DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 875 RC 005 252

TITLE	Wednesday's Children; A Report on Programs Funded Under the Migrant Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
INSTITUTION	National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	132p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Community Migrant Projects, *Educational Quality, Expenditures, *Federal Programs, *Migrant Children, Migrant Education, National Programs, *National Surveys, Operations Research, Planning, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires, School Visitation, State Programs, Working Parents, Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

Findings and recommendations growing from a 1-year study of the status of education for the children of migratory farm workers are presented. The major focus of this Ford Foundation study is an evaluation of programs financed through special Federal migrant education funds authorized by Congress in a 1966 amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Using as principal sources of information the Migrant Programs Branch of the U.S. Office of Education, state education agencies, local project questionnaires, and site visits, the following specific areas of migrant education were monitored and reported upon: (1) national program planning, (2) allocation of Federal migrant education funds to the states, (3) expenditures of Federal migrant education funds within the states, (4) participation of migrant children, (5) staffing, (6) educational planning and implementation, (7) educationally related services, and (8) participation of migrant parents. A general conclusion is reached that immediate changes to the existing Migrant Amendment to Title I are required to guarantee that migrant children receive the services they need; however, the Migrant Amendment has succeeded in mobilizing most state education agencies to develop services for migrant children. A complete section of the document is devoted to specific findings and recommendations, and an appendix of tables is included. (AL)

wednesday's children

A Report on Programs Funded Under the Migrant Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

NATIONAL COMMITTEE
ON THE EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN
145 East 32nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10016

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 70-155731

Printed in the United States of America

PREFACE

Over the past fifty years there have been sporadic efforts to provide some sort of education for migrant children. For the most part these efforts were initiated by private organizations and were directed toward only a few children. It was not until the mid-sixties when federal funds became available specifically for migrant education, first under the Economic Opportunity Act, and then under an amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that the public schools became involved on a nationwide basis.

However, it soon became evident that late appropriations, inexperienced personnel, uneasiness about federal intervention in the local schools, and the lack of any national leadership or plan for educating the migrant child were ample reason to fear for the effectiveness of these programs. When, after three years of federal support for the education of migrant children, there were still many unanswered questions about the administration and effectiveness of the ESEA migrant programs, the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children decided that there was a real need to monitor these programs in order to gain the necessary information to begin to assess whether they were meeting the needs of the children. The monitoring effort was funded by the Ford Foundation. This report is the result of the investigation.

We are saddened that this is not a more optimistic report. We regret to add yet another to a growing list of accounts of failures in the public schools. This one is, perhaps, even sadder because migrant children have already been more shortchanged than any others among our nation's children. They are indeed Wednesday's children—"the children of woe."

The National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children is a private, non-profit organization. It operates as a program division of the National Child Labor Committee which was founded in 1904 to fight against the exploitation of children in industry and agriculture. Its sole purpose is to improve the educational opportunities for migrant children. It provides consultation services to governmental agencies and private organizations, and through its information services keeps the general public alert to the educational needs of migrant children. The Committee is committed to the use of the public schools as the major means for educating migrant children.

We want to express our appreciation to all those who contributed to this report. Without the cooperation of migrant parents and their children, teachers, staff and directors of state and local projects, and the Migrant

Programs Branch of the United States Office of Education this report would not have been possible. We are also grateful to those members of the NCEMC Advisory Committee who assisted the staff in the development of the plans for the study and who read and offered helpful comments on the manuscript.

Cassandra Stockburger
Director

December, 1970

Study Staff

Mrs. Sally Sullivan, Study Director
Mrs. Irene Nannery, Secretary
Mrs. Maren Potter, Research Assistant
Nicole Potter, Research Assistant
Jane Clark Seitz, Editor
Leonard Mayhew, Editor

Study Consultants*

Jesse Frank Clay
Mrs. Karolyn R. Gould
Dr. Paul Graubard
Harry Lewis
Dr. Roy McCanne
Pablo Navarro
Dr. Ronald Petrie
Dr. Thomas Roberson
Clarence Thompkins
Dr. Houston Wade
Hector Zavaleta

*See biographies pages 131-2.

CONTENTS

Introduction to the Monitoring Project: Goals, Resources, and Methods

This report will present the findings and recommendations growing from a one-year study of the status of education for the children of migratory farm workers. More specifically, the report will focus on programs financed through special federal migrant education funds, authorized by the Congress in a 1966 amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Monitoring Project was financed through a grant of $63,030 from the Ford Foundation. It was conducted by a private agency, the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children, and had available the resources of this Committee and its parent agency, the National Child Labor Committee. These resources included the ongoing supervision and daily participation of NCEMC's Director, who has been actively involved in migrant education for the past 16 years. There was also frequent consultation with the Executive Director of NCLC and with members of NCEMC's Advisory Committee, many of whom have done pioneering work in the field of migrant education.

One full-time staff member who was employed to direct the project had the services of a secretary throughout the year and part-time research assistance for three months. In addition, nine consultants participated in site visits to migrant education projects, and two consultants provided specialized services in connection with educational finance and statistics.

The project year began on October 1, 1969, and may be roughly divided into three phases: planning (five months), data collection (five months), and data analysis and writing (two months). The principal sources of information were:

1) *The Migrant Programs Branch of the United States Office of Education.* Three conferences during the project's planning phase and frequent communication throughout the year provided guidance and specific information about legislation, administration, and finance. Of special help was the cooperation of the Migrant Programs Branch in transmitting and helping to interpret state expenditure reports.

2) *State Education Agencies.* State migrant education directors and staff participated in several ways. Their response to a "Checklist of Available Information about Migrant Education" sent in November assisted in planning the study, both by indicating what information state agencies could provide and also by making it clear that most program information would have to be secured directly from local projects. State questionnaires were mailed in early May; by July, 43

of the 45 states with migrant education programs had responded to at least three questionnaire items relating to estimated migrant enrollments. However, the full 15-item questionnaire was returned by only 32 states, and much of the information was incomplete or unclear. It could therefore not be used as a source of nationwide data. In addition, at various times throughout the project year, state directors in Florida, New York, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin met individually with project staff and provided much valuable guidance and information.

3) *Local Project Questionnaires.* In February, preliminary questionnaires were mailed on a trial basis to a small sample of local education agencies. The 50 replies received were extremely helpful in finding out the kinds of information available from the local projects and in formulating a shorter, more specific questionnaire, which concentrated on programs for the 1968-69 school year and the 1969 summer session.

In May, this revised questionnaire was mailed to about 400 local migrant education projects. (In California and New Mexico, regional migrant education directors helped greatly by distributing questionnaires and encouraging local response.) Replies to this questionnaire yielded more complete statistical information than any other source. The response was as follows:

Total response	*223 projects*
Included in sample	183 projects
Not included	40 projects

The reasons for excluding 40 replies were as follows:

No program for time period requested	7
Some information omitted or unclear	30
Replies arrived after data were compiled	3

In geographic distribution, the 183 sample projects represented 39 states in all sections of the country, not including Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Vermont. In migrant enrollments, the sample included about 35,000 migrant pupils in 120 school year projects and 20,000 in 131 summer projects. (Not all projects had programs during both sessions.) On the basis of available estimates of migrant enrollments throughout the nation, these sample projects appear to have enrolled about one-fourth of the nationwide total for fiscal year 1969. They spent $10.2 million in federal migrant education funds, or almost exactly one-fourth of the $40.3 million total nationwide expenditures.

Thus, the local project questionnaire response would seem to constitute a substantial and reasonably representative sample of migrant education projects throughout the nation.

4) *Site Visits.* Thirteen local migrant education projects were visited by teams of staff and consultants. Within the limitations of time and budget, sites were selected to provide as much variety as possible in geographic location, size of projects, timing of peak migrant enrollments, ethnic backgrounds of the migrant children, and types of

agriculture for which migrant labor was needed. For summer site visits, local questionnaire responses were available as an aid to selecting projects to be visited, and in some states, migrant education directors suggested programs they felt would give us the variety we sought. However, no claim is made that these 13 projects were in any way representative of hundreds of others throughout the country. Findings from site visits apply only to the programs we actually observed.

During the 1969-70 school year, teams visited three Florida counties, two school districts in Texas, and one in New York State. During the 1970 summer session, site visits were made to a five-county region in California, one school district in each of four states (Illinois, New Jersey, New York, and Washington), and two school districts in Wisconsin.

The most important qualification sought in site observers was thorough, direct experience in migrant education: however, educators who were currently employed by programs receiving ESEA Title I migrant funds were excluded. Altogether the consultants had had experience with migrant education in many parts of the country. This experience included classroom teaching, school administration, community organization, teacher training and health education. In ethnic background, they included: Anglo (5), Negro (2), Mexican (1) and Puerto Rican (1). Three consultants and one staff member were bi-lingual in Spanish and English. Detailed accounts of the observers' backgrounds are presented elsewhere in this report. (See page 131.)

The instruments used as guides for reporting on site visits were based on consultants' suggestions, as discussed at a one-day briefing session in February. Program information was collected largely through interviews with project staff, community representatives, and migrant families, and through observations in schools, classrooms, migrant camps, and special facilities such as health clinics and day care centers. However, the format of the guides not only permitted but demanded initiative in finding sources of information, flexibility in adapting to local situations, and the ability to combine evidence from many sources in arriving at judgments. The guides were intended to be used by men—not robots. The reliability of site observers' findings is based solely on their individual and team resources.

Most visits were made by teams of two or three persons and lasted for two or three days. Exceptions were the Texas visits, in which four team members participated for three days in two school districts, and one Florida county, where a consultant worked with a team of college students over a six weeks' period. Wherever possible, family interviews were conducted by team members of the same ethnic background as the migrant families. At least one bi-lingual team member was included on all visits. For the purpose of continuity, one of the two staff members (either the NCEMC director or the project director) was present on all visits but one.

The six instruments used in collecting data for the study (state check-

lists and questionnaires, local questionnaires, and guides used by site visitors) are available to qualified researchers on request.

As a final introductory note, it must be stated that, at the end of the study as at the beginning, there are more questions than answers about migrant education. The simplest facts about the children and the school programs are still unknown. One by one, the questions posed at the beginning of the study had to be dropped because the information needed to answer them could not be secured. For example, it was found necessary to limit most data to a single fiscal year, 1969.

Many factors contributed to these difficulties. To state the problems encountered during one year's effort to research migrant education is to mirror the far more severe and poignant problems encountered by migrant farm workers throughout their entire lives. Migrants are hard to count because they are always moving and hard to characterize in statistical terms because they have for generations been isolated from the very contacts and services to which researchers usually turn as sources of information.

I. National Program Planning

Migrant children are found at some time during the year in each of 47 states. (Only Alaska, Hawaii and Rhode Island report no use of migrant farm labor.) Most of these children will live for various periods of time in two or more states. Their periods of migration do not coincide with the school term, but rather include, as a rule, the end of one term in the spring and the beginning of another in the fall. Therefore their education should become the concern of more than one school district in more than one state.

Given these patterns of migration, the education of migrant children is a problem, national in scope and interstate in nature. Any effort to provide for migrant children's educational needs must likewise be nationwide and include the many states involved.

Obviously the task of giving leadership to such efforts must be the responsibility of the United States Office of Education. Over the years the USOE has shown varying degrees of interest in providing such leadership, usually commensurate with the degree of pressure brought by outside groups concerned with the education of migrant children.

For a number of years prior to the appropriation of funds under the 1966 amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the USOE did have a person on its staff designated to handle questions related to migrant education. However, this person never enjoyed the benefits of any substantial funds with which to either promote interest in or develop programs in migrant education.

With the passage of the migrant education amendment a small staff was assembled to handle the administration of these funds. From the beginning the number of staff members was inadequate and the initial development of the program was handicapped. Within the past two years a larger staff has been provided. This staff is responsible for determining allocation of funds, approving and funding state grants and seeing that the guidelines established for the program are adhered to in the administration of state programs.

However, it has long been the contention of the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children that the USOE also must assume a strong role in national planning. It has been the Committee's belief that solutions to the educational problems of migrant children are not to be found in the hit or miss manner of present patterns of program development by the states and local school districts. Therefore, we have found serious deficiencies in this area in the USOE. This is not to say that some efforts have not been made by the staff of the Migrant Programs Branch to influence program priorities and administrative policies and procedures. In 1969 four program

priorities were established and all states were asked to incorporate at least these into their programs. They were: (1) nutrition and health; (2) individualization of instruction; (3) in-service training; and (4) oral language development. Site visits carried out during the course of this study did not indicate that these priorities were necessarily being emphasized in those programs observed. Also in 1969 the national staff initiated Project T.I.M.E. (Total Involvement in Migrant Education) as a tool for more effective management. Its purpose was to increase the time allotted by the states in the planning and development phases of their migrant education programs. However, in our contacts with state education agencies no mention was made of Project T.I.M.E. as an important factor in their planning.

Major energies and concerns of both the national staff and the states have been devoted to the development of an Interstate Record Transfer System. The Arkansas Education Department was funded in 1969 for the amount of $426,150 to develop the System which was to operate manually in fiscal year 1970 and become mechanized in 1971. NCEMC has made no effort to evaluate this phase of the program since its stage of development is such that evaluation at this time would, we believe, have little significance. However, it should be noted, that while local administrators in those schools visited by NCEMC observers are complying with record keeping procedures, they do not share the optimism of the national and state leaders that such a record system will solve their problems in educating migrant children.

Certainly the very existence of the federal funding for migrant education has brought about unprecedented involvement of the public schools. It has created awareness of the presence of migrant children in communities where school leaders had never recognized their existence before.

However, there remain a number of areas in which the USOE has not involved itself and which seem essential if the best use is to be made of the funds available. For example, no procedures have been developed for the evaluation and monitoring of programs. To date the only evaluative measures available are self-evaluation reports submitted annually by the state directors in compliance with the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Little or no technical assistance is available to states and local projects from Washington. In a word, the USOE is performing a funding function but has little knowledge of how the funds thus granted are being spent.

In fairness to the staff of the Migrant Programs Branch we would like to emphasize that this limited role is not necessarily of their own making. The Branch is inadequately funded, disgracefully so. Funds available for the expenses of the Branch for the past three fiscal years have been provided on the basis of a continuing resolution which has meant that the exact amount was not known until well into the fiscal year. According to information from the Chief of the Branch:

> In FY-69 and FY-70 we were not notified until October. In FY-69 we spent $25,000, of which approximately $17,000 was allotted to Project

T I.M.E., our management model. In FY-69, however, our allotment was $8,500 as of October and $19,000 in April. For FY-70 we were notified in October that $7,900 would be available for S&E (Salaries and Expenditures) funds, a sum considerably lower than program priorities necessitated. We spent $11,000.

Obviously the administration of such a multi-million dollar program on a nationwide basis requires and deserves more adequate funding than that described above.

Because of the uncertainty of funding, staff have found that they have frequently been unable to visit projects until late in the year when it is too late to make changes which would have improved the services offered.

This lack of adequate funding cannot be dismissed as a lack of funds in the Health, Education and Welfare budget, but must be attributed to the relatively low priority assigned to the activities of the Migrant Programs Branch within the HEW bureaucracy.

While the Migrant Programs Branch is expected to operate on such ridiculously inadequate funds the Office of Planning and Evaluation of HEW has spent tens of thousands of dollars in several contracts related to migrant education. One of these contracts was to evaluate the ability of community leaders to act as project evaluators. The other projects were related to the development of a design for reporting to the Secretary of HEW and the Commissioner of Education. None of these projects is specifically designed to further the cause of migrant children's education, but each is simply a means of testing designs for evaluative and reporting techniques.

However, we do not see that inadequate administrative funding is justification for a failure to assume a dominant leadership role for programs developed with federal funds. It would seem imperative that the USOE must place the highest priority on development of the most effective means of educating migrant children. National goals and strategies for implementation of these goals must be established. In a matter so crucial as the futures of several hundred thousand children there can be no place for political maneuvering and protection of state and local interests when they stand in the way of meeting a child's needs.

The nationwide and interstate nature of the migrant child's educational problems calls not for 47 separate ways of attacking the problem, but for national leadership and planning which exhibit a united purpose and determination to find the migrant child wherever he is and meet his needs whatever they may be.

II. Allocation of Federal Migrant Education Funds to the States

Special federal funds to help educate migrant children were first authorized by Congress in a 1966 amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Before this amendment was passed, migrant children were—and continue to be—eligible for the special educational assistance which Title I provides for all low-income children. However, very few local school districts used their Title I funds to serve migrant children until funds were earmarked especially for them. Migrant education funds are allocated to the states. The states, in turn, distribute them to local school districts which serve migrant children; or, states may operate migrant education programs directly (as New Jersey does) or through private agencies (a method used until recently by Minnesota and North Dakota).

Problems of Determining the Number of Migrant Children in Each State

Formulas for allocating Title I funds (both regular and migrant) are based in part on a determination of the number of eligible school-age children residing in the area to be funded. However, nobody really knows how many migrant school-age children resided in each state during all or part of a given year. Until there were federal funds, there was really no reason why school officials should try very hard to find out. Children who come and go at unpredictable times disrupt the orderly administration of a school and pose severe problems for traditional teaching methods. To this day, few state migrant education directors would profess to know exactly how many migrant children there are *in* their own states.

Estimates of the number of school-age migrant children in each state have therefore been derived from employment statistics on *adult* migratory farm workers collected by the Farm Labor Offices of the United States Department of Labor. However, there is the same problem with these statistics as there is with most other data about migrants. Because farm workers are not protected by most federal and state labor laws, there are no very accurate records on the number of agricultural migrants who worked in a given area during a given month. Farm Labor Office figures include only those workers who register with them or whose presence is reported by some cooperative employers. Those who live in substandard housing are not likely to be reported, nor are those who travel in buses or trucks which do not meet safety regulations. A survey which NCEMC conducted in 1968 showed wide variations in the data-collecting methods used by Farm Labor Offices throughout the country.

As unreliable as the Farm Labor Office data are, they have been used by the United States Commissioner of Education as the "best available method" for determining the number of children in each state who are eligible for special programs funded through federal migrant education funds. The number of migrant children in each state has been computed at 75% of the estimated monthly average number (or "full-time equivalency") of adult migrants employed in that state during the most recent year for which Department of Labor estimates have been compiled.

Thus, to the uncertainty of the employment statistics, this "magic formula" has added the equally doubtful assumption that each adult migrant who travels to do farm work brings along wherever he goes an average three-fourths of a school-age child. Even a cursory examination of the facts shows that while migrant workers in some localities tend to travel with large families, there are other areas where the migrant farm labor force includes a large proportion of single men.

Since 1967, an alternate but still shaky source of information has been available through state education agency estimates—filed with applications for federal migrant education funds—of the number of migrant children "to be served" in programs financed through these funds. Any relationship between these state education agency estimates and figures derived from Farm Labor Office compilations would appear to be pure coincidence. For example, for fiscal year 1969, state education agencies estimated a total of 208,872 migrant children "to be served," while the "magic formula" yielded a "full-time equivalency" of 157,153.

A 1970 amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act *permits* state education agency estimates of "children to be served" to be used as an alternate basis for allocating federal migrant education funds. However, as migrant education officials have pointed out, the phrase "children to be served" is not easy to interpret: Does it mean the number of children who *ought* to be served, are *hopefully* to be served, or are *actually* to be served? According to a letter of September 11, 1970, from the Chief of the Migrant Programs Branch, United States Office of Education:

> A draft of the Title I Regulations indicates no supplemental interpretation of the legislation naming "children to be served." Our office is requesting subsequent interpretation of the relationship of the "children to be served" clause and the original allocation formula. For FY-71, however, initial State allocations have been determined by the formula.

Problems in Identifying Migrant Children

Difficulties in arriving at an equitable method of allocating federal migrant education funds among the states are intensified by the lack of a precise, uniform definition of a "migrant child." The United States Office of Education defines a migrant child as one who has

> . . . moved with his family from one school district to another during the past year in order that a parent or other member of his immediate

family might secure employment in agriculture or in related food processing.

However, there is no official federal definition of the occupations to be included in "agriculture" and "related food processing," so that interpretations vary from state to state, and from project to project. To compare two site visit reports:

> As to the occupations classified as agricultural, the coordinator reported that by far the largest number of parents work in the citrus groves. A few are in related occupations, such as driving trucks or processing citrus concentrate. The State Education Department disallowed the inclusion of peripheral occupations, such as workers in phosphate mines, even though phosphate is used as fertilizer in the groves.
>
> (A Florida county)

* * *

> The project coordinator was quite open about saying that he includes in his migrant count children whose parents work in related occupations: "Even if they make shovels, they're used in agriculture. If they're poor, I get them in, one way or another." (A New York State school district)

There are also variations among the states in the extent to which they make use of the "five-year amendment" of 1968, which provides that

> . . . with the concurrence of his parents, a migratory child of a migratory agricultural worker shall be deemed to continue to be such a child for a period, not in excess of five years, during which he resides in the area served by the agency carrying on a program or project under this subsection.

This amendment has led to attempts to distinguish between "true" or "current" migrants (who have migrated within the past year) and "five-year" migrants (who have settled out of migrancy during the past five years).

State questionnaire responses would indicate that the great majority of children served by ESEA Title I migrant funds during fiscal year 1969 were "true" migrants. According to a tabulation of responses on this item, 91% of the children served during the 1968-69 regular school year and 78% of the children served during the summer session were "true" migrants.*

There appeared to be great variation in practice among the states. Eight states (California, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Carolina, Utah, and Virginia) reported serving current migrants only during both regular and summer sessions. Two other states (Florida and Texas) reported serving only current migrants during the school year, with small numbers of "five-year" migrants during the summer. However, in six states (Illinois, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, Oklahoma, and Washington), half or more of all migrant children served during both sessions were reported as

*It should be noted that internal inconsistencies within state questionnaires make these figures difficult to interpret precisely. Their reliability is called into question by the fact that many state directors gave different total figures in responding to the three questions about enrollment breakdowns for migrant children.

"five-year" migrants, and two states (Mississippi and Vermont) reported all children served as five-year migrants.

Local site visits also revealed great variations in practice from one project to another. As consultants reported:

> School officials report that 2,100 migrant children are enrolled in the district. These figures represent current migrants. There were no estimates of number of children of families who have settled out of migrancy in the past five years (A Texas school district)

* * *

> School officials estimate 3,300 migrant children in the Region, which is a five-county agricultural area . . .There was no indication of funds being used for any other than current migrants.
>
> (A California five-county Region)

* * *

> Since recruiting is primarily among regular school-year children who need help, it would seem that few current migrants can enroll. Before the close of the school year, teachers were asked to recommend children from their classes. With an enrollment cutoff of 120 in the summer program, chances of vacancies by the time the true migrants arrive are slim. (A Washington State summer school)

* * *

> School officials have *no* estimates on the number of children enrolled who are current migrants. According to the coordinator's liberal definition, a child qualifies as a "migrant" if someone in the family works in an agriculturally related job. In this small-industry town, most families have more than one wage earner. Work rotation from seasonal factory work to seasonal farm work is common. Thus—as defined by the coordinator—most local year-round residents would seem to qualify as "migrants."
>
> School people do plan a census, so as to be prepared for accountability, which they foresee soon.
>
> My impression was that there were some "true" migrants in the area, but that they lived in outlying areas and that their enrollment was somewhat limited by the number of available school buses.
>
> (A New Jersey summer school)

* * *

> Total enrollment of 89 consists almost entirely of children from current migrant families. I found only three families who have settled out of migrancy within the past five years. The majority of families contacted in my interviews were currently migrating from home base in the Valley of Texas. (An Illinois summer school)

* * *

> The director *estimated* the enrollment as being 60% migrant and 40% other. Apparently there is no effort to determine five-year status.
>
> (A New York State summer school)

Problems Caused by Late Appropriations

As every newspaper reader knows, federal education appropriations are sometimes delayed while Congress debates other issues. These delays have contributed to problems in developing educational programs for migrant children, among others.

Until a federal education appropriations bill is passed and signed, the United States Office of Education does not know how much money there will be to allocate among the states. Each state's share cannot be determined before the total amount of the funds is known. Sometimes, a fiscal year is well under way or almost over before the Office of Education is in a position to tell each state exactly how much money it will receive for that year's migrant education programs. In the meantime, funds are allocated on a quarterly basis under a "continuing resolution" which permits no program expansion. Even continuation of the previous year's funding is not an absolute certainty, and some states—fearful of having to pick up the tab for federal funds which may not materialize—cut back on budgets until they know for sure.

For fiscal 1969, full allocations could not be authorized until December, five months after the beginning of the fiscal year. In fiscal 1970, the situation was even worse: by March, when the exact amount of the full allocations was known, the fiscal year had only four months to run. By this time, migrant workers in some of the southern states were beginning to move north to follow the crops, and the money which had just been allocated to the states where their children had been going to school all winter was of no use to them.

In view of the extremely late funding in fiscal 1970, it is fortunate that states will be permitted to carry over unused funds into fiscal 1971. However, some state directors have reported that regulations governing the carryover of funds—specifically, those which require decisions in the spring about whether to spend funds in the summer or hold them for the fall—turn program planning into a kind of "Russian roulette": it is hard to know until the summer migrants arrive whether funds will be more needed in the summer or the fall.

A 1970 amendment also permits the transfer of the unused part of one state's allocation to another. However, we have not yet seen a copy of the regulations which spell out the procedures. According to a letter of September 11, 1970, from the Chief of the Migrant Programs Branch of the United States Office of Education:

> Reallocation may be possible between states after sufficient evidence that the state requesting funds unused in another state has more children to be served than its initial allocation indicated.

It seems important that workable procedures be developed to permit the carryover and transfer of migrant education funds. In the past, the lack of flexibility—combined with late appropriations—has meant that the maximum allocation available to a state has not always been budgeted for and granted.

As the following table shows, during the first three years of program operation under the Migrant Amendment, there was *an uncommitted balance of over four million dollars*, of which the greatest amount was in fiscal 1968.

ESEA Title I Migrant Funds
(Millions of Dollars)

	Fiscal Year			Three-Year Total
	1967	1968	1969	
Maximum Allocation	$9.7	$41.7	$45.6	$97.0
Grants to States	9.5	37.7	45.4	92.6
Uncommitted Balance	0.2	4.0	0.2	4.4

III. Expenditure of Federal Migrant Education Funds Within the States

Procedures to Assure Accountability

A thorough, precise assessment of all of the factors involved in accountability would require teams of auditors, not educational consultants. At this writing, no audits of migrant education programs have been completed by the Audit Agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Our correspondence with this agency indicates that some local project audits will be completed soon.

We did, however, secure some information worth reporting about accountability for the use of federal migrant education funds. One aspect of accountability—the use of migrant education funds to serve migrant children—has already been discussed in connection with problems in identifying migrant children. Our information shows that not all funds are being used to serve the children of current migratory agricultural workers. While we recognize the urgency of meeting the educational needs of rural poor children—especially those handicapped by years of former migrancy—the use of limited Title I *migrant* funds (rather than regular Title I funds) for this purpose must be questioned.

Two other aspects of accountability—the maintenance of state and local support for migrant education and the use of a variety of federal funding sources to meet migrant children's educational needs—were very difficult to investigate. Assurances of maintenance of effort must accompany each state application for migrant education funds. However, at present, there is no agreement at the federal level on what documentation should be required of the states to demonstrate that:

> The amounts of funds derived from state and local revenue that are expended for free public education of migratory children will be maintained at the same level as they would have been maintained if no projects had been approved.

Perhaps the lack of federally required documentation is partly responsible for the fact that neither state education agencies nor local school systems have procedures for separate accounting of funds spent for migrant children from sources other than the Migrant Amendment to Title I.

Responses to local project questionnaires provided some clues to the differing degrees local school districts rely on federal migrant education funds to meet basic educational needs of migrant children. Project directors were asked to estimate what part of the cost of five educational services to migrant children were paid by ESEA Title I migrant funds during fiscal year 1969.

They were asked to check whether federal migrant education funds paid the "total cost," "half or more," "less than half," or "none."

Among projects which reported that federal migrant education funds were used to pay the *total* cost of some of these five services to migrant children, there were far more summer sessions than regular school year programs:

PER CENT OF PROJECTS REPORTING THAT ESEA TITLE I MIGRANT FUNDS PAID THE TOTAL COST OF SOME SERVICES TO MIGRANT CHILDREN

	1968-69 Regular School Year	1969 Summer Session
Teachers' Salaries	22%	65%
Pupil Transportation	9%	58%
Building Operation and Maintenance	6%	37%
Food Services	15%	61%
Health Services	24%	51%

Other data secured in answer to this question are presented in the appendix. Our interpretation is that these data raise serious questions about whether some projects—especially summer programs—are maintaining local support for the education of migrant children.

Delays in Securing Expenditure Reports

Up to this time, there have been no public reports on actual expenditures of federal migrant funds. Annual progress reports prepared by the Migrant Programs Branch of the United States Office of Education have dealt only with state budgets and expenditure *projections*. When project staff requested expenditure reports, there was some resistance at all administrative levels, and repeated follow-up was necessary to secure them.

The effort it took to persuade migrant education officials to part with expenditure reports may be attributed partly to the self-protective instincts which seem native to any bureaucracy. There were also indications that our requests were simply inconvenient and somewhat bothersome. As one senior fiscal specialist put it in a telephone conversation: "I have larger amounts of money to worry about than these migrant funds."

Program Officials' Lack of Fiscal Knowledge

Probably the major source of delay in securing solid fiscal data about federal migrant education funds was that the program administrators from whom we first inquired about this information did not have ready access to it themselves. At all administrative levels—federal, state, and local—there seemed to be a communications gap between program departments and

accounting departments, even when they were housed in the same building. It was shocking to find that our persistence in pursuing fiscal information from program directors to accountants sometimes appeared to result in a program director's seeing for the first time an expenditure report on his own program. It is hard to see how program directors' responsibilities can be discharged without information on the current state of their finances.

Site visits also showed that many local project directors were only vaguely familiar with the financing of their programs. Their lack of fiscal knowledge made it difficult for consultants to assess financial accountability factors in the projects they visited. Project directors' lack of understanding of their financial responsibilities and their lack of participation in budget planning seemed to some consultants to hinder the most effective use of funds.

> There is general dissatisfaction with this year's funding which is about $7,000 less than previously. The local people say the state made the budget decisions. The state says they only indicated the formula used to arrive at the total amount. The state had many more applicants for funds than funds available. Consequently, they took all of the proposals and funded them for about 75 percent of what they asked for. The state arrived at a formula and notified the districts of the total dollar amount that they had available to run their projects. In this local project, for example, the limitation of funds made the local director decide that they would only take 120 children into the program.
>
> (A Washington State summer school)

* * *

> The director of the program doesn't have any control over the budget or the proposal for the following year. The superintendent and board are responsible for that phase of the program. The superintendent at the time of my visit was in Europe on a trip and could not be reached for comment. The director indicated that there were some things that he might do differently if he had an opportunity to help plan the program. When asked why he didn't do them anyhow, he said he hadn't had permission and direction from the superintendent.
>
> This program had a budget of approximately $13,000 to pay for five teachers and five teacher-aides. Two groups of migrants who normally come into the area did not arrive this year. Consequently, they had a much smaller enrollment (about 65) than they expected (120). It was estimated that they would spend approximately $10,000 rather than the $13,000.
>
> In this summer school there were no breakfasts or physical education program for the children. Several migrant parents had asked that their children get swimming lessons, and there was a local community pool, but no arrangements had been made for the migrant children to use it. Yet when I asked the director why some funds couldn't be used for such purposes, he said he didn't know and that he didn't have any control over the budget.
>
> There also seemed to be a lack of understanding between the local

project people and the state director of migrant education concerning how much money a local project can apply for and what the program should be. The local people were of the opinion that the state tells them how much money they are going to receive, whereas the state director indicated that his instructions to the local districts are to develop a program based on need and then put in for money that fits the program. Local educators appear to be reluctant to take this approach, however.

(An Illinois summer school)

What the State Expenditure Reports Showed

State expenditure reports on ESEA Title I migrant funds are prepared by the senior fiscal officers of each state and filed quarterly with the senior fiscal specialist in the Operations Branch, Division of Compensatory Education, United States Office of Education. The reports transmitted to us on April 20, 1970, by the Migrant Programs Branch of the United States Office of Education provided total adjusted expenditures for fiscal years 1967 and 1968, and both totals and breakdowns by expenditure account for fiscal 1969. Because, to the best of our knowledge, these reports have never before been combined and made available to the public, our compilations of them are included in the appendix.

In summary, what they show is that of *$92.6 million in federal migrant education program grants to the states during three fiscal years, $12.6 million (or 14%) had not been spent* at the time these reports were filed.

ESEA TITLE I MIGRANT FUNDS
Millions of Dollars

	Fiscal Year			Three-Year Total
	1967	1968	1969	
Program Grants	$9.5	$37.7	$45.4	$92.6
Expenditures	8.2	31.5	40.3	80.0
Unspent Balance	1.3	6.2	5.1	12.6
% of Grant Unspent	14%	16%	11%	14%

If this $12.6 million in unspent state program grants is added to the $4.4 million which, as reported above, was never allocated to the states, then it may be seen that $17 million which Congress appropriated to help meet the educational needs of migrant children was not used.

It seems superfluous to comment on figures as shocking as these. One point, raised by some state migrant education directors, must, however, be clarified immediately. As an examination of the appendix will show, the state expenditure reports on which our information is based were prepared by state fiscal officers on different dates, ranging from August 1969 to March 1970. All of these dates fell well after the close of the 1969 fiscal year

—on June 30, 1969. However, some state directors indicated that their 1969 accounts had not been closed at the time these expenditure reports were filed. For example, in a letter of June 24, 1970, the director of migrant and preschool programs in the Texas Education Agency stated in part:

> The final report which was submitted to the U.S. Office of Education was in the amount of $9,920,620. The figure of $8,518,244 was our preliminary report which showed only expenditures not included in outstanding encumbrances. . . . The official report from the Fiscal Department showing the migrant expenditures is not available from this office, as it is a part of the total federal expenditure report which is too large for us to furnish Xeroxed copies.

In a memorandum dated June 22, Florida also reported that final expenditures for fiscal 1969 were then "estimated at $350,000," or an increase of $20,559 over the amount previously reported. However, a final check with the United States Office of Education on August 13, 1970, at the time of the final writing of this report, showed that neither Texas nor Florida had filed new expenditure reports for fiscal 1969 as of that date.

Smaller changes in fiscal 1969 expenditures (some increases and some decreases) were reported by other states. *If all these changes are later substantiated by official reports which can be made available for public inspection, they will add a net $1.4 million to fiscal 1969 expenditures, thereby reducing to $11.2 million (or 12%) the unspent state program grants for fiscal years 1967 through 1969. This would not seem to us to alter substantially the impact of our findings.*

Their impact on the education of migrant children may be more clearly realized when it is noted that—of the $5.1 million unspent in fiscal 1969 at the time these reports were filed—*the largest amounts of unused funds* were in three of the expenditure accounts which seem most important in meeting the needs of migrant children. They were:

	Unspent Balance*
Instruction	$3,336,000
Health Services	$ 686,000
Food Services	$ 955,000

*Figures rounded to nearest $1,000.

Reasons Given by State Migrant Education Directors for Unspent Funds

Of 20 state directors who responded to a questionnaire item on the reasons for unspent funds, six mentioned unexpected changes in crops or migrant worker movements:

> Unexpected shifts in the pattern of migrant workers' movement. (Alabama)

Incomplete programs due to early frost. (Indiana)

We had "saved" for a small program in August. This was designed for 20 children of tomato pickers. They had a very small crop of tomatoes, so we had no children for the program. (Kentucky)

The mobility of migrants and the mechanization of crops. (Michigan)

Flash floods and tornadoes which destroyed a large part of the tomato crop in northwest Ohio. (Ohio)

Rain damage to cherry crop early in spring cut down number of migrants in some districts. (Utah)

Seven state directors referred to problems at the local level:

Local agencies returning unspent funds at too late a time to reallocate such funds. (Arizona)

Smaller number of migrant children enrolled than originally projected by the local educational agencies. (Colorado)

Programs failed to materialize. (New York)

Unexpected savings in program operation which were too late to start new programs. (Oklahoma)

Overestimates. (South Carolina)

Overestimating costs at local level, poor coordination at local level in one instance, lack of cooperation between program director and system administration at local level were the primary causes for the failure to spend our total program allotment for 1969. (Tennessee)

Local school districts underspent their allotted budgets, through overestimation of actual costs. (Washington)

Two attributed unspent funds to late receipt of state allocations:

Late notice of state allocations. (Oregon)

Late final findings. We received final allocation figures as our migrant children were leaving, making it impossible to implement new programs. (Texas)

Five state directors gave a variety of reasons, including late funding, administrative problems, and difficulties in finding teachers.

Per-Pupil Expenditures by Local Projects

According to projections made in an annual progress report prepared by the Migrant Programs Branch of the United States Office of Education, migrant education projects planned to spend an average of $217 in supplementary federal migrant education funds per migrant pupil during fiscal year 1969. This estimate was based on anticipated state expenditures which did not fully materialize and on the states' estimates of migrant children "to be served."

For each project included in our local sample, NCEMC staff computed the expenditure per migrant pupil from federal migrant education funds by dividing the project's reported expenditures from these funds by the number of migrant pupils reported as enrolled. We found *actual average per-pupil expenditures* considerably lower than those which had been projected: *$177 per pupil in 1968-69 school-year programs* and *$195 per pupil in 1969 summer sessions*. These figures include only expenditures of federal migrant education funds by local projects; they do not include (as the projection did) expenditures of these federal funds by state education agencies for administration or contractual services.

It will be noted from the above figures that the average per-pupil expenditures for supplementary services in the summer schools, which average seven weeks, was higher than in the regular school year when the children were served for seven months. When the range of per-pupil expenditures from federal Migrant Amendment funds by the migrant education projects in our sample are examined, this disparity in expenditures is even more striking:

> *In 1968-69 school-year projects, the range was from $11 per pupil* (in Lee County, Florida, and Las Vegas, New Mexico) *to $1,002 per pupil* (in Kansas City, Kansas).
>
> *In 1969 summer projects, the lowest supplementary expenditure was $24 per pupil* (in Albuquerque, New Mexico) *and the highest, $1,021* (in Spartanburg, South Carolina).

One reason for the higher costs in federal funds for summer projects has already been suggested in discussing questions about local support for migrant education. It is clear that more summer programs than school-year programs in our sample charged the full cost of some migrant educational services to Uncle Sam. A related reason—which will be discussed more fully in the next section of this report—is that far more summer projects (61%) operated separate schools for migrant children only. In addition (see page 79), more food was served in summer projects. These three factors would seem paramount in contributing to the higher costs of summer programs.

However, these factors cannot explain the extraordinary range in per-pupil expenditures within both school-year and summer programs. In an effort to understand more about the reasons for this range, a compilation of all local questionnaire data was done according to the rank order of per-pupil expenditures. This analysis showed little correlation between per-pupil expenditures and other criteria that we studied. There was *no* pattern relating per-pupil expenditures to location or size of project, length of time migrant children were served, grade placement patterns, number of high school graduates, or number of migrant children receiving health services.

In the 1968-69 regular school year, there was a clear correlation of higher per-pupil expenditures in separate migrant schools—and to a lesser degree in separate migrant classes—as the following table shows:

SCHOOL AND CLASS PLACEMENT OF MIGRANT PUPILS
1968-69 REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR

How Migrant Pupils Placed (by Project)	Expenditure Per Migrant Pupil in ESEA Title I Migrant Funds						
	Under $50	$50-$99	$100-$149	$150-$199	$200-$249	$250 and Over	Total
Together with Non-Migrants	94%	88%	70%	53%	47%	44%	68%
In Separate Classes	0%	6%	5%	5%	24%	13%	8%
In Separate Schools	0%	3%	0%	0%	11%	19%	5%
Some Separate, Some Together	6%	3%	25%	42%	24%	25%	18%
(By Number of Pupils)							
Together with Non-Migrants	99%	95%	87%	82%	32%	40%	69%
In Separate Classes	1%	4%	9%	11%	58%	10%	21%
In Separate Schools	0%	1%	4%	7%	10%	50%	10%

In the *1969 summer session*, there was some correlation between per-pupil expenditures and the number of migrant children receiving free breakfasts and lunches.

Per-Pupil Expenditure	1969 Summer Session: Percentage of Migrant Children Receiving Free Breakfast	Free Lunch
Below $100	36%	65%
$100–$149	63%	94%
$150–$199	61%	94%
$200–$249	59%	99%
$250–$299	60%	93%
$300 & above	73%	99%
TOTAL SAMPLE	60%	92%

Beyond the relationships cited above, our analysis would tend to indicate a completely random pattern for per-pupil expenditures at the local level. On the basis of the criteria we investigated, it is impossible to tell what better educational opportunities migrant children were receiving in the higher-expenditure projects, and--at the point where federal funds met migrant children--equitability seemed non-existent.

IV. Participation of Migrant Children

School Enrollment

To the best of our knowledge and judgment, there are no really precise school enrollment figures for migrant children throughout the United States. Various sources would place the number of children who participated in educational programs financed through ESEA Title I migrant funds during fiscal year 1969 between 205,000 and 245,000.

As we have already indicated, problems in identifying migrant children complicate the seemingly simple task of recording their school enrollment. Another confusing factor is "duplicate" enrollments. Many migrant children may be counted several times during a fiscal year—in each locality or school session they attend. The mobility of migrant children also causes irregular enrollment patterns which follow crop seasons instead of school schedules; thus, in states like California, where many migrant families move in early spring, quarterly migrant enrollment records have been kept without separating the school year and summer sessions.

All of the factors which tend to complicate the collection of accurate migrant enrollment data would tend to indicate that all of the figures we have been able to compile are high. By enrollment we mean what educational statisticians usually mean—the number of individual children enrolled in school at one certain time. It would thus seem that *an estimate for fiscal year 1969 of about 200,000 migrant children enrolled in school programs financed through ESEA Title I migrant funds would be a maximum figure.*

Many migrant educators hope that when the Interstate Record Transfer System has been put into operation, it will provide accurate data—including enrollment figures—about individual migrant children. It is too soon to assess the effectiveness of this system, which is just entering its computerized phase.

Non-Enrollment and Non-Attendance

No accurate estimates are available on the number of migrant children who are not reached by federally financed migrant education projects—or those who are not attending any school. Problems in counting the children who *are* enrolled are nothing by comparison with the difficulties encountered in trying to count those who aren't.

There are, indeed, many problems; this is confirmed by evidence at all administrative levels. Few state migrant educational officials who responded to our "Checklist of Available Information" indicated that they could provide an accurate census of school-age migrant children residing in their

states. In interviews, most state directors freely admitted that they realized all migrant children in their states were not being served. Several pointed out the unwillingness of some local school districts to operate migrant education programs, even when federal funds were offered. One regional statistician expressed concern that he had not yet been able to compile a list of all *schools* located in areas where migrant children reside.

The only place to start assessing the dimensions of the problem is, of course, at the local project level. No state or national compilations of sketchy local data will help. As a small step in this direction, NCEMC site visitors were asked to provide any evidence found concerning non-enrollment or non-attendance of migrant children. Here are some excerpts from their reports.

> I do not believe we secured hard evidence on non-enrollment. However, the county coordinator of migrant education said the compulsory attendance law was not rigidly enforced with migrants. As coordinator he tries to maintain a liberal view on this and asks his people not to be too "hard nosed" about it. "If there is sufficient evidence that the children are really needed to help earn enough money to support the family," he said, "we sort of let them slide. After all we want to encourage people to assume more responsibility for themselves and members of their families, rather than having them sit around waiting for a handout." (A school-year visit to a Florida school)

* * *

> The enrollment of this junior high school is 900, of whom 600 are white and 300 black. No separate records are kept of the attendance of migrant pupils. However, the absence rate of black students runs at about one-third daily, or about 190 absentees a week. The Negro assistant principal reported that about 150 of these absentees "would be working in agriculture under parental guidance."
>
> (A school-year visit to a Florida junior high school)

* * *

> School-age population figures show about 2,000 pre-kindergarten and kindergarten children not enrolled. Only 100 Mexican-Americans (all migrants) are enrolled in any program below first grade.
>
> School district officials were not able to estimate the number of school-age migrant children who were not enrolled. They were unable to name anyone in the community who might know.
>
> Inquiries in neighborhoods where there were a number of migrant families indicated that there were a few teen-age migrant children who no longer attended school. This observer found no indication that there were children under fourteen not attending school.
>
> (A school-year visit to a Texas school)

* * *

> Although no figures were available, I am quite sure many migrant children—particularly in areas outside the two main farm labor camps—were not enrolled in the migrant summer session because of the prac-

tice of admitting first children who had attended local schools during the regular term. There were about 90 *bona fide* migrant children under age six in the day care center next door to the school.

Another reason for non-enrollment of migrant children was that there are no child labor laws applicable to summer farm work in this state at this time. (A Washington State summer program)

* * *

There is little evidence on non-enrollment, except that some of the Negro farm workers' children in a neighboring town were not being served. This was attributed to lack of space on the bus.

(A New Jersey summer program)

* * *

Prior to the July 13 opening, the summer school director and the attendance officer visited the camps and homes to announce the school. Flyers were left and, when parents were not home, return visits were made. First, visits were made to current migrants, according to the director, and then to those who had settled in the community.

In my visits to camps during school hours, I saw a number of children either fishing, walking around, picking fruit, or just playing around. A community worker claims that over 50% of the available children were not in school. She has tried to get them there, but parents have to be out in the field much earlier than the bus comes or are just not interested in the summer school because they see it as play. In the case of one family I saw, four children were home, mother nowhere to be seen, father a construction worker. Last year the school gave them a lot of trouble about absences, so this year they did not send the children. In visiting the orchards, I saw about seven children of early elementary age picking cherries. (A New York State summer school)

* * *

Staff members believe that all migrant children in the area have been recruited. The school-community coordinator, who has been with the migrant summer school for two previous years, visits the homes before the program opens with a migrant aide—a high school student who is also working his third summer in the program. There are no longer any large camps in the area; families are scattered on many farms, and two buses are needed, morning and evening, to transport the 52 children. Each takes about an hour for the total trip; one covers 50 miles each trip.

The school-community coordinator said that most migrant children in the summer school have been returning to the area for several years, and that many families are relatives or have known each other for a long time. She thus believes that she knows where all of the migrant families are living, because the families advise her about each others' whereabouts. She says the parent attitude is "friendly to the school staff." (A Wisconsin summer program)

* * *

It appeared that all eligible migrant children were in the school program

due to good personal relationship of school staff with both the employers and the migrant families.

The summer school program is well accepted by all concerned. Farmers notify the school when families arrive; the program director immediately visits the families and explains the total program. Many families return each year to this area and count on having the summer program for their children.

Non-enrollment involved only those over 12 and under five, and that was due to the fact that there was no program for them. Children over 12 years of age were in the fields. Parents and teenagers agree that they need to work in the summer in order to have money for school in the fall. No program has been devised for those past sixth grade level. However, the school could be encouraged to provide something for teenagers when they are not in the fields.

(An Illinois summer program)

* * *

From interviews with migrants and persons who work with migrants in the area, it appears that the school's estimate of 3,300 migrant children is much too low. Some interviews suggest that the school is probably serving less than 20 or 25% of the migrant children in the five-county area! School officials appeared to be unaware of the fact that many migrant children reside in places other than the Migrant Family Centers. School bus service did not reach such areas. From spot checking, it appears that families living outside migrant family service centers are in greater need, but they had little contact with services of the migrant education project.

(A summer visit to a California five-county region)

* * *

Another reason for non-enrollment of migrant children in California summer schools was the anxiety—expressed repeatedly by migrant parents interviewed in the Family Centers—about the expenses involved in attending school in the home base areas. The following excerpts from family interviews are typical:

When there is work, the 16-year-old son must work. When work is good, the 12- and 13-year-old daughters must go to work also to make money for next year. However, when there is no work, all three go to the summer school and get the benefit of the meals. The girls say that all they do at this summer school is throw paint and color pictures.

The parents said that they have difficulty in paying for school clothing and supplies for their children during the regular school term in Texas. That is why they feel the children should be allowed to work in the summer in order to have things they need during the regular school year. (A migrant family with five children)

* * *

None of the four school-age children (aged 6, 11, 13, and 18) are in summer school in California. It is imperative that they work in the

summer. Earnings will enable them to pay for school clothes, lunch, and supplies during the regular school year in Texas.

(A migrant family with eight children)

School and Class Placement

Local questionnaire responses showed a marked contrast between school-year and summer programs in the placement practices used for migrant children. Far more summer programs separated migrant children from non-migrants, as the following table shows:

School and Class Placement	1968-69 Regular School Year	1969 Summer Session
By Project		
Together with non-migrants	68%	30%
In separate schools	5%	61%
In separate classes	8%	7%
Some together, some separate	19%	2%
By Number of Pupils		
Together with non-migrants	69%	29%
In separate schools or classes	31%	71%

In the majority of local projects we visited, migrant and non-migrant children were being educated in the same classrooms. Exceptions were:

An elementary school in Florida located adjacent to a migrant camp.

Two all-migrant six-month schools in Texas.

Some summer programs in California, Illinois and Wisconsin which enrolled migrant children only, or which grouped them in separate schools or classes.

In *none* of the states mentioned above were *all* migrant children being educated separately throughout the year. In summer programs observed in two states (New Jersey and Washington) uncertainties concerning the identification of migrant children made placement practices difficult to define. (As discussed earlier, these two programs were migrant in funding, but the majority of the children enrolled appeared to be year-round residents.)

None of our consultants found that placing migrant children separately or together with non-migrants made a decisive difference in the conditions under which they were educated. They reported educational advantages to migrant children in some separate schools, and these advantages may have been related to the higher per-pupil expenditures reported earlier.

School personnel were generally reported to prefer to educate migrants and non-migrants together. However, as one put it:

Although it is theoretically desirable to bring migrant and non-migrant

children together, community attitudes are not always the best and the experiences migrant children have are not always positive.

Most migrant parents and children interviewed were indifferent to issues of school segregation or desegregation.

Observations in Schools Where Migrant Children were in Regular Classes With Non-Migrants

Most consultants reported that in classrooms where both migrant and non-migrant children were present, it was impossible to tell which children were migrants. No outright discrimination in the treatment of migrant pupils was observed. For better or for worse, the migrant children were receiving about the same kind of education as the others. As two observers reported:

> All migrant children except those in pre-kindergarten are placed in regular classes with non-migrant children. This is state policy, and school personnel seemed to accept it as an advantageous arrangement.
>
> In the classes I observed, all children were receiving about the same amount of the teacher's time and attention, which was considerable in the kindergarten (where a class of 20 children had been divided into two groups, through the use of an aide), and negligible in the first grade (where 35 children in three reading groups were taught without the use of an aide).
>
> It was not possible to tell which children were migrants, and therefore not possible to describe interaction between migrant and non-migrant pupils. The amount of interaction between all kindergarten pupils was high; in first grade, almost non-existent. Even in the lunchroom the teacher and most children ate silently. (A Florida elementary school)

* * *

> While visiting classes and eating lunch in the school cafeteria, I found no indication that children separated according to migrant and non-migrant backgrounds. Administration in this situation appeared to be the key to effective relationships; the "all day" teacher was an outstanding example of one who is able to facilitate good human relationships in his dealing with students. This teacher knew what the children needed, and he was secure in his convictions. Children seemed to be comfortable in his presence, whether they were migrant or non-migrant. His communication with all children was relaxed and purposeful; he responded to them in either English or Spanish, depending upon what language they had used in speaking to him.
>
> (A California summer school)

Observations of Schools Where Migrant Children were in Separate Schools or Classes

> The migrant school is separated from the regular summer school program for remedial students and for disadvantaged students under Title I of ESEA and Head Start. The administration gives its reasons for separation as one of maintenance problems in the school. Other sources

report that the non-migrant poor whites refused to ride the same buses with the migrants.

One could argue the pros and cons of this decision but basically it would appear to me that separation did not seriously hinder the program for the migrants or for the residents. In some ways they may have been better off because the local poor whites may have driven some migrant children away from school with their taunts and jeers.

(An Illinois summer school)

* * *

Situations vary in each school district. In one, the summer program was separate because of funding and appeared to have good facilities and a program comparable to what is generally offered to resident children of the area.

Pre-school programs within the Migrant Family Service Centers are segregated due to funding and location; there appear to be no problems in this form of segregation, and there may be benefits as programs are geared to particular needs of migrant children.

In only one school district did I find some indications that segregation of migrants may have been due to parental pressure of district residents. In that district, there was a full summer school program, but migrants were set up in different facilities and grouped into a different program. (A California five-county region)

In two Texas school districts, there were opportunities to compare educational conditions in the all-migrant, six-month schools with those in other schools where migrant and non-migrant children were being educated together. NCEMC observers raised many questions about the educational programs of *all* schools in these districts. In one school district, brief visits revealed about the same conditions in the all-migrant classrooms as in the regular schools—most teachers were talking loudly from the front of their rooms and most children were bored and squirming in their seats. In another school district, consultants found the all-migrant school—where there was a special pilot project—superior to the others in meeting the needs of migrant children. Here is one consultant's analysis and opinion:

Factors present in the migrant education program of the separate school seemed to be to the advantage of the children.

Conditions observed which seemed most to the advantage of migrant children included the following:

- more relaxed schedule
- less pressure and less anxiety
- less competition—more encouragement
- better ratio of teachers to children
- more equipment
- more acceptance and understanding
- more individual attention and instruction

Parents could transfer children to integrated schools if they chose to do so. All students are required to go on to junior high school at age

14 or on completion of sixth grade, and junior high schools are integrated.

A brief observation of two classes in a regular elementary school provided an opportunity for comparison with the migrant school. In the regular school, there were 480 children enrolled, of whom 200 were reported to be migrant. There was no separation of migrant and non-migrant. The only difference was that migrant children enrolled late and left early in the spring. Teachers had become accustomed to this procedure and did not see it as a problem; they felt migrant children should be integrated. Most of the children in the school were Mexican-American, whether migrant or non-migrant. Instruction was supposedly individualized to accommodate migrant children, but it did not seem as effectively individualized as in the migrant school.

The following points were noted in comparison with the migrant school:

- teacher-pupil ratio was not so good
- teacher-pupil relationship was not so warm
- pressure on children was more evident, with increased anxiety and boredom
- less flexibility and freedom.

Grade Level Placement

We secured grade placement figures from 42 state directors of migrant education. However, as indicated above, there are many problems related to the reliability of all migrant enrollment figures. State directors' enrollment breakdowns by grade placement yielded lower totals than those reported in answer to other enrollment questions, probably indicating that state education agencies had been unable to collect grade placement data for all migrant pupils. In summer projects especially, many programs grouped migrant children by age or ability, and grade placement was thus not a critical factor.

Even with the limitations just noted, it seems worthwhile to offer—as the only data which are, to our knowledge, available on a very important criterion of educational opportunity—the following comparison between the total enrollment in United States public day schools for the fall of 1968, and 1968-69 migrant pupil enrollments, as reported by state directors of migrant education:

	Percent of Enrollments	
	U.S. Total	Migrants
Pre-K & K	6%	7%
Grades 1–6*	50%	71%
Grades 7 & 8	16%	14%
Grades 9–12**	28%	8%
	100%	100%
Number of Pupils	44,961,662	143,507

*Includes elementary ungraded
**Includes secondary ungraded

It will be noted that less than one-fourth (22%) of the migrant pupils were reported as enrolled beyond the sixth grade; for the United States as a whole, the percentage (44%) was twice as high.

V. Staffing

Recruitment and Selection of Personnel

In introducing our findings concerning the staffing of migrant education programs, we must strongly emphasize that an overwhelming obstacle to the recruitment of qualified professionals is the late funding (see pages 12-13). If migrant education projects are not in a position to contract for teachers at the same time as other educational programs, they cannot possibly compete for highly qualified staff. Two examples from consultants' reports may be cited:

> Teachers are reappointed in April for the following school year. Without assurance of funding, the county board has to attach a rider to migrant teachers' contracts saying that the appointment is invalid if federal funds are not forthcoming. The federal coordinator asked: "What kind of teacher can you get to accept a position like that? Teachers have to eat—it's a habit with all of us. Except for a few very superior and highly dedicated individuals who stay because they believe in the program, the only teachers we can get on this basis are the least qualified."
>
> For efficient planning, the county board would need assurance of funding by February or March 1 of the year preceding the program year.
>
> (A Florida county)

* * *

> Funding from the state came through so late that it was impossible to hire some of the teachers they wanted. They were told unofficially on May 15 that they would have a program, but official notification and budget approval did not come through until a week before the program started. By that time, some of the best teachers were already committed to other endeavors. (An Illinois summer school)

In the migrant education projects we visited, late funding was an almost universal problem, intensifying other difficulties and weaknesses in the teacher selection process. For example, in one project, it was combined with a low supply of certified teachers:

> The assistant superintendent for instruction stated that the school district has great difficulty in finding qualified personnel. The nearest graduate school is approximately 150 miles away, and Texas teachers' salaries are generally low. However, of the 17 non-degree teachers in the school district at the time of our visit, none was placed in the all-migrant school.
>
> It would therefore appear that the school district had been as conscientious as their circumstances would allow in the selection of personnel to work with the migrant children. (A Texas school district)

In another project, late funding and a shortage of certified teachers were

accompanied by a lack of leadership in developing criteria for the selection of migrant education staff:

> When staff selection and in-service training were discussed with the three county coordinators who were responsible for migrant education, they indicated that there had been difficulty in securing fully qualified staff. They reported that pre-kindergarten teachers are not fully certified and that assistant teachers "may have two years of college or so." Aides are formally required to be high school graduates, but this requirement is not strictly enforced, if other positive qualities are present. Every effort has been made to hire migrants as aides, but not enough have been found to fill all positions, according to the coordinators.
>
> When asked what qualifications are sought in migrant education staff, one coordinator said they want "the best", i.e., fully certified teachers. When asked to define the criteria for deciding which teachers are "best" for migrant children, he said that this is left up to school principals. The county allocates money to the schools and lets them decide whom to hire and what educational materials they need. When pressed as to whether they sought such qualities as empathy in teachers, another coordinator said "certainly, if they don't have that, they won't last with the children," and mentioned a teacher "from a very fine home" who had survived for only one hour. (A Florida county)

To one NCEMC consultant, the coordinators' observations clearly indicated the extent to which they were failing to provide the kind of leadership which is so urgently needed in a migrant education program. He commented:

> Surrendering the final actions to be taken to the principals does not relieve the county migrant education director of providing a kind of leadership and guidance that is in the best interest of the migrant education program in general and migrant children in particular. With regard to the teacher "from a very fine home," one could raise such questions as: What criteria are used in the selection of teachers of migrant children? To what extent were they used with this teacher and how did she rate on them? If they were used, how do you account for her having slipped through? What kind of orientation was provided this teacher before she met with the children for the first time? How well did it prepare her for her first experience? If not very well, why and what needs to be done about it? Was this a good experience for either the teacher or the pupils? Was it intended or planned this way?
>
> I firmly believe that carefully selected criteria, and a well-planned program of orientation which are absolutely clear about what is to be achieved are urgently needed in order to deal more adequately with teacher selection and orientation. Also, I am most doubtful that the present migrant education director could provide this kind of leadership, even if asked to do so.

Local school district prerogatives often took precedence over the development of a clear statement of the qualifications needed to work with migrant children. Especially in the summer projects we visited, a "home

folks first" hiring policy often meant that positions were offered first to teachers who worked in the district regularly during the school year.

As one California regional migrant education staff member pointed out, education is the second largest source of employment in the area—urpassed only by agriculture—and the jobs created by federal education funds make a significant contribution to the economy. Consultants reported the following on two summer school projects:

> The director stated that teachers who had been employed during the 1969-70 school year in the district were given first consideration among applicants for the summer migrant education project. All but one position was filled from this source. The exception was a primary teacher who had been employed by the district for next fall. She was chosen over two other applicants who had experience in the district but none in the primary grades. Thus, of twelve applicants, ten were hired, with no need to advertise the positions outside the local school system.
>
> (A California summer project)

* * *

> The director said that the first chance at summer jobs went to local teachers. Only one had been recruited from outside the local system, and only "three or four" applicants had been turned away. The director said that his selection criteria had been to give preference to teachers with elementary school experience, especially in reading and arithmetic. Two of the rejected applicants had high school experience only.
>
> (A Wisconsin summer project)

In a California five-county region, consultants found regional staff members positively oriented toward hiring teachers who were sensitive to the needs of migrant children and remarkably successful in doing so in pre-school programs which the regional migrant education center operated directly. One consultant commented:

> In the migrant pre-school we visited, the teacher was an exceptionally sensitive person with an understanding of children so rare that she clearly had been selected for these traits and for her love of children and concern for migrants.

However, in programs for school-age children, regional staff saw their role primarily as stimulating and enabling local school systems to build their own migrant education programs. Except for occasional recommendations, they did not attempt to influence the hiring practices used by local school districts.

Thus, in the migrant education projects we visited, late funding, teacher shortages, local school district prerogatives, and weak leadership were factors which tended—singly or in combination—to block the development and use of criteria for the selection of staff best suited to meet the educational needs of migrant children. As the following section will show, local practice also exerted a decisive influence on the ethnic composition of migrant education staffs.

Minority Group, Migrant, and Bi-Lingual Staff

Florida

Schools in the three Florida counties visited by NCEMC team members were at various stages of complying with court desegregation orders. In two of the schools observed most thoroughly, desegregation had thus far consisted of moving a very few Anglo children and staff into formerly all-black schools. In most of the Florida projects visited, the majority of the migrant children and the majority of the teaching staff serving them were Negro. However, less than a third of the schools visited in Florida had Negro principals, and only one of the three counties had a Negro as director of migrant education. In this county, there was an integrated staff at the county migrant education center and at one elementary school adjacent to a migrant camp.

A serious problem in Florida was the lack of bi-lingual staff members in migrant education programs which enrolled substantial numbers of Mexican-Americans or Puerto Ricans. In one elementary school, 90 children a day met in small groups for half-hour classes in English as a second language. A nearby elementary school had its own FM radio station to broadcast programs in Spanish and English to parents. However, neither of these schools was equipped for a modern bi-lingual approach to language instruction. In both, school staff members—including the county director of migrant education—were heard to admonish children to "speak English" in school; a consultant reported that in one school a Spanish-speaking teacher was prohibited from speaking Spanish with the children.

A junior high school in the same county had a considerable number of Spanish-speaking students; an observer learned that some of them had been in the school for three years without learning English. There was no program to teach them English or to give them a foundation in the Spanish language and culture. A Spanish language class existed, but it was not open to Spanish-speaking students.

Texas

In two neighboring school districts, all of the elementary schools which enrolled migrants were predominantly Mexican-American in pupil population (both migrant and non-migrant). In the all-migrant school observed most thoroughly, 40% of the teachers and over half of the aides were Mexican-American.

In some school districts in Texas, pioneering work has been done in implementing a thoroughly modern bi-lingual education program. However, in the all-migrant school we observed, there was still what one consultant described as "administrative anxiety over the use of Spanish." He recommended:

> The administration needs to encourage use of English while realizing that security involves freedom to communicate in Spanish as long as it

is more comfortable and more useful to express feelings and ideas. Administration needs to realize that use of English is artificial among those who are accustomed to speaking and conversing in Spanish. (It is important for those who speak English to realize that Spanish "cuss" words are more expressive of feeling than those provided by the English language. Use of "bad language" may be preferable to physical attack and is an indication of progress in socialization.)

California

In a California five-county region, the majority of the migrant children were Mexican-Americans, although some school districts had large numbers of Anglos and Negroes as well. At the regional level, the migrant education director and the curriculum coordinator were Mexican-Americans, and in the pre-schools and health clinics operated by the regional office, there were many Mexican-American or Anglo bi-lingual staff members. Both Spanish and English were used naturally and interchangeably.

In summer school programs operated by the school districts in this region, staff ethnic composition varied considerably. The majority of the administrators and teachers we saw were Anglos (in one program, all were).

However, most of the California projects we saw were not staffed *exclusively* by Anglos. One project had a Negro director, and in most, one or more teachers and the majority of the aides were Mexican-American or bi-lingual.

A Mexican-American all-day teacher in one project was described by a consultant as contributing significantly to the effectiveness of the program:

> His relationships with teachers, aides, Mini-Corps teachers and students appeared to be unusually good. Children felt free to ask if they could come eat at his table in the cafeteria, and they conversed freely with him and the visitor. Children spoke to him in either English or Spanish, and he was able to respond in the language in which they addressed him. The use of Spanish presented no threat. He is extremely aware of the needs of these children and their families, and he has the concern required to see that they get what they need.

The Northern States (Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Washington, Wisconsin)

It was in northern projects that the phenomenon of predominantly Anglo professionals serving predominantly Mexican-American, Negro, or Puerto Rican migrant children was most striking. In many communities, "home folks first" had been institutionalized into a fixed employment policy. In only one, did minority groups give evidence of being strong enough to even begin to protest this policy.

In a New York State school district with large numbers of poor Negro and Puerto Rican children, not a single principal or teacher in the nine schools of the district was Negro or Puerto Rican. It was stated that several Negro teachers had been accepted for employment, but only one had ever

taught there (he stayed one year) because the others had been unable to find suitable housing in the town. Of the eight school-year aides, four were Puerto Rican, two were Negro, and two were Anglo. In addition, two "reverse Peace Corps" volunteers from Costa Rica and Argentina were providing many educational and social services which were otherwise completely unavailable to Puerto Rican children and parents. In the 1969 summer migrant education project (pupil enrollment 70% Puerto Rican, 20% Negro, 10% Anglo), teachers had been 100% Anglo. However, the director reported utilizing a number of recruitment sources from outside the school system to try to build a more heterogeneous staff for the 1970 summer school.

In all other summer projects visited in the states listed above, all teachers were Anglo. However, one director and two supervisors were Mexican-American, and a fairly substantial number of home-school coordinators, classroom and community aides were minority group members.

As indicated by local questionnaire response, only 28% of the 1968-69 regular school year programs and 46% of the 1969 summer programs in our sample employed any migrant adults in any capacity.

Of the large numbers of aides observed in 1970 summer migrant education programs, few were recruited from the migrant stream. In the Illinois and New Jersey projects we observed, there were, to the best of our information, no current or former migrants employed as aides. In a New York summer school, two teen-age aides were migrants (they expected to return to Florida and graduate from high school the following school year). A Washington State summer school employed two former migrants as aides. In one Wisconsin summer school, ten of the 21 teen-age Neighborhood Youth Corps aides were migrants; in another Wisconsin community, one migrant mother was employed as the only aide in the summer school program.

In-Service Training and Staff Development

In two of the migrant education projects visited by NCEMC consultants, in-service training programs were currently in operation at the time of our visits. Observers noted a marked contrast in effectiveness.

A Washington State Summer School

The migrant summer school program in this school district was operated in conjunction with a migrant teacher education institute conducted by a state college and financed through $70,000 in ESEA Title I migrant funds. The institute began with two weeks on the college campus, followed by four weeks of in-service experience in the migrant summer school. NCEMC consultants visited the summer school during its first week of operation.

As described to the consultants, the first three days on campus were spent in a workshop program utilizing problem-solving techniques. The rest

of the two-week period emphasized training in the Spanish language and seminars on Mexican-American culture. In the afternoons, the supervising teachers (but not the teachers-in-training) developed a schedule and lesson plans for the migrant children's summer school.

While observers noted that the language and cultural training were reflected in the classrooms, they found other aspects of the program "poorly conceived," "ludicrous," and "deplorable."

One severe problem was the extreme unsuitability of the six "master teachers," to each of whom four or five teachers-in-training were assigned for their in-service classroom experience. As one consultant described it:

> It seems obvious that the selection of the "master teachers" was done on a strictly arbitrary basis. Their backgrounds in migrant education were extremely limited. All were recruited from within the local school system. We were told that there were six openings for master teachers and that they had six applicants.
>
> Some of the teachers-in-training seemed to have more skills and experience than their supervising teachers. One of the "master teachers" was in her first full-time teaching job, having graduated from college in March 1970 and worked for a few months as a substitute in the local schools. She did not know how to maintain classroom control, she threatened and ridiculed the children, and was generally unprepared to be the teacher of any child, let alone a migrant child.
>
> Another "master teacher" was described by an administrator as a "cracker jack . . . and besides, he is the only man who applied, and we wanted to have a man." This man was experienced—but in teaching creative writing to high school seniors. He admitted that he knew nothing about primary or elementary school methods or curriculum.

An equally basic weakness was that decisions to facilitate the teacher-training aspects of the program were made at a sacrifice to the instructional program for the migrant children. To quote from another consultant's report:

> In terms of dates, times, numbers, and age levels of children, it appeared that little thought had been given to meeting the needs of migrants. The migrant summer school was planned as a four-week program, five hours per day, limited to 120 children in grades 1-5 only.
>
> This consultant deplored the process by which each of the above decisions was made. The dates were set for the convenience of the teacher training institute, so that participants could have a two-week training program before meeting the children. Thus, the school started too late in the season to reach some migrant children.
>
> Recruitment was done initially from regular school-year classes. As a result of this method, little space in the summer school remained for the migrant children when they arrived. Not only was total enrollment limited to 120, but enrollments at any age level were also limited. There was no attempt at flexible placements to enable a family to enroll all of its children. (Enrollment for six-year-olds was closed while we were

there, but it was open for ages seven to eleven. What was a family with a six-year-old to do?)

As a result of the five-hour day, those migrant children who were in school were taken home and left unsupervised in the labor camps from 1:30 p.m. on each day.

In short, little attempt was made to structure the program to the logistic needs of migrant children and families, and only a general attempt (not specific to each child) was made to meet the children's academic needs.

In several respects, the school effort was in sharp contrast to that of the migrant day care center next door. The day care center, run by an OEO agency, accepted all migrant children from one month to five years of age, five days a week, from 4:30 a.m. until 4:30 p.m., every week of the year. Breakfast, lunch and a full program of education, health care, and safety were provided for each child.

Thus, according to our consultants, this migrant teacher training institute provided no acceptable model for the teachers-in-training to follow—either in how to plan programs to meet the needs of migrant children or how to implement plans in the classroom.

A Florida Migrant Education Center

The director of this county's migrant education program has chosen to provide in-service teacher education from a centrally located migrant education center. He has been with the center since its inception in 1967, and is a former principal in the county and the founder of an outstanding migrant elementary school now in its fourth year of operation. He has built the first and only truly integrated staff in the county. All center personnel were recruited directly out of the classroom, on the basis of skill, empathy and attitude. The administrator has little trouble recruiting staff.

The migrant education center serves 35 schools throughout the county in which migrant children are enrolled. It is strictly an auxiliary service organization which supplements but does not duplicate the services offered by the instructional service division of the schools.

To request help from the center, a teacher of migrant children asks the principal for permission. An indication of the "popularity" of the program is that the center is not able to fill all the requests for training it receives. At times it has to turn teachers away because of lack of space.

Workshops are usually initiated by the center in response to a felt need or a new program. They are scheduled up to a year ahead of time and the staff spends many hours preparing materials with great care. As a rule teachers are actively involved in the workshop and they are immediately able to practice new techniques. Many well-known national consultants are also used. The stress at all times is on practicability and classroom application.

Many of the workshops are held on Saturdays. Attending teachers are given a nominal incentive of $15 to attend the session. This compares with

$35 to $45 per day that the average teacher is reimbursed for a day's teaching. Altogether, during the 1969-70 year, the center offered 39 workshops, conferences, or in-service training activities.

Discussion with principals indicated that they approved of the workshops and encouraged their teachers to attend, but when asked, "Are your teachers applying their new knowledge?" the answer was, "I don't know." While principals supported the training sessions, few had ever actually attended one.

While the training was universally acclaimed as being useful there was little tangible evidence of its application in the classroom. Though behavioral goals are stated, determination of achievement is not made nor is the training followed by classroom visits to determine how it is applied.

In-Service Training in Other Projects Visited

There was no opportunity for direct observation of in-service training programs in the other projects visited. However, consultants did interview administrators and teachers about in-service training opportunities which had been offered, and they tried to assess their impact on classroom performance.

In a *Texas school district*, the migrant school is participating in a pilot program called "Project Learn," which is directed by Behavioral Research Laboratories of California and involves the extensive use of programmed teaching materials. A consultant reported as follows on the special in-service training which was provided here:

> To prepare for the project, all teachers participated in a four-day workshop in the fall. In addition, a consultant from Behavioral Research Laboratories worked with the teachers individually from October 20 through Thanksgiving, and she returns periodically to continue this work. Her function is to help the teachers make the best use of the programmed materials provided in reading, math, spelling, intermediate level science, and social studies. Another consultant worked briefly with the teachers on math games which could be used in conjunction with the programmed math materials.
>
> The visitation team found the teachers and aides to be fairly well-organized and knowledgeable about the Sullivan programmed materials. It appeared that the in-service training provided in this area was beneficial and effective.
>
> In-service training in the special educational needs of migrant children was provided in the fall through a statewide workshop for teachers in the migrant program.
>
> It is not known by this consultant how many of the teachers from this school district attended, but we did talk with several who commented on the high quality of this workshop.
>
> Although participation in a pilot program of instruction ("Project Learn") and in-service training programs of the Texas Education

Agency were meeting some of the needs, it is felt that a more coordinated program of in-service training is needed. A program in which non-degree teachers could earn a degree, and degree teachers could upgrade needed areas of competence for college or salary credit, would be beneficial. The area's difficulty in finding certified teachers certainly warrants efforts in this direction. A similar program for the large numbers of recently hired teacher aides would greatly help to improve the instructional program over the years.

A *California regional migrant education center* offered local school districts resources, funds, equipment, consultation, and a well-stocked, attractive, and conveniently arranged curriculum resource center. As one observer commented:

> The regional curriculum coordinator seemed to me an unusually able advocate of creative teaching practices. She described many instances of teachers' use of resources, and of presentations to chambers of commerce and businessmen's clubs which stressed the values to all children of the new educational methods local teachers were learning through the migrant resources. However, because the coordinator had to cover many programs she could visit them only occasionally. Under these circumstances I think it would be difficult for her to offer help in a form in which most local staff could accept and use it.
>
> The three school districts in which I visited regular summer school programs showed the same variety in teaching practices and classroom atmosphere which one would expect to find in any three school districts. Certainly, as in all "migrant education projects" I have visited, the quality of the education which migrant children were receiving depended much more heavily on local conditions than on the leadership which may accompany federal funds.

Another consultant, who visited two other school districts in this California Region thought that regional staff could and should play a more active role in staff development. He reported that principals in both school districts seemed receptive to the idea that regional migrant education center personnel might have some positive influence on the development of teachers in their schools. However, both stated that no suggestions had been made or ideas put forth. This consultant felt a "distinct absence of project-level influence on willing local programs." In his opinion:

> The overriding consideration in assessing support of staff development has to be the rather nebulous ways a teacher behaves with the children. If the administrators of migrant programs, whether state, region, or local personnel, cannot communicate plans, educational goals, programs of an academic nature in such a way that the teacher is reinforced in his basic humanity and affection for the children, all else fails.

In *a Wisconsin summer program*, staff had been working together for several years and had developed cooperative team teaching relationships through participation in sensitivity workshops offered by the state education department and through daily one-hour planning meetings throughout the

summer session. Here, in-service training was a matter of daily interaction among the staff. Observers thought it could have been strengthened by more interaction with migrant parents.

During a full day of observation in *a Florida elementary-junior high school*, consultants found a sensitive new principal working effectively to create harmonious relationships and a positive learning atmosphere for both migrant and non-migrant pupils. They also found, however, many evidences of the need for better staff selection and in-service training.

In the kindergarten, one observer found a former high school business education teacher with no training in early childhood education. She was relating very well to the children and was enthusiastically trying to learn "as fast as I can" and to "give the children all I can, because they'll be leaving so soon." When asked where she got her ideas for program planning, she mentioned the aide ("she has more kindergarten experience than I do") and another kindergarten teacher.

In classes for elementary school children, another observer "saw or heard nothing which would indicate that the teachers knew how to plan for individual needs or to build up the child's self-concept. On the contrary I heard a great deal of sarcasm in response to the children's inability to respond correctly. In one sentence, I saw very poor teaching."

In junior high classrooms, a third observer found teaching ability which ranged from highly creative to very weak. At neither end of the spectrum had any teacher received orientation or in-service training relevant to the needs of migrant children—except that reading materials published by the state education department had been distributed to them. There had been no real opportunity to discuss these readings or to have questions clarified.

A conference with school aides and assistant teachers also indicated the need for in-service training. For example, pre-kindergarten aides spoke impatiently of the migrant children's "short attention span"; apparently, no one had told them that this is a normal characteristic of all young children. While the paraprofessionals were warm and enthusiastic as a group, several expressed discouragement with the children's behavior and slow learning ability. A sample report:

> I work with the lower level class in the sixth grade, in social studies, math, and reading. I help them say the words. Some of them can't read, even a book on a lower level . . . In math, they're slow, too. For instance just such a simple thing as addition and subtraction. We got them an easier social studies book. They ought to be able to read that—it's so easy —but I don't know whether they will.

In summary, in the projects visited consultants found wide variations in the amount and kind of in-service staff training. In most projects, they found little evidence that in-service training programs were having an important impact on day-to-day classroom performance.

Ratios of Staff to Pupils

In no case did site observers find the ratios of school staff to pupils less favorable for migrant children than for others. Staffing was usually shared equally by all children in a school. In programs where migrant children were in separate schools, the staff-pupil ratios were usually more favorable than in other schools in the district.

Staffing in the regular school-year programs we visited was in general much sparser than in the summer schools. In one Florida county where more than 5,000 migrant pupils were enrolled and where most classes observed were oversize with more than 30 pupils, Federal migrant funds had been used to pay the salaries of 100 assistant teachers. Thus, the ratio of these paraprofessionals to migrant children enrolled was 1 to 50. In this county (except for the pre-kindergartens, where classes of 20 children were served by three adults), it was not possible for any child to receive much individual attention. As one observer reported:

> Concern about large classes at one school in this county was expressed by a first grade teacher whose class of 35 I observed. She stated that there are five first grade classes in the school this year, all with 35 pupils, and only one aide for all five classes. Last year, when there were seven first grade classes, with an average size of 25, about half of the children were reading on grade level (1.8) by the end of the year. This year, the teacher finds it very hard to give enough time to each of the three reading groups she has organized according to ability level. She said she "feels bad" that she cannot give the children the individual attention they need.
>
> The school principal expressed strong dissatisfaction with the large classes (32 to 36) in all grades above kindergarten. He attributed it to a shortage of certified teachers in the area. However, the county coordinators expressed little concern about large classes; as a matter of fact they differed among themselves about what state regulations are on this matter.

Class sizes of 25 to 35 pupils were the general rule in other school-year programs observed. The number of classroom aides varied widely. In one Texas all-migrant school, two aides were assigned to each class. In another Florida elementary school, two aides "floated" among all classes in grades 1-6 (four aides were assigned to the pre-kindergarten). In an upstate New York school district, one aide was assigned to each of eight schools.

In the summer migrant education projects we observed, class sizes of 15 to 20 pupils were usual, and—with the exception of two California programs—all classes we saw had one or more aides assigned full-time. The lowest ratio of adults to children was thus 1 to 10, with an average of about 1 to 5 in most summer programs. The peak was a program connected with a teacher training institute, where six or seven adults were present in each classroom. Here, one observer felt that "children were in danger of being overwhelmed by adults."

Questions must be raised about the sharp contrasts we observed between short staffing in many school-year migrant education projects and the ample staffing which was general in the summer.

Paraprofessionals, Volunteers, and Mini-Corpsmen

In school programs where the teaching staff was largely Anglo and monolingual and where there was little contact between migrant parents and school staff, paraprofessionals often represented the only tangible link between the migrant education project and the migrant child's own cultural background. In a few school districts, volunteers from community organizations, churches, colleges, or seminaries provided much needed services and at least token evidence of local concern for migrant children. The presence of minority group paraprofessionals—and, to a lesser extent, majority group volunteers—helped to reduce somewhat the essential isolation of the migrant education projects from both the migrant and the non-migrant communities.

Paraprofessionals

Various practices were encountered in the recruitment and use of paraprofessionals and in the in-service training and upgrading opportunities offered to them. This variation and the inexperience of many administrators and teachers in the use of paraprofessionals' services are not distinctive to migrant education: they are part of the awkwardness and growing pains of a new development in school staffing which has not yet come of age.

It was in pre-school and primary grade programs that the largest number of teaching aides were observed and where they seemed, in general, to be most effectively used. Perhaps this is because early childhood education has decades of experience with using several adults together in the same classroom and because the kinds of individual care and attention which small children need are so readily apparent. Here is one consultant's observation and comment on a California program:

> An interesting feature of the program was that the children were not grouped according to grade levels. They were grouped by ages; within age groups, there were enough aides for adequate sub-groups and individual instruction to meet the wide variations of ability and interest.
>
> In the five-year-old group, for example, the head teacher was working with two children at a large wooden puzzle board and was conversing with them about geometric shapes. One aide helped two children with counting, using a number board. Another aide supervised art and play activities—two children at easels, others at table, a boy with wooden tracks, and a girl with dolls in the housekeeping center. There were planned activities, but freedom to choose and no pressure for participation.

In other classes in this same school, however, another observer questioned why "the very ample staffing could not have been used to provide

more individualization of instruction for the older children as well." As this observer reported:

> In an arithmetic lesson for nine and ten-year-olds, a teacher and two aides were present, but all children participated together in activities which ranged in difficulty from counting by ones through counting by tens, to reading four-digit numbers. Through careful selection of the children who recited, the teacher saw to it that no questions were missed while visitors were present. It was thus impossible to tell whether any child was learning anything he did not already know, but it seems a fair presumption that children who can already read four-digit numbers do not need practice in counting.
>
> In the same way, I questioned why all the children in the non-English speaking class should have been put to the same task during their art period. The activity we observed involved cutting and pasting with two colors of construction paper, with successful completion requiring that the pieces cut out of the smaller sheet be pasted along its edge in a "mirror" relationship to it. Towards the end of the period, many children had not got it right, and I actually saw the art teacher pull freshly pasted pieces off a girl's work in an effort to get her to rearrange it according to the instructions.

Even where classes with aides were grouped for instruction, effective teaching was, of course, not automatically guaranteed, as illustrated by the following two consultants' classroom observations in Florida:

> This was a low-performing *fourth grade arithmetic class* with fourteen students present, grouped into two sections for instruction by a teacher and an aide.
>
> The teacher stood or sat in front of the class and asked questions or assigned problems from the open textbooks. During the brief period I observed, the group covered place value (to millions), quart and gallon measurement, perimeter and centimeters. Although all material was review, I felt there was no thorough comprehension of the concepts which were being presented. For the most part, the children showed total indifference to the material. The teacher seemed to make little use of any knowledge of the children's ability. She seemed to proceed without much regard to whether individual children were grasping the material.
>
> The aide was working with five more advanced students, but was having problems in holding their attention. They engaged in considerable horseplay, causing aggravation and embarrassment to the aide, who at one point exclaimed in a rather loud voice, "You have guests in the room! Why don't you act like gentlemen?"
>
> * * *
>
> A *fifth grade reading improvement class* was composed of seven migrant children judged to need special help in reading. The teacher was an assistant paid through ESEA Title I migrant funds. The class was housed in a small room, previously used as an office. Hardly large enough to accommodate the teacher and his seven pupils, the room was neither adequately lighted nor ventilated.

During my brief visit, both the teacher and pupils were engaged in silent reading, but there seemed to be an almost complete lack of interest in what was going on. At no time was an attempt made by the teacher to provide individual help. It was therefore not possible to assess either teacher skills or teacher-pupil relationships.

In a Texas all-migrant school, one consultant commented very favorably on the use of aides in connection with programmed instructional materials:

The much increased use of aides was helping to make more individualized instruction work. This experience can be transferred to the other schools.

In-service training for aides—as for all staff—had been spotty and in most cases insufficient. As consultants reported of a New York State summer program:

Some of the paraprofessionals have gone to training labs and have come out very confused. The regular teachers have had little or no training on how to work with migrants, and they left to the aides duties for which they were inadequately prepared. Few or no teachers were seen in the lunchroom, but instead there was an aide with a paddle.

However, in a New York State school-year program, an observer interviewed two aides who were taking advantage of continuing education courses at a nearby state university:

There they are given college credit for seminars on the role of the paraprofessional. They learn how they can assist in science classes, reading, arithmetic and other subject areas, and also how they can help with social problems in the school. Both of them are interested in continuing their education and becoming full-time teachers.

In terms of the Puerto Rican community, the Puerto Rican paraprofessionals have done a great deal. They have translated for the parents in and out of school. They have helped children with language difficulties and, probably most important, they have shown smiling faces to the Puerto Rican child who must go to school here.

In a Washington State summer program, an aide confided to an observer that she felt better prepared for her role than the teacher was for hers:

One aide indicated that on three different occasions she had had a week of training in how to be an aide. However, she disclosed that she didn't know what to do for this particular teacher, who had never had an aide and didn't know how to use one. The aide didn't think it was her place to tell the teacher what it was that she was supposed to have her do.

In a Wisconsin summer project, ten of 21 teen-age Neighborhood Youth Corps aides were migrants. An observer reported:

The use of paid teen-age migrant aides was an extremely effective way of making it possible for them to participate in a summer educational program. They enjoyed and benefited from many of the activities planned for younger children, and were given clear-cut responsibilities for supervision, clean-up, and home-school contacts. In the afternoon

arts and crafts program they were especially useful in activities which would have been very difficult to carry on without their help.

According to an experienced staff member, there is "very little question" about all ten of the migrant aides completing high school. They have talked about that a lot, she said, and they all know high school graduation is a minimum; many are talking about college. One aide is a high school graduate and plans to attend secretarial school in the fall. Another, who will be a junior next year, stayed in the Wisconsin community last year without his family (living first with a teacher and then in a rooming house, supporting himself with an after-school job at the Ford garage) in order to get a full year of high school. He is a "straight A" student, the staff member said, and definitely plans on college.

As the above anecdotal reports and comments indicate, NCEMC observers found many positive uses of classroom aides in migrant education projects, but they also saw many situations in which the services of paraprofessionals were not being very productively utilized. On balance, the use of aides—especially those from minority group, migrant, or bi-lingual backgrounds—seemed a very positive step in the right direction. At least, where they were present there was the beginning of contact and the opportunity to gain the experience through which problems in the use of paraprofessionals can be solved.

A different and more serious problem was created by principals and teachers who were actively hostile to the presence of minority group paraprofessionals as exemplified in this report of an interview with a Mexican-American community aide:

At the OEO pre-school, I interviewed a community aide who is paid by OEO funds and lives at a nearby migrant camp. She described how she comforted and reassured young children from the camp when they first entered the pre-school. She thought that seeing her at school helped to give the children a link with home and made them less fearful in a strange situation. When asked whether some of the children in public school might also need this kind of reassurance, she said the principal did not welcome her there. She also said that he had been generally negative towards the OEO pre-school, feeling that the staff (largely Mexican-American paraprofessionals) were interested only in their own salaries and that to permit them to observe his professionally trained teachers would be to "give away" knowledge. She said only two of the teachers at the elementary school had welcomed aides in their classrooms. However, she saw recent indications of some thawing.

Volunteers

In most communities we visited, voluntary services to migrant children were limited or non-existent. Perhaps the most common were the donation of used clothing and the provision of eyeglasses or shoes. In some communities, doctors and dentists donated some services or provided them at reduced fees. For the most part, however, the local residents we saw in migrant education projects were on the payroll.

A notable exception was one Florida county where the contrasts between extreme wealth and extreme poverty were especially sharp. Here, an energetic young woman on the county migrant education staff had organized a very active corps of school volunteers from junior colleges, women's clubs, and service organizations. In one elementary school, junior college students were observed providing individual tutoring to migrant students in reading and arithmetic. In another, a retired teacher had developed a home economics program for elementary school girls which included nutrition, first aid, laundering, sewing, and a monthly party for all girls whose birthday fell in that month.

In addition to school volunteers recruited by the county migrant education staff, two church-affiliated groups provided services which were exceptional for their continuity and relevance to the real needs of migrant children and families. A Protestant-affiliated service committee, with a small staff, provided a wide range of services which included, as a partial list: bilingual interpreters to help with school-related problems such as refusal of admission without a birth certificate or refusal of free lunch; transportation to medical and welfare services; help with housing problems and job placement; help with college scholarships and other educational opportunities.

Catholic seminarians provided continuous services of many kinds. They conducted educational, recreational, and religious programs in the migrant camps; they provided transportation to medical clinics and pre-school programs which would otherwise have been completely inaccessible to migrants; they helped migrant families to cut through the seemingly endless bureaucratic procedures which stood between them and the services they needed.

In a New York State school-year program, two volunteers were members of a reverse Peace Corps program. One of them was from Costa Rica where she was a teacher in the university's experimental elementary school. The other was a reading specialist from Argentina. An observer stated:

> Their contributions to the school system have been tremendous. They have done social work; taught the children; recruited parents; held recreation programs; been friends to the children; dealt with the Welfare Department; gone apartment hunting for people; taught English as a second language to adults; and taught Spanish to a group of elementary school teachers. It seemed that they, better than anyone else, understood what the agricultural worker and his children were like.

In California family centers, volunteer dental students and faculty from the University of California staff three dental vans which serve migrant children. Funding comes from the state and the dental school. An observer reported:

> On the day I visited, the van (a converted Greyhound bus) seemed to be doing a land office business. However, it was working with less than its usual equipment. One of the three chairs was being used only as a screening chair because its equipment was out, and the trailer housing the X-ray unit was not available that week. A portable X-ray unit had been set up in an office of the camp.

> The students work for four weeks and usually come two years in a row. The more advanced students help the less experienced, and the whole project was supervised on site by a practicing dentist and University of California faculty member who had volunteered two weeks of his summer to the project.

The Mini-Corps in California

In an interview with the assistant director of Mini-Corps for the State of California, NCEMC observers learned that it is in its third year of operation and is financed through ESEA Title I migrant funds. Its purpose is to give prospective teachers in California colleges experience in working with migrant children and also to provide them with summer jobs to help them stay in college.

Recruits must be bi-lingual (many are former migrants), must come from low-income families (average annual family income is $5,000, and average family size is five members), and must plan to enter teaching or a closely related profession. They and the teachers who supervise them in their summer teaching assignments receive college credit for courses, which are conducted largely through field work. Most Mini-Corpsmen live in migrant camps or nearby.

They are paid a stipend of $1,125, receiving $100 semi-monthly during the summer and $625 on September 1, to help with next year's college expenses.

In most of the California migrant education projects we observed, Mini-Corpsmen were at work, providing individual help to the children. In a woodworking class in one school, a Mini-Corpsman helped a boy learn to use a jigsaw. In another school, a Mini-Corpsman worked with two teen-age girls who were just learning to read. Mini-Corpsmen were in their first week of assignment in most schools at the time of our visit.

One consultant commented:

> Use of Mini-Corpsmen appeared to enrich the program in various ways. Their training and enthusiasm and their ability to converse in both Spanish and English contributed to the effectiveness of all the activities.

Another consultant reacted as follows:

> One of California's most impressive efforts in the field of migrant education and service is the Mini-Corps. Of course it is designed as much to help the Mini-Corpsmen as it is to help the children. It is better than anything like it I have seen.
>
> I talked with five students serving as Mini-Corpsmen and watched them and several more at work. They were assisting teachers, perhaps in an important way. However, they were minor figures in the classroom, largely relegated to service roles. I wished that they had been freer to relate more closely to the children in their own individual ways and to help break down the arbitrary separation so many teachers make between human things and learning things.

VI. Educational Planning and Implementation

At the Local Project Level

In many of the migrant education projects visited, consultants felt the lack of any educational plan. They often reported that a *listing* of educational techniques or the repetition of currently popular educational phrases was being substituted for clearly defined program objectives and components. For example, three consultants reported:

> It seemed apparent that there were no clearcut program objectives. The director kept saying, "We wanted to break them out of the self-contained classroom." There was other talk of educational techniques such as team teaching and developing teaching styles like those in "pod" buildings. All added up to an impression nobody knew really what he was talking about.
>
> Poor organization was another major problem. By the end of the second day of a four-week summer program, everybody was dissatisfied with the departmentalized schedule of 50-minute classes which was being used. However, nobody was sure who had planned it that way, and nobody had any real authority to change it.
>
> In the classrooms, the same disorganization prevailed. "Master teachers" usually figured out in their heads what they were going to do in the next hour and then told their teachers-in-training and aides sometime during each hour what they wanted them to do.
>
> (A Washington State summer project)

* * *

> The director described the approach to program planning as "pragmatic—we try different things and see if they work." When asked what had so far been found to work, he mentioned dittoed materials, small groups, help with individual problems, games, creative dramatics, and puppets. Obviously, this is a list of materials and activities and not an educational plan. (A Wisconsin summer project)

* * *

> The school accepted the state objectives for migrant education: (1) self-image, (2) vocabulary building, (3) skills development in math and reading, (4) health and nutrition and (5) cultural experiences.
>
> The theme for the school was "S-U-M-M-E-R," with each letter of the word giving emphasis to a special topic each week.
>
> During the time we were there, they were in the third week. However, I visited only one class when any work was being done on the week's topic of "My Family."

The curriculum was described as being experience centered. The principal particularly emphasized self-made reading charts. The only ones I saw were in kindergarten. Some textbooks (and workbooks) were being used.

The director and staff members I interviewed all talked about the child's self-concept. Yet few people in the program were able to verbalize program goals beyond "a good self-concept" and, as a consequence, there was the groping and insecurity commonly found in people who don't know where they are going. (A New York State summer school)

Some project officials seemed to consultants poorly qualified to plan and direct a migrant education program:

In a newly desegregated school district, three coordinators (two white and one Negro) shared the responsibility for the county-wide supervision of migrant education. Their roles were not clearly defined, and they exercised little program leadership. They worked within state policies and left decisions about the use of funds up to individual school principals.

Although the Negro coordinator was thoroughly experienced in migrant education, the white coordinator had been appointed only a few months before our visit. He was a former athletic coach, and, more recently, campaign manager for the county superintendent of schools. He really had little to say about migrant education, except for some general comments about how migrants may be happy as they are (like Eskimos, who know nothing better than to sit on the ice and fish) and about how it may be unwise to try to get them to learn "middle-class values." To put it mildly, this man did not seem qualified by interest, experience, or attitude to lead a migrant education program.

(A Florida county)

* * *

The federal coordinator showed an ability to secure and use the services of knowledgeable people who have status in migrant education circles. He expressed great satisfaction with the consultative and evaluative services provided by the state education department. Thus, his orientation to program planning is to seek guidance from those above him in the administrative structure, but he is out of touch with the needs of the people the programs serve. This was especially apparent in his insensitive comments about minority group members, his inability to answer questions about health and welfare services for migrant families, and his lack of concern about how children of working parents eat lunch and are cared for after school closes.

(A New York State school-year program)

Local politics were described by one consultant as creating formidable obstacles to educational planning:

After the state receives its guidelines from Washington, it sits down with the counties to draw up a set of guidelines for them. The counties then evaluate their needs and write a proposal to the state. In this county, each proposal is scrutinized by the local school board, and un-

less it fits their political guidelines, it is sent back for revisions or killed outright.

Thus, when the project director prepares a proposal for a migrant program he needs to consider not only what is best for the children but "What is it the board will allow me to do and how do I go about acquiring the other services that I also need?"

Another problem at this level is how to go about making sure that migrant money actually reaches the population for which it is intended. State-imposed millage limitations make the migrant program's annual budget of $1,400,000 very tempting. The director is aware of this problem and he tries to spend his money only as he has direct control over it. (Another Florida county)

A consultant found a regional project well-organized and able to define its priorities clearly. However, he found an essential ingredient lacking:

Much of the planning has been done at the state level, and there are weekly regional staff conferences where program objectives, components, and techniques are discussed. Regional staff plan and implement a comprehensive program of pre-school education, day care, health and nutrition services in 11 Family Centers in 15 counties. The Region also finances and provides consultative services to migrant education projects conducted by local school districts. At the time of our visit, 22 schools in the region had summer migrant programs (last summer there were 14).

One of the overall objectives is to get local districts to shoulder the responsibility of meeting the special needs of the migrant child. A coordinator expressed what might be considered a minimal goal: getting the migrant children into school. Regional personnel also had a realistic concept of the urgency for seeing that migrant children are given basic language and number skills.

There are discrepancies between this very reasonable statement of goals and my own concepts of both reality and ideal. Often, with children who feel like aliens in school, the very desire to give skills creates a gap between the teacher and the child which simple goodwill does not bridge. Regional leadership has not been able and/or willing to work on disseminating approaches to the child at the local district level which will lead rather than push a child to the desired congruence with learning. (A California five-county region)

In another project, a consultant found a clear sense of priorities. However, she also found strategy fragmented and curriculum concepts limited:

In a community where reading and math levels are low for most residents, the schools identify the need for learning skills as paramount. Games and kits of programmed materials to provide these skills most pleasurably through game motifs form the bases of the curriculum and the program.

However, it appeared to the observers that the approach stopped short with the components—they were not integrated into a coherent program plan and the objectives were not expressed in a sequence. The frame

of reference for the pieces or parts was lacking or unperceived. It was as if the pieces would add themselves up.

The children's lives outside of school were not usually known to the teacher. Teachers did not make home visits and the culture of the children (migrant or subdominant other) had no place in the classroom. The culture, actually, was that of the SRA and Peabody materials. Personality and individuality were virtually excluded. No meetings with parents were held either. Their goals and wishes had no opportunity for expression.

Nor was the natural environment utilized for learning. For example, an expensive set of "life-like" plastic fruits made by Peabody was in the classroom—but the children have never been taken to the orchards or berry farms which abound in the area to see fruit in life. One child could not identify a plastic peach; the area is noted for its peach orchards.

The most characteristic weakness of the project as a whole was the overemphasis on programmed materials. Under these circumstances the teacher functioned more as an aide than a teacher, having little opportunity to draw upon her own experience and training. It seemed needlessly expensive to use teachers for these functions.

(A New Jersey summer project)

In a traditional, skill-oriented program a consultant found many solid values:

The emphasis was on reading and language arts, with arithmetic and health instruction close behind. Staff indicated that curriculum was based on past experience with migrant children in this district's summer schools.

An attitude of flexibility was apparent in the instruction. Teachers indicated that they worked with children on an individual or group basis, depending on interest. For example, if a child got interested in reading, they wouldn't stop him until the interest and the lessons had been completed. If this took an hour or if it took 15 minutes, that was what they took.

The program could have been better with additional in-service training, resources for curriculum development, recreational facilities, and parent involvement. Teaching methods were fairly "bookish" and traditional. There was little evidence of pupil-initiated activities or creative work. Children were kept in their seats for long periods of time, and teachers were doing too much talking and children not enough.

(An Illinois summer program)

In one school district, the migrant school was participating in a pilot program called "Project Learn." For this project, a team of outside consultants (Behavioral Research Laboratories) was employed and paid $21,000, or about $70 per student. The company supplied all teaching materials, plus in-service training for staff. In deciding to employ them, school officials thus delegated some of their planning functions. While consultants found positive aspects in the pilot project, they also found a distortion of

emphasis. Two consultants' comments summarize the concerns of all team members:

> Whenever a team of consultants with materials and a methodological approach to sell is given too free a hand in developing a total program, distortions of emphasis can occur very easily. In this case, a skill-oriented faculty were given very efficient skill-oriented materials and plentiful teacher aide time. The result appeared to us to be a dramatic increase in efficiency in developing the prescribed reading and math skills which are contained in the programmed material, accompanied by a very serious lack of balance.
>
> There was no corresponding increase in human involvement, curiosity, motivation to read a wide variety of books, motivation to think critically about what was read, motivation to create one's own thing using the newly developed reading or math skills. We saw a school of small groups, each dutifully listening to its earphones or responding to its program, chairs in straight rows, all responding on cue. We saw little or nothing in the way of student initiated projects, democratic living, or scientific problem solving.
>
> * * *
>
> The essential fact that has escaped teachers, officials and their paid advisors is that any knowledge or idea made available to a child—any child—is infinitely more likely to be absorbed, assimilated, and subsequently used if the child is happy and self-assured, and if the fact or idea is truly relevant to him personally.
>
> Self-assurance is to be certain that you have a place, no matter how unique, in what you do and where you are. The ego cannot be fooled. Tasks which have essentially no meaning or are exceptional only in their triviality do not count for reassurance.
>
> What is truly relevant to a child is what grabs him. It is something so meaningful to him that he cannot pass it up, that he will go out of his way to do it, and it will take an effort to draw him away from it. It is bound to be a highly individual thing, and its discovery will take time, effort, and many opportunities for self-expression for the child. This is the value of freedom in the schools, and this is the reason for the absolute necessity that the school must not only tolerate the child's cultural and individual heritage, it must revel in it.
>
> This school district's classrooms do not have activities of this type. Nor does there seem to be any consciousness of a failing in this area by school district officials. (A Texas school district)

To another team, one school they visited "stands out nationally as a remarkable example of what can be done with the proper use of expertise and federal expenditures." They reported:

> This elementary school is operated on a non-graded basis. Children are grouped into suites, rather than grades, according to their proficiency and academic accomplishments rather than by tenure. Ability is determined both by periodic examinations and teacher observations.

There are five suites, each with approximately 120 students and five teachers, plus teacher aides. Suites are divided into sections, and sections into groups. Each section teaches a certain subject and when the student masters the subject to the teacher's approval, he advances to a new section of the class. The average class has four of these sections with teachers preparing lessons in a team-teaching arrangement.

The child can advance at his own speed without the pressure of having to measure up to a certain standard. The child may take seven years to finish elementary school, but at least he is not pushed into junior high before he is ready. Nor is the child left to sit and be promoted by default.

Two types of standard readers are used, but are supplemented by "peer books," written by the children themselves about their own experiences. Some peer books are kept in the child's own classroom, and some are placed in the library.

In each section there is a remedial teacher to help students who are drastically behind in their work. The problem is that she is neither full-time nor can she help all the students who are in need of help. A full-time remedial teaching staff would be a great boon to the school.

Four separate teachers, one each for industrial arts, art, physical education, and music, supplement the instruction. Children are exposed to different experiences in school. They visit grocery stores, prepare imaginative dinners, talk to black professional people and receive proper health care. They also take field trips throughout South Florida.

A permissive atmosphere exists for both student and teacher. Imagination and improvisation are encouraged. (A Florida elementary school)

Diagnosing and Meeting Individual Needs

For migrant children, who move so often from school to school, individualization of instruction is essential. If they are to benefit at all from migrant education programs, staff must learn to diagnose their individual interests and needs quickly and to provide immediately learning experiences which are relevant to them.

In *none* of the migrant education projects we visited did consultants find that the very challenging problems of individualizing instruction for a mobile population had been adequately solved. There were, however, some promising approaches and experimental attempts. One very promising approach was through a *flexible, ungraded method of class organization* (consultants' report on a Florida elementary school as described above).

Another approach was through the use of the *diagnostic instruments which accompany programmed teaching materials*. In two projects which used this method, consultants found both strengths and weaknesses. Of a school-year program, a consultant commented:

When a child enters the migrant elementary school, he is given a placement test in reading and another in math. These scores indicate where the child should be placed among the 15 levels available in the school.

After a child is placed, it appeared that little further diagnosis of needs is done. Rather the child participates in the on-going program of the group, and his response to the lessons is used to determine how appropriate the work of that group is for him.

Migrant children have serious gaps in their learning, because of their many transfers from one school to another. Placement tests for the Sullivan programmed materials are a satisfactory first step, but are not adequate to find specific gaps in learning. Many of the children must be repeating skills they have learned, and still missing some they have not.

Additional in-service training on diagnosing student progress and following up the diagnosis with individually prescribed instruction would probably be beneficial. (A Texas school district)

In a summer project, a consultant reported as follows:

All students (migrants and others) are diagnosed according to their levels of ability with materials from Science Research Associates, and they subsequently use the SRA materials appropriate to their individual levels. The children are matched to the materials, rather than the materials to the children. All children are to learn everything the programmed series provides, even if at varying rates. No differentiation is made for individual interests or experience.

In effect, SRA and not the teacher is the diagnostician. One teacher told me she didn't know much about the performance ranges for the age groups she was teaching. (A New Jersey summer school)

Standardized tests are being used in many migrant education projects. In one Florida elementary-junior high school, standardized testing had reached epidemic proportions. Not only was initial class placement based on standardized scores, but periodic testing every six weeks was used for regrouping by class and by subgroups within a class. Even aides who demonstrated almost no knowledge of how to impart reading or math skills were able to discourse fluently on the testing and grouping procedures:

"This boy started at a 0.6 level this fall and moved up to one point something."

"I work with the six class at the third grade level and the low sevens in a second grade class."

Classroom observations and interviews with teachers and aides did not indicate that this proliferation of testing and grouping was being followed by effective individual or small-group instruction. The staff-pupil ratio was too high and staff in-service training too limited.

In a Washington State summer school, consultants also reported that achievement tests administered by the college staff of an affiliated teacher training institute were *not* being used as the basis for the individualized instruction. As a matter of fact, they were not being used at all—on the second day of a four-week program, they were still at the college. As consultants commented:

It appeared that no comprehensive plan for the diagnosis of individual learning problems, strengths or weaknesses, existed at all. The first three days of classes consisted largely of games and small group skill exercises. These activities could have been used for diagnosis if checklists or similar records had been started on each pupil. They were not.

Nor did it appear that the teachers had available to them any of the cumulative records for children who had been enrolled there during the previous school year, or that there were resources for individual testing. Teachers had not developed any sort of informal reading or math inventories, or anything else which would help give them a clue as to where the child was so they could build a curriculum based upon the children's individual needs. Consequently, everyone was in the dark.

In the other projects we visited, standardized tests were usual, but individualized instruction was unusual. The work of some outstanding individual teachers who were attempting it will be described, among other classroom observations, in the following section of this report.

In the Classroom

When it comes to the implementation of educational plans, the classroom is of primary importance. In the following series of classroom observations, we would like to enable the reader to see, through consultants' reports, some of the classrooms we visited in migrant education projects.

Classroom Observations

Pre-Schools and Kindergartens

A school-year and a summer program provided a marked contrast in class size, staff-pupil ratios, and learning atmosphere:

A kindergarten class of 35 children was taught by a teacher on her first job out of college. The children were lined up at one end of the room, practicing songs for a school assembly program. The teacher sat at the other end of the room urging the children to sing louder. A boy who had misbehaved sat apart. The aide (a young Negro woman who said she enjoyed the children but would have preferred a secretarial job) expressed doubts about whether they could get the children ready for the assembly on time. (A New York State school-year program)

* * *

In a group of ten children (two through five-year-olds) two teachers and a migrant aide were present. A trip to three dairy farms was planned for the whole school for that afternoon, and before I arrived, the children had begun to construct and paint a red cardboard dairy barn. When I entered, they were all seated around one table cutting out pictures from farm journals to paste on the barn. The atmosphere was informal and pleasant; conversation about the pictures and other matters was in both Spanish and English; adults gave many indica-

tions of interest in and approval of the pictures the children selected. From time to time, they sang a song together.

(A Wisconsin summer program)

In two Florida classes activities were quite formal, but there were sharp differences in the interaction among the children and between children and adults:

> The program was begun on February 17, about a month before this visit. While the trailer was new, facilities were crowded and the air conditioner was not working. Children had no place to store things of their own.
>
> Materials of all types were plentiful including reading pacers and other audio-visual equipment. Conventional toys, tricycles, and wagons were available and being used. Paper and drawing materials were also plentiful, and children's drawings were on display. Cooking facilities for student teacher projects were in each classroom.
>
> I was struck by the total lack of interaction among the children. They literally did not talk to each other on the playground and very little in the classroom. I saw little physical contact between teachers and students.
>
> As a group, the children were lethargic: even the little girl crying because she didn't want to take a nap was doing it quietly, hoping she would be noticed. (A Florida pre-kindergarten trailer)

* * *

The teacher had planned a cutting and pasting activity which involved making flowers out of colored paper cupcake liners. She had prepared a sample of how it was supposed to look and encouraged the children to follow definite rules in order to complete a picture which would closely resemble the sample. She moved among the children showing them how to do it. She was very encouraging:

> Child: I can't do this!
>
> Teacher: Oh, yes you can. Cut all the way down. There, you can do it!
>
> Child: (smiling, seems very happy): Like this?

The teacher used the activity to introduce words to describe colors and shapes:

> What color did you choose for the flower?
>
> What color is the stem?

(Answers to the second question included brown, purple and green, which was the actual color of the stem on the teacher's model.)

> Cut your little piece to go in the center any shape you want. It goes in the center part. That's the center, isn't it?

There was a running commentary from the teacher throughout the activity and the children were also free to talk with each other and move around. They called out often to the teacher for help.

The children seemed very pleased with what they had finished and they walked over to the bulletin board and held their pictures up to see how they were going to look there. The teacher came over immediately and began to pin the pictures up, talking about which one would look good where and about how nice it was going to be "when I sit at my desk and look over and see this." (A Florida kindergarten)

In a summer pre-school class supervised by teen-age aides, it was possible to observe a small group of migrant pre-school children in unstructured play activities:

Some of the pre-school children painted with water-colors under the supervision of several teen-age aides, who ignored the children once they had got the materials set up. The children painted with apparent absorption and pleasure, and the aides cleaned up very thoroughly when they were done.

Some of the pre-school children then spent the rest of the afternoon playing with the housekeeping equipment, blocks, and trucks. Again, the aides offered almost no supervision, so that the children were free to work things out at leisure in their own way.

A girl rocked a doll in her arms, bending over it tenderly, and then placing it in a bed which she sealed off completely with blocks. Another girl made many cakes for her doll out of small colored blocks, topped with pine cones. Each time she finished one, she would point to it and smile with delight.

Later, the doll bed was converted into the back end of a dump truck by a boy, who was experimenting with many combinations of small blocks along the edge of it—balancing and dumping.

(A Wisconsin pre-school class)

In a school-year pilot project which relied heavily on a programmed curriculum, one pre-school teacher told about the problems they had with "these children when they first come. At first they wander off. But we go and get them and let them know that they can't do what they want." An observer found the pre-school classrooms "magnificently equipped" but the program "so structured that children were using the materials only briefly and under stern supervision." Another observer described an hour's observation of a pre-school class in this school:

The classroom was a portable building, beautifully decorated for Easter, and divided physically into three seating areas. There was much audio-visual and play equipment, including a slide projector, a record player, a see-saw, trucks, tricycles, and hand puppets.

Three small-group activities were proceeding simultaneously. At a signal from the teacher, the groups would change places, so that by the end of the hour, all of the children had participated in each of the three activities which had been planned.

One group listened to recorded stories ("The Little Red Hen" and "Peter Rabbit"), and watched a filmstrip depicting them. During this

activity, children seemed quite fidgety, stood up and sat down, put the headphones on and off.

A second activity—using colored chalk to decorate large paper Easter eggs—aroused more sustained interest. However, there was little individuality in the style of the decorations, and the aide who supervised this activity insisted that no white spaces could be left—the eggs had to be completely covered with color.

The teacher gave an oral language lesson to a third group, following carefully the format of the speech patterns presented in the manual, which she kept open before her at all times. Some children responded actively, showing a good command of English vocabulary. Others were unable to focus their attention on the lesson.

(A Texas school district)

* * *

In a neighboring school district, another observer described pre-school classes in two schools. In one, where Title I migrant funds were used, he found:

Rooms were cheerful. Equipment seemed adequate and well selected. Each room had a teacher and two aides. Teaching was very structured. One group was at work with filmstrip, records and earphones. Other teaching machines were in use. Machines freed aides, but aides did not seem to utilize freedom to develop human relationships with the children.

In another, where there were no federal migrant funds:

There was no equipment for pre-school education except for two little trucks and a few old books. The room was set up like a first or second grade, and children were in school until 2:30 p.m. with no naps or extended play periods. Children were learning by repeating what the teacher said. The aide's function was to keep order.

(Another Texas school district)

Classroom Observations

Primary Grades

Observations in the primary grades showed a major emphasis on reading and language development. Here are two examples of the use of programmed materials for this purpose:

The teacher stood in front of the room, holding Peabody cards—pictures of various articles of clothing. Children took turns coming to front of room, looking at a picture and pantomiming the article for the class to guess what it was. The children had considerable difficulty, partly because the teacher insisted on rather specific names rather than the general ones. Some of the articles were unusual and unknown to the children such as "parka" and "jogging suit." Afterwards, the teacher had the children look at the pictures and name them.

(A New Jersey summer project)

* * *

A small group was copying the letters A, B, & C from sandpaper cards. A large group was writing A, B, & C on ruled paper. Later, the teacher wrote a letter on the back of each child and had him guess what it was. Afterwards, she presented a reading lesson from Sullivan materials. The teacher sat in front with chart and manual. Purpose was to teach: (1) colors, (2) concepts such as right and left, first and last, before and after, and (3) the names of animals. Children responded with moderate enthusiasm. One child was particularly restless. The nurse later said she was only five and should be in pre-school.

(A New Jersey summer project)

Observers noted more than one way to teach consonant sounds, or group a class for reading, or use a slide projector. They found equipment and methods no substitute for human relationships in the classroom:

For 15 minutes the class worked on the initial sound of "n," using an overhead projector and workbooks for the children to follow and mark. For another 10 minutes they worked on the sound of "b" in the same manner. During the lesson, an aide checked seat work. Children were restless throughout. (A New York State summer program)

A lesson dealing with "g" sounds was introduced by showing a live grasshopper in a jar, as well as a picture of a grasshopper. (One child guessed it to be a mouse.) For about 20 minutes, the children looked for people or things or pictures in the room which could be named by words with "g" sounds. The teacher helped them to distinguish between the hard "g", the soft "g" and "j". For the most part, the children participated enthusiastically, often finding two words at a time. Some of the words they found were *giraffe, pig, gazelle, George,* and *jar.*

The words were presented visually as well as orally. If they were not already printed under a picture, the teacher wrote them on the board.

The teacher seemed very sure of the learning level of each child and made minute, appropriate variations to meet each child's needs. She found ways to respond positively to every child's contribution—to turn a wrong answer into a right one by supplying a new question.

(A New Jersey summer program)

* * *

The room had been darkened to use a slide projector for a lesson which emphasized number concepts (one to five) and oral English practice in reading and counting with these numbers. The slides featured colored pictures (a house, baby chicks, rabbits, pigs, an elephant), with the numbers from one to five printed below in large type.

The teacher operated the slide projector from the back of the room, and also moved among the children almost constantly, caressing them or guiding them when they answered a question:

"Danny, point to how many houses you see."

Danny hesitated in front of the picture, and the teacher went up and held his hand, whispering to him. She pointed to the numeral "1" and then Danny pointed to it.

"One house! Good boy!"

She maintained good balance between encouraging children who seemed to know almost no English to take part in some way (by clapping or pointing, with help to make sure they succeeded and lavish praise when they had) and giving the more experienced ones an opportunity for more advanced practice:

"Where do you think these pigs are going?"

"I wonder where the elephant lives."

For the first 20 minutes of my observation, the children were attentive, and most seemed eager to take part. When they became restless, the lesson was discontinued. (A California summer school)

* * *

In a third grade, the teacher was conducting oral reading with eight children seated around a table, while the rest of the class did seat work in a desultory fashion. An aide was doing paper work. I thought everybody in the room looked rather worried and unhappy. Most of the children in the oral reading group found the selection very difficult, and the teacher discontinued it after a while, saying that it was not "appropriate" and she would have to find another.

(A California summer school)

* * *

A class of seven and eight-year-olds had been divided into four groups for reading. The teacher had the largest group; two aides were working with smaller groups, and one aide was giving individual help to a child who was having difficulty. Reading was thus a comfortable situation, and no child was isolated and plugged into a machine. All children were expected to participate, but teachers seemed supportive and kind, and there was no pressure or competition.

(Another California summer school)

* * *

Individualized instruction was rare:

In a second grade classroom, six of the 25 children present were migrants. The teacher was a black former migrant. At eleven o'clock she was working with the migrants using cut-outs from magazines to suggest words to students, and help them identify the various sounds. The Spanish-speaking students listened, and the English-speaking students responded fairly well to the exercise. The rest of the class was working on various assignments.

At twenty minutes to one, she grouped the migrants for a reading lesson. Lucy read well at the second level and her comprehension was very good. Denny read slowly, at a lower second level. Terry was a slow reader, with poor comprehension. Tony was reading at the first grade level and comprehended poorly. Joe's reading assignment consisted of looking at a set of three pictures, and finding which two start with the same letter. Pete's lesson was to point out parts of a diagram using English names. (A Florida elementary school)

* * *

During half-hour interviews with two of the three reading specialists and a brief observation of a third in her classroom, I gained a very favorable impression of the professional quality of this service. Three to five children were present at a time and were receiving individual help. Materials were plentiful and seemed to me well-selected. Children seemed comfortable and worked with concentration. Teachers showed knowledge of individual children's problems, skill in varying their approaches, real concern for the children's progress, and real evidence of their achievement. (A New York State school district)

In two observations carelessness in preparing or selecting teaching materials was noted:

The purpose of the activity was learning to identify the first five letters of the alphabet, both large and small letters. Children were given boxes of letter cards and told to pick out the letters A-E and put them in correct order on their desks. Most seemed to be able to do this, except that nobody had bothered to check and see that all the sets were complete. Some children were quite frustrated because no matter how hard they tried they couldn't find letters which weren't there.

(A Washington State summer program)

* * *

A number of children played on the floor with sewing cards and toys. Others were finishing leather coin purses—a frustrating activity, since the gimp was too large for tiny pre-punched holes, and to trim it, children were using 12-inch scissors which were too warped to cut very well. As a result, teachers did most of work.

(A New York State summer program)

In an arithmetic class with six adults and 27 children, team preparation was lacking:

When I arrived, children were divided into four groups. One group was working on dittoed sheets dealing with sequence in math. Another group was working on a tape recorded math lesson using earphones. The machine did not seem to be working too well, as it was often audible to the entire room. As the hour progressed, two of the groups used lima beans for counting. Another used flash cards, placing the cards under the correct sum on the blackboard. The groupings were by ability although I was unable to learn how the teacher had determined their ability.

The reactions of the children were varied. Some seemed quite bored with the whole business, others reasonably enthusiastic. All showed enthusiasm when orange juice and cookies arrived. After snack, this group moved on to another classroom.

As a second group of 22 primary children came in, the teacher sent them to various tables. There was some confusion initially as she made these decisions. She then gave assignments to the various student teachers as to both content and the group they would work with. This whole session was devoted to flash cards and lima beans.

(A Washington State summer program)

Teachers did not always welcome a child's special effort to overcome learning difficulties:

> In a third grade language development class, the teacher gave little praise but much sarcasm. One boy rewrote the spelling words he had missed but was told, "Yes, they're right but I've already graded the paper, so it doesn't do any good." (A Florida elementary school)

* * *

> In a third grade social studies lesson, one of the children who did not recite at all was José. The teacher gave him a good deal of attention (she was "on him" often about sitting up straight and holding his book on the desk, rather than on his lap). However, once when he smiled for the only time during my 30 minutes of observation and raised his hand to recite, the teacher looked straight at him without smiling and then called on someone else instead. (According to information secured by another consultant, José can speak English, but cannot read or write it.) (A New York State school district)

Some lessons seemed completely inappropriate to the children's experience:

> The lesson was about playground safety, with special emphasis on safety at the slide. The playground of this school had no slide. A teacher led the discussion, while an aide kept children from moving out of their seats. (A Texas school district)

* * *

> Children were sitting in rows of chairs, repeating numbers. They were then asked to get up in front of the room and describe what they had for breakfast. (Some, who might not have wished to say so, had certainly had none. Some indicated they had eaten carrots; carrot harvest was then in progress in the area.) (A Texas school district)

* * *

> In a third grade oral English lesson, an Anglo teacher was saying to a group of Mexican-American children:
>
> "What . . . is . . . this?"
>
> "An . . . egg."
>
> "Willie! Quit that! Get your hands out of that box! When . . . do . . . you . . . eat . . . the . . . egg?"
>
> "With beans!"
>
> "Easter!"
>
> "When you're hungry!"
>
> The teacher is silent. Another child volunteers an answer:
>
> "Breakfast."
>
> "That's right . . . b-r-e-a-k-f-a-s-t. Irene! Irene!"
>
> Irene straightens.
>
> "Do . . . you . . . eat . . . it . . . like this?"
> she asks, leading.
>
> "N-o-o-o,"

answer the children looking around the room. The observer passed the open door of the room fifteen minutes later to see Willie, his eyes red, returning from a spanking by the assistant principal.

(Another Texas school district)

Observers also reported examples of primary grade instruction which they found very well related to the children's experience:

In a group of six to eight-year-olds, several reading and language activities were related to a field trip to three dairy farms planned for the whole school that afternoon. Three teachers were present. One read the children a story, "I Want to be a Dairy Farmer," giving them a chance to see and discuss the pictures. Another taught a brief reading lesson from the board: *dairy farm, milk, bull, cow, calf.* A third teacher showed magazine pictures of animals, crops, and farm machinery, passing the pictures around so that each child could look at them individually.

There were indications in the room of previous activities related to the children's experience: photographs and life-size, brightly painted cutouts of each child; gilded montages of seeds, pods, and grasses; an experience chart story about a trip to the zoo:

"We saw tigers, gorillas, alligators, and snakes. Mary Jane liked the birds who talked. Lisa liked the little birds. Chris liked the snakes. The elephant liked papers, peanuts, and pine cones. There was a man with the monkey.

"Before we went home, we rode on the train."

(A Wisconsin summer program)

* * *

In a first grade, the teacher was using large pictures to help the children describe what they saw and to express how it related to their lives. The picture of how potatoes grow stimulated conversation about migrating to potatoes. Experiences in travel and field work were shared. The large pictures were also used to help the children learn to distinguish right hand from left hand. (A Texas school district)

* * *

The children copied a two or three sentence story about their families from a chart. It went something like: I have a_____(big, small) family. I have_____brothers and_____sisters.

Then the children were asked to draw their families. I was fascinated by the beautiful pictures most drew. All were colorful. Except for one, they had well-shaped bodies, heads, arms, legs. Almost all colored the skin brown (several drew outline in green). Clothing was colorful. One child drew his brother first and very large. Parents were among last and quite small. Another child added a ball and a scarecrow (his identification). At least two drew their parents holding hands.

The teacher expressed fear in dealing with this week's unit on the family because she was afraid of creating embarrassing situations. She told me that before I arrived one boy was repeatedly told by his classmates that he did not have a mother. I watched his drawing. He drew children first, then mother, father, and a baby.

(A New York State summer project)

Classroom Observations
Intermediate Grades

Perhaps by coincidence, fewer lessons observed at the fourth grade level and above were focused on reading and language. In two examples reported, teachers were making excellent use of the children's experience:

> A fourth grade classroom was a little small for the thirty children, one teacher and two aides, but the room was neat and contained lots of interesting activity. Some children were drawing and finding words in the dictionary related to spring; they were busy and obviously interested. There were drawings and written descriptions on the wall which the children had prepared to tell of their trips to potatoes, tomatoes, or other crops.
>
> The teacher may have lacked efficiency in preparation and plans for her aides, but I thought she obviously loved and enjoyed the children, and had the grandmotherly attitude which gave the children the love and security which they needed. (A Texas school district)

* * *

> A fifth grade teacher had provided the children with long scrolls of illustrator's paper and encouraged them to do illustrated autobiographies. Although this classroom was only slightly less structured and disciplined than others, this work had obviously caught the children's fancies, and the autobiographies were beautiful:
>
> > We are leaving to Ohio in a truck.
> > I am carrying a box.
> > We are on the road. We are
> > going to fill the tank with
> > gas at a gas station.
> > My brother Frank is driving.
> > We are picking tomatoes. (A Texas school district)

In two other language classes, teachers seemed unaware of the interests and skill levels of their pupils:

> In a class which combined grades four through six, both the teacher and the aide were patient and kind, but completely inexperienced in planning and conducting learning activities for this age group. In the lesson I observed, a filmstrip of "Jack and the Beanstalk" was used in an effort to teach adverbs. Since the quality of the filmstrip was poor and since "adverbs" were not presented as relevant to the children's experience, they seemed more interested in the projector than in the instruction.
>
> A number of the children with whom I spoke expressed a desire for more physical activities. Some sixth graders told me they were planning a "walk-out" if they did not get some time to climb the trees on the playground. I wondered whether the lesson on adverbs might have been more effectively taught by letting the children climb trees "carefully" or "cautiously" or "speedily" or "gracefully." (An Illinois summer program)

* * *

The children had heads bent over their tables, writing according to instructions on a chart: "Words that Name, Words that Describe, Words that Express Action." They were then to list fifteen words under each category. This appeared to be beyond the comprehension of most of these children. Even with considerable help I found they were scarcely able to proceed beyond the word suggested to similar words.

(A Washington State summer program)

Another teacher attempted to provide oral language experience through an activity related to a field trip. In an observer's opinion, "the teacher and her curriculum got in the way":

A class of older children (nine years old and above) were in the gym pasting pictures they had cut out of old farm magazines onto pieces of construction paper. The lesson was one on "montages," and coordinated with an afternoon trip to some local farms. There was also a box of vegetable matter from a farm: corn, wheat, hay.

The teacher was moving and talking throughout the activity:

"I'm going to show you the corn, now. Carlos, are you with me?"

"Which one is the corn plant? Pete. O.K., now, wait a minute. Only Pete."

Pete points out the corn plant.

"O.K., right. How does a little plant make a big one?"

No one answers.

"Have you ever seen a little ear of corn? There's a little thing inside here that what? Grows, right."

A child finally asks a question:

"Do I cut this out, too?"

"Uh, uh. Peter! here's your paste. Are those cows?"

"Yeah," says Carlos.

"They sure are. Could you milk them?"

Carlos fidgets in his seat, looks around the room.

"*Carlos*," impatiently,

"could you *milk* them?"

She waits, but finally gives up.

"Yes, you could."

"Do we gotta use these things?" asks Pete.

"Do you *have* to use them?" she corrects him.

"No, Pete, I was just showing you how to overlap the pictures."

"Carlos, Carlos!" she says, moving him with her two palms against his back to the table.

"Cut the magazine. Don't you want to
cut the magazine?" (A Wisconsin summer program)

In one observer's opinion, a library period offered an outstanding example of individualized instruction:

> In the library the fourth grade teacher helped the children individually to choose books. All seemed eager for his advice and for contact with him. He seemed to have enough time for everyone, and to welcome all overtures the children made. The Spanish books were on a high shelf, and the teacher took about 20 of them and spread them out on one table. Five or six children spent the rest of the period reading them without raising their heads. One boy followed the teacher around, scuffing his feet to try to give him shocks. Another climbed on his back when he bent down to a lower shelf. A very pert, self-possessed little girl called out, "Hey Mr. S., I can read Spanish," and he went to her immediately, saying, "Oh, is that so? Well let's see about that now," and spent ten minutes listening to her read. (This girl later told me that it was her first day in school and that she lived in Mexico.) By the end of the period, all children but one had checked out books.
>
> (A California summer school)

In intermediate arithmetic classes, consultants reported a wide range in *teachers'* efforts and skills:

> A sixth grade teacher allowed his class to play jacks for 35 minutes, then gave them a 20-minute review lesson on fractions (if you knew fractions you were praised; if you did not, little was done to teach them).
>
> (A New York State summer program)

* * *

> A fifth grade arithmetic class (all boys—the girls had gone to typing) were doing seat work. They seemed completely concentrated on it, and the teacher, a middle-aged man, talked with me for a few minutes about his concern that they learn the basic math skills. He said that many, resident children as well as migrants, did not know their multiplication tables, and that, old-fashioned or not, he was going to get the tables duplicated and go ahead and teach them. (A California summer school)

* * *

> The teacher was half-heartedly working on place value of numbers. They then played a baseball game which she only half-way knew how to organize. The difficulty of the problem was determined by the number of bases the pupil chose to run.
>
> The efforts to teach were interspersed with all sorts of discipline problems, serious only because the teacher did not know how to control a class. She referred to her class as problems from the regular school term: "Loud mouths." She put one boy in the hall for some minor behavior problem. Every time someone talked he was made to cover his mouth with his hand—this lasted about five seconds. At one point she counted to five and said whoever wasn't quiet would have to wait

five minutes for lunch. She doled out extra juice and coffee cake on the basis of who had been "good." (A Washington State summer program)

* * *

Upon entering a fifth grade arithmetic class, the writer found each pupil actively involved in seat work to the point that an observer's presence went almost unnoticed. The objective of the lesson was to develop skills in short division, making use of reading problems in the process. Two examples of problems used were:

> Let's assume that the rate of pay for picking a hamper of beans in Maryland is 60¢. If at the end of the day you are paid $3.30, how many hampers of beans did you pick?
>
> Writing pads that formerly sold for 15¢ are now on sale, for a limited time only, for 10¢. If you had bought them before they were put on sale, how many pads, and how much change—if any—would you get back from a $1.00 bill? Likewise, if you buy them while they are on sale, how many pads and how much change—if any—will you get back from a $1.00 bill?

The teacher provided help on an individual basis to those needing and/or requesting it. To me, it was gratifying to observe the extent to which pupils were seeking as well as the manner and spirit with which it was being provided. Rather than telling the pupils what to do, the teacher raised questions and guided pupil thinking in such a way as to have each arrive at the appropriate decision as to what should be done next.
(A Florida elementary school)

One observer reported the comment of an intermediate teacher in a summer migrant education program that "academic work must be given in very small doses, because the children are not interested in it." She questioned this assumption, and offered two observations "as a tribute to teachers who, with varying degrees of sensitivity and skill and under circumstances which sometimes offered little support, had not given up trying to meet migrant children's individual learning needs":

> In the class for 11-year-olds and above, the teacher, who works with a physically handicapped class during the regular school year, said that his pupils ranged in skill levels from pre-reading to senior high. The pupils, several of whom appeared to be in their teens, were working alone or by twos on individual assignments. There was a businesslike but comfortable atmosphere; everyone was working in a concentrated manner. A Mini-Corpsman was working quietly with two older girls, and the teacher paused to talk with me for a few minutes, responding simply and specifically to my questions and comments—showing the materials he had found best for a particular purpose, expressing doubts about some of his own methods, stopping to look at the math paper a boy brought him and to tell him he was ready for more advanced work, commenting on what a wonderful class they were and what quick progress they made—"some days they're in a bad mood and some days I am, but most days it's great." When the principal joined us, the

teacher told him he now needed *two* algebra books, and would appreciate it if he could have them *soon*. (A California summer school)

* * *

In a sixth grade class of 31 pupils, children were working at varied assignments. In math, the range was from multiplication of whole numbers through division of fractions; in reading the teacher said she works with the children in four groups, ranging from reading readiness to sixth grade level. She had no aide or modern equipment.

The teacher invited me to look at the children's work and speak to them individually about it. As I did so, the children responded very readily to my requests that they explain how they had done a math problem, read something to me they were working on, or let me check one of their problems. They were working in a concentrated manner, for the most part, and most children in the top group certainly did know their fractions. However, many of the others were experiencing considerable difficulty with assignments which seemed too advanced for their actual skill levels. For example, a boy who was multiplying 6-digit numbers and getting them all wrong did not know his multiplication tables (he looked them up on a sheet where he had copied them—inaccurately) and did not understand how to "carry." (If he found that 9 x 4 was 36, he tended to write the 3 as the product and carry the 6.)

While I was speaking with the children, the teacher was dictating some fraction problems to four children, who sat at a table near her desk. (A Florida elementary school)

In the upper elementary grades, teachers often mentioned the need for homemaking and sex education for the girls. A Negro fourth grade teacher in Florida was in unusually close contact with her migrant children's home lives. She commented on the results of extremely bad housing, often just "a few houses behind a beer joint":

The children see all kinds of things, and they pick up habits of others. Girls get pregnant early—they commit incest without even knowing what they are doing. We wait too late to prevent this, but we're trying to do a little better. Most girls leave in the 6th or 7th grade. We can't stop them. We should teach them something about homemaking before they leave. We asked the county for some simple homemaking equipment—a sewing machine and a stove, but we haven't got them yet.

In another Florida elementary school, a fifth grade teacher tried to help. She was very active with the migrants before school each morning. During this time she taught the girls how to cook and sew and out of her own pocket provided them with milk and cereal, knowing they received no breakfast before coming to school. She understood from these children that they were responsible for the care of their younger brothers and sisters and would, in a few years, be responsible for cooking the family meals while the other members of the family would work in the fields.

Classroom Observations

Junior High Schools

Few migrant children were observed in classes above the sixth grade. When school principals speak of "older" migrant pupils, they are often referring to ten-year-olds. We can offer only two classroom observations at the junior high school level:

> A low-track math program was presented as being individualized. Students in the classroom were working in locally produced workbooks with the teacher circulating and helping students as they needed him.
>
> A girl was sitting by herself at a separate table. She was not working at her math but kept busy drawing pictures and sending notes to several of the boys. When I walked over to her one of the boys informed me that she spoke no English. As I looked at the workbook in front of her, it became obvious why she wasn't working—most of the math she had been given to do consisted of word problems in English.
>
> The workbooks did not seem to me to present mathematics in any new or exciting way. They were used to achieve learning by rote and repetition. No manipulative materials were observed. Most students looked and acted bored. (A Florida junior high school)

* * *

> A "Creative Expression Program" operates continuously from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Fridays of each week in the junior high school library. Student participation is on a voluntary basis. In order to accommodate as many pupils as possible, groups change every 50 minutes. The overall purpose of these activities is to develop within pupils self-esteem, dignity, and a feeling of worth and confidence.
>
> Three junior high school teachers—two migrant teachers and one special education teacher—meet weekly to plan activities and to agree on responsibilities. Effective team teaching was clearly demonstrated during the visit; all teachers expressed great satisfaction in working with migrant children and appreciation of the school principal's support for the activity. Teachers seemed capable, outgoing, and well-liked by the pupils.
>
> The session observed by the writer consisted of 12 pupils—eight migrants and four non-migrants. On display throughout the library were various articles made by the students which indicated past activities: improvised doorstops (paper and wood); psychedelic paintings and posters; children's clothing; papier mache statues of animals; place mats of raffia and construction paper; party treats—decorated paper caps, rattlers, confetti. Posters on personal hygiene and good grooming reflected a visit by a public health nurse—invited at the request of one of the groups of students—at which the use of some materials for grooming (soaps, deodorants, perfumes, hair oils, face creams) had been demonstrated.
>
> Presently, most of the pupils were engaged in making paper caps for their pre-Easter party. Two pupils were preparing a poster to depict the eclipse of the sun scheduled to occur the very next day. The poster was

the pupils' interpretation of a lecture one of the teachers had given the day before to prepare the pupils for the eclipse.

These teachers frequently visited pupils and parents in their own homes. They expressed a feeling of need for greater involvement of parents in the activities of the school, and also for a special room for their activities to avoid depriving other students of the use of the library each Friday. (Another Florida junior high school)

Special Activities

Multi-Age Groupings

Especially on summer afternoons, many projects offered varied activities, including swimming, crafts, recreation, and field trips, to children of all ages together.

Afternoon activities in two nearby summer schools seemed outstanding to an observer:

The afternoon program on the day of our visit was a field trip by the whole school to three farms: the Carnation Breeding Farm, where they went through the two barns where valuable bulls were kept; the Carnation Dairy Farm where they saw how the cows are cared for and milked in a large, mechanized operation; and a smaller farm where they saw a cow milked by hand and by a smaller milking machine, took a ride on a hay wagon through the fields, and then spent an hour on the farmer's front lawn, putting on two short skits, holding sack races and three-legged races, and talking and singing into a tape recorder. There was an almost overwhelming amount for the children to see and absorb, but they were for the most part allowed to do this in their own way without adults dominating the experience.

It seemed clear that these children and adults had taken many trips together and that procedures and expectations for the behavior and safety of the children had been worked out thoroughly and required very little comment by now. The trip was therefore not marred by tense prohibitions and commands. There was a good deal of singing on the bus, and most of the adults had small children on their laps, by the hand, or in their arms—holding them up to see things—most of the time.

The afternoon closed with ice cream cones at the school. The director played the piano, and some of the children danced on the stage.

(A Wisconsin summer program)

* * *

In the kitchen, a teacher was heating a large tub of water for a tie-dye project, and teen-age aides were helping the children to tie the pieces of cloth. They planned to use some as curtains for their puppet theater. The water was carried outdoors, poured into cans, and dyed four different colors, and the children were shown how to do the dyeing and rinsing with a minimum of fuss. Aides hung the dyed pieces on a clothesline. This activity seemed very interesting to children of all ages, including the teen-age boys, one of whom tied up his white tee shirt and dyed it.

By about four o'clock the pieces had dried, and the children brought them into the sewing room, where everybody exclaimed over the beauty of them. An aide hemmed two as scarfs for a "new" boy who had been involved in a fight earlier: he sat watching with fascination and showed them proudly to the boy with whom he had been fighting. Another aide helped some of the girls to put fringes on their scarfs, and several of the smaller children used theirs for blind man's buff.

One girl was cutting out a dress for herself, with the help of an aide, and another was stitching hers—it was almost finished. The boy with the tie-dyed tee shirt was a sensation; several others asked the teacher whether they could do this again. Meanwhile, the teacher and an aide had finished making flower-shaped invitations, with messages in Spanish requesting the parents' permission for the girls to visit the teacher's apartment the following evening.

(Another Wisconsin summer program)

Needs at the Senior High School Level

All of our sources of information indicate that only a very small number of migrant students are receiving a high school education. State questionnaire responses show that only 8% of the 1968-69 school-year migrant enrollments reported were in grades nine through twelve, as compared with 28% of the total public school enrollments for the United States as a whole. Local questionnaire responses from 120 projects enrolling about 35,000 migrant pupils include reports of only 201 migrant pupils who graduated from high school during the 1968-69 school year. These graduates came from only 28 projects; over three-fourths of the sample projects reported no migrant high school graduates at all.

Local Questionnaire Follow-Up

To try to determine the factors which had helped this small number of migrant students to graduate from high school, NCEMC sent follow-up letters to the 16 project directors who reported at least five migrant high school graduates for the 1968-69 school year. Very informative replies were received from five projects in three states (Florida, New Mexico, and Texas), which among them had graduated a total of 59 migrant students.

Four projects provided information about the educational and family backgrounds of their migrant high school graduates:

- In *Broward County, Florida (23 graduates)*, all were described as black, with the majority classified as "five-year" rather than current migrants.
- In *Gallina, New Mexico (nine graduates)*, all were reported "of Spanish descent" and "from good families, some of whom have lived in the district all their lives; however, they go out and work during the fall."
- In *Las Vegas, New Mexico (six graduates)*, all were described as current migrants from low-income, Spanish-American families.

– In *Santa Rosa, New Mexico (eight graduates)*, all were reported to be Spanish-Americans who had been part-time residents of the school district all of their lives, normally attending school in Santa Rosa for five or six months a year.

Five respondents provided information about some of the factors they believed had helped migrant pupils to graduate from high school. Their replies show the comprehensive nature of the effort which was required. For example, in *Laredo, Texas (13 graduates)*, Neighborhood Youth Corps *jobs* were combined with special efforts by the migrant education project to secure *college scholarships*. As the other four projects reported (emphasis added):

* * *

> Some of these children have had difficulty attending school regularly; however, we have had *teachers who have been willing to give individual help* to most of our students. We had *special classes* for these students during the regular school term which I would say was the main factor which helped them to graduate. (Gallina, New Mexico)

* * *

> Our feeling is that these students were provided enough of *a challenge to see the value of a high school education*. They were *made to feel a part of the total high school environment*, and the course offerings were of such nature that they were *able to experience success in school*. For two of the boys, another contributing influence was that they *participated in athletics*. (Las Vegas, New Mexico)

* * *

> Some of the reasons that these students stayed in school and eventually graduated are as follows:
>
> (a) *Intensive counseling* has helped these children understand themselves much better.
>
> (b) *Vocational programs* designed to provide practical and valuable experiences in the world of work.
>
> (c) A variety of *supportive services* designed to provide for the various needs of the children have inspired and *raised the self-esteem* of these children–they have become better motivated in school.
>
> (d) *Counseling with parents* has increased their awareness of the importance of education. Parents became more concerned and sent children to school regularly.
>
> (e) *Direct involvement in many extra-curricular activities* . . . has changed their self-concept to a more favorable image.
>
> (Santa Rosa, New Mexico)

* * *

> Some factors which may have helped these 23 students to graduate include:
>
> A. *The students*: (1) awareness of the need and importance of a higher education; (2) desire to raise their standard of living; (3) effort to obtain a better and higher paying job; and (4) hope to continue their education (junior college or more).

B. *Encouragement* from the following sources: (1) parents; (2) teachers; (3) principals; (4) counselors; (5) deans; (6) community groups; (7) religious affiliations.

C. The Broward County Migrant Child Compensatory Program helped to make this possible by (1) initiating the *Learn and Earn Program;* (2) working closely with community and religious groups to obtain the necessary funds for *clothing, shoes, better housing and health care* to help meet the needs of the student and his family; (3) supporting the *educational assistant program;* (4) initiating *a unique language arts program* to make a high school curriculum relevant to the migrant student; (5) *providing pre-kindergarten and kindergarten centers so the high school student doesn't have to leave school to baby-sit* and provide funds for paid care for his younger brothers and sisters; (6) furnishing *summer sessions to care for and keep his younger brothers and sisters;* (7) scheduling courses which provide *saleable skills such as Industrial Arts and Home and Family Living* that provided students with a skill which helped them obtain after school work; (8) *allowing 11th and 12th grade students to work half a day* and receive an academic diploma upon graduation; (9) *using the Advisory Council* to investigate such issues as: housing –parent retraining–program relevance to the student's need; (10) using consultants to provide *individualized curriculum* planning for students reaching high school placement. (Broward County, Florida)

Four projects provided information about the present occupations of some of last year's migrant high school graduates. This information was available for a total of 30 graduates from New Mexico and Texas, whose occupations were reported as follows:

In armed forces		4
In higher education		6
Housewife		1
Employed		15
As secretaries	2	
As nurse's aide	1	
As teacher aide	1	
As salesgirls	3	
In construction	1	
At a ranch	1	
As "labor workers"	6	
Not employed or in school		4

VII. Educationally Related Services: Nutrition, Health, and Day Care

Nutrition, health, and child care services are recognized as essential components of federally financed programs designed to meet the educationally related needs of all poor children, especially migrants, whose parents are among the lowest paid workers in the United States. That children who are unhealthy and undernourished do not learn well in school, that a working mother needs safe care for her children while she is away from home—these are simple facts, abundantly established by research as well as common sense and common humanity.

For migrant children, they have not been established by practice. It is painful to report that the *majority* of migrant children we studied were hungry most mornings in school, did not receive a free lunch during the regular school year, did not receive even minimal health services like immunizations, and were unsupervised for much of the time their mothers were working. That this callous neglect of basic human needs should exist concurrently with unspent migrant education budgets for food and health services is inexcusable.

Nutrition

About $3 million in ESEA Title I migrant funds were budgeted by the states for food services in fiscal year 1969. However, according to expenditure reports filed with the United States Office of Education by the senior fiscal officers of 44 states, only $2.1 million of this amount was spent. *Thus, while migrant children went hungry, almost a million dollars ($954,986)—or about 31% of the migrant education funds budgeted for food services—were not spent.*

Breakfasts in School

Of the 35,000 migrant children included in our local questionnaire sample of 1968-69 school-year migrant education projects, only 13% received breakfast in school. During the 1969 summer session, breakfast was served to 60% of the 20,000 migrant children enrolled in the sample projects. Why the children should be considered hungrier in the summer than in the winter is not known, but widespread neglect of nutritional needs, especially during the school year, was apparently continued into fiscal 1970. Few of the 1969-70 school-year programs we visited served breakfast in school.

In one Florida county, most schools provided free breakfasts to migrant pre-kindergarten children only. One school included kindergarten children

also in a hot breakfast program (an example of a menu was hot grits with yellow cheese). In another county, milk and cookies are served at one school, with no breakfast or morning snack in the others.

In one Texas school-year program, juice and crackers were served during the morning. A consultant commented:

> These children need a real breakfast program instead of snacks. They need something simple but they need protein as well as fruit and carbohydrate.

In the California region in which we visited summer programs, those migrant children fortunate enough to live in the Family Center camps received a hot breakfast before going to school. NCEMC interviewers found that these were very much appreciated by families and children.

However, most of the California school district programs we observed served no breakfasts or morning snacks to children who did not live in the Family Centers. In one classroom observed by an NCEMC consultant, some children became listless at about 10:30 a.m., rested their heads on the desks, and said they were hungry. Their teacher said it was a long time to lunch, and sent them out to the playground for recess.

No breakfasts were served in the four summer programs observed in Washington State, Wisconsin, or New York, although three served morning snacks. Hot or cold cereal and milk were served in the New Jersey summer project we visited, and the director of a New York State summer program (not observed, because we visited this district during the school year) reported that breakfasts are served in the summer (toast and eggs were given as a sample menu).

In three communities in which we found no breakfasts being served in migrant education projects financed by ESEA Title I migrant funds, we found day care centers financed through other sources serving breakfasts daily to migrant children.

It was apparently very hard for some school officials to believe that migrant children might be hungry in the morning. In one project, teachers reported to an observer that some children had had no breakfast and were hungry, but when the observer conveyed this information to the project director, he said there was nothing he could do about it because "there's no money."

In another migrant summer school with no breakfast program or morning snack, the director was asked at about 9:30 a.m. whether he thought some of the children might be hungry. He thought not. He thought his school drew its migrant children from a "better class" of parents, who would surely give their children breakfast at home. He did not comment on the four or five hours which had at that time passed since most migrant parents had left home to begin work in the fields.

It was distressing for NCEMC observers to note that not all school officials welcomed breakfast programs in migrant education projects, even

if there was no cost to the school district. A summer school director in California was lukewarm about an OEO-financed breakfast program introduced during the previous school year. As an observer reported:

> The director said that during the second semester of the regular term, breakfasts were available without charge to all children who wished them, and about 150 to 200 children ate them each day. However, the director questioned whether all children who ate the free breakfasts were from needy families; he thought some mothers used the program to save themselves work. He also said there was a problem with supervision, which was supposedly handled by volunteer parents but actually had to be done by regular lunch staff, who complained that the parents did not keep good order or clean up properly.

By contrast, the Negro principal of a Florida elementary school with an enrollment of 75% migrant children urged a breakfast program as the first priority for improving migrant education in his school. He stated:

> The free and reduced cost lunch program is good, but at least 60% of the children come to school without breakfast. At present, milk and cookies or cake are served from 8 to 8:30 a.m., with the help of the pupils on "safety patrol," but this is not enough. The problem is that the county school lunch bureau doesn't have the personnel to prepare a hot breakfast. They say they can't handle it. A good breakfast program in this school would be just as important as lunch. It would be good if there were some way we could move part of the lunch food to breakfast, but the county bureau will not permit this.

Lunches in School

During fiscal year 1969, our questionnaire sample of local migrant education projects shows the same disparity between school-year and summer programs for free and reduced-price lunches as for breakfasts. For the school year, respondents reported 39% of the migrant children receiving free lunches and another 4% receiving reduced-price lunches. The regular price of school lunch in these projects ranged from 15¢ to 50¢. For the summer session, 92% of the migrant children enrolled were given free lunches and 1% were served lunch at a reduced price.

During 1970, only one of the migrant education projects we visited served no lunch at all in elementary or junior high schools. This was an upstate New York school district where children who lived within a mile of their school were not even permitted to bring bag lunches from home. In this district, the superintendent and board of education members were reported to believe strongly that "schools are made to help the mind, not the body." This philosophy of education was cited by the federal coordinator as one reason why $11,000 in federal migrant funds were returned unspent by this project in fiscal 1969. It was also suggested by a Puerto Rican community leader as one cause of the "delinquency" about which police and school officials expressed much concern. This community leader reported that quite a bit of this delinquency occurs during the lunch hour.

All of the other migrant education projects we visited served lunch. However, in the school-year programs, an astonishingly high proportion of migrant children were considered too wealthy to deserve a *free* lunch.

Probably the most flagrantly indefensible denials of free lunch were encountered in Texas, where $578,000 or almost half of the fiscal 1969 Title I Migrant Amendment funds budgeted for food services were unspent (as of a November 28, 1969 report) and where migrant parents were subjected to humiliation and refusal when they requested the free lunches which these funds were intended to supply.

In the Texas school district we visited, no figures were provided on the number of migrant children receiving free lunch. Of the ten migrant families selected at random for interviewing by our consultants, only three had been granted free lunches for their children. The price of lunch in this school district was 35¢ a day in the migrant school (elementary) and more in the junior and senior high schools. The families our consultants interviewed had as many as seven school-age children. One family was told they were ineligible for free lunch because they were buying a new truck on time payments to replace one unsafe for migrancy. Free lunch cards were taken away from the children in another family because their mother had found some work in a nursing home for the elderly.

Another problem in this Texas migrant school was that it had no kitchen or lunchroom facilities, and children were therefore bused across town to another school for lunch. The round trip—plus the time spent in eating—had to be completed in 30 minutes. Many children in the families interviewed reported that they did not have enough time to eat the lunch.

In Florida, policy on free lunches varied from school to school. Prekindergarten children usually received free lunches (perhaps, since they were also the only ones who received breakfasts in most schools, it was thought that their stomachs would not have shrunk).

In one Florida school where the regular price of lunch was 40¢, 56 out of 70 children in the elementary grades received a free lunch, and ten others received a reduced price lunch. According to the principal, the child pays what he can, no child is refused lunch, and second helpings are available to all who want them.

In another Florida elementary-junior high school, about half of the enrollments in grades 1–6 are migrants, and the principal reported that "over half" of the children receive free lunch and another 10% receive reduced-price lunches (regular price is 40¢ in elementary school and 45¢ in junior high). As an observer reported:

> The principal stated that there is no investigation of free lunch applicants except in cases where it is "obviously not needed." Families are considered eligible if their weekly income is below $15 to $18 per family member. The turn-down rate is 1%, and (in answer to a question) there is not much "static" from parents who are turned down, because the refusal is conveyed by letter.

For about 10 minutes during lunch time at this school I sat beside the school aide, who was distributing lunch tickets to second grade children. She had four kinds of tickets. The children's tickets were all the same color—red—and the staff tickets were blue. *Free* lunch tickets for children had a very heavy black line drawn with a felt tip marker through the center. *Reduced-price* tickets had an "X" drawn heavily across each one. The tickets which were fully paid had no marking. As the children lined up in front of the aide to receive their tickets they would say either "free" or "reduced price" or put down the money. During the time of my observation I would estimate that about 20 children passed through the line, of whom at least 15 received free lunch. There was no questioning of children who asked for free lunch, but on the other hand there was no privacy. When I asked the principal about the purpose of the special markings on the tickets he said they were needed for record keeping.

Of the two migrant families interviewed in this school district, neither was receiving free lunch. One family had not applied, because they felt that with four family members working and only two children in school, they should not take the funds away from others who needed them more. In the other family of seven people (mother, father and five school-age children) the mother reported being refused free lunch. She said that both she and her husband had been working at the time she was first refused. However, in January, when she stopped working, she made a new application and had not yet received an answer as of March 7, the date of our interview. She said the weekly cost of school lunch for all five children was $10.05. The children like the school lunch, but she cannot always afford it for all of them, and she said some days some of them come home (a few blocks from school).

In another Florida elementary school, about 200 of an enrollment of 385 children received free lunch. The principal reported that only five applicants for free lunch had been turned down this year. A consultant reported:

The school lunch program at this elementary school is supervised by volunteer mothers recruited by the PTA. They helped to provide a pleasant, orderly atmosphere in the lunchroom. Another positive feature is that tickets are not used, so that children who receive free lunch are not identified in any way when they go out to eat.

A group of seminarians, who provide daily volunteer services to migrants in one Florida county, reported to NCEMC consultants that they knew migrant parents who were not aware of the existence of a free lunch program or do not understand the procedures necessary to secure it. As they reported to an observer:

No announcements or flyers are sent home by the schools. Parents have to find out, through sources outside the school system, that free lunch exists, and then have to take the initiative to apply and to complete the required forms or seek help outside the school system in completing the forms. As a specific example, in one junior high school an announcement was made over the public address system concerning

opportunities to earn lunch by working in the lunchroom, but no announcement was made concerning the availability of free lunches without working.

Another example was of a family with seven children and a $60 weekly income whose mother understood that her children had been refused free lunch in a school where the price was 65¢ a day.

In all of the summer projects we visited, free lunch was being provided to all migrant children who attended. Paradoxically, many migrant families in California Family Centers reported to our interviewers that they could not afford to send their children to summer school to get the advantage of these lunches. Instead, the children had to work during the summer to help pay for their lunches and other school-year expenses in Texas.

Surplus Food and Food Stamps

While educational programs financed through the ESEA Title I Migrant Amendment were the focus of our investigation, we did gain some information worth reporting about the distribution of other federally supported food services to migrant families in some of the communities we visited.

In a Texas school district, a migrant family with eight children commented that during the summer in Ohio, the food stamp program had been a major source of help. They wondered why food stamps were not available in this Texas community, where work is harder to find and food more needed during the cold months.

They thought the welfare program in this Texas town offered little help to anyone. They said there was no concern for individuals, but they have to wait a long time and be investigated "like criminals"—and "you just keep going from one place to another for information."

This was one of the families who had been denied free school lunch for their children by the "visiting teacher" described earlier in this report. As the interviewer commented:

> If the school could be the center of help for some of these families, people would take advantage of it. The visiting teacher should be able to provide information to families in need in order to cut the red tape and get help promptly for the welfare of the children in school.

A Florida community service director thought that the best indication of welfare services available to migrants in his county was the fact that the welfare office is two miles outside town, about four or five miles from the migrant camps (which are on the other side of the town). This location cuts down considerably on the number of migrants who apply for surplus food and other welfare services. The service organization has tried to help by arranging transportation of surplus food orders once a week. The Welfare Department will not release food supplies for a longer period.

When it was suggested that the Welfare Department—like the Social Security office—might open one-day-a-week service in the local police station to serve families who had no transportation to the main office, Welfare officials were not interested, and refused the offer of space.

A meeting of migrant parents was attended by an NCEMC consultant in this same Florida county. He reported as follows:

> Many of the parents were aware of food stamps and preferred them to surplus foods because they could choose what they wanted. They also said that it would be good to have a home economics teacher to teach them about the use of the surplus foods. They expressed some worry as to whether when they went to the grocery store to use the food stamps they might be singled out by having to stand in separate lines.
>
> They felt they were treated unfairly when they went to the Welfare office and that there were no rules or standards applied uniformly to applicants. They thought that the granting or refusing of their requests was based simply on the mood of the worker they happened to contact. Some of the things they had asked for at the Welfare office were food, shoes, blankets and medical assistance. They got to the Welfare office mostly by hitch-hiking, although two members of the group had cars. They said they never got food enough for more than a few days and would be told to come back at times when they were working, such as 9:00 a.m. They said no Welfare officer had ever been to their homes.

In a community served by an upstate New York school-year program, the situation was discouragingly similar, as reported by another consultant:

> It would seem that the philosophy used by the Welfare Department that serves the township is that if you make it very difficult for people who are on welfare, you will have fewer people living off the government. And indeed they have made it very difficult for people. The offices of the Welfare Department are a great distance away from where the people live, in another town. This creates tremendous hardship on the people who must depend on welfare to get by during the periods of unemployment for the agricultural workers.
>
> When asked about how migrant parents get in touch with the Welfare Department, the federal coordinator said that he himself has been unsuccessful in trying to contact and meet the County Welfare Commissioner. Those farm workers who do make it to the Welfare office depend on transportation by Peace Corps volunteers or by the staff of the Family Center, a municipal social agency.

Health Services

Statistical Data

One of the most shocking revelations of the local questionnaire sample was that the *great majority* of the migrant children included were not re-

ceiving even the routine, minimal health services. The statistical findings are:

	1968-69 Regular School Year	1969 Summer Session
Number of Migrant Children included in sample	35,432	20,090
Per Cent of Migrant Children receiving Health Services through ESEA Title I migrant funds:		
Physical Examinations	34%	44%
Hearing and Vision Checks	55%	54%
Immunizations	35%	18%
Medical Treatment	18%	11%
Dental Examinations	36%	37%
Dental Treatment	15%	15%

The abysmal neglect revealed by the above statistics can only be seen as grimly inhumane when it is realized that, according to the state expenditure reports previously cited, *about $686,000 (or 30% of the $2.3 million budgeted by the states for health services in fiscal 1969) were not spent.*

Site Visits

Observers found no single pattern for the 1970 health services to migrant children financed through ESEA Title I migrant funds. In most of the projects visited, health services were contracted with county health departments, medical associations, or private physicians and dentists. Some projects or school districts employed their own health personnel. The quality and scope of health services to migrant children ranged from excellent to non-existent in the projects we visited.

A Florida County with a Low Migrant Health Budget

For fiscal year 1969, the county migrant education budget included $5,000 for health services, which were contracted with the county health department. For this same fiscal year, the county reported a school enrollment of 6,068 migrant children. Thus, the budget included about 82¢ per migrant child for health services.

Until last year, the county health department received federal funds under the Migrant Health Act, but at the time of our visit, they no longer received them.

According to two migrant families we interviewed in this county, no free health services were being provided to their children. Both families mentioned that their children receive free medical and dental services in Maryland, where they migrate and attend school during the summer and

early fall, but not in the Florida community where they live during the winters.

Realizing that these two migrant families might not be typical of thousands of others in this county, we checked by letter with the county coordinator of federal projects. His reply of April 3, 1970, stated in part:

> Although some parents may not be aware of the fact that health services are available for migrant children, such services are provided by our county health department. Children requiring such services are referred to the health department nurse in their area by the teacher, principal, or the visitation records assistant. If no other agency will provide the services needed free of charge, the health department arranges for the services to be provided and bills our project for the costs.

The coordinator also enclosed a copy of a letter he had requested from the director of the county health department indicating some of the services provided since January, 1969, as follows:

> There were 58 different children seen in the period 1–69 to 9–69. The majority of the problems were visual and dental but included tonsillectomy and eye surgery. There were many repeat visits for completion of dental care. There have been 37 different children seen from 9–69 to 3–70. Visual and dental problems again are the major defects corrected. There were problems of speech and hearing, corrective facial surgery, two hospitalizations requiring surgery and a few medical exams. There were a large number (approximately 940) of tuberculin skin tests done with the positives receiving chemoprophylaxis. I hope this is the information desired.

On the basis of this letter, it would seem that between January 1969 and March 1970, 95 migrant children were seen by the county health department for services other than tuberculin tests. At a conservative estimate, this would seem to leave over 5,900 migrant children who were *not* seen for any other purpose by the county health department and more than 5,000 who did not even receive tuberculin tests.

A Florida County with a Higher Migrant Health Budget

Another Florida county reporting slightly lower migrant enrollments of 5,238 for fiscal year 1969 had a health services budget of $35,200 from ESEA Title I migrant funds. That would be roughly seven dollars per pupil.

This county is respected throughout the nation for its high standards and pioneering work in providing medical services to migrants. Except for one California county, it has the oldest program of medical care for migrants in the United States. The county health department's migrant project is directed and staffed by able, concerned public health professionals. Its comprehensive program of migrant health care includes medical clinics in two locations, a well-equipped dental trailer, referrals to private physicians and hospitals, physical examinations and immunizations, family planning serv-

ices, maternal and infant care, and referral and follow-up when migrants leave the county.

And yet—*many* migrant families seem completely unreached by this program. The county director of migrant education reported that within the available budget, emphasis must be placed on serving the youngest children. Complete physical and dental examinations, plus any necessary follow-up (examples were hernia operations, tonsillectomies, and eyeglasses) are limited to pre-kindergarten children and others entering school for the first time. For all other pupils, treatment is limited to emergencies for which no other way of paying is available.

As for migrant adults, here is a consultant's report on a meeting in this county with 16 migrant parents:

> Most of the women had never been hospitalized. They have their babies at home. The name of a midwife kept coming up. Some of them felt that they could get into the hospital if they had their own doctors, but they didn't.
>
> None of those present had ever been to a dental clinic. They did say that their children were covered in school.
>
> Two of the ladies told jokes about an experience they had had when the county health clinic referred them to a private doctor to get health certificates required for a job. Before they were admitted to the doctor's office they were taken outside and sprayed with insecticide. They laughed and said it was the only time they had been asked to lift up their dresses in a place like that.
>
> There was almost no indignity that those women couldn't laugh about. For example, they talked about how when they were eating at home, they had to set an extra place for the roaches and flies. Then they would tell the children, "Hurry up and eat before they finish and come and get yours."
>
> A father did tell of one positive experience with health services. His son needed glasses and received them within three days of the request. No bill was ever sent to the parents and they never knew who provided the glasses. However, the mother sent a thank you note to the principal.

Volunteer seminarians in this county also commented on how procedural red tape and the location and office hours of the medical clinics make it difficult for migrants to make use of health services. As an observer recorded their comments:

> Seminarians reported that the migrant health clinic is located at a distance from migrant camps and is open one day a week, when migrants are working, and one evening a week, when it is grossly overcrowded and waiting time is very long. They urged that the location should be changed or transportation should be provided, and that the daytime clinic should be transferred to the evening. (At the time of NCEMC's visit, county health department personnel provided a copy of their 1970 proposal, which outlined a plan for opening this clinic two eve-

nings a week. However, as of March 1970, this had apparently not been done.)

In addition, seminarians pointed out that most migrant parents can't complete written applications, and don't understand the necessity to return many times to secure approval of a service: they think that if the service is not approved at the time they ask for it that it has been refused. For example, one seminarian told of efforts to help a migrant woman secure an emergency eye operation, which he said was necessary to prevent blindness. He reported that the first application was filed in September 1969, and the operation was finally performed in March 1970.

A New York State Regular School-Year Program

In a school district guided by the philosophy that "schools are made to serve the mind, not the body," school health services to all children are, as a matter of principle, minimal. Here is an observer's report:

The school dental hygienist checks and cleans all children's teeth (if their parents don't object—some do, because they may feel embarrassed that their children's teeth are in bad condition, the federal coordinator said). Then a notice is sent home (in Spanish, where needed), advising the parent if the child needs dental care. "That's as far as it goes." If the parent has no money to pay a private dentist, he "has to get it out of Medicaid or Welfare." (The Welfare office is in another town.)

The same principle applies to medical treatment. If a child is sick in school, the parents are notified. The school nurse is not legally permitted to give medical treatment. "The parent is on his own to arrange medical service." (After persistent questioning by team members, the coordinator finally said that in extreme cases—such as a gangrenous leg—the school nurse will refer or take the child to a private doctor, with the parents' permission.)

A New York State Summer Program

A much more encouraging report was provided by observers at a New York State summer program:

The school has a full-time nurse who makes a number of home visits. She appeared to be a warm, motherly person able to get along well with the children. A school physician is also employed and available when needed. There is a first-aid class for the older girls.

A health center within the school contains space for the doctor, nurse and a dental examination area. In the summer, preference is given to migrants.

The dental examination area is staffed by a dental technician who visits the school twice a week to examine teeth and identify children who need treatment. Students she identifies are referred to the dental clinic for further examination and treatment by a dentist. The clinic will do extractions, fillings, and fluorine treatment for both children and adults. It is now in its second year and staff reported that a number of mi-

grants who were treated the first year are returning. The clinic attempts to save as many baby teeth as it can with its younger patients. Most of the medical follow-up is done by the county Rural Comprehensive Health Program–Migrant Health Program, which operates medical and dental clinics at the Community Action Program Center four evenings a week from July 13 to October 29.

A Texas School-Year Program

As reported in parent interviews, medical services in the Texas school-year program we visited were limited to physical examinations, including tuberculin tests for some children, and immunizations for some children. Observers found no evidence of medical follow-up services for migrant children, and no health services at all for migrant adults.

The situation with regard to dental services was especially shocking in the extreme callousness displayed. Although ESEA Title I migrant funds were budgeted for dental services during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, as of March 1970 no services had been provided because, according to one school official, no decision had been reached about how to distribute the work among local dentists!

A California Five-County Region

Health care for migrant children seemed to follow much the same pattern as other services in this region. For children living in the Family Centers, it was of high quality and readily available. For those living elsewhere, it was often almost completely neglected.

The five counties in this region have different systems for organizing and funding migrant health programs. According to the regional director, each has advantages and disadvantages.

In one county, the migrant education project runs its own health program in its five Family Centers, hiring its own full-time nurses, health aides, and per-session doctors. Each center has a night clinic once a week, and a nurse or health aide is on duty eight hours a day at all centers. If a child is sick on a non-clinic day, he is referred to a town doctor. The project pays the doctor's fee and provides transportation and a bi-lingual escort. A disadvantage of this program is that since it is financed entirely through ESEA Title I migrant funds, only children aged two through 17 can be served.

Here is an observer's report on an evening clinic in this county:

> The waiting room was attractive; it included a toy chest painted orange and a table with children's books. The aide in charge seemed friendly to the children and parents who were waiting. (There were about 20 at the peak I saw.) The atmosphere seemed relaxed; the children moved around and used the books and toys, and everybody was talking, mostly in Spanish.
>
> According to the head nurse, physical examinations of migrant children show the following chronic conditions most often: tuberculosis,

heart murmurs, epilepsy, kidney trouble, ear problems (no hearing, no ear drum). Temporary illnesses for which children are treated frequently are upper respiratory infections and parasites.

We also met the doctor—young, friendly, and enthusiastic about his work—for which he is very well paid. He commented on how well behaved the children are, and on how much healthier they are than he had expected.

Migrant education projects in the other four counties of the region contract with public health departments, medical associations, or private physicians for migrant children's health services. A consultant who visited a family center in one of these counties reported as follows:

I had a long conversation with the county public health nurse. Her program has funds coming from several sources including Title I migrant. She has a clinic in each of three Family Centers, and in each there is a nurse and a health aide. The aides come from the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The clinics are open a minimum of 40 hours each week. Because of the broader funding, she sees adults as well as children and has begun a program of routine health and sex education, including Pap smears for women. Her approach has been to put the burden of responsibility directly on the local medical society and ask them to train the personnel she provides. For example, physicians have been training her staff of nurses to do routine tests, and they are now branching out into other paramedical functions.

According to the public health nurse's estimates, about 200 migrant families are served in the three family centers where health programs are offered. She estimated that this represented about one-fourth of the total migrant population of the county. She regretted that the other three-fourths of the county's migrants could not be served with existing resources.

She told a most heartening story of an older farmworker with a large family, a former migrant, who was nearly blind. The only work he could get was hoeing and the family required a lot of service, including partial welfare. They took him to an opthalmologist and paid for the eventual operation. With his sight restored, he rose to foreman in a short while and the family is now completely independent and on its feet.

Visits to an elementary school and an OEO pre-school which served migrant children who did not live in family centers provided a sharp contrast in the meagerness of their health services. In the elementary school, there was no nurse during the summer. During the regular school year the nurse spent one-fifth of her time in the school. There was little or no screening or routine health care for the children. Of an interview with the director of the pre-school, an observer reported:

During the past year, there has been no money for medical examinations. A doctor gives immunizations on a volunteer basis, and a psychologist also helps with referrals on the same basis. There is a night clinic on Tuesdays at a county hospital about 20 miles away. As the

pre-school director put it, the children in the Family Centers are receiving "golden platter services" by comparison with hers.

Other Summer School Programs

Consultants' reports from other summer school programs we visited indicate a regrettable shortage of health services for migrant children. Here are excerpts:

> In this project there were no health services at all during the summer school, not even a school nurse. The school was using the nurse at the OEO Day Care Center next door when emergencies arose.
>
> (A Washington State project)

* * *

> The director thought that migrant children are, in general, very healthy. Three local dentists who gave volunteer check-ups found their teeth in "very good shape." The county nurse screened vision and hearing and found only one boy—with poor hearing—who needed referral to a doctor.
>
> Local doctors used to give free physical examinations to migrant children, the director said, but this year they "backed out." For one thing, they were overworked and "cannot see turning away others who may need it more." In addition, since some migrant children who were attending summer school lived outside the regular school district, local physicians thought there might be transportation problems and that doctors in some of the other towns should take a turn. If teachers should have reason to suspect a health problem, a doctor will examine the child, the director said. (A Wisconsin project)

* * *

> A dental hygienist visited the school while we were present, and did rough checks of the children's teeth in the classrooms. She found almost all in urgent need of treatment. She promised to arrange for it, even after the school program closed the following week, and employed the school's migrant aide for escort and interpreting services. School staff thought—but were not sure—that this dental service was funded by OEO. Apparently the visit was unexpected; there was no evidence that dental services had been routinely planned.
>
> (Another Wisconsin project)

* * *

> Both schools had nurses. There was a school doctor, but his services were unsatisfactory since he failed to keep appointments. At one school, where a child was ill, he had not arrived over two hours after the time he indicated he would be there. The nurse in this school felt that the years of medical and particularly dental services had to a degree caught up with the serious problems. What dental services were currently available was not clear.
>
> The coordinator has gotten permission to take some cases to private doctors and have them paid for by either school or welfare, depending on family status. (A New Jersey project)

* * *

A migrant nurse is employed full-time; half of her salary is paid through the county health department by a Migrant Health grant. A physician was employed by the school program to give physical examinations to all children.

If families needed any other health services, they had to contact the migrant nurse. To get dental services, she took children to a dentist in a nearby town. Local dentists did not choose to cooperate with "federal red tape."

Families interviewed by an NCEMC consultant were aware of health services, but there had been no major health problems among them, and they had not been approached or counseled about the need for routine, preventive health care for their children.

The migrant health nurse indicated that their federal Migrant Health programs have been cut 20% from last year (from $12,000 to $10,000) and will be cut to $8,000 next year, with the idea that the local sources are supposed to make up the difference. She indicated that these funds would not be forthcoming. She currently was $2,800 short of meeting the needs of the children in the program for emergency services and had gone to the Community Chest for assistance. The attitude was one of apathy, at best, and downright hostility at worst. At this point the request for additional funds had not been approved and it appears unlikely that the children will be able to receive the type of health treatment that they need even on an emergency basis.

The phase-out approach of expecting local districts to pick up the tab on a migrant program seems extremely unrealistic. (An Illinois project)

Day Care

Few of the migrant education projects we visited provided all-day programs for migrant children during the hours their parents were working. In many cases, children of all ages were left without supervision in migrant camps for several hours in the morning (between the time their parents left for work and the time the school bus came) and for a large part of the afternoon and early evening.

California

By far the most comprehensive program of child care we encountered was in the California Family Centers. In the region we visited, the migrant education office is responsible for providing supervision in eleven Family Centers for all children, aged 2 through 17, for the entire time their parents are working. An observer reports:

All children—pre-school and school-age—receive breakfast in the Family Centers, and the school-age children are supervised in recreational activities before they are picked up by the school bus and after they return in the evening. All-day programs (12 hours) for pre-school children—age two and over—are conducted in the camps.

(At present, there is no care for children under two, most of whom accompany their parents to the fields.) Maximum class size is 15, with one teacher and two aides.

All consultants were very favorably impressed by the relaxed atmosphere, individual attention, and free choice of activities in the Family Center pre-school programs.

New York State

In an upstate New York school district, the Board of Cooperative Educational Services was operating a pre-school migrant center for children aged two-and-a-half through five. In the regular school-year program, however, none of the children were current migrants and the hours (regulated by the need to use the same buses as the school system) were 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. In the summer, the center contracts for one special bus to serve the mobile migrant children, picking them up at 7:00 a.m. and returning them home at about 4:45 p.m., which the director said is about the time their parents get back from the fields.

This pre-school program seemed to an observer to be of excellent quality. The curriculum was flexible and experimental. Five former migrants were employed as aides. Home visits were frequent. Health services were provided by a registered nurse, a dental hygienist, and a home-school coordinator who (as reported by the director) follows up to see that not only the pre-school children but all other family members receive needed medical and dental services.

However, because migrant farm labor is decreasing in this area (we encountered *no* current migrants when we visited in June and secured no solid figures on the number of current migrants served in the summer), the future of the pre-school program is in doubt.

Florida

In Florida, the State Education Department provides fully equipped, pre-kindergarten trailers to local migrant education projects. These trailers seemed well-designed and much needed in the school districts we visited, where many school buildings were overcrowded. Their programs ran from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Only current migrant children between the ages of three years, nine months and four years, nine months are served in these pre-kindergarten trailers. The state provides no transportation for them, on the theory that the trailers should be placed near migrant homes, where parents can bring their children to the program and be in close contact with it.

While this idea may be very sound in theory, it was not working very well in the Florida counties we visited. All of the pre-kindergarten trailers we saw were parked on the grounds of regular elementary schools; some directors indicated this was necessary in order to hook onto the schools' utilities.

At one elementary school, lack of transportation was apparently partly responsible for extreme underutilization of the trailers at the time of our visit. Two trailers, each with a capacity of 20 children, had a register of 11 children each. Even this small enrollment was achieved only through the volunteer transportation provided by two students from a local seminary. The seminarians indicated that the one-year age range served for a full day also limited the program's usefulness to migrant mothers. Unless they had care for their children below the age of three years, nine months, they had to stay home with them or take them to the fields. The seminarians recommended that day care programs for migrants should include all children, beginning at six months.

By contrast, at another elementary school in the same county, the pre-kindergarten trailers were utilized up to capacity by children who lived close enough to walk, and the principal reported that some children were turned away. "If we could go even lower in age, it would be still better," he commented.

A still more serious problem at this school was that there was no space for a kindergarten in the school building. Thus, five-year-olds are out of school for a year between pre-kindergarten and first grade. Last year, the principal reported, an attempt was made to run a kindergarten on the stage of the auditorium, which also doubles as a lunchroom. Although 40 five-year-olds attended for three months, the teacher found it impossible to provide for the physical safety of the children in this setting.

A priority recommendation of this school principal and of the county coordinator of migrant education was for permission to use ESEA Title I migrant funds for purchasing relocatable units to provide kindergarten space.

Other Projects Visited

No other ESEA Title I migrant education project we visited provided any full-day care for migrant children. Most served five-year-olds and a few served younger children, but they opened at 8:00 a.m. at the earliest and closed at 4:00 p.m. at the latest, with the majority providing care for an even shorter time. One Washington State summer migrant education project closed at 1:30 p.m.

In several communities we visited, day care programs financed through other sources (usually OEO) were being operated near ESEA Title I migrant projects. However, program coordination seemed to be minimal. In no case we observed (except for California, where day care in the Family Centers was financed through ESEA Title I migrant funds) were nearby day care centers used to provide care before or after school for young children enrolled in Title I migrant education projects.

VIII. Participation of Migrant Parents

Home-School Contacts

In almost all of the migrant education projects we visited, consultants found home-school contacts to be the weakest part of the program. Few school personnel visited migrant children's homes, and even fewer migrant parents had any voice in planning, implementing, or evaluating educational programs for their children. As some consultants reported:

> Parents and community groups have had none or minimal inputs—in fact, there is *no* communication between the school and most migrant groups. (A Florida county)

* * *

> In talking with individual teachers at this school it was reported that they make no home visits because the principal tells them not to. (Another Florida county)

* * *

> None of the teachers I talked to had had contact with the parents, except for a recent Parents' Night during Public School Week which parents were reported to have attended in large numbers. The failure of the tutorial program would indicate little planning with parents or students. (A Texas school district)

* * *

> Parents and community groups have not participated—have not been asked to participate—in the planning, implementation and evaluation of any part of the program. There is not yet any consciousness on the part of the coordinator or the school staff of how essential this is to the success of the program. The coordinator noted that this is one of the things they have not gotten to as yet. She did not appear hostile to the idea, but, on the other hand, her attitude implied that nothing substantial or important was lost, nor would much be gained from such participation. (A New Jersey summer project)

* * *

> The federal coordinator stated that migrant parents do not participate in school activities during the regular school year. When asked the reason for this non-participation, he said that this was "another problem on which we haven't concentrated, except in spurts." He described difficulties in securing minority group representation at a planning meeting for a family service center. He wanted "five or six respected parents" for this meeting. However, "we got one timid representative, too backward—I mean bashful—to speak out clearly, too afraid to get in trouble."
>
> I thought there might have been another reason for this coordinator's difficulty in involving minority group members in school activities.

While he spoke of efforts to create sympathy and understanding among school personnel, his own insensitive comments about blacks' and Puerto Ricans' irresponsibility, easy resort to welfare, and lack of motivation were made routinely in the presence of our team members from these groups. He seemed completely unaware of the offensive nature of his stereotypes. (A New York State school district)

* * *

A number of teachers do visit the camps. One teacher had taken her children to visit each other in their homes. Another had gone to the children's homes and taken pictures of them with their parents and favorite possessions. She was making these photographs into books. A school aide, who goes into all the camps and knows many migrants by name, makes an especially valuable contribution.

However, migrant parents are not consulted in any way in planning the school program for their children. There is strong resentment in the Negro community about the marginal representation of blacks on the school staff and the discrimination against Negroes in the use of public facilities in this community. Many people commented that conditions are better in the South. (A New York State summer project)

* * *

Three migrant parents were members of the regional planning committee for the migrant education project. However, a staff member reported that at a recent meeting he had attended, they had not participated actively in the discussion.

Eight migrant families were interviewed in their homes. Of these, five parents had visited the day care centers in the Family Centers, but none had visited the programs for school-age children operated by local school districts, only three sent their school-age children to summer school, and none had been visited at home by summer school personnel. (A California region)

* * *

A parent-contact worker from an OEO agency had appeared on radio programs and visited homes to inform migrant parents about the summer school. Teachers were also riding the buses and planned to visit homes. However, their approach to communication, which began by sending home notes to which there was no response, left much to be desired. So did the office procedure for greeting migrant parents. This consultant was present when a parent came in to enroll two children. The parent was treated indifferently, and no attempt was made to show the parent around the school or interpret for her what the school could do for her children. (A Washington State summer project)

* * *

None of the staff has made home visits this year. A few had been made last year, but staff members stated that they were not very productive. Also, they had had very low attendance (three or four at last year's parent night) and had been discussing at the staff meeting how they might encourage better attendance this year. The program was planned to feature performances by the children (dramatics, sing-

ing, and dancing) and possibly a videotape of the children to be made by the drama teacher at the high school.

The director reported that on the first day the children had been taken swimming this year, many parents had turned up to watch and find out whether their children were safe. Once assured on this point, he said, they never came again. (A Wisconsin summer project)

A Texas school district has almost no contact with its parents. School officials indicated little effort to include migrant or even non-migrant parents in planning school programs. Team members reported as follows:

The migrant school principal noted several efforts to get parents to meetings and conferences at school, but he said few came. He himself had made only two or three home visits for disciplinary reasons, and it was felt that the extended school day made home visits out of the question for classroom teachers. Therefore, a special staff member called "visiting teacher" was employed. His main duty was to investigate school lunch applications.

The visiting teacher appeared to be the weakest point in the whole migrant school program. He had been a junior high school principal, a city councilman, and a candidate for mayor, and he considered his present position a demotion.

He expressed disapproval of the migrants, saying that they went north, made good money, spent it and returned to Texas for the school to feed and clothe their children. He felt the school is too easy on the children and that parents do not take part in conferences because they do not care.

We interviewed ten migrant families in their homes. Among the ten families interviewed, only two parents had visited the school during the past year. Four had been called upon by the visiting teacher for the purpose of investigating free school lunch applications (he refused three applications and granted one). No other school staff members had visited any of these ten families at home.

We found that contact with the visiting teacher had made parents feel very uneasy and uncertain about the attitudes of the school teachers and administration. They felt there would be no point in going to the school if other school personnel were going to treat them as they were treated by the visiting teacher.

Parents indicated that they would like to be able to participate in meetings at the school, especially if Spanish were used and if meetings were scheduled in the evening hours after work.

(A Texas school district)

In a Florida elementary school, where almost all of the staff and children were black, many families lived within walking distance of the school and there was an active parent-teacher association. The principal said he was receiving more cooperation from parents than ever before, and parents who were interviewed seemed to trust him to give their children a good education. They said that if he failed, they would "string him up,"

because as a black man, he ought to know the pitfalls and be able to deliver. A pre-school teacher said that, even without home visits, she met most of the children's parents and that, being black and a native of the area, she assumed parents' goals for their children were the same as her own.

A consultant reported on an interview with another teacher who was in even closer touch with her children's home lives:

> A fourth grade teacher reported that she visits all parents at the beginning of each school year and also goes to the camps at other times to organize drives to "clean up the trash" and to give children's clothing to the parents. She said that the parents, seeing her around the camps, get to know her, visit school often, and send her notes about their children's problems. She said, "There's a parent here almost every day."
>
> This teacher expressed strong concern about extremely bad housing in the area. She said she knows that crowded housing prevents the children from getting enough sleep at night, and that if a child falls asleep in school, she doesn't wake him up. She mentioned her special concern about one "problem child" who lives in a one-room house with one bed and four or five brothers and sisters; she is absent a lot and "doesn't try" when she is in school. Like "most of the older ones," she will probably drop out soon unless something is done.
>
> This fourth grade teacher did not seem to think that the county health department's approach to preventing early pregnancy through birth control information would be very well accepted by the parents she knows. She referred to religious objections.
>
> She thought the only hope was through better housing: "Across the track, they are building some *new homes*. A lady with 20 children (I take clothes to her) now has a new home. White people who have land should sell—that would be a beginning." (A Florida elementary school)

Among summer projects, two in the Midwest had closer home-school contacts than any others we visited. In both, home visits were a regular part of the program:

> An experienced staff member and a teen-age migrant aide recruit children and follow up absences by home visits, and report good attendance as a result. This staff member said that she is in a migrant home at least once a week for some reason.
>
> Recently, there had been a good many fights among the children who, she says, carry over home quarrels in the school. For example, children from a family who had migrated there for the first time this year were low in the pecking order and were constantly "put down" by the other children. The staff member visited the homes of the children involved in fights and also arranged for an experienced migrant aide to supervise one of the buses, because she said she knew the parents would not let their children come to a school where there was fighting.
>
> (A Wisconsin summer program)

* * *

In this community, I found the migrant program serving the most handicapped migrants of our migrant stream. The program had reached them despite their shyness and fear of school and programs; response of these families was largely due to the efforts of the summer school program director, who bridged all gaps of communication.

It was encouraging to find a migrant education program director who knew crops, seasons, camps, names of crew leaders and farmers—and had visited every migrant family as they arrived! The director could converse in Spanish if needed. He could anticipate questions and anxieties of parents and provide information immediately.

Teachers were required to ride buses, thus enabling them to visit camps on a regular basis. It also gave more informal time for visiting with children and provided a safety factor on the bus.

Home-school communication was the best I have seen. Not all parents had visited the school, but those who attended the open house said they really enjoyed it. It had been interestingly done with videotapes, using the school's closed-circuit television equipment.

(An Illinois summer program)

Aspirations of Migrant Parents and Children

Almost all of the parents we interviewed hoped that their children would be able to leave the migrant stream. To cite a few examples from interviewers' records:

Several times during the visit, the father lamented the fact that his son had dropped out of high school, insisting that the only thing he wanted to be was a man like his father—one who works in the groves. The father was yet hopeful that his son would change his mind and return to school. He seemed committed to doing whatever he could to help his ten- and twelve-year-old daughters achieve their goals—of becoming a nurse and a teacher, respectively. (Florida)

* * *

Three older girls dropped out of school and are married. Parents hope that the three younger girls may finish high school and will marry someone who does not migrate. (Illinois)

* * *

The parents have migrated all their lives, They used to travel the year round. Since 1960, they have migrated for the summers only, to California, in order to keep their younger children in school. Five older ones did not finish high school and are trying to be settled farm workers. Two teen-agers are in high school in Texas and work during the summer to pay expenses,

Parents feel there is no future in migrancy for children—or even for adults. The father would like to settle down. He finds that jobs are hard to come by everywhere—especially if you are getting old and speak no English. (California)

* * *

Parents hope the children will find hetter johs out of the migrant stream. They see the migrant work gradually decreasing. The parents would like to know how to help their children more. (Texas)

In a group interview with 20 migrant children (fourth through eighth grade), almost all said they work with their parents in the fields during the summers. As one teen-ager put it, "You have to work to live. I don't like it, hut I like the money." However, nohody hoped to migrate as an adult:

On the questions of what they wanted to he when they grew up and how their school work could help them, some of the answers were: "I want to he a doctor and writing books helps." "I would like to he a school teacher; everything helps, especially home economics." "I would like to he a hand teaeher and I am learning to play scales, count music and do sight read[illegible]g." A hoy who wanted to he a mechanic said that he was learning at home on hicycles, especially his own when it got torn up. A hoy who wanted to he a policeman was one of several who were wearing hright orange school crossing guard insignia. Other choices mentioned were jet pilot, shop teacher, and music teacher. One hoy, who said that he did not like the school or the teachers, mentioned hesitantly that he would like to he a senator. (Florida)

Some parents hoped that they themselves might he ahle to leave the migrant stream:

Having already finished high school herself, this mother has definite goals for herself and her children. For a long, long time now she has wanted to hecome a secretary or a harber. She is currently attending classes at night preparing herself to he a secretary. She often tells her older children that if harvesting the crops is the only type of work they want to do they might as well stop school now. She looks forward to the day when they can own a larger home and will no longer have to depend upon harvesting the crops for a living. (Florida)

* * *

The father wants his daughters to marry people other than migrants. He is trying to buy some land and hopes to get out of migrancy into his own husiness. He plans for his children to work on his land whenever such becomes possible. (Illinois)

At a group interview with 16 migrant parents in Florida, hoth hope and fear ahout leaving the stream were expressed:

The one main theme—the general consensus of all of the parents at the party—was that heing a seasonal farm worker or a migrant is no good. A father said: "I'm not just a migrant. I know what's going on."

The hope is to "get out" of the migrant stream. When I say there's hope, it's hasically the ethnic hope that permeates the whole society. It's a carryover from the whele civil rights movement, just reaching the grass roots. There is a ripple in the hlack community. The Negro is just beginning to feel he has some stature. Even within the confines of the migrant settlement, there are improvements. There are Negro-owned restaurants and businesses, and a Negro police deputy with authority to

arrest both blacks and whites. Even the migrant in the worst position has these grand dreams.

Many crew bosses have milked the can dry. People are beginning to look at the system and rebel against it. Some have the courage to refuse to migrate. Our hostess last migrated in the summer of 1968, to Long Island, leaving her 11 children with her sister in Florida. She did not migrate last year because she had been unable to find anyone to care for her children. Another Negro couple migrated in the summer of 1969 to Virginia, where they worked for the first time in peanuts, and to Maryland. However, they do not plan to migrate this summer, because they say they don't make enough money out-of-state.

The parents don't think of migrant farm work as bad just because it's low-paid manual labor. One father talked with pride about how many baskets of potatoes he could pick up in an hour. What these parents want is some kind of stability—a house—something to identify them with the mainstream. Within the past two years, roughly 70 Negro families bought land and put trailers on it. Now there is a city ordinance against putting trailers in this town.

How realistic these migrant parents' aspirations are is hard to tell. It's not a show, but they are also apprehensive—about white retaliation and about leaving the stream. They have a deep-seated belief that they are always going to fall flat on their faces.

Some said they hope the stream dries up. Unless machines put them out of work, they don't really trust themselves to look for something else. Sometimes they expressed their aspirations in terms of displacing somebody else: "I'll be glad when 'so-and-so' moves so I can move up to his place."

Sometimes they cut each other down. After one couple left, somebody else commented: "That's a damn phoney. They'll be up the road next year. That crew leader's been robbing them for years, but they love him and they'll stay."

When asked what jobs they would like their children to have, they referred to such positions as lawyers, doctors, and teachers. Whether they really believed this is hard to tell. The kind of non-migrant job they would like to get for themselves was not specified. (Florida)

Many parents who knew no other way to earn a living were afraid of being forced out by the mechanization of farm labor:

The two teen-aged daughters who migrated with the family were both working during the summer. One is a high school senior in Texas, and the other will enter her second year of junior college next fall in California.

The three teen-aged daughters who migrated with the family were all working during the summer. Two are in high school in Texas, and the oldest will enter her second year of junior college in California next fall. They are working to pay their school expenses.

The family are recent additions to the migrant stream and hope that their children will not have to migrate. They would prefer that they

get steady jobs in Texas. For their five years of migration, they have made it a point to return to Texas in time for the opening of school. They hope they can get enough work to keep their kids in school. Machines are a real threat to all these people, increasing their insecurity and anxiety every year. (California)

* * *

Parents hope children can get a better education and more secure employment. Two daughters (ages 18 and 22) finished high school but have found only agricultural employment. Parents wish there were more jobs available for them.

The best thing the parents can suggest that would give their children a chance for a good education is more work for the parents—fewer machines and more hands in the fields. (California)

* * *

They hope children will not have to migrate since there is no longer enough work in the fields for a good living, but they see little hope for improvement for themselves or children. The best thing they can suggest which would give their children a chance for a good educat on is a steady job for the parents. They keep trying to find better jobs—going where rumor indicates there is work. However, they find that there is not enough work anywhere any more due to machines. (Illinois)

A 65-year-old man was happy that his children had married and settled, but hopeless for himself:

Mr. R. was 65 years old on the day of the interview He used to migrate with his family until they all married. Now he comes alone to California for the summer from his home base in Texas. He works in peaches, figs, and tomatoes.

He said that about five years ago, the machines began to affect his income to the extent that it no longer pays to spend the year in migration. He is glad his children have married and settled. For himself, he has no hope because, as he said: "People are going to have to fight each other for jobs in another five years. Those of us who are old do not have a chance. We will probably starve to death. Already, we cannot work as much as the farmer wants for his money. There is no hope for us." (California)

Attitudes Toward Education

Some migrant parents saw education as the key to realizing their aspirations and were taking new kinds of action to try to secure a good education for their children:

All of the 16 parents who were present showed a strong concern about education. Most announced that they did not intend to take their children out of school early, because they felt that if they didn't get an education, they would be left by the wayside. The push is on education because it is seen as a way to make money. A Negro assistant principal tells his junior high students: "You've got to get it upstairs before you get it downstairs."

Three of the women had taken adult education courses; one said she was going to school because she knew there had to be something better for her children than a trail. Parents are trying to keep up with their children—they want to be able to help them with their homework.

The adult education programs have been like the key to the door. Adult education graduates are spokesmen for the rest of the community. For the first time in my 16 years of being close, I saw some magazines and school books ordered by mail in a migrant home. Our hostess' 16-year-old pregnant daughter is going to night school because they wouldn't permit her to continue during the day. (Florida)

* * *

This was a real career migrant family until machines affected cycles. The family finds that a career of migration is no longer possible. Until two years ago, they were able to piece out a living by year-round migration. Now it is impossible.

The family now returns to Texas in time for opening of school, because they have begun to realize since 1965 or 1966 that school is the only solution for their children. The four oldest had to drop out to work in crops, and parents have found the seasonal cannery in Texas about the only source of income for them. They see school as the only hope for the four younger children (aged six through 18) who are still in school. They hope to keep them there until high school graduation. (California)

* * *

Of nine children in this family, two graduated from high school, and six are still in school in Texas (four are in summer school in California and two are working). A five-year-old attends the day care center in California.

The oldest daughter is in her second year of college and also works for a law firm. Parents regret that the oldest son went into the army after high school graduation; they hope to send all the others straight to college. They know from experience the handicaps of limited education and limited English, and they want much more for their children. Their daughter's experience in college has made them aware of its advantages. They only hope farm work will last long enough for them to educate their children before the machines take over. (California)

Other parents who were aware of their children's need for more education felt inadequate to help them. They expressed anxieties and the need for help:

They want the children to have free choice of occupations, but expressed some apprehension about their ability to support the younger ones all the way through school. (Texas)

* * *

The parents were uncertain about their children's future. They seemed to want to do something besides migrate, but were somewhat hopeless that any of them would finish school. (Texas)

* * *

They think it would be better for the children to find stable jobs, rather

than to enter the migrant stream. They would like to have school meetings in Spanish, so that they can participate more easily. They need things described simply and clearly so they will know how to cooperate with the school. (Texas)

* * *

They have hopes that education may enable children to do something other than migrate. In addition to the six children who were with them in Illinois, six older children remained at home in Texas. Two of these finished high school and are both working for schools in Texas, hoping to go on to college but not knowing how they can afford it. The family urgently needs counseling in order to discover resources for further education after high school. (Illinois)

* * *

Parents at a group meeting expressed interest in adult education during the times of little work in the home base area. Younger parents are interested in information about job training in order to move into something more secure. They all love farm work and the out-of-doors, but they are afraid of the future.

Parents of teen-agers expressed real concern for ways they might encourage their children to finish high school. These parents worry about drugs and the kind of associates their children might find in towns. (Illinois)

* * *

The father had migrated for years until, four years ago, he brought his family to California to settle. He feels jobs are hard to come by everywhere, and they can make as much in one location as another.

They are grateful for the family center, the child care center, and the clinic. Their children are not yet old enough for public school. The father wishes he had the opportunity to learn English and get some job training in order to give his children a better education which they will need in the future. (California)

Many parents wanted a better life for their children, but did not understand the relationship between education and their hopes for the future:

Parents hope that their children can get better jobs, out of migrancy. However, they do not really understand the relationship between education and improved job opportunities. They do not know about job training or educational opportunities beyond the high school level.

They would like information about what makes good education and anything that their children should have. (Texas)

* * *

With five small children (the oldest is seven), parents are more concerned with the present struggle for existence than with matters of education for the future of their children. They entered migrancy two summers ago when work in Texas became too scarce. They find it does not pay except when both husband and wife can work. They wish there were day care programs for their three pre-school children. Counseling for family planning might be very relevant at this point.

Parents hope the children will not have to migrate—but future offers little hope for them. (Illinois)

* * *

Both children in this family are too young for school; the mother stays home to care for them, since they did not like the child care center. Parents have no awareness of what the future may hold for their children, and no anxiety about the future. All energy goes into the present effort to care for the basic needs of the family. They have not yet become aware of any relationship between education and employment and future needs. (California)

* * *

The mother feels the children have gotten a good education already: they know how to read and add—in both Spanish and English, having lived for three years in Mexico. There is no real comprehension of what the future may hold for their children. They just know that the children are very happy in summer school, with the kindly attitudes of the director and staff—plus meals, which are a problem in Texas. (Illinois)

* * *

Some teenagers were also uncertain about the meaning of education for their future:

The son who is in high school indicated he would have to drop out soon to help his father—he had considered doing so this year. Both older boys were eager to discuss the relative possibilities for employment with and without a high school diploma, but they didn't really understand what was needed to finish high school or what possibilities are open in the job world. (Texas)

Parents' Evaluation of the Migrant Education Projects their Children Were Attending

Interviewers found most migrant parents slow to criticize the schools their children were attending. The fact that the children were permitted to attend was sometimes seen as an improvement over previous conditions:

The parents have little knowledge of the goals of the migrant school. They are pleased that now all their children are accepted in school when they return to Texas in the fall. Previously, they had been turned down in one small town and had met open hostility at the schools in the town where they now reside. In expressing the feeling that everything was now all right at the schools, the father asked for the interviewer's address, so that he could report any future change to the contrary. (Texas)

Many parents felt unqualified to judge the schools:

The parents like the school, and feel they have nothing to say about it anyway. They seem to feel that migrants have no voice in such matters; that is part of being a migrant. They know only that the migrant school is for their children because "it opens when we come back from up north and closes when we leave for the north." (Texas)

In Texas, most parents were pleased to have their children attend the six-months' migrant school:

> The parents like the migrant school. They feel that the teachers are interested in their children and that the methods used by the school have been helpful. They are not aware of what Title I money is. They just know there is a school for migrant children, and they like it, primarily because they think that in a school with "city kids" their children would be corrupted by such problems as glue-sniffing and marijuana. They feel they have to work hard and need help from their children. They feel that work gives the children something worth doing, and that as long as they keep them away from city kids, they will not have to worry about discipline and narcotics.
>
> * * *
>
> Prior to migrancy, the children of this family attended a regular elementary school. Since they started migrating, they have chosen to send their children to the migrant school.
>
> Parents like the migrant school. They have no concept of the sources of funds, but they know the school calendar has been adjusted to migrancy and understand that it is designed to meet their children's needs and that the teachers try to help the children keep up with their school work.
>
> They like their children to be among others with the same needs and background. They indicate that junior and senior high students need the same consideration with regard to scheduling, because it is hard for them to enter late and leave early.
>
> * * *
>
> Parents expressed pleasure at recent changes in the school calendar which made them feel their children were welcome even though they registered late. They felt teachers at the migrant school were interested in helping their children. There was little understanding of programs beyond this. For the most part, parents were pleased that there was no trouble; they seemed resigned to the fact that this was the best they could expect.

In two Texas families, parents had not understood that they were free to choose either the migrant school or a regular elementary school for their children:

> Parents were not aware that they had the privilege of choosing the regular elementary school. They understood they had to send their children to the migrant school. There was some misunderstanding and unhappiness at the time of registration.
>
> The parents say they would like the schools to treat them like people. They think education is important, but they do not understand the school system, and this causes some anxiety.
>
> * * *
>
> Four children attend the migrant school. The parents do not understand its goals and purposes. They resent that, although they live across the

street from another elementary school, their children were not allowed to register there in December. Their understanding is that they were required to bus them to the migrant school.

In one Florida county, both families we interviewed seemed quite pleased by the program provided by the school. A mother thought the schools were much better than they used to be. Teachers show more personal interest and see that the children study more. When asked to suggest improvements, a father said: "Let them continue what they are now doing."

In this same county, children who took part in a group discussion thought their school could be made a better place mostly through improvements in the school plant, such as painting the rooms, repairing equipment, and adding facilities like parking space for bicycles and more classrooms, especially for the pre-school—to "get those babies out of the trailers." They also asked for larger servings and lower prices at lunch—they found the quality of the food very satisfactory.

In another Florida county, a consultant summarized the reactions of a group of 16 migrant parents to their children's schools:

> For these parents, a "good school" is largely equated with a clean, modern school building and good meals. It goes down the ethnic line—it's part of the striving for suburbia. You can't get much discussion of "quality education" in other terms, because the parents have never experienced it.
>
> Parents judge a "good teacher" by whether she gives homework and whether she keeps the children in line. Parents mentioned, as an example of a good teacher, a Negro woman who had been with the school system nine years, is a stern disciplinarian, and makes the children do their work before they can go to the playground. They expressed some dissatisfaction with a white teacher who is a former social worker and suspected of being guilty of maternalistic instincts.
>
> Parents also judged a school by how much trouble it took to get their children to attend. They mentioned recent improvements in this respect; children who "wouldn't go to school at all" are now going willingly. They did speak of some teen-aged boys (not their own) who were learning to cut cane and hadn't been in school for quite a while.
>
> They expressed dissatisfaction with the report cards the schools are using. They felt they were not thorough enough. For example, if the teacher wrote that "Johnny does not read well," they wanted to know the criteria on which this judgment was based. They felt the teachers overlooked their children's achievements. They have a crying need for success—the children to achieve it and the parents to feel it.

In summer programs in both California and Illinois, parents expressed great appreciation of the summer school offerings:

> The father has a third grade education, and the mother went through second grade. They have worked in the fields all their lives, but are worried because work is getting hard to find. This is their first attempt to migrate. They hope their children can get more secure jobs for their

future—but they do not know how this can be accomplished. They feel defeated and alienated from all around them.

The summer school is the only bright spot in this family's existence right now. The parents know the children like it and that it keeps them out of danger and they think they may also learn some things and keep up practice in English.

Parents were very much impressed with the fact that there was no cost for the children to attend. They were most pleased to have the director come and personally explain all the arrangements. Parents might have been afraid of expenses if the director had not explained so fully.

The home base situation in Texas does not offer so much assistance. School costs are a problem there, and the school staff does not make such pleasant home visits as do those in this summer school. (Illinois)

* * *

The mother works a night shift and the father works a day shift at the processing plant. Having children happily placed in school makes this work schedule easier for parents. When both parents work, there are no financial problems. Their main concern right now is whether the school will have a place for their four-year-old in the fall. (Illinois)

* * *

In a group session with 24 people representing about 14 migrant families (held in a shed in a private camp while it was raining), attitudes toward the summer school program were all positive. Parents' personal relationship with the program director seemed to contribute to favorable attitudes. The only negative comment was on the closing of school at the end of July; parents would like it to continue through the month of August. They also requested a progress report to take back to home base schools. They thought this might improve the attitudes of the teachers there.

The discussion of the summer school program resulted in an expression of concern for the type of education offered in home base areas in Texas. Parents longed for personal contact with education staff in Texas such as they had experienced in Illinois. The migrant summer school has given parents a better attitude toward education. It has helped them see what they may expect from a school system, even though the time is too brief for major educational accomplishments. (Illinois)

* * *

Three of the school-age children are in summer school in California, and look forward to it as a vacation, with trips and recreational activities. The older child works, because school-year expenses in Texas are a major problem. (California)

* * *

The mother has little understanding of the summer school program, but she appreciated the field trips, the recreation, and the food. The school is good, because it is good to her children. She thinks they do not learn so much, but it is good enough for the summer. (California)

However, parents in both California and Illinois during the summer stated again and again that it is the home base schools which really make a difference in their children's school achievement, because the children are there longer. All expressed concern about the high cost of school expenses in the home base area of Texas, where too little work is available.

After extensive parent interviewing in Texas, California, and Illinois, one consultant offered as his most important overall conclusion:

> Migrant education is important in summer areas, but the major efforts and expenditures must be made in the home base areas—in terms of good teaching and primarily in terms of supporting services, including counseling, school lunches, medical care, and transportation.

Summary of Findings

1. The education of migrant children is interstate in nature and national in scope. Solutions to the educational problems of migrant children are not to be found in the hit or miss manner of present patterns of program development by the states and local districts but must become part of an organized national thrust. (Chapter I)

2. The federal funds for migrant education are not equitably allocated because they depend on unreliable estimates of the school-age migrant population and inadequate methods for identifying migrant children. (Chapter II)

3. A combination of late Congressional appropriations and inflexible allocation procedures has severely hindered the effective use of funds. Of $97 million appropriated by Congress during the three fiscal years ending with 1969, $4.4 million were not granted to any state. (Chapter II)

4. At this writing, no audits of migrant education programs have been completed by the Audit Agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Because of the absence of federal audits and the varied interpretations of legislative provisions regarding accountability for the use of federal migrant education funds by state education agencies and local school districts, it was difficult to determine to what degree the states and local schools were maintaining support of migrant education. (Chapter III)

5. At all administrative levels—federal, state, and local—officials who are responsible for planning and implementing educational programs are often out of touch with those who make budget decisions and keep track of program expenditures. Site observers found much confusion about the respective fiscal responsibilities of state and local officials. Some local project directors had not participated in preparing budgets for their projects and had no flexibility to adjust budgets to meet actual needs. (Chapter III)

6. Over a three-year period (fiscal 1967, 1968, 1969), a total of $12.6 million in federal migrant education grants to the states was not spent, according to the most recent official state expenditure reports filed with the United States Office of Education. In addition there were $4.4 million in unallocated funds, making a total of $17 million in unspent funds. (Chapter III).

7. An analysis of actual per pupil expenditures from federal migrant education funds by migrant education projects included in our local project sample showed that more federal funds were spent for seven weeks in the summer than for seven months in the regular school year. The average per pupil expenditure from ESEA Title I migrant funds in 1968-69 school-year projects was $177; in 1969 summer projects, $195.

   The range of these federally supported supplementary per pupil

expenditures was extraordinary: from $11 to $1,002 in the school year and from $24 to $1,021 in the summer.

Our analysis shows that the higher per pupil expenditures from federal migrant funds were to some extent correlated with (1) lower local and state support and (2) more ample staffing and food services in summer projects. *However, the clearest correlation was between higher expenditures and separate programs for migrant children.* Beyond these factors, the extreme range in per pupil expenditures seemed largely random and inequitable. (Chapter III)

8. It was impossible to arrive at a figure on the number of migrant children served in educational programs financed through ESEA Title I migrant funds. Neither unduplicated enrollment figures nor average daily attendance records are available for migrant children by school-year and summer session at any administrative level. (Chapter IV)

9. All evidence points to the existence of many migrant children who are not being reached by federally financed educational services. (Chapter IV)

10. Sixty-nine per cent of the migrant children served by school-year projects included in our local questionnaire sample were placed in classes together with non-migrants. In the summer, the situation was almost reversed: 71% were being educated in separate schools or classes.

    Consultants who made site visits did not find that placing migrant children separately or together with non-migrants made a decisive difference in the conditions under which they were educated, or in the reactions of migrant parents to school programs. They noted, however, that some school districts provided more staff and special services to migrant children who attended separate schools. (Chapter IV)

11. In the migrant education projects visited by NCEMC consultants, late funding, teacher shortages, local school district prerogatives, and weak leadership were factors which tended—singly or in combination—to block the development and use of criteria for the selection of staff best suited to meet the educational needs of migrant children. (Chapter V)

12. Local practice exerted a decisive influence on the ethnic group composition of migrant education staff. As indicated by local questionnaire response, only 28% of the 1968–69 school-year programs and 46% of the 1969 summer programs in our sample employed any migrant adults in any capacity. (Chapter V)

13. In the projects visited, consultants found wide variations in the amount and quality of in-service staff training. In most projects, they found little evidence that in-service training programs were having an important impact on day-to-day classroom performance. (Chapter V)

14. In the projects we visited, staffing ratios were at least as favorable for migrant pupils as they were for non-migrants. However, in some school-

year projects, staffing for all children was so sparse that the few positions added by federal migrant education funds could not begin to meet migrant children's needs.

By contrast, in most summer projects we visited, staffing was ample. Most had class sizes of 15 to 20 pupils with two or more adults assigned full-time to each class. (Chapter V)

15. Despite the inexperience of many administrators and teachers in using their services, paraprofessionals, volunteers and students made important contributions to the migrant education projects we visited. They helped to reduce the essential isolation of many migrant education projects from both the migrant and the non-migrant communities.

    Classroom aides sometimes represented the only tangible link between the school and the migrant child's own cultural background. In a few communities, volunteers provided essential services to migrant families and were in closer touch with their needs than were the paid members of the project staff.

    Where migrant high school or college students were employed, there were reciprocal benefits to both the students and the projects. (Chapter V)

16. In many of the migrant education projects we visited, consultants found no real educational plan. They often reported that a listing of educational techniques was being substituted for clearly defined program objectives and components.

    Some project officials seemed to consultants poorly qualified by interest, experience, or attitude to plan and direct an educational program for migrant children.

    Some projects depended heavily on programmed teaching materials, to the exclusion of curricular balance and human interaction. (Chapter VI)

17. In none of the projects we visited did consultants find that there was adequate individualization of instruction. There were, however, some promising approaches and experimental attempts. (Chapter VI)

18. All of our sources of information indicate that only a very small number of migrant students are receiving a high school education.

    Available data from state education agencies shows that less than one-fourth (22%) of the migrant pupils reported for the 1968–69 school year had gone beyond the sixth grade. For the United States school population as a whole, the percentage—44%—was twice as high. (Chapter IV)

    Local questionnaire responses from 120 projects enrolling about 35,000 migrant pupils include reports of only 201 migrant pupils who graduated from high school during the 1968–69 school year. These graduates came from only 28 projects; over three-fourths of the sample projects reported no migrant high school graduates at all. (Chapter VI)

19. In order to determine the factors which had helped this small number of migrant students to graduate from high school, follow-up letters were sent to projects which reported at least five migrant graduates. Their replies showed the comprehensive nature of the effort which was required.

    The factors they listed as having helped migrant pupils to graduate included: part-time jobs; college scholarships; individual help from teachers; individualized curricula and special courses, including language arts, industrial arts, home and family living, and vocational programs; participation in athletics and other extra-curricular activities; intensive counseling of pupils and parents; supportive services for students and families, including clothing, shoes, better housing and health care, and care for young brothers and sisters so that high school students would not have to leave school to baby-sit. (Chapter VI)

20. Of migrant children included in our local questionnaire sample for 1968–69 regular school-year programs, only 13% received breakfast in school and only 39% received free lunches in school.

    For the 1969 summer session, the sample showed a higher percentage of migrant children receiving breakfast (60%) and free lunches (92%) in school.

    While migrant children went hungry, almost a million dollars ($954,986)—or about 31% of the migrant education funds budgeted for food services in fiscal 1969—were not spent.

    Site observations did not show improved nutrition services during fiscal 1970. Few breakfasts were served in projects we visited. Some project directors doubted that the children were hungry. One saw a free breakfast program as the first priority of his school. (Chapter VII)

21. The local questionnaire sample showed that of the migrant children included in both school-year and summer programs during fiscal 1969, less than half received physical or dental examinations or immunizations, and less than one-fifth received medical or dental treatment.

    While this abysmal neglect was allowed to exist, about $686,000 (or 30% of the $2.3 million budgeted by the states for health services in fiscal 1969) were not spent.

    Observers found no single pattern in the 1970 health services to migrant children and families in the projects they visited. The quality and scope of health services ranged from excellent to non-existent. Even the best were reaching only a fraction of the migrant children in their areas. (Chapter VII)

22. In the projects we visited, program coordination to meet the total needs of migrant families was lacking. Only three of the 13 migrant education projects we visited provided all-day programs for migrant children for the full time their parents were working. In others, even where there were nearby day care centers under other auspices, no care was

provided before or after school for young children enrolled in Title I migrant education projects. Children of all ages were left without supervision in migrant camps for several hours in the morning, and for a large part of the afternoon and early evening. (Chapter VII)

23. In all but three of the migrant education projects we visited, consultants found home-school contacts to be the weakest part of the program. Few school personnel visited migrant children's homes, and even fewer migrant parents had any voice in planning, implementing, or evaluating education programs for their children. In the two projects where home visiting was a regular part of the program, all other aspects of the educational program benefited greatly. (Chapter VIII)

24. Almost all of the parents we interviewed hoped that their children would be able to leave the migrant stream. Some parents hoped that they themselves might be able to do so. In addition, many who knew no other way to earn a living were afraid of being forced out by the mechanization of farm labor. (Chapter VIII)

25. Some migrant parents saw education as a key to realizing their aspirations. They saw their children's need for more education, but some felt inadequate to help them. They expressed anxieties and the need for help.

    Many parents wanted a better life for their children but did not understand the relationship between education and their hopes for the future. Some teenagers were also uncertain about the relationship between education and employment opportunities. (Chapter VIII)

26. Parents who were interviewed during the summer expressed appreciation for the food, health, and recreational services which were available to their children in summer schools. However, many families reported that their children could not attend summer schools because they had to work in the fields to earn money for their regular school-year expenses. Parents stated again and again that it is the home base schools which really make a difference because the children are there longer. All expressed concern about the high cost of school lunches and other school expenses in the home base areas, where too little work is available. (Chapter VIII)

RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this report indicate that the Migrant Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has succeeded in mobilizing most State Education Agencies to develop services for migrant children. These efforts vary greatly in the degree of their commitment, competence and effectiveness. However, migrant children cannot yet count on finding programs geared to their needs in many communities which they enter. Where such programs do exist there is a wide variation in the kind and quality of services provided. This is caused, in part, by the lack of consistency in funding from state to state and from project to project within a state, attitudes of communities and school leadership, and lack of criteria for staff selection. Other factors are the failure of the United States Office of Education to effectively mandate the establishment of nationwide goals and priorities.

That the Migrant Amendment to Title I as now constituted and administered can meet the demands of migrant children is doubtful. It is clear that immediate changes are required to guarantee that migrant children receive the services which they need.

We recommend that action be taken by the appropriate and or designated agencies in the following areas:

LEGISLATION AND ADMINISTRATION

1. The United States Office of Education must give stronger leadership to the development of national goals and strategies. The Office's Migrant Programs Branch must be more adequately funded and staffed and must more vigorously fulfill its responsibilities for national program planning, technical assistance, monitoring, and evaluation.
2. It is imperative that the Congress appropriate funds in time for states to receive notification of the full amount of their migrant education grant at least one year in advance of the beginning of each fiscal year.
3. The Audit Agency of the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare should include migrant education programs in its investigations in order to assure accountability within the intent of the law.
4. While we recognize the urgency of meeting the educational needs of all rural poor children–especially those handicapped by years of former migrancy–*regular* Title I funds should be used to serve them. Until all *current* migrant children have been reached by the concentration of edueational services they so desperately need, Title I *migrant* funds should not be diverted for other purposes.
5. Present allocation procedures must be changed. Financial support should be provided on the basis of pupil needs, providing higher per-pupil expenditures where needs are greater and less where needs are less. Assistance formulas should consider not only the concentration of pupils

in a project area, but the financial ability of the area to provide for the needs of pupils. The federal allocation procedures must apply not only to state grants, but also to the distribution of funds by the state to local projects.

6. The Commissioner of Education should take steps to see that all appropriated funds are allocated. If a State Education Agency fails to request its maximum allocation then the balance of funds should be made available to another public or private non-profit agency in the state.
7. Federal, state, and local officials must coordinate their program and fiscal planning. National and state program officials must be routinely informed about expenditure reports prepared by their accounting departments. State Education Agencies must clearly define their own and local projects' fiscal responsibilities.
8. Because of the wide variations in per-pupil expenditures by local projects which appeared in our sample we recommend further investigation by the Migrant Programs Branch of the USOE to determine whether they are as random and inequitable as our analysis would indicate.
9. The USOE must develop consistent and comprehensive procedures for collecting and recording data essential to fiscal and program planning. These should include such records as are required to substantiate maintenance of effort and comparability of services. They should provide proof of identification and eligibility of each child for participation in programs and assure the availability of complete enrollment, placement, and attendance data.

STAFFING

1. Congress must eliminate delays in approving appropriations so local projects can be assured of funding in time to employ the best staff. (See recommendation two, under Legislation and Administration.)
2. Clearly stated criteria should be developed by the Migrant Programs Branch of the USOE in cooperation with State Education Agencies for the selection of all migrant education staff, including state project administrators.
3. Open recruitment policies must be instituted which will permit the selection of the best qualified applicants from all sources. Special efforts should be made to find and hire migrant, minority group, and bi-lingual staff.
4. A national program for recruitment of competent teachers and administrators of migrant education programs should be initiated by the USOE in cooperation with appropriate teacher training institutions. A program could include such approaches as internships and Teacher Corps.
5. In-service training programs should give priority to helping staff learn

to diagnose individual interest and needs quickly and to provide immediately relevant learning experiences.

6. More funding and staffing priority should be given to school-year projects. (See recommendation four, Educational Planning.)
7. Use of paraprofessionals, volunteers, and students in migrant education programs should be continued and expanded. Wherever possible, migrants and former migrants should be employed. Preference should also be given to qualified applicants with the same ethnic and language background as the migrant children who are served. Much greater use should be made of paid teen-age migrant aides. Their employment can contribute not only to the education of the younger migrant children, but also to helping them complete their own education.

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

1. The initiative for educational planning and implementation must be assumed by the Migrant Programs Branch of the United States Office of Education. It must assist the states and local projects to more clearly define program objectives and components which are built on specific assessment of the individual educational needs and interests of the migrant children served, and on consultation with migrant parents about their educational aspirations for their children. (See recommendation two, Home-School-Community Relationships.)
2. Program personnel must participate in preparing budgets and be enabled to adapt them to meet changing program needs. (See recommendation seven, Legislation and Administration.)
3. Programmed teaching materials must not be substituted for a balanced curriculum and good human relationships.
4. The correlation between high per-pupil expenditures and separate migrant schools needs special examination by the Migrant Programs Branch of the USOE and the U.S. Congress. It should not be necessary to place migrant children in separate programs in order to provide for their special needs, therefore, we believe, more funding priority should be given to projects where children are grouped together. While we are not, at this time, recommending that summer schools be discontinued, our analysis of the cost factor would indicate that priority should be given to integrated school-year programs.
5. All segregated school facilities whether on the basis of race or migrant vs. non-migrant must be eliminated except where and as long as temporary separation is required for language or other special instruction.
6. The USOE must take the initiative for planning a comprehensive nationwide effort to enable more migrant students to graduate from high school. The experience of the small number of local projects which are already having some success in this effort should be fully utilized.

Educationally Related Services

1. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, should provide leadership for the coordination of the various federal education, health, nutrition, and day care services available to migrant children.

2. All local projects funded under the Migrant Amendment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should include funds for the basic health needs of all children enrolled. This should include a) immunizations as needed, b) a school nurse, and c) medical and dental examinations followed by essential treatment. The school health program should be coordinated with any existing community health program for migrants.

3. Every migrant child, regardless of age, should receive a free breakfast and lunch during both the school-year and summer sessions. These meals must be provided to all migrant children without any identification of or humiliation to children or parents. School personnel should visit the parents' homes to let them know that their children are welcome to make use of this service and to answer any questions they may have about it.

4. All programs should include, or have available through a cooperating agency, pre-school, or Head Start facilities with appropriate care before and after school hours for all children.

   The extension of the school into the camp or residential community with after school and/or evening recreation programs, especially for older youth, should be considered.

   Where children are left alone for many hours, the best use of ESEA funds would be the development of expanded child care or day camp type facilities which would give the children not only protective care but an enriched environment over a longer period of time than that now provided by most summer schools.

Home-School-Community Relationships

1. Non-enrollment of migrant children must be the concern of local education agencies. They must assume the responsibility for identifying and enrolling every migrant child who lives in the school district for any part of the year. They must develop greater outreach into less accessible areas and provide for more home contacts. Identification criteria must be clarified and observed. Stricter enforcement of school attendance and child labor laws is required, but such enforcement mandates that the school and community assist migrant families in compensating for the income no longer available when children are removed from the fields. (See recommendation four below.)

2. Home visits by teachers and project directors should be a regular part of every migrant education project both during the school year and summer sessions. These visits should be used to acquaint the parents with the objectives and services of the school as well as to share reports on the progress of the children.

3. Local schools should provide much more guidance to both parents and children. Families should be helped to understand the relationship between education and future work *potential*. The schools should help them plan for ways to keep their children in school. They should also provide guidance in planning for careers beyond farm labor. Adult education programs, planned after thorough consultation with migrant parents, should be a part of every migrant education project.

4. Schools should also provide the supporting services migrant families need if they are to be able to keep their children in school until high school graduation. Migrant education projects should be a place to which migrant parents can turn for help to secure the services they need from all sources in the community.

5. Each community must work together with other communities throughout the nation to bring about basic changes in the farm labor system which will assure the farm worker of adequate wages and decent working conditions.

* * *

In order to provide for a vehicle through which continuous efforts can be made to bring the resources of public education to bear more effectively on the educational needs of migrant children, we recommend the formation, under private auspices, of a coalition of concerned agencies. This coalition would be expected to use the resources of each member agency to bring about the action needed for the development of legislation and new program goals and techniques. It would also establish and carry out continuous nationwide monitoring of migrant education programs.

APPENDIX

TABLE I

ESEA TITLE I MIGRANT FUNDS
FISCAL YEAR 1969[1]
BY EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT

Account Number	Account Title	Budgeted[2] by States	Expended[2] by States	Unspent[2] Balance	Per Cent[2] Unspent
100	Administration	$ 2,617,658	$ 2,381,458	$ 236,200	9.0%
200	Instruction	29,528,790	26,192,801	3,335,989	11.3%
300	Attendance, Guidance, Social Work	657,230	589,029	68,201	10.4%
400	Health Services	2,326,669	1,640,935	685,734	29.5%
500	Public Transportation	1,326,009	1,237,424	88,585	6.6%
600) 700)	Plant Operation and Maintenance	812,030	738,146	73,884	9.0%
800	Fixed Charges	1,570,908	1,442,526	128,382	8.2%
900	Food Services	3,096,345	2,141,359	954,986	30.8%
1000	Student Body Activities	119,327	75,328	43,999	36.9%
1100	Community Services (including clothing)	487,480	375,004	112,476	23.1%
1200	A. Construction	1,047,242	779,937	267,305	25.5%
(Capital Outlay)	B. & C. Equipment	1,377,351	1,829,807	(452,456)[3]	(32.8%)[3]
Reserved for Interstate Record System		——[4]	426,150	−426,150	
Subtotal, 44 States		$44,967,039	$39,849,904	$5,117,135	
Connecticut Expenditures (Undistributed in Report to USOE)		$ 427,367	$ 426,194	$ 1,173	
TOTAL, 45 States		$45,394,406	$40,276,098	$5,118,308	11.2%

[1]Ending June 30, 1969. Programs funded ended August 31, 1969.

[2]These figures were compiled from state expenditure reports prepared by state fiscal officers on the various dates listed in Table II, Column 4, and filed with the United States Office of Education, which transmitted them to NCEMC on April 20, 1970.

[3]Overexpenditures.

[4]Distributed by USOE among various expenditure accounts.

TABLE II

ESEA TITLE I MIGRANT FUNDS, FISCAL YEAR 1969[1] BY STATE

	Grants to States	Expenditure[2] by States	Unspent[3] Balance	Date of State Expenditure Report
Alabama	$ 422,481	$ 323,761	$ 98,720	10 31 69
Arizona	1,249,840	1,227,640	22,200	1/28/70
Arkansas	446,411	444,610	1,801	11/26/69
California	6,106,501	5,882,017	224,484	No Date
Colorado	904,923	795,634	109,289	11/28/69
Connecticut	427,367	426,194	1,173	2 18 70
Delaware	198,266	169,974	28,292	12/19/69
Florida	6,621,070	6,250,511	370,559	1/12/70
Georgia	319 337	306,331	13,006	11 25/69
Idaho	540,204	534,786	5,418	1 15 70
Illinois	425,841	401,503	24,338	1/28/70
Indiana	433,483	393,888	39,595	11/28/69
Iowa	47,309	47,309	0	11/15/69
Kansas	396,489	377,755	18,734	11/26/69
Kentucky	39,608	38,307	1,301	No Date
Louisiana	290,181	251,781	38,400	11/26/69
Maine	4,389	4,389	0	1/26/70
Maryland	163,525	145,556	17,969	12/2/69
Massachusetts	188,055	188,039	16	12/15/69
Michigan	2,357,965	2,183,237	174,728	1/26/70
Minnesota	219,211	219,211	0	8/7/69
Mississippi	616,347	612,536	3,811	11/26/69
Missouri	276,153	276,100	53	11/26/69
Montana	461,832	362,738	99,094	No Date
Nebraska	134,955	129,887	5,068	11/25/69
New Jersey	1,296,834	1,226,368	70,466	11 30 69
New Mexico	604,015	545,998	58,017	11 24 69

	Grants to[2] States	Expenditure[2] by States	Unspent[2] Balance	Date of State Expenditure Report
New York	1,760,849	1,754,607	6,242	No Date
North Carolina ..	918,126	752,893	165,233	11/21/69
North Dakota	150,179	112,496	37,683	No Date
Ohio	786,686	633,173	153,513	11/28/69
Oklahoma	459,339	455,765	3,574	11/15/69
Oregon	1,172,691	1,074,846	97,845	1/26/70
Pennsylvania	322,189	320,703	1,486	No Date
South Carolina ...	382,598	327,113	55,485	11/28/69
South Dakota	22,218	22,218	0	3/4/70
Tennessee	84.716	77,821	6,895	12/1/69
Texas	11,512,283	8,518,244	2,994,039	11/28/69
Utah	124,874	108,499	16,375	11/24/69
Vermont	3,566	2,465	1,101	11/30/69
Virginia	351,911	271,790	80,121	11/21/69
Washington	1,317,405	1 264,385	53,020	11/ /69
West Virginia ...	5,226	5,019	207	11/26/69
Wisconsin	306,987	288,822	18,165	2/15/70
Wyoming	93,821	93,029	792	No Date
Reserved for Interstate Record Transfer System ..	426,150	426,150		
TOTAL	$45,394,406	$40,276,098	$5,118,308	

[1]Ending June 30, 1969. Programs funded ended August 31, 1969.

[2]These figures were taken from state expenditure reports, prepared by state fiscal officers on the dates listed in column 4 and filed with the United States Office of Education, which transmitted them to NCEMC on April 20, 1970.

TABLE III

ESEA TITLE I MIGRANT FUNDS, BY STATE, 1967 AND 1968

	Fiscal Year 1967			Fiscal Year 1968		
	Grants to States[1]	Expenditures by States[2]	Unspent Balance[3]	Grants to States	Expenditures by States	Unspent Balance
Alabama	$ 69,651	$ 55,811	$ 13,840	$ 425,652	$ 250,297	$ 175,355
Arizona	265,010	249,440	15,570	1,162,372	1,135,332	27,040
Arkansas	108,491	108,491	0	379,435	378,242	1,193
California	1,420,932	1,177,900	243,032	6,150,119	5,550,516	599,603
Colorado	260,883	237,621	23,262	1,134,220	813,344	320,876
Connecticut	57,484	39,890	17,594	290,066	209,373	80,693
Delaware	36,381	33,260	3,121	147,518	138,464	9,054
Florida	1,156,323	988,455	167,868	5,454,573	3,258,878	2,195,695
Georgia	103,734	93,119	10,615	438,419	396,431	41,988
Idaho	121,730	121,730	0	512,723	509,596	3,127
Illinois	92,272	80,540	11,732	375,350	351,606	23,744
Indiana	72,098	31,061	41,037	338,531	222,012	116,519
Iowa	9,800	8,617	1,183	42,642	40,714	1,928
Kansas	112,904	107,683	5,221	386,862	350,054	36,808
Kentucky	62,859	47,551	15,308	169,830	138,146	31,684
Louisiana	114,000	106,776	7,224	378,756	250,788	127,968
Maryland	35,361	32,288	3,073	153,177	153,177	0
Massachusetts	10,752	0	10,752	155,247	153,913	1,334
Michigan	532,199	441,422	90,777	2,084,085	1,906,315	177,770
Minnesota	36,393	35,796	597	157,289	156,792	497
Mississippi	131,187	129,023	2,164	579,622	573,900	5,722
Missouri	100,639	60,206	40,433	418,247	374,652	43,595

Montana	102,925	60,558	42,367	441,483	312,609	128,874
Nebraska	32,879	32,681	198	112,861	107,421	5,440
Nevada	0	0	0	8,000	11,759	(3,759)[3]
New Jersey	237,901	238,746	(845)[3]	1,013,700	952,753	60,947
New Mexico	128,035	95,566	32,469	564,301	513,732	50,569
New York	284,324	284,324	0	1,102,303	1,102,303	0
North Carolina	189,106	122,831	66,275	498,061	409,748	88,313
North Dakota	123,736	105,169	18,567	314,579	289,000	25,579
Ohio	179,959	159,774	20,185	716,995	421,954	295,041
Oklahoma	132,377	128,300	4,077	529,575	526,295	3,280
Oregon	201,931	179,163	22,768	943,301	715,208	228,093
Pennsylvania	82,128	34,926	47,202	327,346	218,318	109,028
South Carolina	89,464	57,194	32,270	372,210	296,673	75,537
South Dakota	2,000	0	2,000	29,619	29,619	0
Tennessee	32,209	23,407	8,802	75,070	70,254	4,816
Texas	2,294,684	2,058,242	236,442	7,194,794	6,352,311	842,483
Utah	28,856	19,834	9,022	115,378	87,935	27,443
Vermont	630	0	630	0	0	0
Virginia	100,000	87,994	12,006	276,722	189,047	87,675
Washington	242,658	209,139	33,519	1,121,964	1,046,150	75,814
West Virginia	17,194	9,132	8,062	14,891	30,221	(15,330)[3]
Wisconsin	78,804	73,668	5,136	308,961	285,312	23,649
Wyoming	36,661	26,791	9,870	233,891	187,284	46,607
TOTAL	$9,529,544	$8,194,119	$1,335,425	$37,650,740	$31,468,448	$6,182,292
Percent Unspent			14.0%			16.4%

[1]Ending June 30. Programs funded ended August 31.

[2]These figures were taken from reports on *net adjusted expenditures* reported by state fiscal officers on the various dates listed in Table II, Column 4, and filed with the U.S. Office of Education, which transmitted them to NCEMC on April 20, 1970.

[3]Overexpenditures

TABLE IV

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

LOCAL MIGRANT EDUCATION PROJECT SAMPLE

	1968-69 Regular School Year	1969 Summer Session
Description of Sample		
Number of Migrant Education Projects	120	131
Number of States Represented	26	37
Number of Migrant Pupils Enrolled	35,432	20,090
Percentage of Total Enrollment Reported by States	23%	24%
Total Expenditures (ESEA Title I Migrant)	$6,258,480	$3,924,070
Per pupil Expenditure (ESEA Title I Migrant)	$177	$195
Average Time Migrant Pupils Served	7 Months	7 Weeks
School and Class Placement		
By Project		
Together with Non-Migrants	68%	30%
In Separate Schools	5%	61%
In Separate Classes	8%	7%
Some together, some separate	19%	2%
By Number of Pupils		
Together with Non-Migrants	69%	29%
In Separate Schools and Classes	31%	70%
Grade Levels Served (by Projects)		
Pre-Kindergarten	9%	35%
Kindergarten	57%	70%
Grades 1–3	98%	97%
Grades 4–6	96%	95%
Grades 7 & 8	78%	46%
Grades 9–12	47%	16%
Total High School Graduates (120 Projects)	201	
Food Services (Percent of Migrant Children Receiving)		
Free Breakfast	13%	60%
Free Lunch	39%	92%
Reduced Price Lunch	4%	1%
Health Services (Percent of Migrant Children Receiving)		
Physical Examinations	34%	44%
Hearing and Vision Checks	55%	54%
Immunizations	35%	18%
Medical Treatment	18%	11%
Dental Examinations	36%	37%
Dental Treatment	15%	15%

Migrant Adult Participation

(Percent of Projects Reporting that Migrant Adults Participated in the Following Ways)		
Paid Employees	28%	46%
Advisory Committee Members	49%	47%
Parents' Association Officers	12%	6%
Room Mothers	27%	14%
Attended meetings and socials	57%	51%
Attended adult education activities	29%	24%
Visited children's classes	60%	49%
Conferred with school staff	61%	63%
Helped with trips, recreation and educational activities	48%	48%
Helped in kitchen or lunchroom	9%	15%
Helped inform and recruit for school program	50%	50%

Part of Cost Paid by ESEA Title I Migrant Funds (by percent of Projects Reporting)*

Number of Projects Reporting		*95*	*106*
Teachers' Salaries:	Total Cost	22%	65%
	Half or More	22%	27%
	Less than Half	35%	7%
	None	21%	1%
Pupil Transportation:	Total Cost	9%	58%
	Half or More	7%	31%
	Less than Half	22%	8%
	None	61%	4%
Building Operation and Maintenance:	Total Cost	6%	37%
	Half or More	6%	25%
	Less than Half	23%	22%
	None	65%	16%
Food Services:	Total Cost	15%	61%
	Half or More	30%	29%
	Less than Half	21%	7%
	None	34%	4%
Health Services:	Total Cost	24%	51%
	Half or More	24%	30%
	Less than Half	32%	7%
	None	20%	12%

*Because of rounding, not all categories add to 100%.

Advisory Committee

Rev. Austin H. Armitstead, *Chairman*. Pastor, Grace Methodist Church, Staten Island, New York.

Fay Bennett, Director of Development, National Sharecroppers Fund, New York.

Dr. John E. Codwell, Associate Director, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Atlanta, Georgia.

Dr. Shirley E. Greene, Field Secretary, United Methodist Church, New York.

Dr. Lewis W. Jones, Sociologist, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama.

Dr. Gloria Mattera, Director, New York State Center for Migrant Studies, State University College, Geneseo, New York.

Mrs. Winifred A. Moore, Early Childhood Education Specialist, New York.

Johnny E. Parham, Jr., Curher Associates, Inc., New York.

Dr. Alfred M. Potts, 2d, Retired Educator, Former Director ERIC Clearinghouse, New Mexico State University, St. Petersburg, Florida.

Dr. Milton Schwebel, Dean, Rutgers Graduate School of Education, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Dr. Elizaheth W. Sutton, United States Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Max Wolff, Research Sociologist, Center for Urhan Education, New York.

Mrs. Mildred F. Woodhury, Retired Professor and Civic Leader, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.

Study Consultants

Jesse Frank Clay, Teacher, public schools of New York. Mr. Clay, who has worked in the migrant stream, has served as Assistant Director of the Migrant Education Workshop, State University College, Brockport, New York, since 1967.

Mrs. Karolyn R. Gould, Contributing Editor, *Innovation* magazine. Consultant, National Advisory Council on Education. Mrs. Gould was for two years the coordinator of New York City's Head Start Program during which time she designed and developed the Family Day Care Program. She was one of those involved in the conceptualization of Follow-Through and other federally funded education programs. In 1969, she carried out a study of career mobility for paraprofessionals in the human services.

Dr. Paul Graubard, Associate Professor, Department of Special Education, Yeshiva University. Dr. Graubard is director of programs for training the educationally disturbed. His major research interests are in groups with learning difficulties, and in development of reinforcement systems which eliminate punishment from school.

Harry Lewis, Educational Consultant, Center for Urban Studies, University of Miami. Mr. Lewis is a former public school teacher and principal with specific experience in special education and education for migrant children and adults.

Dr. Roy McCanne, Head of Educational Services Division of Regional Services Institute, Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo. Dr. McCanne has taught elementary school and for four years was the State Director of Migrant Education for the Colorado Department of Education. He directed the study *Approaches to First Grade English Reading Instruction for Children from Spanish-Speaking Homes.*

Pablo Navarro, Assistant Director, Institute of Puerto Rican Studies, Brooklyn College, City University of New York. Mr. Navarro has served as Coordinator of Human Relations, Institute for Community Development, Cayey, Puerto Rico, and consultant on English as a Second Language, Inner City Project, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Dr. Ronald Petrie, Assistant Professor-Director of Teachers Corps, Oregon State University, Corvallis. Dr. Petrie's experience with migrant education began in 1956 in the public schools of St. Paul, Oregon, where he developed special programs for migrant children. He later served for four years as Director of Migrant Education in the Oregon State Department of Education. In 1965 he became Education Analyst for the migrant section of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Dr. Thomas Roberson, Consultant in Health Education. Dr. Roberson was for a number of years the Chief, Health Education and Information Services of the Migrant Health Branch, United States Public Health Services. More recently he was Education Services and Training Officer in the Office for Civil Rights.

Clarence H. Tompkins, Research Director, United Federation of Teachers. Mr. Tompkins, the fiscal consultant to this study, was for almost twenty years the Research Director for the Public Education Association. In that position he was frequently required to analyze school expense and capital budgets as well as participate in school finance studies.

Dr. Houston Wade, teacher fourth grade, Ogden Elementary School, San Antonio. Dr. Wade, who was formerly assistant professor of Genetics and Cell Biology at the University of Minnesota, St. Paul, returned two years ago to his native San Antonio to work with disadvantaged children in the Mexican-American *barrios*. In addition to his teaching he has produced two films about migrant children and their educational problems.

Hector Zavaleta, Counselor for Hispanic American Ministries, Presbyterian Board of National Missions and Synod of Arizona. Mr. Zavaleta, a former high school teacher and counselor, has been working with migrant farm workers families since the mid-nineteen fifties. His assignments have included work in South Texas, Indiana, Arkansas, Colorado, California, New Mexico and Arizona. From 1965-1967 he carried responsibility for job preparation and family counseling in migrant camps of Arizona for the Migrant Opportunity Program.