DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 189 UD 011 454

TITLE	Education for the Urban Disadvantaged: From Preschool to Employment. A Statement on National Policy.
INSTITUTION	Committee for Economic Development, New York, N.Y. Research and Policy Committee.
PUB DATE	Mar 71
NOTE	83p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Committee for Economic Development, 477 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10022 ($1.50)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Control, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Development, *Educational Finance, Educational Opportunities, Educational Quality, *Educational Resources, Educational Technology, Equal Education, Higher Education, Preschool Education, School Industry Relationship, School Integration, *Urban Education, Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This report of the Committee for Economic Development focuses on findings which indicate that while American schools have succeeded with middle and upper income youth, they have commonly failed with educating disadvantaged urban youths. The report deals mainly with three groups of urban disadvantaged -- Blacks, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans. Chapters in the report deal with school environment, preschool education, vocational education, teachers and educational facilities, accountability and local control, financial resources, and research and development. (Author/JM)

Education for the Urban Disadvantaged: from Preschool to Employment

A Statement
on National Policy
by the Research and Policy Committee
of the Committee for Economic Development
March 1971

Single Copy . . . $1.50

Printed in U.S.A.
First Printing March 1971
Design: Harry Carter
Photographs: George Zimbel for Educational Facilities Labs Inc. (pp. 22 and 32); Joe Monroe for The Ford Foundation (p. 48); H. Armstrong Roberts (p. 58).
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 75-153374

Committee for Economic Development
477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022

Contents

THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR CED STATEMENTS ON NATIONAL POLICY

This statement has been approved for publication as a statement of the Research and Policy Committee by the members of that Committee and its drafting subcommittee, subject to individual dissents or reservations noted herein. The trustees who are responsible for this statement are listed on the opposite page. Company associations are included for identification only; the companies do not share in the responsibility borne by the individuals.

The Research and Policy Committee is directed by CED's bylaws to:

"Initiate studies into the principles of business policy and of public policy which will foster the full contribution by industry and commerce to the attainment and maintenance of high and secure standards of living for people in all walks of life through maximum employment and high productivity in the domestic economy."

The bylaws emphasize that:

"All research is to be thoroughly objective in character, and the approach in each instance is to be from the standpoint of the general welfare and not from that of any special political or economic group."

The Research and Policy Committee is composed of 50 Trustees from among the 200 businessmen and educators who comprise the Committee for Economic Development. It is aided by a Research Advisory Board of leading economists, a small permanent Research Staff, and by advisors chosen for their competence in the field being considered.

Each Statement on National Policy is preceded by discussions, meetings, and exchanges of memoranda, often stretching over many months. The research is undertaken by a subcommittee, with its advisors, and the full Research and Policy Committee participates in the drafting of findings and recommendations.

Except for the members of the Research and Policy Committee and the responsible subcommittee, the recommendations presented herein are not necessarily endorsed by other Trustees or by the advisors, contributors, staff members, or others associated with CED.

The Research and Policy Committee offers these Statements on National Policy as an aid to clearer understanding of the steps to be taken in achieving sustained growth of the American economy. The Committee is not attempting to pass on any pending specific legislative proposals; its purpose is to urge careful consideration of the objectives set forth in the statement and of the best means of accomplishing those objectives.

RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE

Co-Chairmen

EMILIO G. COLLADO, Executive Vice President
Standard Oil Company (New Jersey)

PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK, Chairman
Urban Investment and Development Company

Vice Chairmen

HOWARD C. PETERSEN, Chairman — *National Economy*
The Fidelity Bank

JOHN L. BURNS, President — *Education and Urban Development*
John L. Burns and Company

JOHN A. PERKINS — *Improvement of Management in Government*
Graduate School of Management
Northwestern University

WILLIAM M. ROTH — *International Economy*
San Francisco, California

JERVIS J. BABB
New York, New York

[2]JOSEPH W. BARR
President
American Security and Trust Co.

FREDERICK S. BEEBE
Chairman of the Board
Newsweek

S. CLARK BEISE
President (Retired)
Bank of America N.T. & S.A.

WILLIAM BENTON
Publisher and Chairman
Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

JOSEPH L. BLOCK
Chairman, Executive Committee
Inland Steel Company

MARVIN BOWER, Director
McKinsey & Company, Inc.

JOHN L. BURNS, President
John L. Burns and Company

RAFAEL CARRION, JR.
Chairman and President
Banco Popular de Puerto Rico

EMILIO G. COLLADO
Executive Vice President
Standard Oil Company (New Jersey)

ROBERT C. COSGROVE
Chairman of the Board
Green Giant Company

MARION B. FOLSOM
Rochester, New York

WILLIAM C. FOSTER
Washington, D.C.

JOHN M. FOX, Chairman
United Fruit Company

DAVID L. FRANCIS, Chairman
Princess Coal Sales Company

WILLIAM H. FRANKLIN, President
Caterpillar Tractor Co.

RICHARD C. GERSTENBERG
Vice Chairman of the Board
General Motors Corporation

ELLISON L. HAZARD
Chairman and President
Continental Can Company, Inc.

H. J. HEINZ, II, Chairman
H. J. Heinz Company

WILLIAM A. HEWITT, Chairman
Deere & Company

CHARLES KELLER, JR., President
Keller Construction Corporation

ROBERT J. KLEBERG, JR., President
King Ranch, Inc.

PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK, Chairman
Urban Investment and Development Co.

RALPH LAZARUS, Chairman
Federated Department Stores, Inc.

THOMAS B. McCABE
Chairman, Finance Committee
Scott Paper Company

GEORGE C. McGHEE
Washington, D.C.

RAYMOND B. MULFORD, Chairman
Owens-Illinois Inc.

ROBERT R. NATHAN, President
Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.

ALFRED C. NEAL, President
Committee for Economic Development

JOHN A. PERKINS
Graduate School of Management
Northwestern University

HOWARD C. PETERSEN, Chairman
The Fidelity Bank

C. WREDE PETERSMEYER
Chairman and President
Corinthian Broadcasting Corporation

PHILIP D. REED
New York, New York

MELVIN J. ROBERTS, Chairman
Colorado National Bank of Denver

WILLIAM M. ROTH
San Francisco, California

ROBERT B. SEMPLE, President
BASF Wyandotte Corporation

S. ABBOT SMITH
Boston, Massachusetts

[1]PHILIP SPORN
New York, New York

[1]ALLAN SPROUL
Kentfield, California

WILLIAM C. STOLK, Chairman
W. C. Stolk & Associates, Inc.

ALEXANDER L. STOTT
Vice President and Comptroller
American Telephone & Telegraph Company

WAYNE E. THOMPSON
Senior Vice President
Dayton-Hudson Corporation

H. C. TURNER, JR.
Chairman, Executive Committee
Turner Construction Company

HERMAN L. WEISS
Vice Chairman of the Board
General Electric Company

FRAZAR B. WILDE, Chairman Emeritus
Connecticut General Life Insurance Company

WALTER W. WILSON, Partner
Morgan Stanley & Co.

THEODORE O. YNTEMA
Department of Economics
Oakland University

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FOR THE URBAN DISADVANTAGED

Chairman

JOHN L. BURNS, President
John L. Burns and Company

[2]SANFORD S. ATWOOD, President
Emory University

DAVID L. FRANCIS, Chairman
Princess Coal Sales Company

STANTON G. HALE, President
Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company

TERRANCE HANOLD, President
The Pillsbury Company

HARRY W. KNIGHT
Chairman of the Board
Knight, Gladieux & Smith Inc.

H. TALBOTT MEAD
Chairman, Finance Committee
The Mead Corporation

JOHN F. MERRIAM
Chairman, Executive Committee
Northern Natural Gas Company

ISADORE NEWMAN, II, President
City Stores Company

[1]DANIEL PARKER, Chairman
The Parker Pen Company

DEWITT J. PAUL, Chairman
Beneficial Corporation

PETER G. PETERSON
Chairman of the Board
Bell & Howell Company

THEODORE SCHLESINGER, Chairman
Allied Stores Corporation

LEON SHIMKIN, President
Simon and Schuster, Inc.

GRANT G. SIMMONS, JR., Chairman
Simmons Company

SYDNEY STEIN, JR., Partner
Stein Roe & Farnham

REV. LEON H. SULLIVAN
Zion Baptist Church

THEODORE O. YNTEMA
Department of Economics
Oakland University

Non-Trustee Members[3]

JAMES E. ALLEN, JR.
Washington, D.C.

J. S. AVERY
Public Relations Manager
Humble Oil & Refining Company

MYLES S. SPECTOR
Tenafly, New Jersey

JACK E. WOOD, JR.
Executive Co-Director
National Committee Against Discrimination In Housing

1. Voted to approve the policy statement but submitted memoranda of comment, reservation, or dissent, or wished to be associated with memoranda of others. See pages 80-82
2. Did not participate in the voting on this statement because of absence from the country.
3. Non-trustee members take part in all discussions on the statement but do not vote on it.

PROJECT DIRECTOR

STERLING M. McMURRIN
Dean, Graduate School
University of Utah

ADVISORS TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE

PAUL W. BRIGGS
Superintendent
Cleveland Public Schools

J. DOUGLAS BROWN
Provost and Dean of the Faculty Emeritus
Princeton University

ALAN K. CAMPBELL, Dean
The Maxwell School of Citizenship
and Public Affairs
Syracuse University

CARL J. DOLCE
Dean, School of Education
North Carolina State University

LYLE C. FITCH, President
Institute of Public Administration

EDYTHE J. GAINES
Community Superintendent
New York City Community School District 12

HAROLD B. GORES
President
Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc.

ROBERT L. GREEN
Assistant Provost
Michigan State University

KENNETH HASKINS
Dean, School of Social Work
Howard University

JAMES L. JARRETT
Associate Dean
University of California, Berkeley

LEON M. LESSINGER
Callaway Professor of Education
Georgia State University

JOHN W. LETSON
Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools

RICHARD J. MILLER
Vice President
Baldwin-Wallace College

THOMAS F. PETTIGREW
Department of Social Relations
Harvard University

SAMUEL SHEPARD, JR.
Superintendent of Schools
East Chicago Heights Board of Education

DONALD C. STONE
Graduate School of Public and
International Affairs
University of Pittsburgh

RALPH W. TYLER
Science Research Associates, Inc.

VICTOR WEINGARTEN
President, Institute of Public Affairs, Inc.

RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD

Chairman
CHARLES L. SCHULTZE
The Brookings Institution

WILBUR J. COHEN
Dean, School of Education
The University of Michigan

OTTO ECKSTEIN
Department of Economics
Harvard University

WALTER W. HELLER
Department of Economics
University of Minnesota

LAWRENCE C. HOWARD
Dean, Graduate School of Public
and International Affairs
University of Pittsburgh

CHARLES P. KINDLEBERGER
Department of Economics and Social Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

JOHN R. MEYER
President
National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

FREDERICK C. MOSHER
Woodrow Wilson Department of
Government and Foreign Affairs
University of Virginia

DON K. PRICE
Dean, John Fitzgerald Kennedy School
of Government
Harvard University

ELI SHAPIRO
Sylvan C. Coleman Professor of
Financial Management, Graduate
School of Business Administration
Harvard University

MITCHELL SVIRIDOFF
Vice President, Division of National Affairs
The Ford Foundation

PAUL N. YLVISAKER
Professor, Public Affairs and
Urban Planning
Woodrow Wilson School of Public
and International Affairs
Princeton University

Associate Members
J. DOUGLAS BROWN
Provost and Dean of the Faculty Emeritus
Princeton University

EDWARD S. MASON
Lamont University Professor
Harvard University

RAYMOND VERNON
Professor of International Trade and
Investment, Graduate School
of Business Administration
Harvard University

Foreword

This policy statement reflects two areas of interest which have claimed an important share of the CED Research and Policy Committee's attention in recent years.

The first of these interests is a concern for the quality and effectiveness of education, which is critical for the economic well-being of American society and the full development of individual potential. We began our studies in this area more than a decade ago with the policy statement *Paying for Better Public Schools* (1959), followed by *Raising Low Incomes Through Improved Education* (1965). We then turned our attention to ways in which the limited resources of the schools could be used most effectively through better school administration and improved methods of instruction. This resulted in our 1968 statement on *Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School.*

Paralleling this research has been a series of interrelated studies over the past three years which have been concerned with alleviating poverty in the United States, especially among the urban disadvantaged. In April 1970 we published a policy statement on *Improving the Public Welfare System*, suggesting how our country's public assistance programs could be improved, largely by integrating them into a national system of income maintenance that would be available to all those in need. Three months later, we issued a companion statement, *Training and Jobs for the Urban Poor*. The present policy statement is closely related to these earlier statements.

As noted in the Summary, this statement reflects the Committee's concern "with the role of educational institutions in carrying out their part of the nation's broad mission of eliminating poverty in the United States, a poverty of cultural as well as material goods, and of opening up the doors of opportunity to those who have been deprived an equitable share of society's rewards." It is our belief that improved education is essential for breaking the poverty cycle. However, it is clear that the elimination of poverty also will require coordinated efforts by government, private agencies, and the business sector to provide training and jobs, supplemented by an improved public welfare system.

Education for the Urban Disadvantaged: From Preschool to Employment was prepared by a subcommittee under the chairmanship of John L. Burns. The Project Director was Sterling M. McMurrin, Dean of the University of Utah Graduate School and former U.S. Commissioner of Education, who was assisted in the research and drafting of the statement by Larry L. Leslie, Associate Professor and Research Associate of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Pennsylvania State University. The Subcommittee on Education for the Urban Disadvantaged was also aided in its deliberations by a number of distinguished advisors. Various papers written by members of this group and other experts are being published as CED Supplementary Papers in three volumes, entitled: *Functional Education for Disadvantaged Youth; The Conditions for Educational Equality;* and *Resources for Urban Schools: Better Use and Balance.*

On behalf of the Research and Policy Committee, I would like to express appreciation to Mr. Burns, Mr. McMurrin, Mr. Leslie, and the members and advisors of the subcommittee for their valuable contributions.

Emilio G. Collado, *Co-Chairman*
Research and Policy Committee

1.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

While the American schools have generally provided middle- and upper-income youth with the intellectual tools necessary for success in our society, they have commonly failed to cope effectively with the task of educating the disadvantaged youth in our urban centers.* To an alarming extent they have simply swept disadvantaged youth under the educational rug.

In the past there have always been large numbers of unskilled jobs for the functionally illiterate. But as technology absorbs the tasks of unskilled workers, the chasm between the poor with inadequate schooling and the remainder of society is widening at a rapid rate. Even where unskilled jobs remain, they are frequently inaccessible to the poor of our central cities.

By concentrating this statement on the urban poor, we do not suggest that the plight of American Indians or other rural poor is less

*See Memorandum by MR. ALLAN SPROUL, page 80.

tragic or less worthy of our concern. We simply recognize that the urban areas, which house 51 per cent of poor Americans, are now in a state of acute and even desperate crisis with far-reaching social implications for our total society.*

The common meanings of "disadvantaged" are vague and ambiguous. Frequently the terms "disadvantaged" and "poor" are used interchangeably, and the members of some minority ethnic groups are typically assumed to be disadvantaged. In this statement, we use the term to apply to those persons whose economic status conforms to the current federal definition of poverty, which establishes a poverty threshold based on annual income.[1] We have adopted this definition for the disadvantaged because it is the most frequently used and commonly recognized and because it is the quasi-legal definition used by the several branches of government.

Our statement is concerned with all the disadvantaged children and youths in our cities. We speak of the masses who are without functional literacy, access to employment, decent incomes, or the other necessities for a satisfying life. We recognize that whether they are white or nonwhite, our people have a common set of goals; these include freedom from hunger, pestilence, and disease and a fair share in the bounties of the larger society. There is a commonality of needs and interests among all groups—advantaged or disadvantaged. Indeed, much that is set forth in this statement will benefit education for all children.

Three urban disadvantaged groups in particular have received special attention in this statement. The acute problem of the black minority—the largest American minority group and the one most heavily concentrated in the cities—speaks for itself. Even though two-thirds of all urban poor in 1968 were white, considering the nation as a whole the probability of being poor was less than one in ten among whites, whereas among blacks the probability of being poor was one in three. We have also devoted attention to special educational problems of the Mexican-Americans, who are estimated to be the second largest ethnic minority in the nation, and of the Puerto Ricans; both of these groups are also heavily concentrated in urban areas and have a high incidence of poverty.[2]

1/The poverty threshold for a family of four is adjusted annually by the Social Security Administration. See Appendix A.

2/For further information on the plight of the Mexican-Americans, see Appendix B.

*See Memorandum by MR. DANIEL PARKER, page 80.

Though we have given our main attention to these particular groups, our conclusions and recommendations for the improvement of education and the enlargement of educational opportunity apply broadly to all the urban poor. The disadvantaged of *all* ethnic groups are now demanding equal treatment and attention. They deserve no less.

A Broad Attack on Poverty

The problems of the disadvantaged and the causes of their poverty are varied and complex. No single solution can cope with them. Improved education for the disadvantaged is indeed our best hope for breaking the poverty cycle. But the ultimate breakthrough will occur only when the environment that fosters discrimination and perpetuates poverty is changed. This will require a massive, coordinated program that will come to grips with basic social and economic ills.

The prosperity of the United States over the past quarter century or more, a greater affluence for more people than has ever been experienced in world history, has not eliminated poverty and deprivation. Though our prosperity has greatly reduced the number of people in poverty, millions are in difficult and even desperate circumstances. The poor in the United States today are largely those unequipped by reason of some inability to find gainful employment in either the private or public sectors of the economy. Their inabilities are commonly due to sickness, age, or other physical incapacity; discrimination because of race; or other circumstances, such as a lack of education or training, over which they have little or no control. Though the poor now comprise only 13 per cent of the population, they number nearly 25 million persons, more than the entire population of Canada and half that of France or the United Kingdom.

The major institutions and social structures that most profoundly affect the disadvantaged were shaped in earlier eras to cope with far different problems and conditions than those now obtaining. Rather than working to the advantage of today's urban poor, these often serve only to perpetuate the disadvantages and disabilities that lie at the heart of their problems. Much of the social welfare structure inherited from the past is inadequate to deal with the problems of poverty in a high-employment economy.

11.

In a policy statement on *Improving the Public Welfare System*,[3] this Committee offered proposals for sweeping changes that would create a truly viable, humane, and efficient system of welfare. Broadly, the system we envisage can be described as being based on need as the sole criterion for qualification whether need results from inadequate earnings or inability to work, thus opening welfare benefits to all the poor. As the basic means for eradicating poverty, a floor would be established under the incomes of all people through some system of income maintenance, with the federal government assuming all or most of the cost. Incentives to work would be an essential component of this system, and this would be coupled with programs for training and measures for assuring opportunities for private and public employment for those able to work. In a subsequent policy statement on *Training and Jobs for the Urban Poor*,[4] we considered the revisions required in national manpower policy to eliminate the chronic unemployment and underemployment of the urban poor by providing training and jobs for marginal workers. We are now engaged in studies of other vital matters related to the problem of poverty. These include a review of the entire health-care problem in the United States and a study of the financing of the nation's housing needs.

The complex nature of the causes of disadvantage are demonstrated by piecemeal attempts at remediation. Better housing, for instance, does not necessarily reduce sickness, nor does it guarantee changes in reading and arithmetic scores; it may produce only very small changes in educational and occupational aspirations.[5] Nor has the educational problem been solved by such programs as Aid to Dependent Children. Almost half of the ADC children, for instance, either drop out of school or are educationally retarded between the ages of fourteen and seventeen; only 25 per cent graduate from high school by the age of eighteen.[6]

In the United States, the school has long been the most promising equalizing force, and thus of the social agencies and institutions most concerned with the disadvantaged, it is of central importance to a coordinated civic effort. As the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children has pointed out, "Urban planning that does

---

3/*Improving the Public Welfare System*, A Statement on National Policy by the Research and Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development (New York: April 1970).

4/*Training and Jobs for the Urban Poor* A Statement on National Policy by the Research and Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development (New York: July 1970).

5/Daniel M. Wilner, *The Housing Environment and Family Life* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1962), p. 159.

6/M. Elaine Burgess and Daniel O. Price, *An American Dependency Challenge* (Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1963).

not now include educational planning is not only unrealistic; it is irresponsible."[7] In the past, far too many public decisions influencing education directly or indirectly have been made in total disregard of the schools. It is now clear that the school must be at the center of those decisions.

Seven Imperatives for the Schools

In this statement we are concerned solely with the role of educational institutions in carrying out their part of the nation's broad mission of eliminating poverty in the United States, a poverty of cultural as well as material goods, and of opening up the doors of opportunity to those who have been denied an equitable share of society's rewards. We conceive education's role in this vitally important enterprise to be the instrument by which the disadvantaged enter the mainstream of American life—the same unique role the school played in the assimilation of the millions who came to this country in the great waves of immigration. But in resuming this historic function, education must now adjust to different cultural patterns and personal motivations, as well as to strikingly different economic, social, and technological conditions, from those with which it successfully coped in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Past discussions of educational equality commonly dealt with school "inputs," such as money, teacher-pupil ratios, facilities, and teaching materials. Too often the school considered its obligation to equality satisfied in these terms regardless of the students' levels of achievement. We insist that educational equality must be judged by school "outputs," by the actual achievements of pupils in intellectual skills, knowledge, creativity, and action. We believe that the American people should refuse to settle for anything less than universal literacy and those intellectual skills which accompany literacy. Except for the less than 1 per cent of any population group who are incapable of normal learning, the schools should be expected and required to bring their pupils up to minimal standards of intellectual achievement—not *some* of them, but *all* of them.

How can this goal be reached? Many seem to believe that all that is needed is more money. Indeed, more money *is* needed urgently, particularly by the central-city school systems serving vast numbers of the dis-

7/ U.S. National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, "Schools for an Open Society," in its *Annual Report* (Washington, D.C.: January 31, 1968), p. 45.

advantaged. However, it is pertinent here to reiterate the observation made in a prior policy statement on *Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School:*

> An increasing over-all expenditure on schooling in the United States in coming years can be anticipated. Yet it is vitally important to recognize that the expenditure of increased funds will not by itself guarantee improved education. It has become increasingly apparent that additional funds are often employed to perpetuate and extend inefficient operational techniques and ineffective instructional methods. The nation cannot afford to waste its resources by investing them in schools that fail to achieve the level of operational efficiency and effectiveness in instruction which is now within their reach.[8]

Programs that give promise for the effective education of the disadvantaged are being developed. We must push ahead with these while recognizing the continuing need for new ideas and new strategies. Continued research and experimentation are mandatory. Among the things we have learned is that the attack on educational problems must itself be a multi-pronged effort.

From our studies we conclude that there are seven imperatives to the successful accomplishment of the schools' mission:*

1. *Improved education for the disadvantaged is the best hope for breaking the poverty cycle. But the schools in the central cities can be made genuinely effective only if there is a transformation of the environment which conditions the attitudes and learning capacities of children and youths.* The school does not function in a social, psychological, or institutional vacuum. Environmental factors outside the schools generate attitudes inimical or favorable to learning which are operative throughout the school years.

2. *Preschooling is desirable for all children, but it is a necessity for the disadvantaged.*** It is now known from social and psychological studies that the experiences of early childhood may have a decisive effect on school failure and success. Moreover, there is evidence that effective preschooling gives the best return on the educational investment.

8/*Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School*, A Statement on National Policy by the Research and Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development (New York: July 1968), p. 11.

*See Memorandum by MR. ALLAN SPROUL, page 80.

**See Memorandum by MR. PHILIP SPORN, page 81.

3. *Education must provide children and youths with a sense of community and a comprehension of the world of work.** It is the vehicle by which the child moves into the larger world and the technological society. *It must open the door to career opportunities, either directly to positions that provide satisfying work or to additional schooling leading to the professions.*

4. *Success in the education of the disadvantaged requires the development of total instructional systems which bring together competent teachers, effective instructional technology, and curriculum materials that are relevant to the interests and needs of the students.* The entire school experience should be designed to enlarge student motivation by exhibiting the concrete value of education.

5. *The schools should be held accountable for their product; they should be judged in terms of their outputs.* National, state, and local assessments of student performance should be employed. *Furthermore, the success of the central-city schools requires increased participation in decision making by their patrons from among the minority groups.*

6. *Equalization in the distribution of school resources has become a necessity.* Even though equality of educational opportunity may require larger school expenditures in disadvantaged areas, central-city schools are expected to function with less money per pupil than their suburban counterparts. There must be basic transformations in the conventional methods of financing the schools.

7. *Continued research is necessary to provide the ground for developing effective methods for educating the disadvantaged.* Research findings must be applied in developing demonstration projects which can serve as models for improving both neighborhoods and schools. Dissemination of research findings must be expanded, and full-scale programs must be established where pilot projects have proven valuable. Both social and psychological research relating to the conditions for learning are essential.

In the remainder of this chapter, we present briefly the basis for these conclusions together with our major specific recommendations. Thereafter, each of the seven imperatives is supported in some detail by a separate chapter of the text.

---

*See Memorandum by MR. PHILIP SPORN, page 81.

Summary of Recommendations

We set forth the following recommendations in the interest of generating public action to transform the quality of education. They are crucially important to education generally even though our specific concern here is with the disadvantaged. We propose their consideration by all persons, groups, and organizations that make the educational decisions of the nation. We especially address legislatures, government agencies, professional educational organizations, local school boards and administrators, and community action groups.

Environment

The children of the poor enter the school system greatly disadvantaged by the deficits they bring with them of cultural deprivation and perhaps language difficulties. They may suffer physiological impairments from early malnutrition. They are far less likely to lack innate ability to learn than they are to lack motivation because of environmental factors. Regardless of ethnic background, middle-class children do better in schools than their disadvantaged peers.

It is clear that the causes of poverty are complex and there is no simple solution. But the cycle of poverty must be broken. **We stand firmly on the principle that education is the instrument by which the poor and disadvantaged must enter the mainstream of American economic and social life. Compensatory and other programs aimed at achieving equality for the disadvantaged should include all who are disadvantaged by their economic condition regardless of their ethnic origin.**

If the urban disadvantaged child is nonwhite, he will almost surely encounter segregated school patterns, compounding many of the disabilities he already suffers. Racial discrimination continues to be the nation's most important single educational problem. Though there has been some disillusionment with the initial promise of integration as a means of providing equality of educational opportunity, we are committed to the importance of integration to both human equality and improvement in the general quality of education. **Racial integration remains basic to the more complex solutions to urban educational dilemmas. School integration is of critical importance for the quality and equality of education as well as for social relationships. We urge that top priority be given to school integration and that financial incentives be offered to districts which make clear progress toward desegregation.**

In going from a poor home to a middle-class oriented school, the child in effect shifts cultures and may experience a further alienation from society. **In providing urban youth with the knowledge and skills necessary for successful careers in our technologically based society, the schools must respect the group values of ethnic minorities. Minority values deserve preservation, and motivation for school success is strengthened by the self-esteem and aspiration for achievement that arise in part from pride in one's inheritance.**

Preschooling

The most effective point at which to influence the cumulative process of education is in the early preschool years, when the child has a large capacity for acquiring skills and cultivating expectancies. **Only a massive effort to establish both public and private preschool educational programs will provide the preparation in motivation, intellectual capacities, and physical skills essential to success in achieving total basic literacy. Government support for free day-care centers providing preschool education for children of working mothers should be continued and expanded.**

A general equality in basic student skills and understandings is both possible and mandatory. Nearly everyone can learn to read and write and develop the skills necessary for a productive life. **An all-out national effort is necessary to secure equality of minimal achievement in the basic literacy skills of reading, writing, and computation. These skills are essential to every person, and their successful cultivation in every person must be demanded of the schools.**

Functional Education

The basic failure of contemporary urban life—a failure that is real for most but greatly accentuated for the poor—is the absence of a meaningful orientation of children and youths to the world of work. During the early years when his vocational interests should be kindled and his aspirations fired, the child all too often is not confronted by the live options that should eventually be open to him. Genuinely functional education uses work and other life experiences as laboratories in which young people find real problems and tasks that require learning.

Effective functional education requires the introduction of children to the world of work in the primary grades and a continuous infusion of job information and counseling throughout the school years.

17.

The schools and prospective employers should jointly plan educational programs that will ensure not only adequate instruction but also satisfactory employment.*

Most important of all is that the disadvantaged child's options be kept open and his opportunities enlarged. The disadvantaged must have equal opportunity with others to pursue education at the community college and university levels and to qualify for professional and graduate degrees. **Education must open the door to career opportunities, either directly to positions that provide satisfying work and incomes or to additional schooling that will lead to the professions. It is essential that educational programs for the disadvantaged keep open every avenue to higher education.**

Teachers and Instructional Systems

The disadvantaged child may be further alienated by his encounter with the rigidities of school and classroom organizational patterns, as well as by his teachers' low expectations for him. The ability and preparation of the teacher have a direct relationship to pupil achievement. Teacher abilities appear to have a cumulative effect, as the relationship is more direct at the higher grades. Because of the lack of flexibility and adaptiveness in schools of education, it may be advisable to look to new organizations to prepare teachers for the central city. Because traditional schools of education have not met the need, new models for teacher education are being developed which deserve serious attention. Some are based on autonomous agencies that would draw their staffs from the universities, public schools, and private organizations.

Teacher education programs should be designed to meet the special demands of urban teaching. Education for prospective inner-city teachers will succeed best if it involves experience in the communities where they are to teach. Qualified minority group members should be actively recruited as teachers of teachers and for teaching positions in urban schools. To provide successful models for minority children, special efforts should be made to recruit *male* minority group persons to serve as both teachers and paraprofessionals.

Extra incentives should be offered in the form of paid internships for teachers who select careers in urban education. Differentiated staffing patterns and salaries should be established in urban schools to provide superior inner-city teachers with incentive goals and rewards. The present

*See Memorandum by MR. PHILIP SPORN, page 81.

lock-step salary schedules do not encourage dynamic and innovative teaching and are ill-suited to promoting teaching as a career.

Success in the education of the disadvantaged will require the development of instructional systems that bring together competent teachers, the most effective instructional technology, and curriculum materials that are relevant to the experience and needs of the students. To reap the technological benefits already enjoyed by industry and communications, the schools must develop instructional systems that provide the teacher with the instruments essential to individualizing instruction while at the same time general instructional quality is greatly improved.

Accountability and Control

The principle of accountability demands radically new approaches to the educational process. It shifts the focus of education from teaching to learning, thereby forcing schools to answer for the achievements of all groups of students as well as to assess the costs and benefits of specific programs.

The schools must be held accountable for their product. Special educational programs for the disadvantaged should be funded only where evaluations have been designed to identify concrete results and the conditions necessary for achieving those results. Programs and program components producing superior results in terms of student achievement and attitudes should serve as prototypes for future funding. Government funding of experimental programs should require appropriate assessment of results.

In our large urban centers, bureaucracy has created a barrier between a school and its patrons. Some form of decentralization is essential. Districts that have decentralized should continue their experiments in this direction. It should be obvious, however, that total segmentation of a large city into numerous completely independent and autonomous small districts could be disastrous to education, considering such requirements as general supervision and review. Furthermore, there is the question of optimum size for a school district.

We urge school governing boards and administrators to solicit both formal and informal community participation in the determination of school policies and programs and to establish policies and procedures which will make that participation both possible and effective. The nation can no longer tolerate conditions that prevent minorities from exerting effective power in matters which determine their own destinies.

While we urge the decentralization of large urban districts to make them more responsive to the disadvantaged communities, we believe that across the country generally there is still need for the consolidation of small school districts.

Competent business, voluntary agencies, and nonprofit enterprises should be encouraged to join with the schools in developing alternative educational patterns. The schools should be given contracting powers that will enable them to contract with private agencies for accomplishing specialized tasks. We encourage experimentation in varying degrees of public school involvement by qualified elements of the private sector. Contracts let to private agencies for specific services should be on a full accountability basis only.

School Expenditures

There is generally a wide differential between the expenditures per pupil in suburban and city schools. The expenditures are often inversely related to need. Public school finance, especially in the urban centers, is not grounded in sound economic theory and practice. With the continuing trend toward redistribution of wealth away from the central cities and into the suburbs, the financial plight of the central cities has deepened. Because communities rely almost exclusively on the property tax for their fiscal needs, there is no possibility of achieving equality in school financing without state equalization legislation or a basic change in the tax structure.

Five actions are essential if the financial plight of the central-city schools is to be overcome:

The assumption by the states of the responsibility for providing equality on a reasonable level of educational opportunity,

The adoption by the states of more effective and equitable revenue systems taking into account ability to pay,

The equitable distribution of state assistance to satisfy real need,

Increased federal funds to provide more adequate resources for meeting the special costs of educating the disadvantaged and a more just distribution of these resources,

Requirement by state governments of school-by-school reporting of budgetary allocations to ensure that inner-city schools and programs for the disadvantaged receive their fair share of funds that otherwise are diverted elsewhere.

20.

Research, Development, and Application

Experimental programs for the disadvantaged child have produced more failures than successes, but some lessons have been clearly learned. Low pupil-teacher ratios are essential especially for preschoolers. Teachers must receive training specifically related to the tasks before them. Parents must become positively involved. Objectives must be clearly defined and made the basis of instructional materials. Programs of brief duration are not effective.

There is no single best way to teach disadvantaged children, but it is clear that individualized instruction is the key strategy. By employing near and familiar materials, the school can more effectively motivate the child and enable him to cope more successfully with abstract concepts.

A greatly inhibiting difficulty has been the failure thus far to evaluate effectively the concrete results of experimental programs. In urging continuing research and development in educational problems, we recognize that findings are of practical value only if they are effectively applied in ways that clearly exhibit their value in improving education.* **We strongly urge the development of social and educational laboratories—coordinated community programs involving not only educational institutions but other public and private social agencies—on a scale that is large enough to provide an environment for the disadvantaged and in which effective educational practices not only can be sorted out but also employed with a real possibility of success.**

*See Memorandum by MR. DANIEL PARKER, page 81.

2.

Environment and the Success of the School

The schools in the central cities will become genuinely effective in the struggle against poverty only if there is a transformation of the environment which conditions the attitudes and learning capacities of children and youths.

Most of the urban poor are relatively recent migrants from rural areas who find that in the cities they face more complex economic and social practices. From a society in which even illiteracy was not always a major obstruction to a successful and happy life, they have come into a social system in which schooling is the most reliable road to employment and general satisfaction. As the number of unskilled jobs continues to decline, schooling will become even more necessary.

That the environment plays an important role in shaping learning can no longer be ignored in the planning and administration of school programs. The school does not function in a social, psychological, or institutional vacuum. Environmental factors outside the school may generate attitudes inimical or favorable to learning which are operative throughout the school years.

The basic problem is not the children's innate ability to learn. It is making home and neighborhood environments more conducive to learning and making the schools' curricula and methods relevant to the experience, talents, and needs of the learners. But education is more than simply learning; it is personal fulfillment. This requires environments in which children and young people are nourished morally and spiritually as well as intellectually.

It has been shown that, on the average, middle-class children are better able to perform certain mental tasks than economically disadvantaged children.[1] Moreover, children from different ethnic groups show different combinations of abilities as well as different levels of performance for various tasks, and middle-class children from different ethnic groups in general perform more like each other than do disadvantaged children from different ethnic groups. This points up the importance of environmental factors as compared to ethnological factors in affecting learning capability. Consider, for instance, that a substantial majority of black children have never been over twenty blocks from their homes--homes that in countless cases contain no books and often neither pen nor pencil. Their view of life and the world is contained mainly within their immediate environment and the television screen.

Another major cause of poor learning is inter-city and intra-city mobility. Where research has been designed to control for this factor, it has been shown that minority students have not regressed in relation to others. The Higher Horizons program in New York City, for example, revealed that constancy in student performance could be expected *if* students remained in the same school. It is clear that all agencies involved with education, housing, job-training, and employment should work together to solve the problems relating to student transiency. Public housing enterprises, for example, should be coordinated with education because of the greatly reduced rate of transiency among public housing occupants. As an illustration, the turnover in East Harlem housing projects, including transfers to other projects, has been only about 5 per cent per year.[2] This contrasts with an extreme mobility rate among ninety-one Manhattan elementary schools that experience a 51 per cent turnover of students during each school year.

It is now clear that the impact of diet and disease on a child's health, mental capacities, and sense of values can impair his motiva-

1/Jane G. Fort, Jean C. Watts and Gerald S. Lesser, "Cultural Background and Learning in Young Children," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 50, No. 7 (March 1969), pp. 386-388.
2/Patricia C. Sexton, *Spanish Harlem* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 37.

tion to learn. Going to school hungry in the morning, as some do, and remaining without lunch has an effect upon learning, as does the failure to get sufficient rest at night. A breakfast program in a Cleveland elementary school, for instance, was accompanied by a significant rise in reading and arithmetic scores. Likewise, the school itself moved up 21 places in its attendance rating among Cleveland's 136 elementary schools.

Perhaps even more serious obstacles to success in school are physiological impairments which may result from improper maternal diet in late pregnancy and in the child's early infancy. It is estimated that hundreds of thousands of babies are born each year with deficiencies due to these causes.[3] Furthermore, the physical and mental effects of drugs may soon outweigh other negative influences in the urban child's environment.

Environment and Expectations

It is especially unfortunate that the typical disadvantaged child may encounter few models of genuine success in his home or neighborhood but many instances of frustration and failure. He is denied much of the hope and expectation common in the experience of typical middle-class children. It is not surprising that many youths from low-income families drop out of school by age sixteen; they often come from broken homes or from homes which are culturally poor and which exert negative influences on their educational aspirations and achievements.[4] Whatever the causes, a serious lack of motivation for education resulting from environmental factors is found in an overwhelming number of children and youths from disadvantaged areas. Every attempt to bring them into the mainstream of American life will be abortive if it fails to strengthen their motivation and their basic interests and enthusiasms.

The relationship of the family's socioeconomic group to the aspiration of children to enter the professions is illustrated by studies showing an almost two-to-one ratio of middle-class students to disadvantaged students who aspire to the professions. The power of environmental influence is further demonstrated by data which reveal that the ratio of middle-class students who aspire to the professions in middle-

3/Irving S. Bengelsdorf, "Atoms and Men: Evidence Links Diet to Mental Retardation," *Los Angeles Times* (December 12, 1968), part 2, p. 8.

4/Robert J. Havighurst and Lindley J. Stiles, "National Policy for Alienated Youth," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 42, No. 7 (April 1961), pp. 283-291.

class schools compared to middle-class students in so-called disadvantaged schools is also two to one. This ratio also holds for disadvantaged students in schools of these two categories.[5]

The generally low aspiration among disadvantaged children was commonly thought in the past to result from low aspirations of parents for their children. But the studies which reached this conclusion apparently confused aspiration with *expectation*. Recent research clearly indicates that it is parental expectations rather than aspirations which are low. In general, parents of disadvantaged children are discouraged by their own inability to further the educational achievements of their children. They have experienced so much disappointment and failure that their feelings of hopelessness outweigh their aspirations.

If the children of the poor are to be strongly motivated toward schooling, their families must develop attitudes and behavior that encourage them to look upon school as the ladder to a satisfying future.* Only when their families regard school as an aid to improvement do disadvantaged children see schooling in a desirable light. This problem is especially acute in the case of boys.

Research has indicated that when poor black students are integrated into schools with a high mix of middle- and upper-class students, their educational goals are clearly raised. When black students sense that the odds for success are against them, academic aspiration seems to decline. The trouble is that the odds usually *are* against them. There is a clear need to raise the typical self-image of blacks, for there is general agreement that black students do in fact often suffer from negative estimates of themselves.

Because our economic system has favored black women over black men for the better of inferior jobs, it has both perpetuated and accentuated the negative self-image of the typical poverty-stricken black male. Often he does not see education as an advantage. For him, education is too often a false promise too expensive to pursue and producing little but disappointment. Even with an education, he frequently faces difficult and often insurmountable obstacles in his effort to get ahead economically.

Most of the attention given to minority group education has been concentrated on the problems of blacks. A large and growing segment

---

5/Erwin Katz, "Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes," *American Psychologist*, Vol. 19, No. 6 (June 1964), pp. 381-399.

*See Memorandum by MR. PHILIP SPORN, page 81.

of the urban disadvantaged, however, bear Spanish names and are Spanish-speaking – Mexican-American or Puerto Rican. The typical Spanish-speaking American has a sensitive awareness of his culture and his language. But the general "Anglo" presumption of cultural superiority tends to destroy his confidence in himself and in his home and ethnic group. It often contributes to an emotional confusion that inhibits his intellectual advancement and affects his personal opportunities.[6]

The causes of poverty are complex and there are no simple solutions. But the cycle of poverty must be broken. **We stand firmly on the principle that education is the instrument by which the poor and disadvantaged must enter the mainstream of American economic and social life. Compensatory and other programs aimed at achieving equality for the disadvantaged should include all who are disadvantaged by their economic condition regardless of their ethnic origin.**

Racial Mix and Quality of Education

Racial discrimination continues to be the nation's most important single school problem. We are convinced that racial integration in the schools can improve the general quality of education. The mixing of disadvantaged with advantaged students, where the former do not exceed about 50 per cent, appears to help the learning of the disadvantaged without negative effects upon the advantaged.

The report on *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, better known as the Coleman Report, has shown that of all *school* factors affecting a child's achievement the most important is the characteristics of the students with whom he is associated. In accounting for achievement, the characteristics of other students apparently outweigh in importance such factors as school facilities and curricula and characteristics of teachers. The report found that only the child's family background is more important. In spite of varying interpretations of the statistics, the Coleman Report's major conclusions seem to be supported.

The performance of minority pupils seems to depend more on the schools they attend than does the performance of majority students. In the South, 20 per cent of the achievement of blacks is associated with

---

6/Clark S. Knowlton, "Special Education Problems of the Spanish-speaking Minorities of the Southwest," in *The Conditions for Educational Equality*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 34 (New York: Committee for Economic Development, Spring 1971).

the particular schools attended, whereas only 10 per cent of the achievement of whites is so associated.[7] A minority pupil from a home indifferent to education will probably benefit from relationships with schoolmates having strong educational backgrounds. Yet white pupils from educationally supportive homes seem to suffer no ill effects in terms of achievement when placed in schools where many of the pupils do not come from such homes.

What benefits can reasonably be expected from an integrated school system? Besides the effects upon academic achievement of integrating the social classes, there are other striking results. The Coleman Report, for instance, shows favorable achievement gains among blacks who are integrated into white schools when they are convinced that they can importantly determine their own environments and futures.

The Sexton study on Spanish Harlem reported that upon transfer of eighty-three black students from East Harlem to white, middle-class Yorkville, numerous behavioral changes were reported. Thirteen students showed improved attendance; fifty-one reported improved work habits as compared to one decline; forty-seven voiced an increased interest in school, while only one reported decreased interest. Parents were likewise satisfied, with only five indicating a disappointment with the transfer while eleven were "pretty well satisfied" and fifty-five were "well satisfied."[8]

The schools will not be fully integrated simply by actions of school boards or in the ordinary course of events. The achievement of integration in our great cities, whether in the North, South, East, or West, will be through changes in housing and income patterns, through an external reorganization of school systems, and through the continual enactment and enforcement of appropriate laws. The demand for separatism now being made by some blacks probably does not represent the majority of black opinion and is not in the real interest of the black segment of our society. Separatism in large part is a product of the failure of the schools and other social institutions to provide for the special needs of minority people. Compensatory gains can be made in improving predominantly nonwhite schools, but we believe that integration is basic to the solution of the educational problems of the disadvantaged.

It is not our purpose here to advance proposals on the techniques of integration. We affirm our support for effective school integration and

7/James S. Coleman and others, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

8/Patricia G. Sexton, *Spanish Harlem*, pp. 51-52.

urge an all-out effort by schools and other appropriate social agencies to devise the ways and means of overcoming segregation and its destructive effects on education. Those ways and means must relate to the internal grouping and instructional practices of individual schools; the instructional programs and deployment of students, teachers, and administrators within school districts; and the establishment of district boundaries as well as cross-district arrangements to determine racial mix.

If middle- and upper-income families are to be enticed toward integrated schools and black separatism is to be contained, schools must offer instruction attractive to higher ability children from both disadvantaged and advantaged backgrounds. To move toward equality of opportunity and to establish a minimal level of competence requires offering instructional programs designed for both gifted children and those needing compensatory programs. Whether white or nonwhite, not everyone can benefit from college preparatory courses nor does everyone need remedial reading.

Though there has been some disillusionment with the initial promise of school integration as a means of providing equality of educational opportunity, we are committed to the importance of integration to both human equality and improvement in the general quality of education. We are opposed to racial segregation in the schools as inimical not only to the nonwhite minorities, but to the white majority as well. **Racial integration remains basic to the more complex solutions to urban educational dilemmas. School integration is of critical importance for the quality and equality of education as well as for social relationships. We urge that top priority be given to school integration and that financial incentives be offered to districts which make clear progress toward desegregation.**

The Classroom Environment

The shift in cultures that occurs when a child goes from a poor home to a middle-class oriented school must be considered in every attempt to reform his education. He is not likely to derive satisfaction from going to a school where he is neither well received nor successful. Verbal rewards may impress him very little, as he may have no interest in pleasing a teacher who may represent to him a hostile world. In fact, the value the child places on acceptance by his schoolmates often means

29.

that he gains more satisfaction from a teacher's disapproval than from approval. Failure in school may bring him more pleasure than does success.

But it is of crucial importance to remember that simple integration of the schools does not guarantee the end of racial discrimination. Even organized discrimination sometimes persists in the classrooms of integrated schools.

The schools must capitalize on the special qualities of character that issue from the social circumstances of being poor. Disadvantaged children, for instance, learn responsibility at an exceptionally early age, often beginning such tasks as babysitting at the age of five or six. They also experience less sibling rivalry because there is less struggle for the love of the mother or father. Moreover, because typically in his home family ties and mutual aid are strong, the disadvantaged child is often more cooperative and less competitive than others. Here are basic traits of character worthy of support and reinforcement, and having important relevance to success in school. But the school can build upon such family values only if they are understood and respected by the child's teacher.*

The difficulty in developing effective curricula for the disadvantaged arises in part from the failure to agree upon primary educational goals beyond the achievement of basic literacy. Much of this is due to the failure to define goals in terms of the values of the disadvantaged. Curricula should be designed to bring the disadvantaged into the mainstream of American economic, social, and political life. But the forces that produce equality should not destroy the distinctive cultural values of minority people.[9]

Developing curricula that are relevant to life in a society which is in large measure grounded in middle-class values without destroying or injuring minority heritages is a difficult task that calls for uncommon inventiveness and innovation. That disadvantaged students may lack motivation for the study of Shakespeare, the Hundred Years' War, or dangling participles is quite understandable. The task of the schools is to ascertain the level of the student's readiness and to excite his curiosity and enliven his intellect through subjects and activities that will have real meaning for him. Life in the big city, for instance, is not an inappro-

---

9/Larry L. Leslie and Ronald C. Bigelow, "Relevance and Self-Image in the Urban School," in *The Conditions for Educational Equality*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 34.

*See Memorandum by MR. PHILIP SPORN, page 82.

priate subject for study, especially for those who live there. "Sesame Street" has clearly shown that life on urban streets can be a fascinating educational vehicle for the entire nation, young and old.

The usual test of the relevance of the curriculum has been simply whether the subjects studied have value and utility in the larger society. Some elements of a curriculum, such as reading and writing, obviously have basic value for any society. But full relevance of a curriculum for schools serving Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, or black children requires attention to studies pertaining to the history, cultural achievements, and general experience of these ethnic groups. Some groups are pressing hard for separate courses to satisfy this need, and such courses may sometimes be temporarily justified. We believe, however, that the long-range goal should be to integrate honestly and fairly such subjects as minority group history and literature into more general courses. The proliferation of special minority courses can ultimately lead only to separate classes for blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Poles, Slovaks, Italians, and other ethnic groups.

An integrated curriculum has value for all students, white or nonwhite, advantaged or disadvantaged. We cannot justify, on social or educational grounds, for instance, our failure to include in our textbooks an honest treatment of black, Mexican-American, or Indian contributions to American social history or the arts. These are important subjects of study for all students, not just for minorities.

Beyond their common value to all, however, curricula that include black literature, black history, Mexican-American or Indian, or other minority group studies should enhance the self-images of minority students. Such curricula may well raise the level of achievement in literacy skills as well as in substantive knowledge and appreciation. As their self-images improve, minority students should gain greatly in self-confidence and in the esteem of their teachers, which in turn should improve their capacity to succeed in academic pursuits and should stimulate them to seek a "piece of the action" that has previously been beyond their reach.

In brief, it is clear that **in providing urban youth with the knowledge and skills necessary for successful careers in our technologically based society, the schools must respect the group values of ethnic minorities. Minority values deserve preservation, and motivation for school success is strengthened by the self-esteem and aspiration for achievement that arise in part from pride in one's inheritance.***

*See Memorandum by MR. PHILIP SPORN, page 82.

3.

Preschooling and the Achievement of Equality

Preschooling is desirable for all children, but it is a necessity for the disadvantaged. Without it, there is little possibility of achieving equality in education.

A better understanding of the early environmental factors underlying the learning difficulties experienced by poor children of school age has gained support for efforts to equalize the starting point for all children. In urging more and better preschool education in our policy statement on *Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School*, we observed that "apparently the most effective point at which to influence the cumulative process of education is in the early years." The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders has supported this position with the following resolution: "The time has come to build on the proven success of Head Start and other preschool programs in order to bring the benefits of comprehensive early childhood education to all children . . ." Not only do we urge the establishment of extensive preschool programs, but we also favor a serious consideration of the advisability of lowering the beginning age for regular schooling.

33.

The Promise of Preschool Education

On the basis of extensive research by himself and others, Jerome S. Bruner holds that "the staggering rate at which the preschool child acquires skills, expectancies, and notions about the world and about people; the degree to which culturally specialized attitudes shape the care of children during these years—these are impressive matters that lend concreteness to the official manifestos about the early years."[1]

Research in this area demonstrates that improvement can be anticipated in IQ scores for low-income children of four and five who are exposed to structured, scheduled, consistent classroom environments. There must be careful planning of instructional units with constant feedback; teachers must have a high degree of control and must not overlook poor effort and careless performance.[2] Sympathetic understanding of children is vital, but to encourage lack of direction and internal discipline can be damaging.

A National Institute of Mental Health study has demonstrated that dramatic increases in IQ scores can be achieved through infant tutoring. A group of sixty-four black children fifteen months old was divided into experimental and control groups. The children in the first group were read to, talked with, and played with for an hour a day in an effort to develop their mental and verbal capacities. The control group received no special treatment. In slightly less than two years, the experimental group showed an average IQ of 106 compared with 89 for the control group. Although regression in IQ began when tutoring ceased, language skills remained constant.[3]

Success in preschool programs depends on carefully defined objectives, specialized teacher preparation, and work with small groups over an extended period of time. It has been shown, for instance, that programs of less than two months have little value at all.[4] Long-range success depends on the continuation of effective programs to prevent regression. It depends also on altering the home environments to make them more supportive of educational efforts. Often it is necessary to

---

1/Jerome S. Bruner, "Poverty and Childhood," in *The Conditions for Educational Equality*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 34.

2/Carl Bereiter and Siegfried Engelmann, "Observations on the Use of Direct Instruction with Young Disadvantaged Youth," *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (Spring 1966), pp. 55-62.

3/"Research Notes: NIMH Study: Tutoring Ups Infant I.Q.'s Dramatically," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 50, No. 7 (March 1969), p. 415.

4/David G. Hawkridge, G. Kasten Tallmadge, and Judith K. Larsen, *Foundations for Success in Educating Disadvantaged Children* (Palo Alto: American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, December 1968), pp. 17-18.

conduct preschool programs in apartment buildings or housing developments to assist working mothers. Such arrangements help alleviate parents' fears of taking very young children into strange environments.

Preschool education is now generally regarded with favor by large numbers of parents of disadvantaged children, by educational researchers, and by national educational leaders. It has wide support among persons who have been disillusioned with much of what has been tried in the name of compensatory education.

The decisive effect of early childhood experiences on school failure and success makes preschooling for the disadvantaged a necessity. **Only a massive effort to establish both public and private preschool educational programs will provide the preparation in motivation, intellectual capacities, and physical skills essential to success in achieving total basic literacy. Government support for free day-care centers providing preschool education for children of working mothers should be continued and expanded.** In advocating such a federally-supported national program in our policy statement on *Improving the Public Welfare System*, this Committee said, "We strongly urge that the age of eligibility for inclusion in any such day-care program be extended down to include two-year-olds, and that the program should be broad in concept so that instead of being merely custodial in nature the centers provide an educational experience and enrichment for young children along the lines of Head Start."

Preschooling and Literacy

In education for the disadvantaged, the failures have outdistanced the successes. To the surprise and disappointment of many observers, it has been learned that compensatory education, remedial programs, and special tutorials in their present forms and magnitude often do not work as expected. Perhaps such programs not only have been too weak and lacking in continuity, but also have not been available to the child at a sufficiently early age. Disadvantaged children who reach school age without preschooling soon fall behind in reading and writing. This results in retardation in all tasks requiring basic literacy. When the beginnings are a failure, ultimate failure is built into the system. We often fail to realize that education is a cumulative process: poor education is usually the result of an accumulation of educational failures.

Inasmuch as a poverty-stricken home is likely to curb a child's advancement because of the dysfunctional (in the school sense) English spoken there, it is undoubtedly desirable to begin work with the language problems of children at an early age. If preschool has value for black children because of language problems, it is a necessity for those Puerto Rican and Mexican-American children who learn only Spanish in their homes and for those American Indians who may learn only a tribal language. Language has been the whipping boy for educators seeking to locate the blame for their inability to provide an adequate education for these children. Poor performance in English *is* a very serious difficulty, but this fact has often been used as an escape from virtually all problems in their education. When a child is reared in an environment where a language other than English is commonly employed, a bilingual education enriches both his learning and our general culture. Far too little has been done to develop curricula that will cultivate bilingual ability among those whose childhood and family environment have clearly provided a foundation for competence in another language.

At entrance to school, disadvantaged children are often less well equipped than others to cope with verbal and abstract matters; psychologically geared more to the concrete, they often perform poorly on intelligence and achievement tests. Their early deficiencies, such as substandard performance in reading, thereafter have a cumulative effect on their learning. This is not to say that these children are lacking in verbal *abilities*. Quite the contrary. They may have a rich and expressive language, fully effective and adequate in communicating with their peers at home or in the neighborhood society. The problem lies in their lack of competence in the established language of the schools, the language usages that generally dominate our culture. We do not argue the fairness of these circumstances; we simply recognize that for countless children the language of the school is in effect a second language.

The matter of language styles is a difficult and delicate educational problem. Language is usually an epitome of the general culture; this is not less true in the case of the typical disadvantaged person of the central city. If the school totally rejects his language, it does him a grave injustice not only in its estimate of his abilities and in his treatment, but also in the implied rejection of his culture. This is a rejection of much that is precious to him personally and may be of great worth to society in general. The damage done to his self-image and ultimately to his attitudes and motives may be irreparable.

On the other hand, to establish a child's formal education in a language far removed from general usage may deny him the opportunity to achieve the very things to which he and his parents aspire. Certainly the school must not fail to teach the child those English language usages that are essential to his success in life within the general society.

A further question raised here concerns the reliability and validity of intelligence tests, which are still the subject of much disagreement despite the efforts that are made to adjust for cultural differences through the construction of so-called culture-free tests. A test intended to measure intelligence is manifestly inadequate and results in an unfair distortion if it employs a vocabulary foreign to a student or assumes a cultural background unfamiliar to his experiences. Unfortunately, the likelihood of producing a genuinely culture-free test is small because test performance depends upon the very complex and interrelated mental processes that occur in problem solving and abstract thinking. The use of such tests with minority group students should be restricted to diagnostic purposes.

Acquiring the Basic Skills

Effective preschooling offers promise that the starting point for those entering the school system in some degree can be equalized. Radical improvement in the education of the disadvantaged will be possible only when there is a full national commitment to education for equality as both an authentic moral ideal and a practical necessity. Education for equality is a necessary condition for the maximum development of every person. It will provide the best ground on which the individual can move toward successfully managing his life and coping with his environment.

Fortunately, there is now a general movement to treat the issue of equality and inequality in education in terms of "outputs," meaning the achievement levels of students, rather than simply "inputs" such as money, buildings, and equipment. Inputs are important, but it is clear that equality of inputs cannot guarantee equality in achievement.

We do not hold that through education we can achieve equalness among individuals when judged by their best performances. Individual differences clearly make this impossible. Rather, the equality that the schools can and must achieve is the equality which is obtained when minimum standards are met. Certain skills and capabilities are so indispensable in our society that without them a person cannot satisfactorily meet the challenge of life.

37.

A general equality in minimal achievement of basic skills and understanding is both possible and mandatory. Nearly everyone can learn to read and write and can develop the skills necessary for a personally productive life. It is a worthy effort, for instance, to require that all first-grade pupils learn to read by June. That is, everything necessary must be done to ensure uniform success in meeting minimal standards, even to the extent of partially sacrificing other things in the curriculum. *All* students should learn to read. This is not to say that all students will learn to read equally well, but it does mean that they must all cultivate the skill to read at or above an established level. The demand for at least minimum skill should apply also to writing, mathematical computation, oral expression, and elemental manual tasks.

Our emphasis on equality in minimal achievement does not mean that we are any the less concerned with the full cultivation of the talents and abilities of all persons. We are committed to the intrinsic worth and dignity of every person and to the full development of all our human resources. There are children and youths of both high and low abilities among the whites and nonwhites of the central cities and the suburbs. Good education must be available to all of them, no matter where they happen to live. To achieve this end, the schools must make an aggressive effort to establish the conditions essential to equality. Without this, the attempt to strengthen the education of the disadvantaged will continue to be simply a holding action.

An all-out national effort is necessary to secure equality of minimal achievement in the basic literacy skills of reading, writing, and computation. These skills are essential to every person, and their successful cultivation in every person must be demanded of the schools.

4.

Functional Education for Careers

Education must provide children and youths with a comprehension of the world of work and must open the door to career opportunities.

A basic failure of urban life, which is greatly accentuated for the poor of the central city, is the absence of an effective orientation of children and youths to the world of work—the work of the productive trades, the various public services, the technical and engineering occupations, and the professions. The home, community, and school do not join effectively in inducting the child, disadvantaged or advantaged, into an understanding of economic life and of the claims it will make upon him as a maturing and adult citizen, or a knowledge of the various roles to which he may aspire.

During the years when his vocational interests should be kindled and his aspirations fired, the child is rarely confronted by the live options which should eventually be open to him. Indeed, the school often works against his gaining any real sense of involvement with work of any kind. Too often it is indifferent to the real world in which the child must live, to his needs, his obligations and responsibilities, and his possibilities.

39.

Only rarely does it develop those connections of academic pursuits with occupational experience which will exhibit to young people the practical worth of education.

To be genuinely functional, according to Ralph W. Tyler, education must use "work and other arenas of life as a laboratory in which young people find real problems and difficulties that require learning, and in which they can use and sharpen what they are learning. There is no intention of substituting learning on the job for the deeper insights and the knowledge and skills that scholars have developed. The teacher, the books, other materials of the school, and the intellectual resources of the community are to be employed by the student as he works on the problems of his job and carries through projects on which he is engaged."[1]

Functional education should begin in kindergarten and even in preschool programs. The child should be made aware of the different forms of productive work, the obligations they entail, and the rewards they produce. As Tyler again has observed, the early years of schooling in particular should "enable each child to develop habits of work that are basic to all group endeavors whether in work, at home, or in socio-civic activities." These habits include getting to the job on time, starting activities promptly and carrying them on energetically, not interfering with the activities of other people. "Many children," Tyler notes, "develop these useful habits through the opportunities and discipline provided in the home, but many do not. Through a broadening of its program, the school is in a position to instill these habits in those who do not have opportunities elsewhere and to afford a wide range of situations for practice by all."

Since many modern processes and institutions of production, distribution, and consumption are not readily observable, special attention should be given to experiences in and out of school that will enable children to gain an understanding of the ways by which they obtain necessary goods and services. Lawrence Senesh has shown in his experiments in Elkhart, Indiana, that first-grade children can easily grasp such concepts as division of labor, medium of exchange, production and consumption, distribution, and transportation. Children in the primary grades can also gain a simple working understanding of more complex matters, including the roles of capital, credit, and insurance.[2]

1/Ralph W. Tyler, "The Concept of Functional Education," in *Functional Education for Disadvantaged Youth*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 32, March 1971.

2/Pioneering work in the entire area of economic education for young people has been carried on by the Joint Council on Economic Education. Through its auspices, programs and materials conveying an understanding of the way in which the economic system functions have been developed and tested in a number of elementary and secondary schools throughout the nation.

An introduction to the world of work and the individual's relationsnip to it, in terms of the possible occupations and functions that are open to him, is desirable for all children. Infusion of information about careers should continue through the elementary grades and become clearly focused at the junior high and high school levels. Here, in assisting the disadvantaged, the function of the counselor should be primarily one of facilitating job placement and furthering educational possibilities. Compatibility of student aptitudes and desires with job requirements and continuing education should be the guiding principle.*

Making Vocational-Technical Education Relevant

Vocational education is sometimes viewed as a general panacea for the ills that afflict the youth of our central cities. Certainly, vocational-technical training when geared to real work experience and job opportunities is desirable for many central-city students, as it is for many suburban students. But an arbitrary channeling of students into programs that limit their range of opportunity disregards both the interests and abilities of individuals and abrogates their right of self-determination. It may even destine them permanently to subservient positions in society. Extreme care must be taken to guarantee that no person will be locked into vocational pursuits at an age when his interests, capabilities, and aspirations have not sufficiently matured.

Nevertheless, vast numbers of persons from the urban minority groups have no jobs, skilled or unskilled. Both unemployment and underemployment among blacks and other minority groups are excessively high. In fact, the unemployment rate for nonwhite high school graduates is higher than for white dropouts.[3] To make matters worse, the future promises fewer and fewer jobs for the unskilled. If large numbers are without jobs in the future, they will surely be predominantly from the minority groups. Without more effective education for the youth of cities, this predicament will persist.

Our best chance of creating a society in which the individual is genuinely free is to keep his options open and varied, to provide him with

3/Seymour L. Wolfbein, "Seven Strategies for Success in Vocational Education," in *Functional Education for Disadvantaged Youth*, CED Supplementary Paper No. 32.

*See Memorandum by MR. PHILIP SPORN, page 82.

a maximum of opportunities, and to support him with good training and career information and competent counseling.

It is an unfortunate paradox that more and more jobs are unfilled. But these are not unskilled jobs; they are technical in nature and require special skills. Business and government personnel officers interested in hiring minority-group people have difficulty securing enough qualified employees to fill the demands for professional and semiprofessional workers. Colleges actively recruiting qualified minority students have difficulty in identifying them in adequate numbers. Even where entrance standards are adjusted and high-risk students are solicited as applicants, comparatively few respond and fewer still are successful. A large part of the recruitment process must be the educating of minority groups to the opportunities that are now becoming or will become available.

A basic problem in the objectives of American schools is clearly set forth in the following statement by Garth L. Mangum:

> As a generalization, each level of the system except the graduate school has as its primary objective the preparation of the student for matriculation at the next higher stage of the education system. With the minor exception of a few vocational high schools and post-secondary technical schools, only the graduate and professional schools are specifically and primarily vocational in their purposes. Elementary and junior high schools have only one objective—getting into high school.[4]

The separation of functional education from academic education must be overcome. The person who has only an "academic" education has important options closed to him just as does the person who has a strictly vocational, "non-academic" education. Alfred North Whitehead insisted that "education should turn out the pupil with something he knows well and something he can do well." A good vocational-technical education is one in which academic pursuits are part of a package that includes but is not limited to occupational skills, leading by way of work experience to employment. We cannot deny that vocational education as presently constituted and pursued is second class. But we believe that the integration of vocational and academic education can greatly reduce the differences between them while improving both. Vocational education without the humanities and social sciences is seriously deficient.

4/Garth L. Mangum, "Preparing Youth for Employment: The Role of the Public Schools," in *Functional Education for Disadvantaged Youth*, CED Supplementary Paper No. 32.

Moreover, vocational-technical education must center on transferable knowledge and skills rather than on specific manipulative operations that are often quickly outmoded. Unless this is done, much time and energy and money will be wasted on instruction that yields no practical worth in a world of rapid technological change and occupational mobility. To quote the Advisory Council on Vocational Education:

> Vocational education cannot be meaningfully limited to the skills necessary for a particular occupation. It is more appropriately defined as all of those aspects of educational experience which help a person to discover his talents, to relate them to the world of work, to choose an occupation, and to refine his talents and use them successfully in employment. In fact, orientation and assistance in vocational choice may often be more valid determinants of employment success, and therefore more profitable uses of educational funds, than specific skill training.[5]

In vocational high schools, the dropout rate is sometimes 60 per cent higher than that of "academic" high schools. Not only does the vocational school sometimes function as a dumping ground for low-ability students, but in actual practice often does not really prepare students for the work force. Moreover, the processes of student selection frequently screen out those in greatest need. Most serious—because it involves the most students—is the lack of an effective relationship between the school and the job, the absence of a continuum from school to employment.

The School-Job Linkage

Successful work-study programs progress from complete school supervision of the student's education to a stage where he is jointly instructed by the school and the prospective employer. Eventually, the student devotes full time to the job with continued supervision by school personnel until he achieves regular full-time employment.

It is now recognized that certain elements must be present in all training programs. The first and most crucial of these is *employment certainty*. When trainees are unable to find suitable positions, their disillusionment about the value of education affects not only their own

5/U.S. Advisory Council on Vocational Education, *Vocational Education, The Bridge Between Man and His Work: General Report* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.)

attitudes but also the spirit and aspirations of others in their group. Another requisite of successful programs is the availability of continuing education, even after placement is made. Continuing education can mean both retention and promotion.

Judged by the hard economic facts, job training is the only program for the disadvantaged which has proved its value in terms of dollar costs. Job training and retraining have produced as much as a ten-dollar return to society for every dollar spent. No other special or compensatory education program for the disadvantaged can claim a ratio that even approaches one to one.

In spite of increased federal and state expenditures, financing vocational-technical programs remains a primary obstacle to their success. The main problem is placing the money where it is most needed and where it will be most effective. Distributing funds indiscriminately to all school districts and to municipalities of all sizes brings little change anywhere. The vocational needs of central cities are so great that the funds available are almost always inadequate. Additional funds are needed for professional staff, equipment, reimbursements to employers where extra costs are incurred, and transportation for students. Vocational-technical education historically has been and remains largely a federal program since major financing has been through federal appropriations. However, without state and local initiative it will continue to suffer from inadequate community support and commitment.

Money, organization, and programming are not the only difficult problems facing successful education for careers. Among school people there is a strong conservatism that has resisted the updating of vocational-technical instruction to meet the demands of a rapidly developing technology and a changing industrial world. And among the students and prospective students there is the persistent problem of motivation. We will not develop successful mechanisms for educating urban youth for acceptable careers until we break through our educational conservatism. We will not succeed in motivating them for education until we can remove the barriers to their employment resulting from discrimination by trade unions, professional organizations, and employers. We must recognize, moreover, that the puritan work values of middle-class white America do not lie at the foundation of much contemporary urban culture.[6] Many young people honestly see no value in pursuing a vocation in the manner that has been taken for granted by the majority of Americans. This clearly

6 Howard A. Matthews, "Education and Urban Youth," in *Functional Education for Disadvantaged Youth*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 32.

points up the necessity for a better understanding of urban life and the motives that today dominate our society.

Effective functional education requires the introduction of children to the world of work in the primary grades and a continuous infusion of job information and counseling throughout the school years. The schools and prospective employers should jointly plan educational programs that will ensure not only adequate instruction but also satisfactory employment.

Higher Education Opportunities

We hold that the opportunities for higher education, through community college, professional school, and graduate school, must be made equally available to all regardless of their racial or economic backgrounds. Although we do not argue that it is necessary or advisable for all youth to have a college education—there obviously are other roads to happiness and success—we believe that it is a betrayal of the American ideal to continue to funnel large segments of our population into educational patterns which deny them the opportunity to exploit fully their interests and abilities. The options available to the disadvantaged through higher education must be multiplied and kept open.

Community colleges are central to any discussion of career education; increasingly they are assuming responsibility for technical instruction as well as general education. In these institutions, the problems of the status of functional education is being largely overcome. "Career programs" are rapidly replacing the traditional "vocational" programs by producing a mix of technical and academic instruction. This is a trend that should be encouraged through all possible means.

The community colleges, moreover, promise to be effective in overcoming racial inequality. Because of their accessibility, they are a gateway through which the disadvantaged may move to civic influence and leadership, high level technical positions, and university preparation for the advanced professions. Investigations have shown that geographic proximity of colleges is the most potent factor in attracting high school graduates into higher education. This was one of the considerations taken into account by this Committee in our 1965 policy statement on *Raising Low Incomes Through Improved Education* when we recommended that "education beyond high school should be easily available to all who can benefit from it, or are willing to pay for it. Establishment of a network of

45.

publicly financed community colleges or technical institutes within commuting distance of most students would be an effective step toward this goal."[7]

Equalizing opportunity in higher education requires a recognition of the injustices that have developed in our educational system. Due to the nature of their environment, disadvantaged youths do not have the same chances for scoring high on admissions tests. Colleges and universities are beginning to face these facts and are modifying their admissions requirements accordingly. In place of the traditional criteria, such factors as leadership ability, creativity, motivation, and academic standing in comparison to other disadvantaged youths should be given consideration. Organizations involved in national college testing programs should continue to reform their examination procedures to guarantee equity in college admissions.

Nevertheless, the modification of admissions standards alone will do little to produce equality in higher education. Scholarship funds for disadvantaged students are a dire necessity—funds that are expended on the basis of cultural as well as economic disadvantage. Many colleges and universities are already making provisions for such funding, as is the federal government, through scholarship awards and work-study programs. Some state legislatures have earmarked funds to be used exclusively for maintaining disadvantaged students in institutions of higher learning. But in most institutions, available funds are now so meager that only a small number of interested and qualified applicants can be assisted.

Furthermore, disadvantaged students usually require more funds than do typical college students. In addition to allowances for tuition and books, they commonly need grants for room and board, clothing, medical costs, and out-of-pocket expenses. Where these funds are not provided and the disadvantaged student is forced to remain at home while attending college, it has been found that there is little chance of success because of the lack of study space, poor diet, and the pressures of an environment not congenial to academic success.

The admission of disadvantaged students to college and the satisfaction of their basic economic needs must be accompanied by realistic academic programs. This should not be interpreted as meaning second-rate programs or watered-down courses. Nor does it imply the channeling

---

7 *Raising Low Incomes Through Improved Education*, A Statement on National Policy by the Research and Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development (New York: September 1965), p. 27.

of disadvantaged students into vocational-technical and paraprofessional or semiprofessional programs. There must be careful provision that special courses are equal in status to those of the curriculum in general and that such programs give ready access to advanced academic work and the professional schools. The disadvantaged need special tutoring, courses designed to compensate for beginning deficiencies, and specialized expert counseling. It is often desirable that their counselors come from their own ethnic groups. They do not need and should not have a separate curriculum, for this would almost surely guarantee them a second-class education.

Education must open the door to career opportunities, either directly to positions that provide satisfying work and incomes or to additional schooling that will lead to the professions. It is essential that educational programs for the disadvantaged keep open every avenue to higher education.

5.

Teachers, Instructional Systems, and Facilities

Success in the education of the disadvantaged requires the development of total instructional systems that bring together competent teachers, effective instructional technology, and curriculum materials that are relevant to the interests and needs of the students.

No matter how skillfully curricula and programs are devised, coordinated, and adapted to the special needs of the clientele, success in the education of the disadvantaged will still depend on the quality of instruction. The reform of central-city education is in part the reform of teacher attitudes and methods.

The reaction of disadvantaged students to teacher expectations has been shown to be of major importance. Indeed, one study suggests that almost all of the variance in learning by children from low-income families is a function of the teacher's belief that these children cannot achieve as well as others.[1]

Teachers influence student motivations and expectations by such behavior as fluctuations in their voices or changes of facial expression.

1/Robert Rosenthal and Lenore F. Jacobson, "Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantaged," *Scientific American*, Vol. 218, No. 4 (April 1968), pp. 16, 19-23.

Students may respond to these expressions with discouragement. All too often teachers bluntly and even cruelly tell students that their abilities are low. As a result, those students may make little or no effort.

Pupil achievement has been shown to be directly related to the abilities and preparation of teachers. This is especially true for minority-group students. Teacher abilities appear to have a cumulative effect, as the relationship is more direct at the higher grades. These characteristics of teachers are identified by the Coleman Report as having the strongest relationship to pupil achievement: their scores on verbal tests, their educational backgrounds, and the educational backgrounds of their parents.

Goals and Rewards

Teacher turnover is a serious problem in urban schools. There is a high incidence of movement from the central city to the suburbs and a high incidence of withdrawal from the teaching profession. For example, although teacher turnover in New York City as a whole has been a relatively low 10 per cent, the turnover in East Harlem has been two to two and one-half times that rate.

The causes of teacher migration and withdrawal are more subtle than is usually recognized. Ego satisfaction and the reward system in the public schools are tied to goals unlike those in most other professions. Since ordinarily there is no relationship in teaching between excellence and remuneration, good teachers have sought other rewards. There are three goals most commonly sought by teachers, and all three tend to lower the quality of teaching in the central city.

Migration to the suburbs after serving an apprenticeship in the city is one of these goals. The suburbs offer newer schools, a clientele whose values are more consistent with those of the teacher, and often a greater appreciation for professional services. Many teachers who have not joined this migration are dedicated teachers whose decision it is to remain in the inner city, and fortunately the number of like-minded younger and equally competent volunteers seems to be growing. But many others are there because they have been passed over by the suburban schools. Often they are inexperienced or are otherwise unprepared to meet effectively the problems of disadvantaged children.

Junior and senior high school teachers quite commonly seek status and satisfaction by competing for elective and advanced courses. Teachers with seniority select trigonometry and calculus rather than gen-

50.

eral mathematics; journalism and the debating team rather than freshman grammar; and even mechanical drawing rather than woodshop. At the elementary level, status is often tied to teaching in the upper grades. Thus, important basic instruction is too often left to the less capable.

The third reward is "promotion" to school administration. That many inner city teachers should wish to get away from the classroom can be readily understood. According to one estimate, 50 to 80 per cent of the time spent in New York City's elementary schools is devoted to discipline and related tasks.[2] However, rewarding good teaching by transfer to administration often injures the quality of the classroom teacher corps.

Among the direct results of the teacher reward system is a wholesale dependence upon substitute teachers and paraprofessionals operating on substandard credentials. Although statistics in this area are difficult to obtain, New York City again provides some evidence. In a recent year, 43 per cent of all Harlem teachers either had probationary licenses or were substitutes.

Other factors are even more basic in determining the level of teacher effectiveness. For instance, teacher education programs attract on the average the least able of all college students. The socioeconomic background of teachers can also play a major role. Although teachers are no longer predominantly from middle-class families, the proportion is still high. Middle-class teachers often have difficulty relating effectively to disadvantaged youth. Teachers who themselves came from low-income families may have even greater difficulty. There appears to be some justification for the view that upwardly mobile teachers from lower economic status may often hold their students in low esteem. A common attitude among such teachers is, "I did it, why can't they?"

Training and Technology

Although there are notable and admirable exceptions, colleges of education in general have been discouragingly slow to fulfill their responsibility for educating teachers in the difficult tasks of central-city teaching. Even the most radical innovations in materials, technology, and methods can be expected to have little effect upon the disadvantaged

2/Martin Deutsch, *Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement* (Ithaca: Society for Applied Anthropology, 1960), 51.

if we do not change the attitudes of teachers and prepare them to employ new ideas and practices. At the present time, approximately 200 institutions of higher education have developed special programs of courses for the education of teachers of the poor. We may hope that these programs will actually attack the problems and in fact give the training which will make the difference between success and failure in teaching the disadvantaged. But the prospect is not entirely encouraging. These institutions are often inflexible in their policies and procedures and monolithic in their structure.

Because of the lack of flexibility and adaptiveness in many schools of education, it may be advisable to look to new organizations to prepare teachers for the central city. Moreover, because the public schools have often been far too unresponsive to social change, it may sometimes be necessary to bypass them in the training of teachers. New models for teacher education are being developed which deserve serious attention. For instance, autonomous agencies that would draw their staffs from the universities, public schools, and private organizations have been proposed.[3]

More teachers and more teachers of teachers should be recruited from ethnic groups in which disadvantage is high. Only those with a strong personal commitment to improving the plight of the disadvantaged are likely to succeed as their teachers.

In addition to insuring basic teacher skills, programs for preparing teachers of the disadvantaged should have the following characteristics:

> They should cultivate the teacher's knowledge and understanding of the cultural heritage, economic and social problems, and individual life styles of pupils in the central city.
>
> They should include courses in urban sociology, cultural anthropology, and the psychology of the disadvantaged.
>
> They should cultivate in the teacher a respect for the individual child and give him a working knowledge of human behavior and how it is affected.
>
> They should initiate the teacher in the spirit and techniques of innovation and experiment.

3/James C. Stone, "Training Teachers of the Disadvantaged: Blueprint for a Breakthrough," in *Resources for Urban Schools: Better Use and Balance;* CED Supplementary Paper Number 33.

> They should be based on internships where trainees are in direct contact with the children with whom they will work. There must be direct application of knowledge and theory to practical problems within the schools. Teacher education must get out of the college classroom and into the schools where the students are.

If education were to follow other enterprises which have reaped the benefits of technology, it would make large gains in its ability to educate the disadvantaged. With certain instructional aids, such as the computer, programmed lessons, teaching machines, television, radio, and moving pictures, the competent teacher can often do a better job in treating individual differences. It is true that these aids, while useful when competently employed, may be useless and even damaging when used without careful and systematic planning. Notwithstanding, we believe that instructional technology, properly employed, could assist materially in coping with several difficulties in the education of the disadvantaged. As the Commission on Instructional Technology points out:

> Some observers see in instructional technology the promise of developing a comprehensive, potent teaching strategy which could be uniquely effective with deprived and minority-group youngsters. It could actively engage them in the learning process through all their senses and modes of awareness; it could adjust to the individual learning style of each child; it could bring material of relevance and interest into the school; it could filter out the antagonism and indifference of some teachers; it could open the school to the media-rich environment.[4]

With respect to instructional technology, the main function of the teacher should be to determine what technique of learning is most effective in the individual case and to provide direction, motivation, and stimulation. A proper use of instructional technology should make a school more rather than less human by multiplying opportunities for personal contact and consulting.

Here we should recognize the almost limitless possibilities of educational television as a medium of instruction, considering the success of carefully planned and produced programs and the length of time which

---

4/U.S. Commission on Instructional Technology, *To Improve Learning: A Report to the President and the Congress of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970), pp. 99-100.

the average child spends in front of a television screen (estimated to be fifteen to twenty hours a week). In our policy statement on *Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School,* we described in detail the potentials of instructional television along with other audio-visual media as teaching instruments within the classroom. But this is not to ignore the great promise that lies in the development of educational television programs going directly into the child's home. We have mentioned "Sesame Street" as a particularly outstanding example of what can be accomplished in educational television, and we encourage experimentation along such lines.

Many disadvantaged children go through school without ever experiencing success, a situation that greatly damages their self-images and contributes to continued failure. This condition is not likely to change basically unless there is a large-scale breakthrough in traditional attitudes and practices. Few teachers are inclined to reinforce correct responses when the individual student is at the bottom of his class in ability and performance. All too often, improvement by a poor student is not rewarded. However, instructional technology, properly employed, can provide this important favorable feedback by programs geared to low-achieving students. Programs can be designed to accommodate to a child's optimum learning rate and to reinforce his learning as he proceeds. The program is not recalcitrant, does not lack in patience, and does not remind the student that he is holding back the rest of the class

Where the child realizes that he possesses essential skills and knowledge and has a strong self-image, he tends to achieve a sense of some power over his future. He can develop a feeling of mastery over programs, consoles, and computers. Nothing breeds success like success; satisfactory work comes in part through achieving satisfaction.

Teacher education programs should be designed to meet the special demands of urban teaching. Education for prospective inner-city teachers will succeed best if it involves experience in the communities where they are to teach. Qualified minority group members should be actively recruited as teachers of teachers and for teaching positions in urban schools. To provide successful models for minority children, special efforts should be made to recruit *male* minority group persons to serve both as teachers and as paraprofessionals.

Extra incentives should be offered in the form of paid internships for teachers who select careers in urban education. Differentiated staffing patterns and salaries should be established in urban schools to provide superior inner-city teachers with incentive goals and rewards. The present

lock-step salary schedules do not encourage dynamic and innovative teaching and are ill suited to promoting teaching as a career.

Success in the education of the disadvantaged will require the development of instructional systems that bring together competent teachers, the most effective instructional technology, and curriculum materials that are relevant to the experience and needs of the students. To reap the technological benefits already enjoyed by industry and communications, the schools must develop instructional systems which provide teachers with the instruments essential to individualizing instruction while at the same time radically improving general instructional quality.

Sites and Facilities

The Coleman Report found that variations in facilities and curricula seem to account for relatively little variation in pupil achievement as measured by standardized tests. It may be true that old and dilapidated buildings are of relatively minor importance in directly affecting test results, but this ignores the important considerations of student and teacher attitudes. Buildings take on considerable importance when the indirect impact on children is assessed in terms of such matters as the long-term effect on teacher recruitment and the psychological impact on school personnel. Moreover, the positive effect of clean, attractive, modern buildings upon children accustomed to crowded and perhaps depressing environments hardly can be overlooked.

In 16 of the nation's largest cities, nearly 600 elementary schools and more than 50 junior and senior high schools built before the turn of the century are still in regular use. Another 700-plus elementary schools and more than 160 secondary schools in these same cities were built prior to 1920.[5]

Age alone will not render a building unsuitable for school use, but most of these schools were designed around the educational and societal attitudes and interests of another era. In these "egg-crate" schools, with their dark halls and standardized rooms and equipment, education tends to be locked into the traditional pattern of thirty or more pupils in a classroom all day, every day, in the elementary schools or, in the secondary schools, into a pattern of "musical boxes."

5/Harold B. Gores, "Educational Facilities for the Urban Disadvantaged," in *Resources for Urban Schools: Better Use and Balance*. CED Supplementary Paper Number 33.

Both educational quality and economy of construction and operation require buildings that can be adjusted to accommodate changing functions. One promising innovation is the systems approach to school construction. Systems construction involves the development of modular, pre-engineered components with which better schools may be built faster and more economically. A key requirement in the systems projects to date has been the design of components to allow for change. Structural components provide long, clear spans free of interior support. Into the structure is plugged a heating-ventilating-cooling system, a ceiling-and-lighting system, and interior partitions, all of which can be easily and economically rearranged to allow for changes in educational programs.

In the past few years, exciting new ideas have developed in architectural planning. These include the linear school, which may feature combined occupancy (space for businesses and social agencies); the so-called classrooms without walls; and the educational park.

The linear school, utilizing air rights, is an attempt to build over and under municipal thoroughfares with the intent of countering the rapidly rising land costs in the central cities. The possibilities of joint occupancy—incorporating commercial establishments, community facilities, and schools in one physical plant—deserve careful study as a means of locating schools at acceptable costs where they are needed. Air rights involve difficult and often costly engineering problems, but these costs usually are more than offset by savings in the costs of condemnation, relocation of tenants, and demolition of conventional urban school sites. In addition, when air rights are used, the city avoids the long-term loss of revenue usually occasioned by the removal of school sites from tax rolls. The linear school concept comes to grips with not one but several urban problems: land shortage, inadequate transportation, blighted neighborhoods, school segregation, and housing shortage, among others.

The classroom-without-walls concept accompanies team teaching and flexible scheduling, in which class periods and instructional arrangements vary. In this design, classrooms are arranged in large clusters of three or four classes, combining resources in teaching personnel and materials. Within such open spaces, usually carpeted, pupils can be easily and unobtrusively grouped and regrouped according to their individual needs and abilities. The new teaching patterns—involving team teaching, teacher assistants, nongraded instruction, and instructional resource centers—are facilitated and encouraged by this type of school architecture.

Educational parks combine on the same acreage elementary schools, junior high schools, and high schools. An advantage here is the

possible reduction of de facto segregation, although economies in supporting services and materials also may be important benefits.[6]

Modernization of existing schools is one option available to educators attempting to relieve overcrowding and update their educational programs. Every city has a supply of abandoned offices, warehouses, and even factory buildings that are suitable for conversion into educational facilities at costs far below those involved in building new schools. Usually the benefits realized through renovation are numerous. Such facilities can often be designed to support effective innovations that would be difficult or impossible in conventional buildings. In Harlem, for example, a school for dropouts is operating in a converted supermarket. The conversion of warehouses into schools with flexible facilities is already an accomplished fact in some cities. Scores of urban colleges and universities have a long history of housing academic programs successfully in converted buildings. Whatever their shortcomings, the old converted World War II barracks supplied excellent academic space for a quarter of a century. Often such space proved more flexible and useful than that provided by many of the permanent buildings that have replaced it.

School officials should recognize the relevance of school sites to the task of racial integration and the importance of school architecture to the variable functions necessary to effective instruction.

6/Thomas F. Pettigrew, "The Educational Park Concept," in *Resources for Urban Schools: Better Use and Balance*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 33.

6.

New Concepts of Accountability and Control

The schools should be held accountable for their product. Accountability requires greater participation by the patrons of the school in decisions affecting the education of their children.

We strongly endorse the principle of accountability in education. Although this principle promises to be a controversial matter—with success depending on extensive study, discussion, and experience—its mandate seems inescapable. The accountability principle has already been voiced by the Congress, for instance, in supporting the National Assessment of Educational Progress program, initiated by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.[1] The President endorsed it in his 1970 message to the Congress on education reform, and numerous school districts have begun new accountability procedures. We believe that the Congress, state legislatures, and the general public should insist that the schools be held accountable for their work. Unless this is done, our people will never get full value for their investment in education.

1/Ralph W. Tyler, "The Problems and Possibilities of Educational Evaluation," in *The Schools and the Challenge of Innovation*. CED Supplementary Paper Number 28, 1969, pp. 76-90.

For decades the Congress and state legislatures have responded to troublesome educational problems by providing additional funds. Until quite recently individual taxpayers have generally been willing to vote additional tax levies. But now both voters and their elected representatives are increasingly dismayed by the apparent inability of the educational establishment to solve some of our basic educational problems. Recent state and local elections have recorded more negative reactions to educational bond and funding issues than are found in any previous period.

Educators too often have rationalized poor school performance by labeling students "slow," "unmotivated," or "retarded." They have convinced themselves that the fault is not theirs, for some children simply cannot learn. But the facts are that much of the teacher's energy that goes into teaching the disadvantaged in urban schools and much of the money that finally gets to these schools is wasted on ineffective, traditional procedures. More of the same old thing will not cure the ills of education.

The call for accountability demands radically new approaches to the educational process. First, the principle of accountability moves the focus of education from teaching to learning, since outputs rather than inputs are its measure. Second, the schools will be unable simply to cite the number of graduates going on to college as their evidence of success, but rather will be expected to answer for the achievement of all their students. Third, the schools will be required to correlate the costs and benefits of specific programs.

That the school should be held accountable for its product is a justifiable demand of parents, who are no longer willing to accept the explanation that their children cannot learn because their homes and neighborhoods are disadvantaged. It is the demand that a child be taught to read in spite of his disadvantage—indeed, because of it. We are convinced that the financial support of the schools should in some way be tied to their actual productivity, so that a better product, when judged by competent techniques of assessment, would yield increased support. If this were achieved, we believe that the schools would become more inventive, more innovative, more effective, and more productive of good education.

We believe that holding schools accountable for their performance is essential to success in the education of the disadvantaged, and we are confident that principles and techniques for applying the requirement of accountability can be developed and applied successfully. As we have said, this is a difficult task that will require much thought and experiment.

60.

and its success will depend on both variety and flexibility. It will depend among other things, on strong national, state, and local assessments of the educational outputs of the schools.

We do not propose here to set forth any particular scheme for establishing accountability to fit all schools at all places and times. To illustrate a few possible modes, we call attention to the proposals of a leading advocate of accountability, Leon M. Lessinger, who has suggested several procedures to assist in establishing accountability.[2]

The first of these is performance contracts under which private contractors guarantee to bring students who are below grade level up to normal performance at a given cost and in a given time. Usually the contractor would agree to be paid only on the basis of a stipulated amount for each student who successfully completes the training program. He would be assessed a penalty for those students who do not achieve specific minimum performance levels.

A second proposal is the independent accomplishment audit, under which student accomplishments would be evaluated (audited) by an independent agency. The process would be similar to the independent fiscal audit that has contributed to improved management techniques in business and government. In the accomplishment audit, the focus would be upon student attitudes, skills, and knowledge.

Still another procedure involves developmental capital, which is the money set aside by school personnel for activities that produce the results described in independent accomplishment audits. The basic purpose of developmental capital is to provide a financial resource to stimulate and sustain re-examination and modernization of the educational system. It is, in effect, risk capital. Developmental capital is not a new idea; in fact, it already exists at the state level in the form of funds under Title III and Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The schools must be held accountable for their product. Special educational programs for the disadvantaged should be funded only where evaluations have been designed to identify concrete results and the conditions necessary for achieving those results. Programs and program components producing superior results in terms of student achievement or attitudes should serve as prototypes for future funding. Government funding of experimental programs should require appropriate assessment of results.

2/Leon M Lessinger, "Accountability in Education," in *Resources for Urban Schools: Better Use and Balance*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 33.

Increasing Local Participation

Accountability is also coming to have another and very vital meaning for the parents of poor children—accountability in their terms meaning tangible results in the form of a relevant education for their children, taught by people who are sympathetic and understanding. To bring this about, these parents are insisting on more participation in the decisions that affect their lives and the lives of their children. There was a time when they were satisfied with peripheral school involvement. Now the issue is their inclusion in the educational power structure. The question is not whether they should be a part of the decision-making process of the schools. Rather it is a question of the proper degree and nature of their power, of the way in which it can be established, and how it can be exerted effectively.

In our large urban centers, bureaucracy has interposed a barrier separating the school from its patrons. Futhermore, competent observers are in almost unanimous agreement that many of the larger city school districts should be decentralized in the interest of efficiency. Some form of decentralization is essential, and districts that have already begun decentralization should continue their experiments in this direction.

It should be obvious, however, that a segmentation of a large city into numerous completely independent and autonomous small districts could create insuperable problems in both administration and instruction. Professional bargaining and purchasing, for instance, require for efficiency a general organizational structure and operation. And the basic educational pursuits that tie the schools together as a common enterprise (e.g., instruction for literacy) could be grossly injured by any segmentation that would isolate individual schools.

While arguing for the decentralization of large city districts, we recognize that the common problem of school systems, when the whole nation is considered, is smallness rather than bigness. There is great need to consolidate small districts into more efficient larger ones. It has been pointed out, for example, that each of the new districts created by New York City's decentralization plan is larger than all but one district in the state outside the city.

The problem of school control is how to maintain general supervision and control where these are essential and establish local participation and control where these will strengthen the schools by better perceptions of need and purpose and by improving the substance of instruction. We favor local control in the sense of adequate involvement of a

62.

school's community in the determination of school policy. Local control should be established to the degree necessary to insure the relevance of the schools to the problems and experience of those instructed and make them effective agents in the transformation of neighborhood and community life.

In considering this question, however, one must take into account the whole structure of American education, which comprises federal and state as well as city governments having interrelated roles in financing, research, and other functions. We do not favor local control as meaning the separation of schools into autonomous institutions, or even into very small completely autonomous districts, which we believe would lead only to confusion and even greater frustration. The limits of local control should be set and enforced by the larger district authority with local elements fully represented. This will never be a simple or easy matter to negotiate.

The optimum size for a school district is a question. Bigness often contributes to efficiency and many things are possible in large districts that are not feasible in small districts. Nevertheless, giant districts increase the impersonality of school bureaucracy and alienate the citizens of disadvantaged areas by their social distance and apparent indifference. Blacks and Mexican-Americans often see large school bureaucracy as a social or political tool of the white middle-class establishment. Districts should be designed to achieve the human advantage of smallness within the framework of efficient bigness. Their size should be gauged to provide maximum concern for the interests, needs, and effective participation of the community.

It is imperative that minorities be represented on boards, councils, and commissions with rule-making powers and that there be larger minority representation in superintendents' and principals' chairs. We believe, however, that such representation will only be a partial step toward a solution to the problem of effective participation of minorities in the decision-making process. In the long run, black power, brown power, or any other minority power with respect to the schools or any other social institution must be established basically and firmly by an equitable representation of the minority populations in the decision-making offices of the nation—in Congress, in state legislatures. This kind of involvement in policy making can contribute to a genuinely integrated society.

Much can be accomplished in school affairs through participation and policy determination by citizens' groups and parent-teacher organizations. Often such organizations need revamping and revitalizing

to become effective centers of influence in educational matters rather than simply social outlets or platforms for complaint oratory. Too often these organizations are ignored by administrators, who should seriously seek advice and assistance from them. This does not mean, however, an abandonment of professional expertise and supervision. The services of the experts are always essential. But education should not be the exclusive province of professionals, whose task relates primarily to the means and methods of achieving goals. The determination of goals is a task especially for laymen.

The community school was once the community center; there should be a return to this function. Schools should be in constant use from early morning to late evening, serving the community at large in programs ranging from children's recreation to continuing adult education. The common practice of utilizing school facilities only during formal school hours is wasteful in both money and unrealized social and cultural benefits.

Moreover, the school should not be subject to the constraints of the old school calendar. The opening and closing of regular classes should not coincide with planting cotton or picking fruit. The traditional calendar may still make some sense in some rural areas, but certainly not in urban schools. The urban school should be open around the clock and around the calendar.

Local participation in the determination of school policy does not mean that state and national interests are not being served. Nor does it mean that regional accreditation, state standards on teacher certification, or state involvement in curriculum design are not both desirable and necessary. It is the genius of the American educational structure that the constitutional system of basic state authority and responsibility for the schools has made possible the pursuit of local, state, and national purposes and goals

The decentralization of large districts and the establishment of limited local control require the development of governing principles that will ensure an effective balance of central with local control and the establishment of agencies capable of supervising effectively the application of those principles. Such agencies might be state review boards that would (1) carefully observe the formation of local districts to guard against such practices as gerrymandering to further segregation, (2) review the budget at the point of the division of central and locally controlled funds, and (3) review the curriculum in the interest of a satisfactory balance of local and general elements.

64.

In view of such considerations, **we urge school governing boards and administrators to solicit both formal and informal community participation in the determination of school policies and programs and to establish policies and procedures that will make that participation both possible and effective.** The nation can no longer tolerate conditions that prevent minorities from effective power in matters which determine their own destinies.

While we urge the decentralization of large urban districts to make them more responsive to the disadvantaged communities, we believe that across the country generally there is still need for the consolidation of small school districts. The school should be reestablished as the center of local community activity for the entire day and the entire year.

Developing Alternative Instructional Patterns

There is no single best way to organize an educational program or to instruct a group of students. Competition in both ideas and practice should yield good results. This competition may be generated within a school or between schools, or it may result from the entry into education of private agencies. Such competition may generate the thrust necessary to produce desirable changes in the educational establishment that are otherwise virtually impossible. The schools of the future must offer more alternatives and options than they provide at present.

One strategy under examination and trial is to increase the number of proprietary schools and allow parents to select the schools for their children to attend. Considerable attention is being given to systems under which vouchers would be issued to parents who would cash them in at the schools of their choice. Ceilings would be established on tuition and fees chargeable under this system. Though there would probably be some resulting improvement in the quality of education, past experience with private schools indicates the possibility of even greater segregation when student bodies are self-selected. Granting tuition payments in inverse proportion to family income and wealth and making such payments only to the children of the poor might overcome this effect.

Another and more promising alternative to traditional practice, which we have already mentioned, is contracting with private firms capable of providing specialized educational services within the public school structure. Such firms might conduct courses in remedial reading and

mathematics, provide counseling, produce programs for courses, or perform other important specialized functions. In fact, some private agencies are already offering such services and are guaranteeing results.

Experiments now in operation show clearly that private industry is sometimes both willing and capable of assisting in improving our educational institutions. For example, Illinois Bell has supplied personnel, equipment, and facilities to help improve the quality of education in inner-city Chicago schools. Michigan Bell has adopted an entire high school for the purpose of helping to prepare students for the job market. In Cleveland, General Electric has donated a large factory building, located in a poor area, for use as a school-factory that offers paid employment, basic and remedial education, and training in job skills under one roof.

Kenneth Clark has proposed a variety of educational patterns that we regard as worthy of careful consideration. He suggests that the educational system of the future might be composed of various kinds of institutions including regional state schools, federal regional schools, college and university-related schools, industrial demonstration schools sponsored by private enterprise, labor union sponsored schools, army schools, educational parks, and linear schools.

Competent business, voluntary agencies, and nonprofit enterprises should be encouraged to join with the schools in developing alternative educational patterns. The schools should be given contracting powers that will enable them to contract with private agencies for accomplishing specialized tasks. We encourage experimentation in varying degrees of public school involvement by qualified elements of the private sector. Contracts let to private agencies, whether profit or nonprofit, should be on a full accountability basis only.

66.

7.

Equalizing School Resources

Equalization in the distribution of school resources has become a necessity for the urban schools, which despite higher costs must function with less money than their suburban counterparts. There must be basic transformations in the method of financing the schools.

The effort to achieve equality of educational opportunity will require larger school expenditures in disadvantaged areas than elsewhere. Yet central-city school districts are expected to function with less money per pupil than their suburban counterparts.

The crux of this problem is the too great reliance on the property tax for the financing of schools and local government services. In practice, this tax has been notoriously heavier on improvements than on land, and it has been unevenly assessed on both. The property tax base of the cities is steadily eroded by the deterioration of buildings; by the location of freeways, greenbelts, and public housing; and by the movement of industry and well-to-do families to the suburbs. Meanwhile, growth in the costs of urban services are accelerated with the increase in the proportion of welfare clients and other "high cost" citizens and by the impact of inflation.

The result is that inner-city and poor school districts with the greatest proportion of disadvantaged children have the least financial resources. Moreover, as will be shown later, state and federal support for education generally discriminates against central cities in the distribution of funds. Rather than offsetting the disparities between central-city and suburban educational finance, this aid from higher levels of government tends to increase these disparities.

We must face the fact that the problem of achieving good education for the disadvantaged means a complete reappraisal and reordering of financial resources to match needs. Revenues should be distributed to reflect priorities and should not be based on the haphazard distribution of property values.

The High Costs of Urban Education

The cities must provide massive educational services in order to place their disadvantaged children on a par with more advantaged suburban peers. All the special programs for the disadvantaged mentioned in this statement tend to be more costly than programs ordinarily required for other children. This is certainly true of compensatory and remedial programs. More youths in the inner city are enrolled in technical-vocational courses than in the suburbs, and the cost of such programs is estimated to be generally 35 per cent higher than the cost of academic high school courses.[1]

The urban schools are expected to accept responsibility for the consequences of society's failure. They must provide more diagnostic, health, and food services to the inner city child to help him achieve his learning potential. Programs for the physically and mentally handicapped are particularly costly, and the cities have disproportionate numbers of such children. For example, the eight cities of Rhode Island had 58 per cent of the state's public school enrollment in 1965 but 76 per cent of its mentally retarded children. Inner-city school systems also have high child-care, truancy, and similar costs, and the need for security forces within the schools is a rapidly rising cost, often borne by the school system. The high degree of transiency and population mobility in the inner city also creates extra counseling, staff, and other costs.

1/It is further estimated that only about 10 per cent of this excess cost is covered by state and federal categorical grants. See Charles S. Benson, *The Economics of Public Education*, Second edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), p. 321.

Furthermore, high costs in the cities mean that tax dollars buy fewer educational facilities and services than they do in the suburbs. Costs for land, construction, and insurance are higher in the inner city than elsewhere. In the twenty-one largest American cities, the average cost per acre for school sites is $68,156 compared to $3,074 in other districts.[2] Wages and salaries for both instructional staffs and ancillary services are also generally higher in the cities.

Will increased school expenditures in poor districts improve educational achievements? It appears that except where funds have been used for specific programs to help correct educational deficiences, there is no certain or consistent relationship between expenditures and school effectiveness. It is known, for instance, that boys from low-income homes in higher expenditure schools accumulate more knowledge than their counterparts in low expenditure schools. Comparisons of the achievement scores of boys in school districts spending less than $200 with those districts spending between $200 and $300 show a difference of more than a full year in performance. The effects of increased spending at the lower levels are encouraging. However, increased expenditures at the $400-$500 and over $500 levels do not show the same gains per dollar.[3]

Nevertheless, even though increased funding is in itself no guarantee of more effective schooling for the disadvantaged, without adequate funding schools with disadvantaged children have little hope of establishing programs that can be effective.

The Overburdened Tax Base

Education is by no means the only high-cost claim on urban financial resources. Decay and other problems in urban centers require the expenditure of 69 per cent of local public funds for noneducational purposes compared to 47 per cent for such purposes in the suburbs. The cities must bear to an exceptional degree the costs arising from congestion, including especially the heavy social welfare services for family support and health purposes that are associated with the large numbers of disadvantaged residents who populate the inner cities. This so-called

---

2/George B. Brain, "Pressures on the Urban School," in Alvin Toffler, ed., *The Schoolhouse in the City* (New York: Praeger, 1968), p. 41.

3/Thomas I. Ribich, *Education and Poverty* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1968), pp. 86-87.

"municipal overburden" represents a claim on city resources that reduces the amount cities can allocate to the schools in contrast with their suburbs, which do not have equivalent demands.

The central cities' over-all expenditures on governmental services are about $50 more per citizen than the suburbs, but $50 less per citizen for education.[4] This results in a per student differential in expenditures of $124, or 30 per cent. This differential is, of course, partly the result of reliance on property taxation to finance schools. Considering one example, the amount of taxable property per resident pupil in Michigan in 1965-66 ranged from $1,319 in the poorest district to $53,000 in the richest.[5] Thus, to raise similar revenues in the two districts would have required a tax rate forty times higher in the poorer district.

The steadily worsening fiscal position of the central cities vis-a-vis the suburbs is summed up in the report of the Task Force on Urban Education, better known as the Riles Report: "Not only has the income base of the central cities been depressed relative to the suburbs but, in addition, the city property tax base has generally grown at a much slower rate than has the property tax base of metropolitan areas as a whole. . . . In sum, the increase in gross assessed valuation in the suburbs far outstrips that of central cities." To which the report adds, "It is significant to note that between 1930 and 1960, per pupil education costs across the country rose at a rate more than three times as fast as the average per capita value of taxable property in large cities."[6]

The urgency of this situation cannot be overstressed. The heavy reliance on the property tax has made school systems highly vulnerable to taxpayer revolts against rising budgets, greatly hampering the operations of major school systems and even in some cases forcing curtailment of the school year. In the past few years, voters have turned down more school bond issues and levies than during any previous period. It should be added that this situation is endemic not only in the large cities but in suburban areas as well.

4/Harold Howe II, "The City as Teacher," in Alvin Toffler, ed., *The Schoolhouse in the City* (New York: Praeger, 1968), p. 14.

5/Michigan State Board of Education, *Ranking of Michigan High School Districts by Selected Financial Data, 1965-66*, Bulletin 1012 (Lansing: January 1967).

6/U.S. Task Force on Urban Education, *The Urban Education Task Force Report: Final Report to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*: Wilson C. Riles, Chairman. (New York: Praeger, 1970), pp. 29, 38.

Aid to Schools: Unequal and Misdirected

The pattern of sharing the school financial burden by the different levels of government has not shifted dramatically in the past two decades. It is estimated that in 1971 the division of fiscal responsibility in the nation for elementary and secondary education was 52.0 per cent local, 41.1 per cent state, and 6.9 per cent federal. True, the federal contribution has increased over this period, but the federal share has never been great, ranging from about 3 per cent of the total in 1950 to a high of 8 per cent in 1968. The state contribution has remained relatively unchanged at about 40 per cent, and though the local share has dropped from about 57 per cent in 1950, it is still roughly half the total. Of course, the actual dollar amounts flowing from all levels of government have risen sharply in order to accommodate the enormously increased cost of public elementary and secondary education, estimated at $42.4 billion nationally in 1971.[7]

Supplementary support from higher levels of government has been justified on the basis of meeting minimum funding needs. In fact, however, the distribution of school funds from higher levels of government tends to aggravate rather than redress the inequities created in the first place by the reliance on the property tax.

Due to the workings of state education formulas, the average amount of assistance for suburban districts is substantially greater than that for city districts. It is impossible to obtain current data, but in 1962, for the country as a whole, per capita state aid to education in the central cities was $20.73, while in suburban areas it was $37.66. On a per-student basis the gap is even more striking. For example, in the year 1966-67 for New York State's six metropolitan areas, the average difference between educational aid to the central cities in those areas and to the school districts in the rest of the counties was $100 per pupil. Aid to the school district of New York City was $319 per pupil, while for the counties of Nassau, Rockland, Suffolk, and Westchester average aid was $453 per pupil.[8]

A 1969 study of the distribution of federal funds revealed that an excessively large portion of federal monies earmarked for the disad-

---

7/Estimates from National Education Association.

8/*Reshaping Government in Metropolitan Areas*, A Statement on National Policy by the Research and Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development (New York: February 1970), p. 36.

vantaged of the urban centers is frequently misdirected to the suburbs.[9]

Furthermore, internal audits of school-by-school funding patterns within cities consistently have disclosed that fewer dollars are spent in schools educating poor children and minority children than in the schools attended by their white middle-class counterparts. The constituencies of the poor have been shortchanged in the distribution of school monies.

A special problem exists in the Southwest, where frequently school districts are not autonomous political units but rather sub-units of municipal or county governments. These school districts are often gerrymandered to form almost totally Mexican-American districts. Within these districts, remedial education is sometimes almost synonymous with Mexican-American education. Here again, federal monies designated for the disadvantaged often find their way to middle- and upper-class urban and suburban districts.

Better supervision and more equitable distribution of federal monies is clearly indicated. However, in view of the magnitude of state aid, there is no possibility of achieving equality of a satisfactory level of school financing without state equalization legislation.

State Responsibility for Schooling

Basically, the states are responsible for public schooling. They determine what can be taught; who shall be qualified to serve as administrators, counselors, and teachers in the schools; how schools shall be financed. Taxes collected for the schools, whether obtained at state or local levels, are levied by state authority. Local school districts are generally considered to be quasi-corporations of the states or instrumentalities whose powers and obligations derive from the state.[10]

In our policy statement on *Paying for Better Public Schools*, this Committee outlined a "foundation" program to support local schooling. It called for "specification of the type and quality of school services that should, as a minimum, be available to students throughout the state . . . determination of the costs of providing these services, and establishment of a method for distributing state funds in such a way as to make it possible for every school district to provide at least the foundation level of education from these and its own funds." Such aid should reflect rising

9/Henry M. Levin, "Financing Education for the Urban Disadvantaged," in *Resources for Urban Schools: Better Use and Balance*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 33.
10/Henry M. Levin, *op. cit.*

school costs and especially the high cost of special programs for the disadvantaged.

In *A Fiscal Program for a Balanced Federalism* we again called upon the states to assume a greater responsibility for financing education and welfare, either through direct expenditures or grants-in-aid, in order to help equalize and improve the ability of local governments to meet their financial needs in these fields.[11] We also warned against continued and deeper reliance upon the federal government, advising that federal spending is vulnerable to political factors and may be restrained by other requirements upon the federal dollar. However, it seems apparent that until the federal government does more to relieve the states of the financial burdens of national interest programs, such as welfare, increased federal aid will be required to assist those schools which face the greatest educational problems.

In regard to the property tax itself—the source of almost 90 per cent of local tax revenue—we have made various recommendations aimed at remedying inequities and making the tax more productive. These have included the following recommendations: (1) States should accept full responsibility for assuring statewide equitable and uniform assessment of real property; (2) assessment ratios of all classes of real property, including land, should be equalized on the basis of market value; (3) limitations on local powers over property tax rates and debts should be removed from state constitutions and, where desirable, should be imposed only by statute; and (4) states should utilize other more elastic sources of revenue and should facilitate their use by localities (e.g., by piggy-backing local supplements to statewide sales and income taxes).

The State of Hawaii offers an example of full state responsibility for school financing. The schools are funded from statewide sources, including a state levy on property that is assessed for this purpose by the state. The effect is to avoid the uneven taxation of property for educational purposes and the tax havens found in many states. A further benefit is the assurance of a reasonably professional administration of assessment processes.

Michigan recently has attempted substantial revisions of the entire tax and financing structure as it affects education. The governor has suggested sweeping reforms to shift the burden of finance to the state from local taxation districts. The governor's Select Commission on Educa-

---

11 *A Fiscal Program for a Balanced Federalism*, A Statement on National Policy by the Research and Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development (New York: June 1967), pp. 31-33.

tional Reform in 1969 recommended among other things (1) a uniform statewide property tax; (2) school accountability for educational products; (3) drastic improvement in property assessment techniques; (4) statewide salaries for teachers, to be adjusted on a cost-of-living basis; and (5) district rights to vote more taxes for education, except that resulting funds are not to be used for teacher salaries. We believe the Hawaii and Michigan examples in financing merit careful study by other states.

Five actions are essential if the financial plight of the central-city schools is to be overcome:

The assumption by the states of the responsibility for providing equality on a reasonable level of educational opportunity,

The adoption by the states of more effective and equitable revenue systems taking into account ability to pay,

The equitable distribution of state assistance to satisfy real need,

Increased federal funds to provide more adequate resources for meeting the special costs of educating the disadvantaged and a more just distribution of these resources,

Requirement by state governments of school-by-school reporting of budgetary allocations to ensure that inner-city schools and programs for the disadvantaged receive their fair share of funds that otherwise are diverted elsewhere.

74.

8.

Research, Development, and Application

Continued research is necessary to provide the ground for developing effective methods and materials for educating the disadvantaged.

If research is necessary for education in general, it is doubly important for the education of the disadvantaged. Here there is need not only for greatly increased knowledge of the learning process and the techniques of effective instruction. There is equal need for understanding human aspiration and motivation, the sentiment of self-esteem, or the impact of the experiences of infancy on rates of learning. The scientific foundations of education must be expanded to provide a more comprehensive coverage of relevant sociological and anthropological as well as psychological problems. We are just beginning to appreciate, for example, the tremendous impact of the child's early environment on the development of his intellect and character. Continued research and experiment should open up many avenues and some of these should move us toward success.

Meanwhile, some things have been clearly learned. In early childhood education it has been established, for instance, that low pupil-

teacher ratios are essential and that small groups should be employed often. Objectives must be clearly defined and made the basis of instructional materials. Teachers must receive training specifically related to the tasks before them, and parents must become positively involved with their children's schooling. It is also now evident, as we have noted, that programs of brief duration are not effective. Nor are those programs effective that involve simply the addition of equipment or personnel where the practices used have been shown to be ineffectual.

Another example of recent experimentation illustrates the possibilities for new approaches to learning. Sixth graders were appointed on an experimental basis to serve as tutors for kindergarten children from disadvantaged neighborhoods. While almost all the high-achieving tutors showed high morale, good attendance, and improvement in reading skills, it was the low-achieving tutors upon whom the program made its most important impact. These low achievers made significant gains in their own learning. Meanwhile, the learning rate of the children was apparently unrelated to the achievement levels of their sixth-grade tutors.

There is no single best way to teach disadvantaged children, but adapting the method to individual differences is the key strategy. This requires a recognition of the differences in learning styles. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, for example, points out that "young learners, particularly those whose background experiences we classify as disadvantaged, need an abundance of sensory and motor experiences dealing with concrete objects before they proceed to abstract learning. These experiences may be with construction toys and games, simple science gear, pegboards, wooden squares and triangles, or with any of a number of manipulative objects around which language, arithmetic, and science abstractions can be built."[1] Teaching the monetary system effectively is aided by the use of coins and practice in making change. If stories are read, there must be pictures—meaningful pictures. Teaching about the relationships of people with each other requires role playing or some other technique which involves the children personally. By employing near and familiar materials the school can better motivate the child and also help him to cope more successfully with the abstract concepts essential to intellectual growth.

Knowledge of this kind is moving us well along the road to an understanding of what we must do to produce a true learning environ-

---

1/U.S. National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, *Annual Report*, p. 11.

ment for all children. For it is increasingly apparent that much of what is being learned in the effort to educate disadvantaged children will redound to the benefit of all children.

Among the causes of our school failures with the disadvantaged has been our failure thus far to evaluate effectively the concrete results of experimental programs. Often we do not know the causes of good or bad results, nor indeed do we always know what results are desirable. By using the shotgun approach in searching for solutions, we are usually unable to identify the specific causes of improvements where they occur. Even where the data are available, we sometimes do not know which components of multifaceted programs have made the difference. An illustration is the Higher Horizons project in New York City, which has already been mentioned. Here some encouraging gains have been reported, but causes and effects have not been clearly established; where effective relationships could be drawn, broad applications of new knowledge and techniques have seldom occurred. Everywhere there are experimental projects, but in few places are these more than prototypes.

A valuable experimental model on an exceptionally large scale is the Department of Defense program, Project One Hundred Thousand. The purpose of this program was to employ modern instructional techniques in qualifying for the armed forces men who were below established standards. As a result, 95 per cent of these below-par men satisfactorily completed basic training, although 13 per cent of them required extra or special training. Even in the formal skill courses the rate of success was high—87 per cent. Of the original number, 63 per cent entered technical specialties. The rate of separation from military service after twenty-two months for those admitted to the program was 12.2 per cent as against a 6.6 per cent separation rate for a control group.[2]

The particular significance of this program is that it is perhaps the only *total* effort to educate the disadvantaged. Here the military services generated and coordinated joint efforts comprising the elements we have advocated for such an endeavor: housing, clothing, food, subsistence, medical aid, entertainment. The question is, how can we produce this type of comprehensive program in an urban setting under civilian management?

2/From the initiation of the project in October 1966 through December 1970, 313,800 men in the military services had received special training. The program includes basic literacy courses and formal classroom instruction as well as on-the-job training in technical skills having relevance to civilian occupations; see U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Secretary, *Project One Hundred Thousand: Characteristics and Performance of "New Standards" Men* (Washington, D.C.: December 1969).

Full-scale Models for Study

In our policy statement on *Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School*, we firmly advocated a strong national program of research and development in education.

> The progress of the schools over the last few years has clearly exhibited the worth of educational research and development. Much has been learned about relating subject matter to instructional goals, refining the techniques of explanation, cultivating the capacity for discovery, and defining other aspects of the learning process. But much more needs to be known if the schools are to continue to move ahead. Better techniques must be developed for disseminating such knowledge and applying it in actual instruction. Both basic and applied research are necessary if false starts, blind alleys, and wasted time are to be avoided.

Continued research is necessary, not only in the areas already cited, such as infant development, but also in social organization and social change. For the improvement of education for the disadvantaged requires more than merely coping with the environment, however successfully; it requires changing the environment itself. Here is a large array of problems which includes the difficult area of personal and social values; but unless we are prepared to attack these problems equipped with reliable knowledge of human behavior, the chances for real success are low.

Among the matters demanding the attention of competent study are the organization, management, and financing of the schools. Our methods of financing the schools are often antiquated, and our techniques of school organization and administration have failed to keep pace with the growing complexities of institutional life and the advancement of management principles.

We agree fully with the federal Commission on Instructional Technology in its report to the President when it says, "Education has long needed a national research effort, commensurate with those in agriculture and health, focused on the improvement of learning and teaching. Now is the prime moment to bring all available resources to bear in strengthening educational research, development, and innovation, which for far too long have commanded insufficient funds and talent."[3]

3/U.S. Commission on Instructional Technology, *To Improve Learning*, p. 43.

In urging continuing research in educational problems, we recognize that research findings are of practical value only if they are effectively applied in developments which clearly exhibit their value in improving education. The results of research must be tried and tested and eventually packaged in forms which make them available for actual use in schools or homes. The value of educational research lies not simply in the increase of knowledge but in the practical application of that knowledge in improving learning. A variety of techniques can be employed in effectively disseminating research findings, ranging from information centers and demonstration classrooms or laboratories to selected school districts employed as full-scale models for study.*

It is this latter concept particularly—the use of full-scale models, perhaps on the order of Project One Hundred Thousand—that we believe has the greatest potential for bringing into play and testing many of the promising ideas developed through research. **We strongly urge the development of social and educational laboratories—coordinated community programs involving not only educational institutions but other public and private social agencies—on a scale that is large enough to provide an environment for the disadvantaged and in which effective educational practices not only can be sorted out but also employed with a real possibility of success.**

---

*See Memorandum by MR. DANIEL PARKER, page 81.

Memoranda of Comment, Reservation, or Dissent

Page 9—By ALLAN SPROUL:

Success is a word with connotations in our society which now appear to be alienating many middle and upper income youth. While this policy statement is specifically concerned with the education of the urban disadvantaged it should not, even by implication, suggest a lack of awareness of the need for some restructuring of our whole educational system.

Page 10—By DANIEL PARKER:

The decision to limit these studies mainly to large city disadvantaged children and youth omits other disadvantaged groups warranting specific study. One of these is education for the urban disadvantaged adult, whose job training has been found to be substantially impeded by lack of basic education.

The other group, omitted by definition, is the rural and non-metropolitan disadvantaged. They are germane to these studies not only because of their special educational needs, per se, but as well because success in attaining the objectives of this study will augment an already burdensome problem of one-way migration from rural to metropolitan areas.

Page 14—By ALLAN SPROUL:

There are a lot of raisins in this pudding, but they are encased in a mélange of noble intention and good advice without adequate consideration of priorities or means. Whatever the educational value of the statement may be in an area in which many studies have been and are being made, the thrust toward effective action is diffuse and weak.

80.

Page 14—By PHILIP SPORN:

I cannot agree that preschooling is desirable for all children and would like to change "is" in the first line to "may be." Certainly in many families, what preschooling can do for a child can be and is being done much better by the father and mother.

Page 15—By PHILIP SPORN:

I am not sure that education alone can provide children and youth with a sense of community and a comprehension of the world of work. I believe that education can provide a very important part of this, but if the family background is one that rejects the community and rejects work, then a good deal of the potential effects of education is not going to be realized.

Page 18—By PHILIP SPORN:

I strongly endorse these two sentences. The idea that a child is too young to think about life's work is based on the philosophy of keeping children wrapped in cellophane. Further, I believe that not only disadvantaged but even advantaged children can gain enormously in obtaining aim and motivation, and indeed stability, in their process of growing up by establishing very early in life some preliminary objectives; i.e., how they are going to live when they grow up and what they will want to do as productive members of society.

Pages 21 and 79—By DANIEL PARKER:

Explicit mention should be made urging all segments of the educational establishment to give fair trial to innovations even if they seem not to comply with established convention. Effective participation by business in these special educational circumstances may be hindered if made to comply with conventions evolved mainly to regulate the mode and practices of education for other than the disadvantaged. New techniques and experiments such as the Harlem Street Academy program should be judged on their merits and the feasibility of extending them, not on their compliance with possibly irrelevant established educational practices.

Page 26—By PHILIP SPORN:

I would like to expand this by removing the period after "future" and adding "—a better future than their present."

Page 30—By PHILIP SPORN:

I believe that the concept developed is one that is based on very perceptive insight into a facet of the life of children who are forced to grow up under disadvantaged circumstances. The fact that they can be taught to understand that being disadvantaged, while not something for a child to choose as an atmosphere in which to grow up, still can be capitalized in one's development is a very important idea and can add immeasureably to the drive of a person who starts disadvantaged to completely change his social and economic position.

Page 31—By PHILIP SPORN:

While I cannot take issue with this recommendation, it seems to me it stops too soon. The whole statement is keyed to the concept of a society *giving something* to the children of ethnic minorities. But a society that is prepared to do that very thing *can receive a great deal also.* What of the advantage that can accrue to a society from perceiving and developing respect for the group values of the ethnic minorities in its midst, which will broaden the outlook of the ethnic majority and give it a better understanding of the richness of American life and a greater pride in that life which can give solid substance to the American dream.

Page 41—By PHILIP SPORN:

The important point in connection with giving a child a solid feeling for the world of work and the individual's relationship to it, which is desirable for all children, has a particular value in very early giving the child orientation, whereas children who do not receive this occupy a sort of unstable, floating position in society. From the record of lamentable campus disturbances over the past few years, it is quite clear that those young men and women who were properly oriented—and this was particularly true of students in the law, business, medical, and engineering schools—simply did not participate in campus burnings and had no desire to see their campuses burned. The reason for that was they were much more grown up, and they sympathetically evaluated what the college and university were doing to contribute to the completion of the first part of their education to be able to take their place in a productive world.

82.

Appendix A

The Poor in the Cities

POVERTY in the United States is officially measured by a fixed standard of real income based on the cost of a minimal human diet. Any household is officially defined as "poor" by the Social Security Administration if its annual money income is less than three times the cost (in *current prices*) of a minimal diet for the persons in that household.[1] The "poverty level" income for a four-person (nonfarm) household was $3,553 in 1968 and $3,743 in 1969. When the figure is officially revised for 1970, taking price increases into account, it will be about $3,950.

The concept of poverty is obviously complex and controversial, so all statistics concerning it must be used and interpreted with caution. Economic disadvantage is quite commonly accompanied by various forms of social, educational, and cultural disadvantage. The objective of this policy statement is to attack the total problem through the improvement of education. Our use of an income approach to disadvantage is for convenience and in recognition of the centrality of the economic factor.

According to the government definition of poverty, there were 24.3 million poor persons in the United States in 1969. The poor are disproportionately members of minority ethnic groups, though precise census data for most of these groups are impossible to obtain. The number of nonwhite poor in 1969 was 7.6 million, of whom 7.2 million were black and the other 400,000 were mainly American Indians, Japanese, and Chinese. The number of poor whites totalled 16.7 million in 1969, and there are only rough indications of the ethnic composition of this group.

The disadvantaged in increasing numbers are becoming residents of the urban centers, with the inner suburbs included in this category. Although population density in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) is decreasing (1967-68) for nonwhites (−8.9 per cent), it is declining more rapidly for whites (−13.5 per cent).[2] Those who can afford to do so are moving in increasing numbers to the outer suburbs or to high-priced apartments. Moreover, the number of city dwellers who send their children to private schools is increasing.

A clear indicator of the relation of urban residence to disadvantage was a recent study showing the median income per family in one large city to be a function of the distance of residence from the central business district. At the six-mile limit, the city limit, and the suburban limit, median income increases over a span of a few years were 3 per cent, 5 per cent, and 37 per cent respectively. Considering that the cost of living rose 12 per cent during the reported period, class distinction clearly became more closely related to location of domicile.[3]

It appears that there is presently a slowdown of rural to urban migration among blacks. Although the major trends in comparison to whites continues, the 1969 intercensus statistics show dramatic decreases in this rate of black migration. The

number of blacks now moving to the central cities from rural areas is estimated at 100,000 per year as compared to 370,000 per year before 1966.[4] Furthermore, the mean annual percentage change in suburban population (including inner suburbs) for blacks was 8 per cent compared to 2 per cent for whites. Blacks finally appear to be moving throughout metropolitan areas just as other ethnic immigrants have done in the past.[5] Nevertheless, 43 per cent of poor blacks resided in central cities compared to 25 per cent of poor whites. Within SMSA's the poverty rate of blacks was three times that of whites and in actual numbers, poor blacks represented a larger percentage of the poor, increasing from 57 to 66 per cent in SMSA's of over 1 million persons.[6]

But it is the rapid nature of the change rather than the absolute statistics that has caused the nation's major social problems. In less than half a century, American blacks have been transformed from a predominantly rural class to a group that is 70 per cent urban.[7] During the decade of the 1950's, two million whites left the city and two million blacks took their places.[8] In the two years 1968-69, white migration to the suburbs grew one-half million per year, up from 148,000 per year before 1966.[9] Since 1940, the black population in New York City has increased two and one-half times to 14 per cent of the total; in Philadelphia, two times to 26 per cent; in Detroit, three times to 29 per cent; in Los Angeles, six times, from 75,000 to 465,000.[10]

There is evidence of some improvement in the position of the disadvantaged minorities relative to that of the advantaged majority. In regard to educational attainment at the secondary level, the latest available data, although fragmented, show certain gains for blacks. By 1969, 61 per cent of all blacks between the ages of twenty-five and twenty-nine in metropolitan areas had graduated from high school, as compared with 42 per cent in 1960. The median years of school completed by whites and blacks had closed by 1969 to 12.7 and 12.3 respectively; in 1960, the figures were 12.4 years for whites and 11.4 for blacks.[11] The narrowing of the gap over the years is demonstrated by other data showing that in 1940 the difference in educational attainment between nonwhite and white men was 3.3 years, that for nonwhite and white women was 2.7 years.[12]

But the higher-education picture for blacks is far less encouraging. In 1960, the percentage of blacks who had graduated from college almost equalled the white rate of twenty years earlier.[13] The 1969 data give rise to added pessimism; the percentage of blacks who have graduated from college had risen from only 5 to 7 per cent since 1960, while the white rate had risen from 14 to 19 per cent.[14]

Though the gap in median incomes between whites and blacks by educational level has diminished at all levels, blacks almost uniformly have incomes only 75 per cent that of whites.[15] Nevertheless, between 1960 and 1969 the median income of black families has almost doubled. In 1960, only 0.6 per cent of these families earned $15,000 and over as compared with 8.3 per cent in 1969; and the percentage of black families with incomes between $10,000 and $15,000 rose from 4.3 in 1960 to 15.5 in 1969.[16] But in the poverty group, where the median deficit below the poverty threshold was $993, the income gap for blacks was $1,260 compared to a deficit of $907 for whites.

The income gains for nonwhites can be attributed almost entirely to geographic redistribution. From a relative point of view, there would appear to have been no decline in nonwhite poverty in the twenty years prior to 1966. On an absolute scale, from 1959 to 1969, white poverty dropped 41 per cent compared to a drop of 27 per cent for blacks. Poverty among members of other minority groups declined by about 20 per cent during the decade.[17]

Appendix B

Plight of the Mexican-Americans

In recent years there has been a massive migration of other minority groups besides blacks into metropolitan areas. Since 1940, the Puerto Rican minority in New York City has increased sevenfold to 700,000,[18] and nearly 40 per cent of the American Indians are now estimated to live in urban areas. Particularly significant has been the migration of Mexican-Americans, who have moved in very large numbers into the cities of the Midwest as well as the Southwest and Far West. However, data regarding the Mexican-Americans is almost totally inadequate. Indeed, the number of research studies, scholarly writings, and fiscal appropriations dealing with Mexican-American problems is so meager that this area has been labeled "the most signal failure in American education."[19]

Estimates of the number of Mexican-Americans in the United States range from 4 to 12 million. This wide-ranging estimate is due to several factors. First, large numbers of Mexican-Americans are known to be in this country illegally. Further, unfamiliarity with the law, combined with misinformation commonly circulating in their communities about government deportation practices, have caused many Mexican-Americans to avoid census takers and to refuse to acknowledge their ethnic origins. There is also the problem of terminology. When is one a Mexican-American?[20] The only differentiation familiar to Mexican-Americans of the Southwest is Anglo-American versus Mexican-American. Finally, census figures tally only the number of Mexican-Americans in five southwestern states, even though very large numbers reside in other states such as Michigan and Illinois.

From what evidence is available, the educational situation of the Mexican-Americans is a very bleak one. The median for years of schooling completed in 1960 by Mexican-Americans in the Southwest was 7.1, and for the nonwhite in the region (primarily American Indians) the figure was 9.0 years. By contrast, the median for Anglo-Americans in the Southwest was 12.1 years.[21]

A study by scholars at the University of Texas in 1960 found 708,238 Mexican-American children and young people of school age living in the state. Of the 424,308 between the ages of five and fifteen, 20 per cent were not enrolled in school. In the sixteen- to nineteen-year-old group of 99,902, 44 per cent were not enrolled. A study in California in the same year found that over 50 per cent of the men and almost 50 per cent of the women among the Mexican-Americans had not gone beyond the eighth-grade level compared to 27 per cent of the males and 25 per cent of the females in the general population fourteen years of age and over.[22] Another California study shows Mexican Americans lag even two years behind blacks in achievement and that their dropout rates are also higher. In the Denver public schools, 12 per cent of the Mexican-Americans of school age are dropouts as compared to 9 per cent in the general population.

85.

Notes

1/Anthony Downs, *Who Are the Urban Poor?* Revised edition, CED Supplementary Paper Number 26, p. 1.

2/David L. Birch, *The Economic Future of City and Suburb*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 30, p. 24.

3/Robert J. Havighurst, "Metropolitan Development and the Educational System," *The School Review*, Vol. 69, No. 3 (Autumn 1961), p. 253.

4/John Herbers, "Negro Migration to Cities Is Found To Drop Sharply," *The New York Times* (February 28, 1969), p. 20.

5/David L. Birch, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

6/Philip M. Hauser, "On the Poor in the United States," CED background research paper.

7/Philip M. Hauser, "Demographic Factors in the Integration of the Negro," *Daedalus*, Vol 94, No. 4 (Fall 1965), p. 851.

8/Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in Black and White* (New York: Random House, 1964), p. 31.

9/Cited in Miriam K. Ringo, "Industrial Stake and Role in Unemployment Solution," unpublished paper.

10/Charles E. Silberman, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31.

11/U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Areas*, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 33 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 3, 1970), pp. 38, 40.

12/Philip M. Hauser, "Demographic Factors in the Integration of the Negro," p. 855.

13/Philip M. Hauser, "Demographic Factors in the Integration of the Negro," p. 856.

14/U.S. Bureau of the Census, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

15/U.S. Bureau of the Census, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

16/U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Income in 1969 of Families and Persons in the United States*, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 75 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 14, 1970) p. 23.

17/Philip M. Hauser, "On the Poor in the United States."

18/Charles E. Silberman, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

19/Clark S. Knowlton, "Special Education Problems of the Spanish-speaking Minorities of the Southwest," in *The Conditions for Educational Equality*, CED Supplementary Paper Number 34.

20/According to the government definition, "Persons of Mexican birth or ancestry are classified as white unless they are definitely of some other racial stock, such as Indian." See U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 91st edition (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 3.

21/Ralph Yarborough, "Two Proposals for a Better Way of Life for Mexican-Americans of the Southwest," in U.S. Congress, *Congressional Record*, Vol. 113, Part 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 599.

22/Faye L. Bumpass, "Supplemental Statement: Mexican American Educational Problems in the Southwest," in U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, *Bilingual Education: Hearings* before the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, Part 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 67.

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Committee for Economic Development is composed of 200 leading businessmen and educators.

CED is devoted to these basic objectives:

1) *To develop, through objective research and informed discussion, findings and recommendations for private and public policy which will contribute to preserving and strengthening our free society, achieving steady economic growth at high employment and reasonably stable prices, increasing productivity and living standards, providing greater and more equal opportunity for every citizen, and improving the quality of life for all.*

2) *To bring about increasing understanding by present and future leaders in business, government, and education and among concerned citizens of the importance of these objectives and the ways in which they can be achieved.*

CED's work is supported largely by voluntary contributions from business and industry, foundations, and individuals. It is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nonpolitical.

The Trustees, who generally are Presidents or Board Chairmen of corporations and Presidents of universities, are chosen for their individual capacities rather than as representatives of any particular interests. By working with scholars they unite business judgment and experience with scholarship in analyzing the issues and developing recommendations to resolve the economic problems that constantly arise in a dynamic and democratic society.

Through this business-academic partnership, CED endeavors to develop policy statements and other research products that commend themselves as guides to public and business policy; for use as texts in college economic and political science courses and in management training courses; for consideration and discussion by newspaper and magazine editors, columnists and commentators; and for distribution abroad to promote better understanding of the American economic system.

CED believes that by enabling businessmen to demonstrate constructively their concern for the general welfare, it is helping business to earn and maintain the national and community respect essential to the successful functioning of the free enterprise capitalist system.