatus imposed on dating between students in some of the programs was a negative factor.

It was clear that student criticisms were similar to those of the Upward Bound directors. More important was the fact that these young people were able to articulate problems of some urgency among themselves and, later, in a dialogue with the project

directors. Moreover, the student meeting revealed clearly the high degree of student interest and concern that they have a greater voice in the development of ever more meaningful Upward Bound programs.

COLLEGIATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

The College Committee on Educational Opportunity was formed in 1964 as an advisory group to the State Education Department and the Association of Colleges and Universities in the State of New York. To date the Committee has prepared guidelines for college self-study, distributed publications, including "Expanding Opportunities for Higher Education," surveyed admissions programs, prepared a master plan for collegiate educational opportunities, and offer consultative services to institutions in New York State. Its members are:

Dr. Anna Burrell
State University College
1300 Elmwood Avenue
Buffalo, New York

Mr. Charles J. Calitri, Director
Programs for Intercultural Education
Hofstra University
Hempstead, L.I., New York

Dr. James A. Colston
President
Bronx Community College
120 East 184th Street
Bronx, New York

*Mr. Lester W. Ingalls
Executive Vice President and
Secretary, Association of Colleges and
Universities of the State of New York
100 State Street
Albany, New York

Dr. Leonard T. Kreisman
Director, Institutional Research
State University College
Oneonta, New York

Mother Elizabeth McCormack
President
Manhattanville College
Purchase, New York

Dr. G. Bruce Dearing
President
State University of New York
Vestal Parkway East
Binghamton, New York

Mr. Candido de Leon, Chairman
Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
The City University of New York
535 East 80th Street
New York, New York

Mr. James Doremus
Dean of Students
Utica College
Burrstone Road
Utica, New York

Dr. George E. Fitch
Supervising Principal
Greenburgh School District #8
475 West Hartsdale Avenue
Warburg Campus
Hartsdale, New York

Mr. Arnold L. Goren
Dean of Admissions
New York University
100 Washington Square East
New York, New York

Mr. Owen F. Peagler, Deputy Director
Office of Economic Opportunity
342 Madison Avenue
New York, New York

Mrs. Harriet Richardson Michel, Coordinator
College Assistance Program
National Scholarship Service
and Fund for Negro Students
6 East 82nd Street
New York, New York

Mrs. Victoria Ruiz, Director
Scholarship and Loan Center
ASPIRA, Inc.
296 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

Dr. Frederick H. Williams, Director
Human Relations Unit, Board of
Education of the City of New York
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York

*Mr. Donald M. Winkelman
Associate in Higher Education
State Education Department
Albany, New York

*Continuing members