DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 391 EA 007 316

AUTHOR	Corbett, Anne
TITLE	Innovation in Education -- England. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France). Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
REPORT NO	80.547; CERI-EI-71.06
PUB DATE	28 Jun 71
NOTE	47p.; Related documents are ED 069 572 and EA 007 313-316
AVAILABLE FROM	OECD Publications Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 (Free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; *Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Educational Innovation; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Government Role; Organizational Change; School District Autonomy
IDENTIFIERS	*England

ABSTRACT

This publication is one in a series of case studies dealing with educational innovation in various western European countries and the United States. This particular report discusses educational innovation in England. Because the British central government is much less involved in educational matters than are many other governments, English educational innovations originate from diverse sources and tend to be very pragmatic in approach. For this reason, the author devotes much of her analysis to examining who the innovators are in English education, what they are trying to change, and where the obstacles to educational change lie. Three examples of recent innovations are described to illustrate different approaches to educational innovation in England. (JG)

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Centre for Research and Innovation

CERI/EI/71.06

Technical Report

Paris, 28th June, 1971

Or. Engl.

INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

- ENGLAND -

by

Anne Corbett

2

Free

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The following case study is one in a series of five dealing with innovation in education. All the studies are descriptive in nature and, as the work of five different authors writing in their personal capacity, they represent five quite individual syntheses and interpretations of vast amounts of information. Yet the confusion that might be expected from this method does not result. What emerges from these studies is instead a reasonably coherent statement of educational responses to the post-war demands of many more people for more and better education.

Perhaps it is not remarkable that the demands have been exerted so consistently on such a variety of nations, nor that the response to them has for the most part been so quick and positive. The nations examined in this book are remarkably similar in that all have a long and honourable tradition of public education, an industrialised economy and a high standard of living. At first glance it even appears that their solutions to the problems posed by recent educational demands are unusually similar: structural reform, curricular reform, compensatory and/or individualised learning systems - examples of each are easy to find in any setting. Yet a closer reading of the five case studies reveals wide and interesting variations: in priorities, in perceived solutions, in strategies evolved or developed to implement them.

Such variety of course reflects to a large extent differences in 'national climate', that peculiar combination of values, objectives, aims and administrative tradition which, aside from language, makes a nation distinctive. The explication of these differences is thus a hidden theme of the five case studies taken as a whole, and an understanding of this hidden theme is necessary to illuminate the more obvious themes of change and growth.

An explanation of this point can be found by comparing, even superficially, Scandinavian countries such as Norway and Sweden on the one hand and the United States of America on the other. At least from the viewpoint of the outside observer, Norway and Sweden have much in common. Both relatively small in terms of population, they can also claim a remarkably unified social and value structure. Furthermore, their style - if such a generalisation can be made - seems to be to have a clear idea of goals and then to set about methodically reaching them. This process is aided by the existence of strong central governments which are able to plan and to legislate with a reasonably clear assurance that what they propose will be achieved. Thus there exists in Norway the National Council for Innovation in Education whose mandate it is to make reality of reform laws passed by the central Parliament. The Parliament, concerned in recent years with "large questions of the role of schools in Society", and sure enough of its constituency, has concerned itself largely with structural reform and new curricula - on a national scale.

The situation in the United States is quite different, even if the question of relative size of total population is ignored. The American federal government is based on a system of checks and balances so fine that it is often hard to determine either the source of impetus or its ultimate manifestation. The situation is further complicated by the well-protected existence of states' rights - particularly the control of education - and, once the issue of taxation is raised, by municipal and regional claims as well. Perhaps more important, the rich diversity of the American population inevitably means conflicting social and ethnic interests, values, and views of national priorities. The past decade of American life has indeed been one of fast-changing goals and objectives and of massive social upheaval. Much of the upheaval has connected itself to education and made demands accordingly: in the light of this political and social background, it is not surprising that American education responded by producing such a variety of innovations in every area and at every level that the final array can be quite bewildering, whilst at the same time providing a vast reservoir of experience for others.

England and the Federal Republic of Germany likewise provide differences quite distinctly their own. Writing of her own country's approach to recent educational change, the author of the English case study notes

> ".....the English style is distinctive. You can seize on it instantly. There is no acceptance of common objectives, except in the most general sense which inspired the last major education act: the need to widen opportunities and eliminate the poverty both of individual children and of the public provision of education (1). There is no national plan for education, no law which specifies where development is necessary as in some OECD countries. There is almost no theory. The point is characteristically made in a recent major report on education (2): 'We invited the help of a number of distinguished educationists and professors of educational philosophy ... They all confirmed the view that general statements of aims were of limited value and that a pragmatic approach to education was likely to be more fruitful.'"

The reference to "two decades of non-reform" in German education, a phrase coined by Professor S.B. Robinsohn, is slowly becoming eroded, especially during the last two years, which have been marked by fundamental changes in many parts of the school system. With increasing co-operation between the Länder and with the initiatives of the new Ministry for Education and Science, the need for a more systematic approach to educational reform, and especially to educational experimentation, seems more important in Germany today than in many other countries.

Despite these differences in background and style, the five country studies do show one overriding problem in common: the need to change and improve their educational systems. Furthermore, as their experience increases, they all face the reality that explicit measures to facilitate the management of educational change are necessary, that innovation and improvement cannot be haphazardly left to chance.

PART I

INTRODUCTION

English education is full of changes. Primary education is being made much freer. Secondary education is being reorganised to break down the old divisions between academic and practical schools for pupils who were supposed to be distinguishable at the age of eleven. Post-school education in universities and local authority colleges is being energetically expanded. Much of the curriculum for students of all ages and all levels of intelligence is being reappraised. Teachers and administrators are facing more urgently than ever before new challenges on what to teach and how, in the light of new knowledge, new appreciation of the way children learn and new demands from society about what children should learn.

The aims of those involved in changing English education are the same as change-makers in countries the world over. Socially they want to widen opportunities. Educationally they want to emphasise learning rather than teaching. And where appropriate they want to update the content of the curriculum.

The English style of change is, however, distinctive. Within the school system, the subject of this report, you can seize on two characteristics. First, innovation (meaning consciously introduced change) comes from many sources. Individual teachers have the freedom - as professionals they are encouraged - not to let the content or method of education ossify. This is a real freedom. Individual local authorities have much scope to organise their schools and may develop strategies for influencing the content of schooling too. But, central government, in contrast with government in many OECD countries, is relatively weak at instituting change and only spasmodically involved. Change may also come through a whole network of interests: universities, teacher-training institutions, professional associations, parents and employers, and indeed through the only compulsory inmates of the education system, the pupils and students.

Secondly, the approach is pragmatic. There is in English education no acceptance of common objectives or priorities, except in the most general sense which inspired the last major education act(1): the need to widen opportunities and to counter the poverty within the system. There is no national plan for education, no law, as in Norway which specifies where development is necessary. There is almost no theory of change. The English approach was summed up in a recent report on education(2). "We invited the help of a number of distinguished

---

(1) Education Act 1944. See New Law of Education, sixth ed. George Taylor and John B. Saunders. Butterworths 1965, p.3.

(2) Children and Their Primary Schools (The Plowden report) H.M.S.O. 1967, para. 501.

educationists and professors of educational philosophy .... They all confirmed the view that general statements of aims were of limited value and that a pragmatic approach to education was likely to be more fruitful."

Such a decentralised approach has obvious disadvantages: change is uneven and the reasons for particular successes or failures are often not appreciated. But the immediately obvious solution of more direction and more centralisation has, where it has been tried, been resisted. And, I would argue, rightly. English-style innovation has two great strengths. It is expected to be diverse. And it relies on the active involvement of those in the classroom as much as, or more, than of those in committees. The people who institute change may well be those who have thought it out in the first place.

Educationists, who want to make the process of change less time-consuming and less wasteful of individual effort need -to quote one man who has been intimately involved, Geoffrey Caston(1)-to discover how "to boost professional self-confidence in a pluralistic setting." They should not be concerned merely with producing strategies, models of change and all the stock in trade of the methods men. They need, so an English argument runs, to devise institutions which can support without directing.

In an international context the most interesting aspect of English innovation is thus likely to centre on the experience of two bodies created to stimulate innovation and development, the Schools Council and the National Council for Educational Technology. The Schools Council is concerned with school examinations and curriculum, the National Council works with industry as well as schools. This report looks at some of their school-directed work.

But since they do not monopolise the means of change, even in their areas of special interest, this report also looks at who the innovators are in English education, what they are trying to change and where the obstacles are. Three examples are given to show the current variety. The primary education example shows the most traditional form of innovation: coming from the local education authority and the schools. It also shows a particularly thorough appreciation that change in content needs to be expressed in a change in method. The secondary reorganisation example is the most political and shows the central government at its most active. It is largely organisational. The curriculum development example, shows innovatory strategy at its most developed in English terms.

A final point: one of the other distinguishing features about English educational innovation is the lack of documentation. This is therefore a largely personal report.

---

(1) Journal of Curriculum Studies, May 1971.

PART II

STRUCTURES AND STRATEGIES

This part deals with the status and function of the various bodies involved in educational innovation and their relationship.

There are three main points to note: (1) that, historically, change has been rooted in the schools, or at any rate the local education authority, (2) that attempts at centralised initiative have not been successful and tendencies to centralisation have been resisted, (3) that the new strategy is a central servicing operation to assist local initiative.

First, therefore, in this section is the local level: the teaching profession and the local education authorities. The national level follows: the Department of Education and Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools (the HMIs) and then the National Council for Educational Technology, and the strategies they use: in-service training and the teachers' centres. Last come those who have had a long standing role in the promotion of ideas: the research bodies, the teacher training institutions (universities and colleges of education) and government advisory committees.

The Local Roots

1. Teachers

The freedom of teachers is part of an English legend. The legend has some substance. Schools are not directed by local or central government as to either what or how they should teach (with the exception that they have to provide religious education).

But freedom of ordinary teachers to decide on organisation and curriculum depends on the head. The head teacher decides how the school should be organised, what books and equipment should be used and what should be the relationship with parents. The head has wide areas of discretion.

The head in turn is subject to a number of restraints: the pressure of exams, competition to get a university place, parental disquiet. The local authority's chief education officer may apply pressure if he feels that a head is being inefficient. But there is little to threaten a head's security: he is almost impossible to sack. Nor does the head expect to feel threatened. There is generally a free and easy relationship between heads, their governors and the authority's advisors.

At its best, the teachers' use of their freedom can be reflected in an astonishing degree of change. A famous and well documented example of a revolution in learning which was entirely school based is the "progressive movement" of the 1920s and 1930s(1). More recently, individual teachers have not only changed the whole content and method of their pupils' education, but have, through books and lecturing, started changes which have gone a long way beyond their own schools(2).

Some of the teachers professional associations have been active. The Science Masters Association and the Modern Language Association were instrumental in securing much of the early curriculum development funds for their own subjects. The National Association for Teaching English has established an international reputation.

The converse, of course, operates: the teacher can be a barrier to change. Much innovation, particularly in the curriculum, threatens teachers. Where traditionally they have been the source of authority, they increasingly find themselves as one among many with a view to contribute. They face all the challenges as the sociologist, Basil Bernstein, points out of having to move from a "given" to an "achieved" role(3). On top of all this they have to try to reduce innovation to a communicable level in terms of management and organisation.

The teacher in the most critical position, potentially the greatest barrier, is the head; though the position of the head in the primary school may be less vulnerable than the head in the secondary school. The primary school head is likely to be one generalist teacher among many. He can exert an immense authority within the school; he is expected to go into every classroom. The secondary school larger, more hierarchic, is potentially more bureaucratic. It is likely to be compartmented by its specialisms and the head less able, therefore, to exert control over the content or method of colleagues' approaches.

2. Local education authorities

The structure of English education is often defined as a national system locally administered. True, there are national legal obligations on authorities to provide education and some national regulations about the way they provide it: uniform pay scales for teachers and officials, centrally-defined cost limits for buildings, national systems of examinations. Yet local education authorities are free to organise their schools as they wish. They administer the system, they spend the money. In many cases they take the initiative. What happens may depend on their political complexion, their traditions, the accident of geography, and indeed their size(4).

---

(1) The Educational Innovators. W.A.C. Stewart.

(2) Examples are Sybil Marshall and David Holbrook.

(3) New Society, 14 September 1967.

(4) There are at present 163 local education authorities. The smallest has a total population of 30,000, the largest outside London a population of over one million. A Royal Commission on Local Government recommended in 1969 that authorities should fall within a population range of 200,000 to 500,000. On their recommendations this would reduce the numbers of authorities to 58.

They certainly vary. Authorities have different ages of transfer from primary to secondary schooling, different forms of secondary schooling and many differences on discretionary provision - the scale of nursery education, allowances for books and equipment, the numbers of teachers above the minimum. They have approached new developments at notably different speeds. Some of these local education authorities have started the primary school revolution in Britain, and some have paved the way for the government to adopt a non-selective secondary education system.(2)

Local advisers or inspectors

Most local education authorities have teams of promoted teachers as advisers, the range and degree of specialisation usually depending upon the authority's size. Advisers' (or inspectors') work consists largely of visiting schools and of running in-service training courses and generally trying to improve mediocre teaching. They also influence the system through the active part they play in the promotion of heads.

Increasingly, however, they are being called on to interpret significant new developments in teaching. In certain cases in primary education they have been notably influential. For just as in the primary school the head has easy access to different classes and teachers, so the primary adviser has easy access to the head. The advisers seem to have been more successful with maths than languages, with science than humanities. Teachers' centres offer them new opportunities of development work with teachers.

As new curriculum projects proliferate, the role of the advisers as necessary guides and interpreters may become still more important.

Teachers' centres

The idea of local development centres for teachers comes from the Schools Council. There are 500 or so now in existence most have been set up and are run by the local education authorities; a few have been set up by universities or colleges of education.

Basically, teachers' centres are intended to be "very local, very accessible centres where teachers can meet, regularly and informally, to test, display, to devise and to discuss their own work and the work of others. If we are having a curriculum revolution, this is how we hope to achieve it. It is at these centres that teachers, teacher educators, local authority staffs and university workers come together - with sometimes those of the youth service, or the employers or the other users of education. The promise of these centres is that they will reflect what can succeed in this town and this village".(1) It may be in a teachers' centre that pressure for a national curriculum project first builds up. It should certainly be there that the results of a national project are evaluated and interpreted through some sort of in-service training. The centres should also stimulate their own development work.

---

(1) Joslyn Owen quoted in Curriculum Innovation in Practice by J. Stuart Maclure, H.M.S.O. 1968.

(2) See p.36 for the effects of a change of government

Their potential is obvious, their achievement less so. Many are recent. They vary in subject coverage and accessibility. They vary in the interest or control that the local authority tries to exercise. They vary in their activities. At a recent Schools Council conference it was discovered that at many centres the emphasis was almost entirely on open discussion and exchange of views and not on devising specific contributions to teaching within certain subject areas. To quote Owen again (1): "As long as the lecture/seminar/discussion group methods of traditional in-service training are regarded as the principal methods appropriate to curriculum development, teachers seem unlikely to provide and to work within their own framework of activity."

The Centre

1. The Department of Education and Science

It is the duty of the Secretary of State for Education and Science (or Minister for Education until 1964) to promote the education of the people of England and Wales and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose. The Education Act of 1944 specifically charges the Secretary of State with the duty "to secure the effective execution, by local authorities under his control, and direction of the national policy for providing a varied and comprehensive educational service in every area."

The Secretary of State's part in directing national policy has, on the whole, been determined in close co-operation with the local education authorities. This is practical politics. To operate smoothly, policies need the support of many of the 163 authorities, a large number of whom will differ from the government in political outlook.

The central government has, however, made a number of important policy decisions since 1944. The system now looks very different from what it was when the act was passed. Thus the all-age elementary schools have disappeared, small rural schools are going, secondary schools are becoming non selective; teacher-training courses have been lengthened from two years to three; unqualified teachers are being edged out of the schools; a local authority sector of higher education has been created, headed by the polytechnics; a great expansion of higher education, including the universities, is taking place.

Mostly the central government influence on the education system is exercised through its control of costs. Some of this control is exercised directly, for example, with the school building programme, with school meals and the number of places in teacher training. Some of it is more indirect but nevertheless quite close. For though most of the current costs of education are met by local authorities, and though the government contribution to those costs is in the form of a general grant, government funds are given on the basis of detailed estimates.

---

(1) Joslyn Owen quoted in Curriculum Innovation in Practice by J. Stuart Maclure, H.M.S.O. 1968.

The interest for this report is that in some of these areas the department has branched out from supervision to development. The policing function - seeing that standards are maintained and that finance is controlled - is no longer its sole one. School building is an example. Here the department's architects branch is behind much of the excellent development work on school design, working in association with local education authorities.

But the content of education is one area where the department has never effectively moved from its supervisory role. The reasons why it has not done so reveal a great deal about the English attitudes to innovation.

In this area, the Secretary of State has two responsibilities: to maintain standards, and to co-ordinate the n[illegible] provision of examinations. Both are generally delegated: [illegible]ons to the Schools Council (see page 18); maintaining standard[illegible] central inspectorate, to Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools.

Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools

There are 550 HMIs. They have four functions. They are required to inspect, assess and report on all schools and on other educational institutions which the government aids financially, except the universities; they give advice and in-service training to the staffs of schools and colleges; they encourage educational development; and they form a link between the Department of Education, the local education authorities and the Schools Council.

The HMIs are in a unique position to know what is going on. They are organised on both a regional and a subject basis with responsibilities extending over most of the education system departments. They can use this unrivalled view of the system to disseminate successful practice, especially through the large number of their in-service training courses. Take their management course for heads, a fairly recently established course. Head teachers involved in secondary reorganisation are likely to face much larger schools, mixed schools where they have been used to single sex, and a much wider range of ability among their pupils. How can they be helped with the much more demanding administrative job? The inspectorate will have seen ways in which some schools manage successfully, and others which have found the usual pitfalls. This experience can be reflected in their courses.

Increasingly they are publishing surveys based on local inspections, which can bring good practice to the notice of an even wider audience. Recent examples include surveys of language laboratories, children with cerebral palsy, home-school relations and organising middle schools for children of 8 to 12 or 9 to 13.

Sometimes individual HMIs become national educational figures. One HMI took on almost single-handed the job of making primary schools aware of new approaches to maths(1). She took the view that it was no

(1) Mathematics in the Primary School, H.M.S.O. 1965.

good just telling teachers about it, they must be involved. Her courses up and down the country became development courses run by teacher training institutions. Another case is mentioned in the primary education chapter.

These examples are typical in that inspectors tend to get caught up individually in innovation. There is no question of the inspectorate taking on the task of introducing widespread change through some institution of its own. It is not charged with the in-service training that should be associated with a curriculum development project. Nor is it involved in a very obvious manner (except through the Schools Council, see page 18) in planning future curriculum development.

It may well strike an outsider as odd: if HMIs are in such a good position to identify trends, why do they not take a stronger developmental role on behalf of the department? This was tried once - and as a government-based strategy it failed.

The curriculum study group

The boost that the Russian sputnik is said to have given American curriculum development in 1957 took a bit of time to cross the Atlantic. But by 1962-63, there were a number of educationists wondering what should be done in England. The Nuffield Foundation was already considering financing a science development project.

Quite independently the Department of Education was thinking about creating a ministry group (analogous with the development group of architects) to stimulate the renewal or redevelopment of school curricula. It appeared to have ready-made resources with the expertise of the HMI's to back up its officials. At the same time the Department had a recommendation from its advisory committee on examinations (the Secondary Schools Examinations Council) that it should devise a new secondary school examination (the Certificate of Secondary Education). It was logical to link exam work with curriculum.

So the Curriculum Study Group was set up, with a dozen or so members and a brief to cover curriculum and examinations. Apart from one academic with a special interest in evaluation, all were officials or HMIs, some of whom had been attached to the Minister's Secondary Schools' Examinations Council. Working with the SSEC, in a very short life the group generated a mass of ideas. It set up the Certificate of Secondary Education, a revolutionary concept in English examinations because it can be school-based if teachers choose so. It worked out priorities for curriculum development projects (it was able to lean on the Nuffield Foundation for ideas on how to run a development project). It formulated a strategy for dissemination and local development through teachers' centres (working, it suggested, to a regional organisation).

But none of this was public knowledge at the time. For the Curriculum Study Group, though potentially creative like the Architects and Buildings Branch development group, ran into almost immediate trouble. In part it may well have been the victim of a larger dispute: the Minister of Education was already quarrelling with the teachers' and local authority organisations on teachers' pay machinery. The CSG was thus a handy extra weapon. Local education authorities and teachers alike were up in arms at the idea of a government department "ursurping"

their responsibilities. The charges stuck. Correspondence in an educational journal at the time immortalised the opposition: "We've fought two world wars only to be faced with this."

Within a few months of the establishment of the Curriculum Study Group, the Minister of Education agreed to its abolition and that instead there should be machinery for the development of schools curricula and examinations representative of all education interests: teachers, local authorities, voluntary bodies and the universities. A working party(1) was established to devise such machinery. This move signalled the end of the Curriculum Study Group and the beginning of the Schools Council for the Curriculum and Examinations.

So the Group was a failure. Or was it? In fact it seems that it failed only on the most limited interpretation. It failed as a ministry group. One of the civil servants involved (the late Derek Morrell), who within a few months of the establishment of the Curriculum Study Group was instrumental in getting the Schools Council working party set up, viewed it differently. In the long term, he argued, the Curriculum Study Group was unlikely to be as effective as the architects' development group; it was not because of its methods, but because it was attached to the wrong power base. With school building there was no doubt of the minister's control: he held the purse strings. But with the curriculum at that stage no one quite knew whether teacher control was a myth or not. It was only when the Curriculum Study Group was set up that it became clear from the reactions to it that control of the curriculum genuinely rested in an area occupied by teachers and local education authorities. It became obvious then that the Curriculum Study Group should be the servant of other masters.

The methods of the Curriculum Study Group, as Morrell suggested, have been triumphantly vindicated in getting curriculum development work moving in England. When the CSG moved in as the strong secretariat for the newly created Schools Council it moved in with ideas for development and ideas for putting them into operation, and gave it the sort of boost that would never have come just with evolution.

Research

After the experience of the Curriculum Study Group, the Department of Education seems likely to revert to a more indirect role in curriculum innovation. But this is potentially important, especially where research is concerned (see page 23 for other research bodies). The DES research budget has grown from £20,000 in 1962-63 to nearly £370,000 in 1967-68, by which time more than £2 million was committed on 135 projects. The DES generally aims to link grants to projects with policy implications. Nevertheless this is, by continental standards, a half hearted dirigisme.

The best known example is the support for an "action-research" project into educational priority area programmes, which the DES finances

---

(1) The Lockwood Working Party which produced the Schools Curricula and Examinations, H.M.S.O. 1964.

together with the Social Science Research Council with a three year grant of £175,000. This research project is under the direction of Dr. A.H. Halsey of Nuffield College, Oxford. It is aimed at finding ways and, to some extent, evaluating methods of improving the attainment of children in impoverished circumstances, of encouring their teachers and of linking home and school. The project is also experimenting with a pre-school language programme. It is, in English terms, a breakthrough to assert that reforms in social policy may be conducted through social science experiment: though at this stage it is too early to say whether the faith pinned on the research will be justified.

The New Style Innovators

The Nuffield Foundation, the Schools Council and the National Council for Educational Technology have an aim in common. They are committed to stimulating self-conscious and coherent change. Nuffield and the Schools Council, both primarily concerned with curriculum development, also share a method. Though the Schools Council's functions range wider than Nuffield's, they have both concentrated their support on curriculum development teams working to an elaborate and seemingly efficient procedure. This section describes them and discusses the strategies. NCET is mainly concerned with the management of innovation and I shall consider that separately.

1. The Nuffield Foundation

English curriculum development owes the Nuffield Foundation a great debt, for it pioneered the idea of curriculum development on a national scale while at the same time maintaining the principle that teachers should play a large, if not dominant, role in development. It started by taking up some of the ideas of the teachers' specialist associations and offered to finance and organise full-time development work.

The Nuffield Foundation is a charitable trust which was set up in the 1940s. Its interests extend across the social services and to scientific and medical research. But education, and particularly curriculum development, has in the last few years absorbed a sizeable part of its budget. Each of the Nuffield projects, claimed the then director, Brian Young, arose from a growing concern among teachers all over the country that the teaching approach in classroom and laboratory needed to be reviewed in the light of recent advances in knowledge, current views on the nature of learning and a new emphasis on the active part that the pupil should play in the learning process. There seemed in the early 1960s to be general agreement that something more was needed than a mere redrafting of syllabuses. The Nuffield curriculum projects were therefore designed to give outstanding teachers the time and the facilities to reappraise their aims and methods in a way which would not be possible while teaching a full programme. Each scheme has aimed to provide "a distillation of what lively teachers are doing to revitalise the classroom presentation of their subject." The Nuffield Foundation has tried to ensure by appropriate examinations that testing (as well as teaching) is directed at acquiring a working understanding of the subject instead of just accumulating facts about it.

The strategy of development is essentially co-operative, with teachers playing a dominant role. The range of Nuffield-supported activities and the fact that these share so many characteristics with the Schools Council's approach (described on page 16) shows how much groundwork had been done before the Schools Council was set up.

Nuffield started with science for secondary school children and then branched out into mathematics and modern languages; later it extended its support to projects for the primary-secondary age range and to projects in linguistics. It was beginning to work in the humanities when the Schools Council was established; and it had moved still further afield with, for instance, its Resources for Learning Project - a study of ways of organising work in schools to make the best possible use of teachers' skills and of new developments in methods and equipment (using machines to help children to learn to read, for example, and designing a correspondence course for sixth formers in subjects where there is a great shortage of specialist teachers).

The programme has diminished since 1967, the time when the Schools Council was getting into its stride. From that time, Nuffield stopped commissioning projects and started to share sponsorship of a number of its projects with the Schools Council. Between 1961 and 1967, it had set up 16 development projects. For much of that time it was in a position of unrivalled influence on curriculum development.

It could have been unhealthy. As Derek Morrell put it(1): "A wrong decision might easily have been made. Had the development work been carried out by a small group of backroom boys without forging close links with many different schools, universities and examining boards, application of the results would have been slow and difficult. In fact application is likely to be rapid."

Nevertheless, Nuffield-sponsored curriculum work has in one sense gone off at a tangent which it is unlikely that any representative body would have followed. Nuffield drew its bright teachers and its trial schools predominantly from the public schools (i.e. the most elite of the independent schools) and thus development work was geared to the special curriculum of these schools. For example the science projects worked on separate chemistry, physics and biology, with courses leading to examinations (i.e. the Ordinary and Advanced Levels of the General Certificate of Education).

Curriculum projects more appropriate to the comprehensive school have been slower to develop, though the science teams, having worked their way through G.C.E. 'A'-level, are now working on combined sciences for the whole of the twelve-year-old age group. The Nuffield public schools bias has also meant that their projects tended not to be of much use to the groups who were quite possibly in the greatest need; the pupils who have disliked school so much that they drop out at the first opportunity but who will have to stay an extra year from 1972-73 when the school leaving age goes up.

---

(1) Derek Morrell: Education and Change. Joseph Payne Memorial Lectures to the College of Preceptors, 1966.

2. The Schools Council

The Schools Council epitomises the most systematic of the English approaches to school innovation. Its novelty lies in an organised approach which is still consistent with the decentralised structure of the English educational system. Having been set up to solve two problems (one professional, one political), the Council has evolved in its solutions to those problems as an important institutional device. It is a force for variety and for greater professionalism in education.

History

Politically the Schools Council had to appease the educational organisations which felt threatened by the Curriculum Study Group. Its complicated constitution is designed to make it a truly representative body, representing all the major education interests and giving teachers a majority on all but its finance committees. Members are nominated by organisations. They cover the spectrum of teachers unions, teacher training and further education interests, the voluntary bodies as well as the local education authorities, the Department of Education and the HMIs.

Its secretariat is also representative. Of its three joint secretaries one is seconded from the Department of Education, one from the HM Inspectorate and one from a local education authority. The joint secretaries are supported by a research team under a research director, field officers responsible for keeping in touch with schools and a large information section.

The professional problem to be overcome was described in 1963 by the Lockwood committee (which devised the Schools Council's constitution and terms of reference (see page 15) as "basically one of inadequate co-ordination where different areas of responsibility touch or overlap", such as insufficient co-ordination between the development of curriculum content or teaching techniques and policy on examinations. These were influences, the committee argued, which could in time seriously diminish the responsibility of schools for their own work.

The Lockwood committee was conditioned by traditional English beliefs about where innovation really takes place: "We note it has long been accepted in England and Wales that the schools should have the fullest possible measure of responsibility for their own work, including responsibility for their own curricula and teaching methods, which should be evolved by their own staff to meet the needs of their own pupils. We reaffirm the importance of this principle and believe that positive action is needed to uphold it .....

"The responsibility placed upon the schools is a heavy one. If it is to be successfully carried the teachers must have adequate time and opportunity for regular reappraisal of the content and methods of their work in the light of new knowledge and of the changing needs of pupils and society. A sustained and planned programme of work is required, going well beyond what can be achieved by occasional conferences and courses or by the thinking and writing of busy teachers in their spare time.

"We concluded therefore that there was no need to define a new principle in relation to the schools curricula and practice. Our task was to examine how far the existing principle is being realised in practice and whether new arguments are needed to uphold and interpret it."

Function

The Lockwood committee provided the following terms of reference for a Schools Council for the Curriculum and Examinations:

"The objects .... are to uphold and interpret the principle that each school should have the fullest possible measure of responsibility for its own work with its own curriculum and teaching methods based on the needs of its own pupils and evolved by its own staff; and to seek through co-operative study of common problems to assist all who have individual or joint responsibilities for or in connection with the schools curricula and examinations to co-ordinate their actions in harmony with this principle.

"In order to promote these objects the Council will keep under review curricula, teaching methods and examinations in primary and secondary schools including aspects of school organisation so far as they affect the curriculum and will draw attention to difficulties arising in these fields which appear to merit consideration by other appropriate authorities."

In particular the Council will:

(1) discuss with the schools the ways in which, through research and development and by other means, the Council can assist the school to meet both the individual needs of their pupils and the educational needs of the community as a whole;

(2) ascertain the views and interests of the schools on all matters falling within the Council's terms of reference, represent those views and interest in discussion of such matters with any bodies or persons concerned directly or indirectly with education in all its aspects; and will be free to publish its findings and recommendations at its own discretion;

(3) carry out all the functions hitherto undertaken by the Secondary Schools Examinations Council, and such other functions as the Minister, acting in his capacity as central co-ordinating authority for secondary school examinations, may remit to the Council;

(4) offer advice on request to any member interested and so far as practicable to any other bodies and persons concerned with the work of the schools."

Action on the curriculum and examinations

(1) Research and development. These activities, but particularly curriculum development, account for the major part of the Schools Council effort. Of its budget of about £1.5 million annually (provided

by the Department of Education and the local education authorities), a large part goes on curriculum development projects.

These activities are intended to provide a focus for change. Most involve the production of new materials in print, film or on tape. And since to an increasing extent it is believed by curriculum developers that the projects present teachers with the need to change attitudes as well as the need simply to update the content of the curriculum, some in-service training is regarded as an essential element.

Most projects work to a similar pattern. A proposal for development is put to the Schools Council. A director is appointed. He or she chooses a team which is likely to include seconded teachers and an evaluation officer. They should clarify the aims of the project. Then, three to five years are spent devising and trying out materials in selected trial schools. The material, and possibly the methods, are revised in the light of the schools' comments. The evaluator should be contributing at this point too. Then, generally, key teachers or teacher trainers are brought together to ensure that they understand the implications of the project and can train others in the use of the new materials.

Since curriculum development implies a threat to teachers' existing practice the subjects chosen for study have been predominant that teachers have wanted. Hence the Schools Council moved swiftly to establish a number of projects in preparation for the raising of the school leaving age to 16, in 1972-73, in linguistics and modern languages. But in the sixth form teachers have often been unwilling to experiment with pupils whose higher education chances depend on examination results. The sixth form, exam centred, hence syllabus - and teacher - dominated, tends to be a block in the cycle of development. For a cycle is apparent. On the whole it seems to be trying to combine the best of the child-centred approach of the primary school with the seminar methods of the university, instead of categorising styles of learning by institution.

The early Nuffield projects had started with the belief that the content of the curriculum needed changing. They even called the work curriculum "renewal" and concentrated on the "useful" subjects such as sciences and modern languages. They also tended to concentrate on a limited group of pupils.

But some of the later Nuffield work and more particularly a number of Schools Council projects have been more concerned with the attitudes of teachers and pupils. These innovators begin to realise, as Derek Morrell put it(1) "That what they need to be concerned with is the manner in which schools and teachers intervene to modify the child's learning and with the questions on what authority and by what methods they are entitled and can realistically expect to do so." For the fact is that children will learn something from their experience of school whatever a teacher does. They may enjoy learning; they may learn only to hate it. In all cases what children learn is bound to be affected by their relationship with their teachers.

---

(1) Derek Morrell: Education and Change. Joseph Payne Memorial Lectures to the College of Preceptors, 1966.

Much curriculum development is a form of research. Increasingly teams set out with hypotheses to be tested and expect that their work should be evaluated as the project goes on. According to the research director of the Schools Council, Jack Wrigley, "most of us in the Schools Council do not believe that there is a very clear division between curriculum development and research."(1)

Nevertheless the Schools Council make some money available specifically to research, on condition that the research is compatible with the Council's policy, that it illuminates some aspect of curriculum development or of examinations and that it has some possibility of improving classroom teaching. Research commissioned by the Schools Council includes a study of attitudes of pupils, teachers and parents affected by the decision to raise the school leaving age, and a number of studies related to classroom organisation or learning theory, for example, the formation of scientific concepts. Much of the research is directed at examinations.

(2) Recommendations on behalf of schools. This, in fact, the Schools Council seems not to have done. It is one consequence of a delegated membership (and one consequence of a strongly held belief in pluralism) that there are few issues on which the Council would speak unanimously. For example, when the Government in 1968 postponed the raising of the school leaving age to 16, the Council did not feel in any position to condemn the move, despite the numerous projects committed to the programme for raising the leaving age.

(3) Examinations. Work on examinations rates in importance with work on the curriculum though with examinations the Schools Council is in a different relationship to the Government. Generally it is advisory to all its member interests. On examinations it is advisory to the Secretary of State.

It is logical that the same body should be concerned with development work on both curriculum and examinations. So far, however, there has been little exam reform which has grown out of curriculum development, except in the General Certificate of Education Ordinary level science papers. But because examinations generate much more public interest, the Schools Council work on examinations is much better known than its work on curriculum. The Schools Council's predecessor, the Secondary Schools Examination Council, was responsible for developing a radically new examination for 16 year olds (the Certificate of Secondary Education) designed for pupils of average ability and above who would not be suited to the General Certificate of Education. The Schools Council has been responsible for assessing the examinations' reliability and validity.

The Schools Council has also had sub-committees trying to devise a new pattern of sixth form examinations, which would be suitable for the non-university oriented pupils who increasingly stay on at the schools. But so far the Council has not approved any proposals.

---

(1) From a paper by Jack Wrigley on the Schools Council and Research to be published in a forthcoming volume of Research in Education.

(4) Advice and publicity. The Schools Council does not have direct contact with the schools nor necessarily with teachers centres, despite projects' contacts with their trial schools. So at the most basic information level it produces an attractive and informative termly broadsheet, Dialogue. It has, additionally, a vast publishing programme (contracted out to commercial publishers) for working papers and field reports. It is also responsible for the publication of project materials.

So far, few project materials have been published. Two were published in 1969; a dozen more are scheduled for 1970-71. So far it is not clear whether the fact of publication, with the Schools Council approval, invests the material with an unusual authority compared with its commercial counterparts. Nor is it clear how far publication will fossilise development in the area concerned.

3. The National Council for Educational Technology

The Schools Council interest in innovation has broadened, as the preceding section shows, from a primary concern with curriculum development to a related concern with research and the training of teachers. But the Schools Council has not concerned itself with the management of innovation - with suggesting how changes in content need to be integrated into a teaching method.

These are however the concern of a newcomer to the educational scene, the National Council for Educational Technology. The Council was set up in 1967, a modified Government response to a recommendation for a National Centre for Educational Technology. The centre was intended by those who put forward the suggestion(1) to be a focal point for future research and development. NCET's remit is to act as a central agency for promoting research, co-ordinating training and disseminating information on educational technology. NCET has also to advise bodies, including government departments concerned with education and training in industry and the service, on audio-visual media and on the most appropriate and economical ways of using them.

Educational technology is interpreted as comprising "the process of applying available knowledge in a systematic way to problems in education and training."(2) NCET is a long way from being a body which merely suggests the best buy for teaching machines or overhead projectors. At school level, it sees its job as helping to solve problems with the aid of technology. For instance how can a teacher give individual attention to every student in a class of widely spread attainments, how to select the most appropriate resources for a particular topic at a particular level, how to locate and obtain these resources quickly and easily, how to provide compensatory techniques - whether for deprived children or say, a student who has been out of school for some time.

---

(1) Audio-Visual Aids in Higher Education. Brynmor Jones report: H.M.S.O, 1966.

(2) Towards More Effective Learning, NCET, 1969.

One recently started NCET project is aimed at helping deprived children between the ages of four and eight with audio-visual materials, particularly television, which they are likely to have at home. Another to use various media for mathematics courses - maths being the subject with the most severe teacher shortage. NCET is also trying to develop a course for non-specialists who have a grounding in maths, producing special materials which the pupil can use largely by himself. These are aimed at many sixth form and first year university students. NCET wants to encourage work on computer based learning. But in each case it is dependent on funds being made available from outside since it has no development budget of its own. It is a melancholy situation.

Despite its wider remit, covering higher education and industry and the services, NCET's method of work is similar to that of the Schools Council. Ideally, NCET claims, it should attempt "to provide a skeletal framework which could be reinforced at the regional level and finally built on at the local level." The Council therefore has kept closely in touch with regional development (especially where expense and the users' requirements have already stimulated regional co-operation, e.g. closed circuit television). It is in contact with teachers' centres.

There is clearly a place for NCET. But will it be given the funds to enable it to fill it?

On the Fringe

The institutions discussed so far have been involved in the whole process of innovation: research and development, diffusion and adoption. But there are a number of institutions which need to be mentioned which are involved in particular aspects only of the innovatory process. At the research and development end, there are most notably the universities, the National Foundation for Educational Research and the Social Science Research Council. At the diffusion end of the process are the teacher training institutions (again universities, but also the colleges of education). Government advisory bodies also have some part to play: in general theirs is a diffusing function, though occasionally a committee will put up suggestions which form the basis for action of a new sort.

The National Foundation for Educational Research

The NFER's research has a practical bias. It was set up in 1947 by the Department of Education and the local education authorities to complement the usually more fundamental research of the universities. About a quarter of its work it funds itself, the rest is commissioned. In the early days much of its effort went into devising intelligence tests and until recently the projects have been strongly biased towards educational psychology. Vocational guidance research, and research on examinations and tests are still an important part of its work, but it is notable that many of the recently established projects are concerned with curriculum or environment. It has not, however, undertaken any research on the economics of education.

Among its current major studies are an evaluation of the Schools Council primary French project, a series of projects on teaching young

children to read, a part in the International Evaluation of Achievement, and an investigation of the organisation of comprehensive schools.

Indeed the recently appointed director of the NFER argues strongly for an extension of the NFER's involvement in innovation, particularly in the curriculum. In discussing the work of the Schools Council(1) he has written of his anxiety that the Council has not pursued curriculum evaluation with the same enthusiasm as curriculum reform. "Let it be made clear," he says "that curriculum evaluation must be a much more comprehensive exercise than many tend to assume. Its purpose is to discover how far the detailed aims of the curriculum have been achieved. Now when we list the aims of our curricula and do this - as, in my view, is essential - in terms of behavioural change in pupils, it will be found that the aims go beyond the relatively simple matter of acquiring information and skills, and they inevitably lead into the field of attitudes. Many (probably the majority) of such attitudes are the product of the method of teaching rather than the content of teaching. (No amount of curriculum development will reduce the importance of the good teacher). If curriculum evaluation is to provide an effective validatory function for curriculum change we shall need the full co-operation of educational researchers and psychometricians in order to produce adequate measuring instruments of attitude and motivation as well as attainment."

It is a plea which takes its place in a long, long English story - the story of English teachers' reluctance to accept the importance of research.

The Social Science Research Council

The SSRC is the new arrival among the public bodies which finance educational research. With a budget of about £2.5 million for all the social sciences, it acts in part as a conventional research agency, giving grants in response to applications. After three full years of activity it is now beginning to refine its strategy. It now sponsors some programmes of research, and has set up research units on wide-ranging topics, such as race relations.

As far as education is concerned, the main beneficiary has been an action research programme on educational priority area policy(2). The intention of the project is not to try and produce an evaluation of compensatory education techniques (impossible in the three-year timetable and with the £175,000 available from the SSRC and the Department of Education and Science) but merely to demonstrate the possibilities of a particular approach in a variety of circumstances, concentrating particularly on pre-school experience and on various means of strengthening links between schools and a community. The project is trying to establish guidelines for government policy, i.e. whether intervention works, whether there needs to be a particular

---

(1) Stephen Wiseman in Research in Education, May, 1969, University of Manchester.

(2) This is the project directed by Dr. A.H. Halsey referred to above (page 15).

kind of intervention for deprived children.

There has been some controversy as to whether the SSRC should have sponsored this project or whether its role should be to support fundamental research. There are signs that with a new chairman the future emphasis will be more on basic research.

Universities

In the early stages of curriculum development and in contrast with a number of countries, the universities had little direct involvement in school innovation. Their contribution has been more in the (expected) direction of fundamental research, chiefly in the sociology and philosophy of education. There is some work on theories of learning and intelligence, and recently universities have taken a lot more interest in the economics of education(1).

The universities' interest now looks like becoming much more direct. Sussex, for example, has an educational technology centre. The University of London has a unit working on linguistics. Increasingly curriculum developments are being sited in universities. The modern languages project is based at York, Nuffield science at London, the Nuffield-Schools Council Humanities project has just moved to East Anglia, another Schools Council Humanities project is based at Keele. Increasingly, also, universities are recognising curriculum development as a permanent feature, by creating professorships in the curriculum.

One university, Manchester, has pioneered curriculum development regionally, using a very different approach from most of the Schools Council projects. It acts as a servicing agency for local teachers to help them devise new courses for raising the school leaving age and has given an unusually academic flavour to development. To start with, teachers spent many months hammering out objectives for themselves (an approach which has produced some difficulties and confusion). The Manchester strategy is also distinctive. It has effectively linked teachers' centres in a number of neighbouring local education authorities in a common effort with the university, whereas most Schools Council projects have created their links direct with schools. The Schools Council is now aiding the project

---

(1) Some examples, invidious though it is to choose. Sociology: A.H. Halsey and Jean Floud of Oxford on education and opportunity; Stephen Wiseman, then of Manchester, on education and environment; J.W.B. Douglas of London on a follow-up study of 5,000 children born in 1946; William Taylor of Bristol on schools and teacher training; Basil Bernstein of London on language use and social class. Philosophy: Richard Peters of London. Intelligence and learning theories: Cyril Burt and H.J. Eysenk of London; G. Peel of Birminghan; Liam Hudson of Edinburgh; J. Fitzpatrick of Manchester; and P.E. Vernon. Economics of education: John Vaizey of Brunel; Mark Blaug of London.

This co-operation between teachers and academics is hopeful. Curriculum development will be more effective for a dialogue about its aim and methods. It could also help to overcome the hostility which seems to be the much more usual response to universities showing interest in what is happening in schools. For instance when a group of London academics recently produced a book evaluating the Plowden report(1) it was more widely regarded as an attempt to destroy a "progressive approach" than as a contribution to discussion.

The education and training of teachers

This section concerns the universities and colleges of education. Universities are involved in two ways. They provide within departments of education training courses for graduates. Most are one-year courses taken after a student's subject degree. A few universities are experimenting with "concurrent" courses - i.e. students do their teacher training at the same time as they are working for a degree. Most universities also run institutes of education. These are responsible for the academic content of courses in colleges of education. The majority of colleges of education concentrate on three "general" training courses. (There are a few for art colleges and for domestic science teaching). The general courses may be biased towards primary or secondary teaching but share a common pattern of concurrent training. A recent innovation is the introduction of degree courses, involving usually a year tacked on to the existing three year course.

Manchester's department has been famous for its work on educational psychology. Bristol is strong on the administration of education and in-service training. But universities have only recently become involved in development work on behalf of schools, as curriculum projects have been attached to universities and as professorships in curriculum have been established.

The common complaint about university department and institute involvement in innovation is the old one: that they do not do much to lessen the gap between theory and practice. It is possibly significant that a university whose vice-chancellor is an ex-schoolmaster (and where the professors too were teachers) has done most to bridge this gap. It is York which has joint appointments with the local education authority: to the university they are part-time tutors, to the local education authority part-time advisers.

The colleges have been diffusers of change rather than developers. One of their problems has been having to work to so many masters. They are maintained by the local education authorities or voluntary bodies; their courses are developed in conjunction with the university institutes of education (through area training organisations); and their numbers are controlled by the Secretary of State for Education who is responsible for the supply of teachers and, over the last ten years, priority has been given to expansion.

On the Secretary of State's behalf, the Department of Education has on the whole resisted attempts to diversify the system of teacher training. The colleges, though larger than they were, remain monotechnic. Five teacher training departments have been set up experimentally within technical colleges. But they have not been able to break out of the university orbit, responsibility for the content of their courses

(1) Perspectives on Plowden, ed. Richard Peters, 1969, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

remaining with the university institutes of education. In theory these departments and the colleges of education themselves could get their degree courses approved by the Council for National Academic Awards, a degree-awarding body for non-university institutions. In practice, there has been little encouragement for students in colleges to work for degrees other than university-awarded B.Eds.

However the colleges have established themselves as an important element in the cycle of innovation. They have been largely responsible for diffusing ideas of informal primary education. Aided by the vast turnover of teachers (four fifths of women teachers leave within five years of starting to teach) and by their own history of preparing teachers for elementary and later primary schools, they have been able to make their views clear to schools.

Few colleges have branched out into development. A reason is suggested by Professor William Taylor(1), Their values, says Taylor, have been oriented towards social and literary romanticism: "The romantic-infra-structure has shown itself as a partial rejection of the pluralism of values associated with conditions of advanced industrialisation; a suspicion of the intellect and the intellectual, a lack of interest in political and structural change; a stress upon the intuitive and the intangible, upon spontaneity and creativity; an attempt to find personal autonomy through the arts; a hunger for the satisfactions of inter-personal life within the community and the small groups and a flight from rationality." There has not been much opportunity for the "creative non-conformity" that might have enabled the colleges to advance significantly in the quality of their work and its effect upon the educational system in general. But with the worst of the strains of expansion now over, and a government enquiry set up in 1970 to consider their future, the colleges have a chance to disprove Taylor's judgement.

Government Advisory Bodies

The government advisory bodies include Central Advisory Councils for Education, one for England and one for Wales. Over the past ten years or so they have been given an area of the system to consider and have been able to make wide ranging proposals. For example the Crowther Council was concerned with the education of fifteen to eighteen-year-olds(2), the Newsom Council with secondary children of average and less than average ability(3), and the Plowden Council with primary education(4).

A committee set up by the Prime Minister, the Robbins Committee, had a similar job to do on higher education. Teacher education and training in the 1950s and early 1960s was influenced by the National

---

(1) Society and the Education of Teachers, Faber and Faber, 1969.

(2) 15 to 18, H.M.S.O.1959.

(3) Half Our Future, H.M.S.O. 1963.

(4) Children and Their Primary Schools (The Plowden report) H.M.S.O. 1967.

Advisory Council on the Supply and Training of Teachers.

Some of these committees have been quite influential, aiding innovation in two ways. They have commissioned research, which has not only added weight to their recommendations but has provided ammunition for continued lobbying (as in the case of the Crowther evidence of the waste of ability among the early school leavers). They have also been important agents in diffusing progressive ideas. The needs of lower ability children have had attention focussed on them as a result of the Newsom Report. Modern developments in primary education have been stimulated by the Plowden committee's accounts of the pioneering then taking place. The Robbins committee on higher education created acceptance for the idea that a vast expansion of higher education was inevitable.

But councils have not been commissioned consistently to consider policy. A central advisory council was never, for instance, asked to consider the merits of comprehensive education. Nor has there been an expected correlation between specific terms of reference and their innovatory effect. The Crowther committee ha the most strategic terms of reference: how to implement the unfulfilled recommendations of the 1944 Education Act. In effect this meant how should the school leaving age be raised and how should the act's provision for compulsory part-time education to 18 be put into operation. But the Government shelved most of the report. The Plowden council was asked to consider primary education "in all its aspects". Yet it made two suggestions of great innovatory importance. The educational priority area programme of Government discrimination in favour of deprived areas is being partially adopted. An action research programme is in progress(1) and the Government gives some priority to EPAs in building programmes and in extra pay for teachers. Plowden also suggested a reform of the school starting system to allow for an extension of nursery education and a more flexible start to schooling.

(1) This is the project directed by Dr. A.H. Halsey referred to above (page 15).

PART III

CHANGE IN ACTION

Change in Primary Education

Primary education is changing and much of that is due to the local education authorities. This section will therefore be concerned with the relationship of the local education authority and the schools in innovation.

Primary education covers the five to eleven age range. Children may voluntarily go to nursery school before that, though the demand for places outstrips the supply. The English system is unusual in that it has been accepted for a century that children up to the age of six or seven need quite different treatment from older boys and girls. So until then, they are educated in infants' schools (with their own head teacher) or infants' departments (under the same head as the junior school). The junior stage lasts until eleven.

And then there has been the great hurdle: the selection examination for secondary education, known as the 'eleven plus'. Its purpose is to separate off the 20 per cent or so brightest children in each area for grammar school. As the Plowden committee remarked, "the 'eleven plus' is as firmly fixed in Englishmen's minds as 1066". It has been prominently fixed in the minds of junior schools. With that sort of responsibility many junior schools have felt forced to direct most of their efforts to formal teaching, often dividing the children into ability groups. In contrast with the freedom, the diversity of experiences and the generally child-centred approach of the infant school, the junior school has been a serious and uncreative place. Now there are changes, especially where secondary education is no longer selective. How have those changes come about?

Background

There have been two cycles of experimentation and development in the recent history of primary education. In the 1920s the experiment was mostly sparked off by individuals with their own schools: Susan Isaacs at the Malting House, A.S. Neill at Summerhill, Dora Russell at Beacon Hill. Their method of starting from the child and its motivations instead of imposing education, was given wide publicity in 1931 by an official report on primary schools, the Hadow report(1).

Hadow strongly recommended progressive practices. "We are of the opinion that the curriculum of the primary school is to be thought of in terms of activity and experience rather than of knowledge to be

---

(1) The Primary School, H.M.S.O. 1931, and reprinted.

acquired and facts to be stored." But unfortunately for primary education, some of the radical edge of this theme was blunted. For alongside its plea for progressive methods Hadow argued for a practice that was bound to be inconsistent with it - streaming children by ability. In that, it did of course reflect its time. Contemporary British psychological opinion held strongly to the view that differences in intelligence between children made such division necessary.

Nevertheless the child-centred ideas were taken up at a key point in the cycle - in teacher training colleges. They have had two characteristics which made them effective diffusers of the Hadow ideas. In the first place, until 1947 they were training teachers exclusively for elementary education: thus they did not have to resolve within the single institution conflicts between child-centred primary and subject-centred secondary methods. Nor did they have much contact with the universities which would have been likely to stress content rather than method. This emphasis, though modified, has continued since the restructuring of teacher education after the war when universities institutes were given responsibility for approving college courses. Also since the war student-teachers have nearly all been young women going into teaching for a few years before raising families. The turnover has been enormous. But so has the opportunity for the introduction of ideas, even though students going into their first job start at the bottom of the school hierarchy.

Nevertheless it is the continuing relationship between the local education authorities and the schools which is more likely to have determined the extent to which primary schools have changed. After the war and in the 1950s, schools throughout certain authorities were transformed. Bristol, Leicestershire, Cumberland, the West Riding of Yorkshire and Oxfordshire are some of the most notable. The Hertfordshire architect, Stirrat Johnson-Marshall, revolutionised primary school building with the development of the CLASP system. These local education authorities are to the 1960s and 1970s what Susan Isaacs and A.S. Neill were to the 1930s and 1940s. Their approach has been similarly given impetus by another official report, the Plowden report; colleges of education are still feeding vast armies of girls into the primary schools.

But this time there are three other factors which are likely to make the child-centred schools the rule rather than the exception. First, is the Government decision that secondary education should no longer be selective; this is freeing the junior schools from the thrall of the 'eleven plus' in areas which had not already gone comprehensive. Secondly, there is a much greater awareness of the importance of the early years of schooling. Thirdly, Schools Council projects provide stimulus on a national scale.

Change in one local education authority

Primary schooling is widely recognised as the show piece of British education. The section that follows looks at the primary school achievement of one local education authority, Oxfordshire. This authority - with Bristol, Leicestershire and the West Riding of Yorkshire - led the way in making primary education notable, with a consistently high standard among its schools.

In Oxfordshire a school playground may seem conventional enough. Inside, the successful schools, whether they are in new buildings or old, have broken with tradition. Gone are the dark blank corridors, the row of desks, the children grouped by ability, all doing the same thing at the same time. The schools are now light, colourful and very obviously alive. You are likely to see a fair number of children moving between classrooms. In old schools some of the walls between rooms have been knocked through and the corridors used too. In some of the new schools the corridors have almost become the school - expanded and with activity bays leading off them. Each base or class is largely self sufficient. In infant classes you see dressing up corners, climbing frames, a cookery corner, sand. In the junior classes there is likely to be a shop. All from five through to eleven have their areas for maths, for reading and for painting and some sort of construction, their plants and often their animals. They all have sets of objects for their number work, very often things the children have collected themselves: pebbles, chestnuts and buttons as well as rods and blocks and manufactured equipment. They all have their carpeted reading corners. The old sets of textbooks have been replaced. Instead there will be a mixture of stories and books (chosen by the teachers) that children can use for reference. These may cover anything from spaceships to old English churches. They are often expensive and nearly always well looked after. It is the walls rather than the layout of the room which give you some clue to the children's ages. For the rooms are decorated with the children's work: in number, writing, project work. Often in the shared areas like the school hall there is a display: some twigs, a pheasant's feather, some tie and dye textiles, a piece of pottery which the teachers use to stimulate childrens' thought, and which acts as a starting point for their enquiry and learning. The approach seems consistently to bring about higher standards in the basic skills, particularly reading. The children clearly benefit from the greater relevance of the teaching approach to their developmental stage and from the extent to which learning is recognised as individual.

Strikingly, the freedom of such schools very often appears to be combined with a great degree of self-discipline, even among children of five and six. The children nearly all work individually or in twos and threes from the moment they reach school in the morning. They go to the teacher when they want help or possibly to another adult: a local mother attached to the class as an infant helper, or a college of education student on teaching practice. But, where the school works well, one notices over a day a teacher keeping quite a check on what goes on: steering children who have spent the morning dressing up and playing at doctors and nurses into writing: talking to a child who has been on his own for a period, absorbed in making a model; as well as dealing with the children perpetually demanding her attention. She brings the children together a certain amount: for a story at the end of the morning; or if there is something she thinks several are confused about which might be aided by general discussion; or maybe she starts them off on something new, such as classroom mural, by talking together.

The organisation of the class varies with the teacher and the school. Some group their classes by age; others take a span - in one school covering four years. In a few and decreasing number of schools the children are grouped by ability. In most, teachers cope effectively with a span ranging from very bright to educationally subnormal. The measure of the school's achievement is the high degree of involvement

by the children, and the astonishing achievement in some of their work: creative writing, painting, ingenious constructions.

The changes have been evolving over a period since the war, when A.R. Chorlton was appointed director of education. The overwhelming impression just after the war was of dinginess and isolation. Very often a school's sole teacher would have lived out her life in the same place, starting as a pupil, going on to pupil teacher, and finally taking charge. Even in 1945 the schools were just as they were when built in the 1890 s, down to coke stoves and water from a pump. It was not a difficult job to analyse what should be done to improve the physical shape of the schools, and break down the professional isolation and stagnation among teachers. It was a different matter to act especially at a time when all authorities were under immediate pressure to plan for universal secondary education. Oxfordshire was among a small number of authorities which provided the conditions to enable primary schools to change, so that by 1969 three-quarters of the schools were in buildings that had either been constructed since the war or had been greatly extended.

But an authority seldom tries to exert such direct control over what happens in a classroom. Oxfordshire played the classic role of forward-looking English authorities: encouraging but not directing.

The history of the change has been to some extent a history of the people involved, and has been aided by the fact that the key figures were together for nearly 20 years. But nevertheless the change has happened within a well-defined institutional structure, with the director of education supported by the elected members of the authority on the education committee and given professional assistance by a team of advisers. Advisers are usually promoted teachers and their job is to go round schools making suggestions and helping with difficulties: there is no question of their being able to instruct. When the head and the adviser are working together, they are in primary schools an almost irresistable combination. The advisers in Oxfordshire, working with heads have been able to effect numerous schemes to give schools greater support. Some of the two and three class schools in an area are linked. Some share minibuses so that the children may share in activities or a teacher with a special skill at one school may go into the other schools in the group as well. Schools in particular difficulties may be helped by a task force of advisory seconded teachers.

The first adviser after the war, Edith Moorhouse, provided a common link for these isolated schools. She could advise as building money came up and heads retired, where to expand, where to contract. The adviser was able to bring teachers together out of school: courses were a revolutionary concept in the 1940 s. As their confidence built up, together the advisers and the heads embarked on development: they started to "unstream", to "family group", to introduce an "integrated day". Gradually the advisory structure was strengthened by the appointment of regional advisers. Their responsibilities run from nursery school through to secondary, enabling them to produce a different perspective for development.

In Oxfordshire from the mid-1950 s, the HMI (Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools) was also actively involved. An HMI, a link man between the authority and the central government department, has many

more schools to see than a local adviser. His development role is very much what he makes of it. Oxfordshire was fortunate to have Robin Tanner, an artistic and sensitive man who was very much in sympathy with any attempt to cut down on dinginess. He was also a person who insisted on high quality, especially in encouraging children's response to their environment. His enthusiasm affected teachers and local authority officials. Many of the schools still show traces of his influence in their italic writing and their attention to display.

The four key forces in Oxfordshire - the director of education, the primary adviser, the HMI and the heads - were aided by others, such as the colleges of education. Not only do schools take in students on teaching practice, some of the teachers lecture in colleges (some are promoted to their staffs). Now teachers' centres provide a new base for development, where all those interested can come together.

But while change may be initiated fairly systematically, the attempts to evaluate and then diffuse the practice are generally much more idiosyncratic, depending largely on the professional judgements of those involved. HMIs are traditionally inspectors. In Oxfordshire's case the HMI was too deeply involved to be objective. The Plowden committee's support of the Oxfordshire approach was a form of evaluation. But it is typical of the English approach that there has been nothing more external. Evaluation on the whole tends to be a matter between the teachers, advisers and administrators concerned. Their measure of success tends to be how far any stimulus or expertise can be shared in order to provide a spring for the next round of development.

Secondary Reorganisation

In common with many countries, England is changing its pattern of secondary schooling, by abolishing the selection tests by which the bright go to the grammar schools (in a few areas, the next brightest go to central or technical schools) and the rest are dismissed to the secondary modern schools. The schools are being replaced by comprehensive schools whose common characteristic is that they do not select their entry. They aim to take all the children - and in theory cover the entire ability range.

Looked at as a national exercise in innovation, the reorganisation of secondary education is more notable for the protracted hope behind it than for systematic planning. Looked at locally - where it all began - there are instances of creative development and long term planning, although subject to delay and confusion when central government and local education authorities have had different objectives. The effectiveness of the change as far as the schools are concerned is always dependent on teachers' attitudes. Belatedly, organisational change is stimulating in curriculum and methods.

Background

The original impetus for comprehensive schools grew out of the pressure for universal secondary education, which dated from the beginning of the century. But the case for a common secondary school made little headway for a number of years. A series of influential official reports from the Consultative Committee (Hadow, 1926 (1), the Spens

(1) The Education of the Adolescent - not to be confused with The Primary School, see footnote (1) on page 29.

report, 1938; the Norwood report, 1944) all upheld the case for selective education, i.e. that innate differences in intelligence required children to be differentiated according to ability. This view was pressed with much firmness by the Norwood report, which claimed that the education system had "thrown up" three "rough groupings" of children with different types of mind. Contemporary cynics lost no time in pointing out that this seemed to be the Almighty benevolently creating three types of children in just the proportions which would gratify educational administrators. And the psychologists, such as Sir Cyril Burt, whose work was supposedly being drawn on to support the Norwood committee's conclusions, claimed that the committee had produced a theory as outdated as phrenology.

Then came the 1944 Education Act with its commitment to secondary education for all. Claims had already been made for common secondary schooling as a counter to social divisiveness; the Norwood report was thoroughly criticised. Even so, the government (a coalition one) was prepared to do no more than be ambiguous about the form of secondary schooling. In the end all the act said was that "children shall be educated according to their age, ability, and aptitude." There was no mention of types of school.

How then has the move to comprehensive education worked out? Let us look at each of the main bodies involved - central government, local education authorities, schools and Schools Council.

Central government

Under the 1944 Act (1), local education authorities had to get government approval for development plans for secondary education plans. And the government's advice was precise. It claimed that it was "inevitable" in the light of different abilities, and the existing layout of schools, that authorities should think in terms of three types of secondary school: grammar, technical and modern.

Yet the government at the time (1945-1951) was Labour. Given that comprehensive education had been a lively political issue in the 1930s and 1940s, it now seemed surprising that a Labour government was not more enthusiastic about the issue. It was prepared to approve comprehensive or multilateral (i.e. all types of education separately organised) schools only if they would take at least 1,600 pupils: large enough to contain an adequate share of top as well as middle and lower ability children. It approved in principle long-term plans for large purpose-built comprehensives (e.g. London and Coventry). It rejected plans for immediate transformation to a comprehensive system (e.g. Middlesex) on the base of existing buildings. It accepted a number of schemes for individual comprehensives especially after 1947 (e.g. in Westmoreland and in the West Riding of Yorkshire). These included some interim comprehensives merging the second-best selective schools (central schools) with modern schools (e.g. in London).

Then from 1951-1964 a Conservative government was in control. It proclaimed itself willing to allow limited experiments and then proceeded to draw the limits quite tight. Thus a scheme for a London purpose-built comprehensive which would have involved incorporating a grammar school was rejected at the last moment (on the grounds that the public were against it since there had been protest marches). In

1955 a new minister condemed the "assassination" - incorporation - of grammar schools. In 1958 the Conservatives issued a policy statement(1) in view of the great demand for academic grammar-type education. This recognised that the pool of ability was much larger than previously supposed. It argued not for comprehensive schools but for a policy of overlap - advanced courses in the secondary modern schools. As more and more authorities, convinced of the inadequacies of selection, produced schemes for comprehensive schools the government built up a convention: schools could be approved where they did not threaten existing (grammar) schools. In practice this meant comprehensives were established on new housing estates and in rural areas. Nevertheless, over 160 comprehensives had been established by the end of the Conservative government's period of office. More crucial, the then Conservative minister (Edward Boyle) stated in 1962 that a Conservative government would not expect local education authorities to build any more grammar schools. Boyle also helped to convince his government that the minimum school leaving age should be raised to 16, aided by a much quoted statement of his in the foreword to the Newsom report that "all children should have an equal chance of acquiring intelligence and of developing their talents and abilities to the full." Secondary education for all thus moved further towards realisation than might have been expected under a Conservative government.

Then the Labour government came to power in 1964 with a commitment to make secondary education comprehensive. Within a couple of months the Secretary of State for Education (Michael Stewart) had justified this as in the national interest, arguing that the selection procedures were inefficient, and that the errors made at eleven could not be adequately remedied later and that it was all but impossible to find an appropriate place for the secondary modern in a selective system. "It will do a great evil to our country if the gap in understanding between the more and the less intellectual is allowed to widen, and one of the great merits of the comprehensive is that it can promote this mutual understanding."

The government acted as though it was in exactly the same position in 1964 as it had been in 1947 when it requested development plans for secondary reorganisation, largely to conform with its own guidance. The 1964 government's line that it was not dictating was fortuitiously aided by the fact that no special funds were allocated to reorganisation. The government also allowed a wide degree of choice within fairly vague objectives.

The circular took its objectives from a Parliamentary motion:

"That this House, conscious of the need to raise educational standards at all levels, and regretting that the realisation of this objective is impeded by the separation of children into different types of secondary schools, noted with approval the efforts of local authorities to reorganise secondary education on comprehensive lines which will preserve all that is valuable in grammar school education for those children who now receive it and make it available to more children; recognises that the

---

(1) Secondary Education for All, H.M.S.O., 1958.

"method and timing of such reorganisation should vary to meet local needs; and believes that the time is now ripe for a declaration of national policy."

Local education authorities were not restricted, they had a choice of any of the current variants of comprehensive organisation - 11 to 18 schools, two-tier schools (11 to 13 or 11 to 14 followed by 13 to 18 or 14 to 18 schools) or sixth form colleges with transfer at 16. Experiments with middle schools straddling the primary-secondary school division at 11 would also be allowed (later on approval was given more freely). Authorities were even in the short term to be allowed to go for a form of organisation which merely postponed selection for a couple of years by allowing children to transfer at the age of 13 or 14 to a grammar type education if their parents wanted it (and were backed up by the teachers).

But the 1947 analogy does not hold. The government had to toughen its approach slightly one year later in a further circular (Department of Education circular 10/66) which stated that the Department would only approve secondary school building plans for comprehensive schemes. Again it was not fully effective; the circular carried only the force of recommendation, and a determined authority has been able to resist (as Surrey did) to the point where the government had to give in or see children without a school place.

So the Labour government belatedly decided it ought to legislate. It had meanwhile set back reorganisation badly by postponing the raising of the school leaving age and with it £100 million worth of building programmes which many authorities were using to aid reorganisation. Early in 1970, near the end of its life, the government introduced a bill to give the force of law to the 1965 circular.

But the legislation, which came to nothing because parliamentary time was too short, would anyway have been a blunt instrument. It might have been used against the few recalcitrant local education authorities, but it could not tackle the real hold-ups: the individual schools that LEAs would not try and draw into the scheme or the schools themselves which were able to stand out against reorganisation (such as the voluntary grammar schools which are maintained by the State but have a majority of independent governors) or the direct grant schools which the government had commissioned advice on from the Public Schools Commission.

Nevertheless the threat of legislation had been enough to break the political consensus on education. The Conservatives, who won the 1970 general election came to power promising to "end compulsion" in education. One of the new Secretary of State's first actions was to send out a circular (Department of Education circular 10/70) withdrawing the Labour circular and suggesting henceforward "educational considerations in general, local needs and wishes in particular and the wise use of resources to be the main principles determining the local pattern."

What happened since goes to show that there is no very clear correlation between government action and local authority reaction. The Labour circular, which officials now say was sent out with their fingers crossed, was in fact taken up by most authorities (partly

thanks to those same officials' coaxing.) Over 26 per cent of children were in comprehensives by 1970 and, but for postponing the raising of the school leaving age, the figure would have been much higher. And as authorities have gradually managed to rebuild some of their secondary schools they are continuing to plan them as comprehensives. Since the Conservative government came in, even some of the "rebel" authorities have submitted plans. The momentum for change is even more firmly in local hands since the Conservatives came into office.

Local education authorities

As with the central government, local education authorities immediately after the war do not appear to have made their educational plans on particularly political grounds. Thus, in London, the Conservative opposition agreed to the experiments the Labour-controlled council put forward. The Conservatives in Coventry created no trouble. One of the earliest comprehensive schemes in the country was proposed by a Conservative authority: the West Riding of Yorkshire. Equally there were many Labour controlled authorities, particularly in the north of England and the midlands which were totally opposed to any scheme which threatened the grammar school: the grammar school had, after all, through the scholarship system given these working class Labour councillors their chance. They saw merit, not money, as the biggest gateway to opportunity. The Leicestershire proposals in 1957 came from a Conservative authority. Most of the comprehensive proposals during the 1950s did however come from Labour councils.

Then in 1960 Labour took control of the majority of local councils and the Labour party headquarters advised its councils to introduce comprehensives or at least modify the harshness of the selection system. The advice was secret but the results were noticeable. Between 1961 and 1964 a quarter of the country's local education authorities modified their selection system and among those making plans for comprehensives were some of the most important in the country, including Manchester and Liverpool. Despite the pace of reorganisation, the introduction of comprehensive schools - or rather the retention of grammar schools - is still a lively local issue.

London

London (the old London County Council and now the Inner London Education Authority) in 1945 looked to American experience when planning its secondary education. It argued that the old selective system was an accident of history. Comprehensive schools it suggested would provide "flexibility of organisation, variety of choice of the subjects which are the vehicles of education and superior general amenities." It therefore proposed the development of over 100 comprehensive schools. It was not a totally comprehensive pattern: the Council at that time had no power to make grants to the voluntary schools (which happened to be grammar schools). It therefore planned to build its own schools nearby to take the rest of the ability range: these were known as "county complements".

Since even with immediate building approval none of the new comprehensives would be ready until the early 1950s, it also proposed that interim comprehensives be formed from central and secondary modern schools. The first purpose-built comprehensive with its six science

laboratories, nine housecraft centres, five gymnasia and 16 acres of playing fields was opened in 1954 under a cloud; at the last moment the government, by then Conservative, refused to allow the incorporation of a grammar school. Nevertheless, the first comprehensives were an immediate success, aided by their buildings, their novelty and a bulge in the London school population.

Numbers grew over the decade. By the time the Labour government circular was sent out, over 50 per cent of London secondary school children were in comprehensives (including the "county complements": the distinction was abandoned in the 1950s). All took the full age range: 11 to 18. Most were large. Most had evolved from secondary modern schools. By then London included schools with varied organisations: house systems, form systems, highly streamed, some with mixed ability groups for certain activities. In response to the circular, the Labour-held council submitted a plan for 113 comprehensives by 1970, leaving 46 grammar schools, 13 modern schools and one technical school. But London shelved the problem of the voluntary aided grammar school which fiercely opposed any connection with a comprehensive system. This grammar-comprehensive divide became more overt when the Conservatives won control of the council in 1967 and re-submitted the plan, having taken out most schemes which involved the incorporation of grammar schools. In 1970 therefore reorganisation had not gone as far as it would have done under Labour. There were only 85 comprehensives, and still 67 grammar schools, 40 "evolving" comprehensives, 28 modern and 3 technical schools. Under their plan, 128 comprehensives, 41 grammar, 12 "evolving" comprehensives and 9 modern schools are scheduled to exist in 1975. Over 15 per cent of London children are still in grammar schools, a number intended to drop to 10 per cent by 1975. This number includes, it must be supposed, a very large proportion of top ability children (figures are not released).

The authority operates a complicated sharing scheme, known as banding, to try and ensure that the comprehensives get a fair share of those who apply to them. Children are tested anonymously at the age of 10 and a formula is worked out to show (with some area variations) the share that secondary schools are entitled to accept. Over 85 per cent get their first choice, over 95 per cent their second choice. But only a handful of comprehensives get a full share of top ability children: most of whom are still in nearby grammar schools.

London's success (in common with many big cities) therefore has to be measured in modified terms. Many of the schools are now in modern buildings (though many have shared sites). They have a wide range of facilities (London did not push many of its extra resources into primary schools in the 1950s and early 1960s). Many of the comprehensives have genuinely opened up opportunities - or at least attracted their consumers. Over half the London children staying on for a sixth year over the school leaving age are children who are not attempting the conventional sixth year advanced work. But the system is still vitiated by selection.

Bristol

Bristol has many totally non-selective areas. There was some great forethought on the part of the Chairman of the Education Committee and the Chief Education Officer immediately after the war when rebuilding

was planned. Bristol, badly bombed, decided to redevelop with large housing estates on the outskirts of the city. The education committee reserved large (50 acres) sites in the middle of each estate, feeling that it was difficult to predict a pattern of secondary education to last the lifetime of those houses. It needed flexibility.

Bristol had in 1946 thought of two types of school - academic and vocational - but by 1951 modified its earlier proposals to argue that all secondary school resources for each area should be concentrated in one place. The great period of school building was during the 1950's while Labour held the council. Schools which were initially planned to serve the neighbourhood were all scheduled to become comprehensive schools of six or nine form entry (i.e. 1,000 to 1,500 pupils). They were mostly started as bilateral: schools had some unselected local children and some selected coming in through the eleven plus procedure.

Though Labour lost the council from 1960 to 1963, it came back pledged to remove the eleven plus. The outer areas with comprehensives were able to abolish selection straight away (parents who did not want their children to go to their local school can opt for another comprehensive school). The outer areas of Bristol are now truly neighbourhood schools - with the advantages and disadvantages. But in the centre of Bristol are a number of academically highly selective direct grant schools and some secondary modern schools which cannot easily be brought in with the comprehensive system. One-third of its secondary schools are not comprehensive.

The West Riding of Yorkshire

The West Riding is a pioneer with a number of forms of comprehensive schooling and a long history of no eleven plus (it used teachers' assessments from 1955). Its comprehensives date from 1946, its first purpose-built one from 1956. The authority had been highly dubious about the Hadow report and downright sceptical about the Norwood report. It took advice from psychologists on the impossibility of selecting children by ability. "We must not allocate children blindly", the education committee said at the time. Instead "we must by experiment discover the needs of children of eleven plus and differentiate our school gradually according to our discoveries". Its first comprehensive was approved by a Conservative authority. Its progress to comprehensive organisation has been complicated by its constitution; it is one of the country's largest authorities (population of over two million compared with London's 800,000). It devolves a lot of planning to divisional executives. They have varied in their enthusiasm. There are now different plans for different areas including 18 schools and a kind of sixth form college, a "mushroom" sixth form on the "stalk" of a grammar school which takes in pupils from the local secondary moderns who want extended courses. The college is physically almost separate from the grammar school but can share staff and resources. It also leaves the options open if there is pressure on the secondary moderns to develop their own sixth form. Since 1962 the West Riding has been working towards a middle school scheme for many of its areas. (The age span runs from 5 to 9, 9 to 13, 13 to 18).

Its approach is characteristic of the way it has innovated. Its chief education officer, one of the most famous in the country, Sir Alec Clegg, uses his teachers. A number were consulted about various

schemes for comprehensives and asked what they felt about the age of selection. They favoured changes in the transfer age for secondary selection to 13 and also breaking the barriers between primary and secondary. The middle school scheme is having a number of useful consequences. Schools are forced to co-operate over curriculum planning: the middle schools introduce subjects which may be unfamiliar in the primary school. They have virtually all had to learn how to teach French for example, and this has been done by groups of teachers from the secondary schools and a country adviser. It has brought the teachers - even in the West Riding where there is a very strong tradition of in-service training - unusually close together, breaking down the isolation between types of school.

Leicestershire

Many of the schemes have one great disadvantage: they do not abolish selection over an entire area, often because the existence of voluntary and grammar schools puts it out of the authority's control. London illustrates the predicament. Many authorities have put their priorities, instead, on abolishing selection for individual schools. Leicestershire has worked the other way round and, with one of the best planned schemes of all, became in 1969 the first county in England to abolish selection totally.

After the war the authority had accepted the Hadow arguments for a system of grammar, technical and modern schools. It shared in the widespread dislike of "monster" comprehensive schools. But during the 1950 s its director, Stuart Mason, grew uneasy about the errors in selection, about parents' opposition to the eleven plus and the fact that selection was ruining the junior schools and even some infant schools, by forcing children to learn by rote. Leicestershire was Conservative-held but the chairman and committee were in favour of Mason's plan for a new comprehensive experiment. In 1957 the authority proposed a "two-tier" scheme: that all children should go to the same "high" school at 11 and then all parents who wanted to could transfer their children to an "upper" school at the age of 14, provided they kept them there till 16 at least. The scheme was a success locally, the central (Conservative) government went out of its way to bless it. It was gradually extended to other areas.

The primary schools benefited immediately (and became famous). The high schools enjoyed the full range of pupils, graduate staff and better equipment than in their secondary modern days. Examination pressures were confined to the upper schools, though these schools have gradually become more comprehensive. And initially the schools remained small - able to use the existing buildings though the upper schools have gradually been enlarged to take 1,000 to 1,200 pupils.

The chief problem of the scheme has been in the high schools - left with the children who did not transfer at the age of 14, often a demoralising element. The local education authority therefore introduced automatic transfer in each area as soon as 80 per cent transferred voluntarily. The high schools may be strengthened further in the future. The authority is now planning to make them four-year schools, taking pupils from the age of 10. This is to be tried in the first areas in 1970.

The Leicestershire scheme seems to some extent to have been a victim of politics. Two-tier schemes, which looked as if they would be very popular with authorities making plans after the government's circular in 1965, were attacked by the political left for not being genuinely comprehensive. Parental choice or guided parental choice was seen (justifiably) as a form of selection: it was still the grammar-type middle class children who went on to the upper school.

It is too often forgotten that the Leicestershire scheme was built on the strengths of existing schools. A number of other authorities have disregarded the schools for the sake of a plan and have ended up with a much less comprehensive system.

Cumberland

The authorities mentioned so far have guided government policy. Cumberland is typical of many of the rest: it had not resisted the idea of comprehensive schools, given the opportunity for building, but it actually had few comprehensive schools when the government sent out its circular. For those authorities the circular has been basically a push to an inevitable process. Cumberland is however among the authorities which have taken this policy forward with great care in a difficult situation. It is a rural area, much of it remote and much of it with a static or declining population.

Cumberland, under its director, Gordon Bessey, had in the 1950s gone much further than many authorities to build up its secondary modern schools. The ones which had particularly strong sides - in art or domestic science for example - were encouraged to build up extended courses and take in children over 15 from other secondary moderns for their 'speciality'.

When there was the opportunity, comprehensive schools were set up. One example shows the very positive conception of the authority. A new school was needed in 1964 for an atomic energy station. It could have been built in the station and drawn predominantly on the middle class research workers. In fact it was sited at a point where it also could draw on the farms and iron and coal mining communities and provide for adults as well as children. It is a flourishing community centre too, housing local clubs as well as classes for adults (this is still fairly rare in England).

A two-tier scheme is being adopted for many of the other areas in the country. Transfer at 13 (as opposed to 14 in Leicestershire) depends on "guided parental choice" for the normal grammar school curriculum. Thus the scheme is subject to the sort of criticism that were made of Leicestershire. But its flexibility should not be underestimated, as long as children are not deterred from transferring to the upper school. As pressure for transfer builds up and the teachers in the lower schools become experienced in teaching children over the whole ability range, the age of transfer can be raised. By starting in a limited way it builds on existing resources.

Others

Reorganisation has inspired a number of other schemes, linking schools and further education for example (in different ways in Devon

and Oxfordshire). Although most authorities have gone for 11 to 18 schools - the original conception - many of the more recent plans propose middle school schemes, two-tier and sixth form colleges. Several combine different schemes. That seems a measure of maturity and an opportunity to concentrate on what goes on inside the schools.

Schools: Organisation and Curriculum

Given the English context, the Department of Education in vetting plans is really concerned with two features only. Is the intake non-selective? Do schools provide a sufficient range of advanced courses to justify regarding them as more than secondary modern schools?

This may well be the limit of the local education authority's concern too. It is only very recently that an official report (on the direct grants schools(1)) argues that local education authorities should be more positive. It suggests ten criteria for schemes; for example that they should ensure that children of all abilities are educated in such a way as to develop their talents to the highest possible degree: that children are not segregated before the statutory school leaving age into separate schools; that the schools do provide opportunities to go on to further or higher education; that schools are not placed in a hierarchy of esteem; that schools are not socially one-class establishments; that there is close collaboration over curriculum and methods between schools in t arrangements.

Had local authorities co to terms with those arguments publicly, it would probably have been a great boost for flexible methods in the secondary school at a much earlier stage. Local education authority action, limited or not, is the key. Once the authority decides to reorganise, the way is open for schools to decide how far they are going to relate - in the phrasing of the American educationalist, Professor John Goodlad - the function of the school to its form. In other words, once the structure of the school has been decided, how far will its curricula and organisational functions be consistent with it?

Nearly all the debate - about forms of grouping, streaming, the place of the gifted child and the slow learner, the extent to which there can be a common curriculum, overlap with further education - comes from the schools themselves(2) though it is conditioned by examination pressures (from the examination boards and the universities) and more recently by the Schools Council.

Significantly the Schools Council's involvement in secondary education was not stimulated by reorganisation. Worry about science programmes for bright children started curriculum reform for the secondary school. The government decision to raise the school leaving

---

(1) Public Schools Commission, Second Report, H.M.S.O., 1970.

(2) The dialogue among innovating schools is effectively monitored in Forum, a journal edited by Professor Brian Simon. Simon is also co-author with David Rubinstein of The Evolution of the Comprehensive School, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969, on which this section draws.

age (RSLA) extended the Schools Council's involvement. The materials from some of the RSLA projects will undoubtedly stimulate many of the non-innovating schools into much more conscious concern about the implications of non-selective schooling. But it does take a long time.

Conclusion

To sum up: reorganisation has gone far enough to acquire its own momentum so that the change of government has not had any marked effect. But if you ask how soon reorganisation is going to change all children's experience of school, then the limitations are obvious. First, without special funds there is the lengthy period needed for the change. Second, there will not be a 100 per cent changeover to comprehensives without a government deciding to use a force which would change its relationship to local education authorities. Third, there is no institutional way of ensuring that changes in the organisation of schools stimulate a reassessment of curriculum and methods. But this is happening, because of the Schools Council and because more pupils stay voluntarily. This is typical. Change in English education relies very heavily on the individual professionals - administrators and head teachers - knowing how to draw the threads together.

PART IV

CONCLUSIONS

Does the experience of children in schools change and for the better? It is a focus which may get lost when there is much activity on curriculum development, educational technology or teacher education. But it is one good consequence, at least, of the decentralised English approach that much innovation involves schools right from its beginnings.

Of the examples in this report, curriculum projects arise from the dissatisfaction of teachers and pupils with the existing situation. The changes in primary education activities, an untimetabled day and varied forms of grouping, have grown directly out of individual schools' experiments. The changes in secondary education are probably much less effective just because they are initiated from higher up the system.

However it would be foolish to suggest that the English education system is particularly receptive to change. One barrier might be apparent to foreign readers. There is no clear chain of control or communication in the English system. A minister cannot snap his fingers, devise a policy and expect it to be implemented by the 163 local education authorities, 23,000 primary schools or 3,000 secondary schools. Nor at the other extreme is there any guarantee that a school which tries to innovate gets the necessary support.

Formally, control is exercised by the Secretary of State for Education and the Department of Education, with local education authorities below them and school governors down at the grass roots. Universities exercise some control over the education of teachers, and the churches exercise some control over some schools. But that control is mediated by a number of pressures of which the strongest are the degree of the teachers' professional interest and involvement, and the interests of local education authorities themselves as developers. Noticeable pressure can also be generated by students, parents, examination bodies, educational publishers and employers. The Department of Education itself generally occupies a relatively limited regulating role.

The system can be more accurately described as a net rather than a chain, a net traditionally kept at tension point by powerful pressure groups, the teachers and the local education authorities especially. Recently the Schools Council and the National Council for Educational Technology have been superimposed as development bodies. Their success depends on how far they can work through the various key groups.

Obviously not all in the net are developers. Individual local education authorities give the lie to the remarkably creative work of

such authorities as Bristol, Cambridgeshire, Cumberland, Devon, Leicestershire, Oxfordshire and Yorkshire West Riding. Individual teachers or local teachers' organisations can shut themselves in their classroom out of earshot of progressive ideas. The strategy for innovators is thus likely to take one of two forms. Either they try and involve all those in the net. Or they so alter the structure as to produce a chain for innovation.

In theory the central government's control could be far more effectively exercised through the HMIs, many of whom are regionally based. But HMIs have spent most of the last 50 years shaking off their purely inspectorial functions. Not surprisingly they are not keen to revive the ancient rivalries between central and local government that inspection would bring. They regard their development work as far more productive. And at present they would be too small a force - there are only 550 of them - to cover the country's schools.

In theory too, the Department of Education could go for an alternative. It could get local education authorities to show good reasons for not developing. This would leave intact the necessary and valuable development function of local education authorities. The department is neither physically nor psychologically equipped to do this. It was a major exercise getting in development plans after the 1944 education act. It has been an equally mammoth effort to get local education authorities to submit plans for secondary reorganisation.

The government has gone as far as it would be likely to go in its recent evidence to the Royal Commission on Local Government. It identifies the problem of many authorities as being too small to perform the functions expected of a forward looking unit of government. They have neither the budget nor the quality of staff for development work: they either do not run or run few in-service training courses, they are less likely to have an advisory staff with enough specialised experience to be useful. They are less likely to set up teachers' centres or experiment with school design.

Many authorities have themselves voluntarily made efforts to counteract the disadvantages of smallness. Most have gone into consortia for school building and equipment. A few (around Manchester, together with the university; and also three north-western counties) have joined together in curriculum development. Five local education authorities are working with Sussex University's Centre for Educational Technology. But the rationale of the building consortia has been essentially economic: local education authorities have foregone their development functions. It is significant that there are few examples of authorities working together in curriculum development or educational technology.

The Schools Council and the National Council for Educational Technology offer an alternative device. They do not alter the control of curriculum and development. They are essentially central servicing agencies which leave the local options open. They try to spread through the whole net. They operate in the belief that power and responsibility in education must be dispersed and that there should be a variety of ways of responding to change. The Schools Council is undoubtedly a powerful force for decentralisation and pluralism in English education, giving power to individuals by organising for them access to research

information which is only likely to be available centrally, and encouraging changes but not imposing them. It is a highly ingenious solution with an additional merit; it recruits into temporary service teachers, and sometimes administrators, who are committed to change, not just the stage armies of academics and educational politicians in the educational organisations.

The fruits of this work are just beginning to appear with the publication of materials of some of the early projects (and about a dozen more are scheduled for 1970-71) and with the attempts to modify examinations in response to new curriculum and social needs.

To some extent the success of the Schools Council is measured in the activities of teachers centres, the demand for related in-service training and the sales of materials. But evaluation of the new curriculum is only marginally more apparent than evaluation of the old. The Schools Council appropriately is backing a number of horses. It has given funds to a university team to evaluate Project Technology. It is helping to finance a Nuffield investigation of the effects of the science project in schools and industry. The National Foundation for Educational Research is evaluating the primary French project. But many teachers and some of the innovators feel that long-term evaluation takes too long to be useful, many local education authorities put its claim for funds low down on their list of priorities. Yet curriculum reform is becoming big business: it needs validating. And more information about the attitudes of teachers and pupils to innovation is urgently needed if new projects are not to start off from the same level of ignorance as the early developers inevitably faced.

In general terms the answers are known. Teachers convinced by the old methods are more effective than teachers unconvinced by the new. So the urgent problem for innovators must lie in preparing teachers for a new and usually less didactic role.

The Schools Council does a certain amount in key areas. Many of the most demanding of its projects have funds for in-service training which they use for, say, 100 teacher-trainers and teachers in especially influential positions. But in-service training is also in the hands of the HMIs, the local education authorities (who provide the bulk of it) and the universities and colleges of education. There are 500 bodies concerned. It is also on a comparatively small scale. Expenditure is only one-twentieth of what is spent on the initial training of teachers (just over £5 million annually compared with £100 million) and most of that goes on one-term and one-year courses for a mere 2,000 teachers. There is a more serious criticism of in-service training: that it is not tied in with what teachers need. A recent survey(1) shows that there was a great unmet demand for courses connected with innovation - on comprehensive schooling, on school organisation, on audio-visual aids and educational television and a surplus of courses on physical education and the initial teaching alphabet. Nor is there any attempt yet to co-ordinate the pattern of in-service training; although the Department of Education did, as a preliminary, announce at the end of 1969 that it would give special grants to certain university institutes of education to expand their activities.

It might be thought that the Schools Council would be the obvious co-ordinating body since it could ensure that the projects are put

(1) H.E.R. Townsend, Statistics of Education, Special Series 2, H.M.S.O. 1970.

across to teachers. But there is no enthusiasm for this among local education authorities who regard it as their job and some of whom feel that they already have to hand over funds to the Schools Council which otherwise they would be able to use for their own development. It looks as if the Department of Education will be encouraging the university institutes and areas training organisations to take a more active role. But there is still a case for the more systematic application of the projects' results to initial training. The colleges can be very effective agents of diffusion.

Will English innovation continue to be enlivened by a device of the Schools Council sort? Can it continue (to quote again one of its administrators, see page 8) "to boost professional self-confidence in a pluralistic setting?" Put another way, can it continue to operate without effecting any change in the control of education? As the scale of innovatory effort rises there may well be a temptation for local authorities singly or in groups to want development decisions pre-empted, where they involve investment on the scale of an educational television service or materials which cost far more than the standard text books.

And can school innovation continue to be linked so closely with the schools? There are signs that development work signals a one-way route out of schools to universities and colleges of education, administration and advisory work. A two-way mobility needs to be encouraged by the career and salary structures. For there is no doubt that the strength of English education has come from developing upwards. It should not lose the roots from which it has grown.

competence and experience in the field of bilingual education. Funds provided under grants or contracts for training activities described in this section to or with a State educational agency, separately or jointly, shall in no event exceed in the aggregate in any fiscal year 15 per centum of the total amount of funds obligated for training activities pursuant to clauses (1) and (3) of subsection (a) of section 721 in such year.

(5) An application for a grant or contract for preservice or inservice training activities described in clause (A) (i) (I) and clause (A) (ii) (I) and in subsection (a) (1) (B) of this section shall be considered an application for a program of bilingual education for the purposes of subsection (a) (4) (E) of section 703.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "eligible applicants" means—

(1) institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and community colleges) which apply, after consultation with, or jointly with, one or more local educational agencies;

(2) local educational agencies; and

(3) State educational agencies.

(20 U.S.C. 880 b-9) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 105(a)(1), 88 Stat. 508, 509.

Part B—Administration

Office of Bilingual Education

Sec. 731. (a) There shall be, in the Office of Education, an Office of Bilingual Education (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Office") through which the Commissioner shall carry out his functions relating to bilingual education.

(b) (1) The Office shall be headed by a Director of Bilingual Education, appointed by the Commissioner, to whom the Commissioner shall delegate all of his delegable functions relating to bilingual education.

(2) The Office shall be organized as the Director determines to be appropriate in order to enable him to carry out his functions and responsibilities effectively.

(c) The Commissioner, in consultation with the Council, shall prepare and, not later than November 1 of 1975, and of 1977, shall submit to the Congress and the President a report on the condition of bilingual education in the Nation and the administration and operation of this title and of other programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability. Such report shall include—

(1) a national assessment of the educational needs of children and other persons with limited English-speaking ability and of the extent to which such needs are being met from Federal, State, and local efforts, including (A) not later than July 1, 1977, the results of a survey of the number of such children and persons in the States,[1] and (B) a plan, including cost estimates, to be carried out during the five-year period beginning on such date, for extend-

[1] Section 501(b)(4) of P.L. 93-380 provides as follows:
"(4) The National Center for Education Statistics shall conduct the survey required by section 731(c)(1)(A) of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965."

94-078 O - 75 - 10

ing programs of bilingual education and bilingual vocational and adult education programs to all such preschool and elementary school children and other persons of limited English-speaking ability, including a phased plan for the training of the necessary teachers and other educational personnel necessary for such purpose;

(2) a report on and an evaluation of the activities carried out under this title during the preceding fiscal year and the extent to which each of such activities achieves the policy set forth in section 702(a);

(3) a statement of the activities intended to be carried out during the succeeding period, including an estimate of the cost of such activities;

(4) an assessment of the number of teachers and other educational personnel needed to carry out programs of bilingual education under this title and those carried out under other programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability and a statement describing the activities carried out thereunder designed to prepare teachers and other educational personnel for such programs, and the number of other educational personnel needed to carry out programs of bilingual education in the States and a statement describing the activities carried out under this title designed to prepare teachers and other educational personnel for such programs; and

(5) a description of the personnel, the functions of such personnel, and information available at the regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dealing with bilingual programs within that region.

(20 U.S.C. 880b-10) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 105(a)(1), 88 Stat. 509, 510.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION [1]

SEC. 732. (a) Subject to part D of the General Education Provisions Act, there shall be a National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education composed of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary, one of whom he shall designate as Chairman. At least eight of the members of the Council shall be persons experienced in dealing with the educational problems of children and other persons who are of limited English-speaking ability, at least one of whom shall be representative of persons serving on boards of education operating programs of bilingual education. At least three members shall be experienced in the training of teachers in programs of bilingual education. At least two members shall be persons with general experience in the field of elementary and secondary education. At least two members shall be classroom teachers of demonstrated teaching abilities using bilingual methods and techniques. The members of the Council shall be appointed in such a way as to be generally representative of the significant segments of the population of persons of limited English-speaking ability and the geographic areas in which they reside.

[1] Sec. 105(a)(2)(B) of P.L. 93-380 provides as follows:
"(B) The National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, for which provision is made in section 732 of such Act, shall be appointed within ninety days after the enactment of this Act."

(b) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but, notwithstanding the provisions of section 446(a) of the General Education Provisions Act, not less often than four times in each year.

(c) The Council shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration and operation of this title, including the development of criteria for approval of applications, and plans under this title, and the administration and operation of other programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability. The Council shall prepare and, not later than November 1 of each year, submit a report to the Congress and the President on the condition of bilingual education in the Nation and on the administration and operation of this title, including those items specified in section 731(c), and the administration and operation of other programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability.

(d) The Commissioner shall procure temporary and intermittent services of such personnel as are necessary for the conduct of the functions of the Council, in accordance with section 445, of the General Education Provisions Act, and shall make available to the Council such staff, information, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its activities effectively.

(20 U.S.C. 880b–11) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93–380, sec. 105 (c) (1), 88 Stat. 510, 511.

PART C—SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 741 (a) The provisions of this part shall be administered by the Assistant Secretary, in consultation with—

(1) the Commissioner, through the Office of Bilingual Education; and

(2) the Director of the National Institute of Education, notwithstanding the second sentence of section 405(b)(1) of the General Education Provision Act;

in accordance with regulations.

(b) The Assistant Secretary shall, in accordance with clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (a), develop and promulgate regulations for this part and then delegate his functions under this part, as may be appropriate under the terms of section 742.

(20 U.S.C. 880b–12) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93–380, sec. 105(a)(1), 88 Stat. 511.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 742. (a) The National Institute of Education shall, in accordance with the provisions of section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act, carry out a program of research in the field of bilingual education in order to enhance the effectiveness of bilingual education programs carried out under this title and other programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability.

(b) In order to test the effectiveness of research findings by the National Institute of Education and to demonstrate new or innovative practices, techniques, and methods for use in such bilingual education programs, the Director and the Commissioner are authorized to make competitive contracts with public and private educational agencies, institutions, and organizations for such purpose.

(c) In carrying out their responsibilities under this section, the Commissioner and the Director shall, through competitive contracts with appropriate public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations—

(1) undertake studies to determine the basic educational needs and language acquisition characteristics of, and the most effective conditions for, educating children of limited English-speaking ability;

(2) develop, and disseminate instructional materials and equipment suitable for use in bilingual education programs; and

(3) establish and operate a national clearinghouse of information for bilingual education, which shall collect, analyze, and disseminate information about bilingual education and such bilingual education and related programs.

(d) In carrying out their responsibilities under this section, the Commissioner and the Director shall provide for periodic consultation with representatives of State and local educational agencies and appropriate groups and organizations involved in bilingual education.

(e) There is authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year prior to July 1, 1978, $5,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(20 U.S.C. 880 b–13) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93–380, sec. 105(a) (1), 88 Stat. 511, 512.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 801. As used in titles II, III, V, VI,[1] and VII of this Act, except when otherwise specified—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "construction" means (1) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of equipment therefore; or (2) acquisition of existing structures not owned by any agency or institution making application for assistance under this Act; or (3) remodeling or alteration (including the acquisition, installation, modernization, or replacement of equipment) of existing structures; or (4) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

(c) The term "elementary school" means a day or residential school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

(d) The term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, and includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as instructional equipment and necessary furni-

[1] Repealed effective July 1, 1971.

ture, printed, published, and audio-visual instructional materials, and books, periodicals, documents, and other related materials.

(e) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however*, That in the case of an institution offering a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or technological fields which requires the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge if the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such institutions, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by such institutions, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify such institutions to participate under this Act and shall also determine whether particular institutions meet such standards. For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(f) The term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such terms also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

(g) The term "nonprofit" as applied to a school, agency, organization, or institution means a school, agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(h) The term "secondary school" means a day or residential school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(i) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(j) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands and for purposes of titles II, III, VI, and VII, such terms also includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(k) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

(l) The term "gifted and talented children" means, in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner, children who have outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies.

(20 U.S.C. 881) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title VIII, sec. 801, formerly Title VI, sec. 601, 79 Stat. 55; redesignated as Title VII, sec. 701, Nov. 3, 1966, P.L. 89-750, Title I, sec. 161, 80 Stat. 1204; amended and redesignated Jan. 2. 1968. P.L. 90-247. Titles I. VII, secs. 142(b). 152(c). 702. 703, 81 Stat. 799. 803, 816, 819; amended April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, Title I, sec. 162, 84 Stat. 152.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 803. (a) (Repealed).

(b) (Repealed).

(c) In administering the provisions of this Act and any Act amended by this Act, the Commissioner shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering programs which may be effectively coordinated with programs carried out pursuant to such Acts, and to the extent practicable for the purposes of such Acts shall coordinate such programs on the Federal level with the programs being administered by such other departments and agencies. Federal departments and agencies administering programs which may be effectively coordinated with programs carried out under this Act or any Act amended by this Act, including community action programs carried out under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall, to the fullest extent permitted by other applicable law, carry out such programs in such a manner as to assist in carrying out, and to make more effective, the programs under this Act or any Act amended by this Act.

(20 U.S.C. 883) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title VIII, sec. 803, formerly Title VI, sec. 603, 79 Stat. 57; redesignated as Title VII, sec. 703, and amended Nov. 3, 1966, P.L. 89-750, Title I, secs. 111(f), 161, 80 Stat. 1196, 1204; redesignated Jan. 2. 1968, P.L. 90-247, Title VII, sec. 702, 81 Stat. 816; amended April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, Title I, sec. 163, Title IV, 401(c)(2), 84 Stat. 153, 173. Sections (a) and (b) superseded by sec. 411 of P.L. 90-247, as amended by P.L. 91-230 (20 U.S.C. 1231).

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON REFUND OF PAYMENTS

SEC. 804. No State or local educational agency shall be liable to refund any payment made to such agency under this Act (including title I of this Act) which was subsequently determined to be unauthorized by law, if such payment was made more than five years before such agency received final written notice that such payment was unauthorized.

(20 U.S.C. 884) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 106, 88 Stat. 512.

LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS UNDER THIS ACT

SEC. 805. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act, or under any Act amended by this Act, for religious worship or instruction.

(20 U.S.C. 885) Enacted April 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title VIII, sec. 805, formerly Title VI, sec. 605, 79 Stat. 58; redesignated as Title VII, sec. 705, Nov. 3, 1966, P.L. 89-750, Title I, sec. 161, 80 Stat. 1204; redesignated Jan. 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247, Title VII, sec. 702, 81 Stat. 816.

DROPOUT PREVENTION PROJECTS

SEC. 807. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange by contract grant, or otherwise, with local educational agencies for the carrying out by such agencies in schools which (1) are located in urban or rural areas, (2) have a high percentage of children from families with an income not exceeding the low-income factor, as defined in section 103(c), and (3) have a high percentage of such children who do not complete their education in elementary or secondary school, of demonstration projects involving the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs which show promise of reducing the number of such children who do not complete their education in elementary and secondary schools.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve arrangements pursuant to this section only on application by a local educational agency and upon his finding:

(1) that the project will be carried out in one or more schools described in subsection (a);

(2) that the applicant has analyzed the reasons for such children not completing their education and has designed a program to meet this problem;

(3) that effective procedures, including objective measurements of educational achievements, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the project; and

(4) that the project has been approved by the appropriate State educational agency.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971, $31,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and $33,000,00 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and each of the five succeeding fiscal years, except that no funds are authorized to be appropriated for obligation during any year for which funds are available for obligation for carrying out part C of title IV.

(20 U.S.C. 887) Enacted and redesignated Jan. 2, 1968, P L. 90-247, Titles I. VII, secs. 172. 702, 81 Stat. 806, 816, amended April 13. 1970, P L. 91-230, Title I, sec. 161, 84 Stat. 152; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 107, 88 Stat 512, 513.

GRANTS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO IMPROVE SCHOOL NUTRITION AND HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN FROM LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

SEC. 808. (a) The Secretary shall carry out a program of making grants to local educational agencies and, where appropriate, nonprofit private educational organizations, to support demonstration projects designed to improve nutrition and health services in public and private schools serving areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families.

(b) Funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (d) shall be available for grants pursuant to applications approved under this section to pay the cost of (1) coordinating nutrition and health service resources in the areas to be served by demonstration project supported under this section, (2) providing dental health, nutritional, mental health, and food services to children from low-income families when the resources for such services available to the applicant from other sources are inadequate to meet the needs of such children, (3) nutrition and health education programs designed to train professional and other school personnel to provide nutrition and health services in a manner which meets the needs of children from low-income families for such services, and (4) the evaluation of projects assisted under this section with respect to their effectiveness in improving school nutrition and health services for such children.

(c) Applications for a grant under this section shall be submitted at such time, contain such information, and be consistent with such criteria as the Secretary may require by regulation. Such applications shall provide for—

(1) the use of funds available under this section and the coordination of health care facilities and resources and such nutrition resources as may be available to the applicant in order to insure that a comprehensive program of physical and mental health and nutrition services are available to children from low-income families in the area to be served;

(2) the development of health and nutrition curriculum materials related to the specific needs of persons involved with the project and to new and improved approaches to health services and food technology;

(3) the training of (A) school administrators, teachers, and school health and nutrition personnel in order to assist them in meeting the health and nutritional needs of children from low-income families, and (B) professional and subprofessional personnel for service in school nutrition and health programs; and

(4) adequate provision for evaluation of the project.

(d) For the purpose of making grants under this section there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and $26,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and each of the five

succeeding fiscal years, except that no funds are authorized to be appropriated for obligation during any year for which funds are available for obligation for carrying out part C of title IV.

(20 U.S.C. 887a) Enacted April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, Title I, sec. 164, 84 Stat. 153; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 108, 88 Stat. 513.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN CORRECTION EDUCATION SERVICES [1]

SEC. 809. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public and private nonprofit research agencies and organizations for research or demonstration projects, relating to the academic and vocational education of antisocial, aggressive, or delinquent persons, including juvenile delinquents, youth offenders, and adult criminal offenders, including the development of criteria for the identification for specialized educational instruction of such persons from the general elementary and secondary school age population and special curriculums, and guidance and counseling programs. All projects shall include an evaluation component.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to appoint such special or technical advisory committees as he may deem necessary to advise him on matters of general policy relating to the education of persons intended to be benefited by this section, and shall secure the advice and recommendations of the Director, Bureau of Prisons, of the Director, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, the Director of the Teachers Corps, the head of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and such other persons and organizations as he, in his discretion, deems necessary before making any grant under this section.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for the succeeding fiscal year.

(20 U.S.C. 887b) Enacted April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, Title I, sec. 164, 84 Stat. 154; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 109, 88 Stat. 513.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIAN CHILDREN

SEC. 810. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out a program of making grants for the improvement of educational opportunities for Indian children—

(1) to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects, in accordance with subsection (b), which are designed to test and demonstrate the effectiveness of programs for improving educational opportunities for Indian children;

(2) to assist in the establishment and operation of programs, in accordance with subsection (c), which are designed to stimulate (A) the provision of educational services not available to Indian children in sufficient quantity or quality, and (B) the development and establishment of exemplary educational programs to

[1] Effective July 1, 1975, section 809 is repealed (sec 402(c)(3), P.L. 93-380).

serve as models for regular school programs in which Indian children are educated;

(3) to assist in the establishment and operation of preservice and inservice training programs, in accordance with subsection (d), for persons serving Indian children as educational personnel; and

(4) to encourage the dissemination of information and materials relating to, and the evaluation of the effectiveness of, education programs which may offer educational opportunities to Indian children.

In the case of activities of the type described in clause (3) preference shall be given to the training of Indians.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to State and local educational agencies, federally supported elementary and secondary schools for Indian children and to Indian tribes, organizations, and institutions to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects which are designed to plan for, and test and demonstrate the effectiveness of, programs for improving educational opportunities for Indian children, including—

(1) innovative programs related to the educational needs of educationally deprived children;

(2) bilingual and bicultural education programs and projects;

(3) special health and nutrition services, and other related activities, which meet the special health, social, and psychological problems of Indian children; and

(4) coordinating the operation of other federally assisted programs which may be used to assist in meeting the needs of such children.

(c) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to State and local educational agencies and to tribal and other Indian community organizations to assist and stimulate them in developing and establishing educational services and programs specifically designed to improve educational opportunities for Indian children. Grants may be used—

(1) to provide educational services not available to such children in sufficient quantity or quality, including—

(A) remedial and compensatory instruction, school health, physical education, psychological, and other services designed to assist and encourage Indian children to enter, remain in, or reenter elementary or secondary school;

(B) comprehensive academic and vocational instruction;

(C) instructional materials (such as library books, textbooks, and other printed or published or audiovisual materials) and equipment;

(D) comprehensive guidance, counseling, and testing services;

(E) special education programs for handicapped;

(F) preschool programs;

(G) bilingual and bicultural education programs; and

(H) other services which meet the purposes of this subsection; and

(2) for the establishment and operation of exemplary and innovative educational programs and centers, involving new educational approaches, methods, and techniques designed to enrich programs of elementary and secondary education for Indian children.

(d) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education and to State and local educational agencies, in combination with institutions of higher education, for carrying out programs and projects—

(1) to prepare persons to serve Indian children as teachers, teacher aides, social workers, and ancillary educational personnel; and

(2) to improve the qualifications of such persons who are serving Indian children in such capacities.

Grants for the purposes of this subsection may be used for the establishment of fellowship programs leading to an advanced degree, for institutes and, as part of a continuing program, for seminars, symposia, workshops, and conferences. In carrying out the programs authorized by this subsection, preference shall be given to the training of Indians.

(e) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to and contracts with, public agencies, and institutions and Indian tribes, institutions, and organizations for—

(1) the dissemination of information concerning education programs, services, and resources available to Indian children, including evaluations thereof; and

(2) the evaluation of the effectiveness of federally assisted programs in which Indian children may participate in achieving the purposes of such programs with respect to such children.

(f) Applications for a grant under this section shall be submitted at such time, in such manner, and shall contain such information, and shall be consistent with such criteria, as may be established as requirements in regulations promulgated by the Commissioner. Such applications shall—

(1) set forth a statement describing the activities for which assitance is sought;

(2) in the case of an application for the purposes of subsection (c), subject to such criteria as the Commissioner shall prescribe, provide for the use of funds available under this section, and for the coordination of other resources available to the applicant, in order to insure that, within the scope of the purpose of the project, there will be a comprehensive program to achieve the purposes of this section;

(3) in the case of an application for the purposes of subsection (c), make adequate provision for the training of the personnel participating in the project; and

(4) provide for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the project in achieving its purposes and those of this section.

The Commissioner shall not approve an application for a grant under subsection (b) or (c) unless he is satisfied that such application, and any documents submitted with respect thereto, show that there has

been adequate participation by the parents of the children to be served and tribal communities in the planning and development of the project, and that there will be such a participation in the operation and evaluation of the project. The Commissioner shall not approve an application for a grant under subsection (b), (c), or (d) unless he is satisfied that such an application, to the extent consistent with the number of eligible children in the area to be served who are enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools whose needs are of the type which the program is intended to meet, makes provision for the participation of such children on an equitable basis. In approving applications under this section, the Commissioner shall give priority to applications from Indian educational agencies, organizations, and institutions.

(g) For the purpose of making grants under this section there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $35,000,000 for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1978.

(20 U.S.C. 887(c) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, Sec. 421(a); 86 Stat. 339, 341; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 631(a), 88 Stat. 585; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 632(a), 88 Stat. 586.

CONSUMERS' EDUCATION PROGRAMS [1]

SEC. 811. (a)(1) There shall be within the Office of Education an Office of Consumers' Education (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Office') which shall be headed by a Director of Consumers' Education (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Director') who, subject to the management of the Commissioner, shall have responsibility for carrying out the provisions of this section.

(2) The Director shall be appointed by the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code relating to appointments to the competitive service.

(b)(1)(A) The Director shall carry out a program of making grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education, State and local educational agencies, and other public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions (including libraries) to support research, demonstration, and pilot projects designed to provide consumer education to the public except that no grant may be made other than to a nonprofit agency, organization, or institution.

(B) Funds appropriated for grants and contracts under this section shall be available for such activities as—

[1] Note: Sec. 505(a)(1) and (2) of P.L. 92-318 read as follows:

"SEC. 505(a)(1) The Congress of the United States finds that there do not exist adequate resources for educating and informing consumers about their role as participants in the marketplace.

"(2) It is the purpose of the amendment made by this section to encourage and support the development of new improved curricula to prepare consumers for participation in the marketplace to demonstrate the use of such curriculums in model educational programs and to evaluate the effectiveness thereof, to provide support for the initiation and maintenance of programs in consumer education at the elementary and secondary and higher education levels the disseminate curricular materials and other information for use in educational programs throughout the Nation to provide training programs for teachers, other educational personnel, public service personnel, and community and labor leaders and employees, and government employees at State, Federal, and local levels, to provide for Community Consumer education programs, and to provide for the preparation and distribution of materials by mass media in dealing with consumer education."

(i) the development of curricula (including interdisciplinary curricula) in consumer education;

(ii) dissemination of information relating to such curricula;

(iii) in the case of grants to State and local educational agencies and institutions of higher education, for the support of education programs at the elementary and secondary and higher education levels; and

(iv) preservice and inservice training programs and projects (including fellowship programs, institutes, workshops, symposiums, and seminars) for educational personnel to prepare them to teach in subject matter areas associated with consumer education.

In addition to the activities specified in the first sentence of this paragraph, such funds may be used for projects designed to demonstrate, test, and evaluate the effectiveness of any such activities, whether or not assisted under this section. Activities pursuant to this section shall provide bilingual assistance when appropriate.

(C) Financial assistance under this subsection may be made available only upon application to the Director. Applications under this subsection shall be submitted at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Director shall prescribe by regulation and shall be approved only if it—

(i) provides that the activities and service for which assistance is sought will be administered by, or under the supervision of, the applicant;

(ii) describes a program for carrying out one or more of the purposes set forth in the first sentence of subparagraph (B) which holds promise of making a substantial contribution toward attaining the purposes of this section;

(iii) sets forth such policies and procedures as will insure adequate evaluation of the activities intended to be carried out under the application;

(iv) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in this section, and in no case supplant such funds;

(v) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of an accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

(vi) provides for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require and for keeping such records, and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Applications from local educational agencies for financial assistance under this section may be approved by the Director only if the State educational agency has been notified of the application and been given the opportunity to offer recommendations.

(2) Federal assistance to any program or project under this subsection, other than those involving curriculum development, dissemina-

tion of curricular materials, and evaluation, shall support up to 100 per centum of the cost of such program including costs of administration; contributions in kind are acceptable as local contributions to program costs.

(c) Each recipient of Federal funds under this section shall make such reports and evaluations as the Commissioner shall prescribe by regulation.

(d) For the purpose of carrying out this section, the Commissioner is authorized to expend not to exceed $15,000,000 for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1978.[1]

(20 U.S.C. 887d) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 505(a), 86 Stat. 349, 350; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 407, 88 Stat. 553.

OPEN MEETINGS OF EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

SEC. 812. No application for assistance under this Act may be considered unless the local educational agency making such application certifiies to the Commissioner that members of the public have been afforded the opportunity upon reasonable notice to testify or otherwise comment regarding the subject matter of the application. The Commissioner is authorized and directed to establish such regulations as necessary to implement this section.

(20 U.S.C. 887e) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 110, 88 Stat. 513.

TITLE IX—ETHNIC HERITAGE PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 901. In recognition of the heterogeneous composition of the Nation and of the fact that in a multiethnic society a greater understanding of the contributions of one's own heritage and those of one's fellow citizens can contribute to a more harmonious, patriotic, and committed populace, and in recognition of the principle that all persons in the educational institutions of the Nation should have an opportunity to learn about the differing and unique contributions to the national heritage made by each ethnic group, it is the purpose of this title to provide assistance designed to afford to students opportunities to learn about the nature of their own cultural heritage, and to study the contributions of the cultural heritages of the other ethnic groups of the Nation.

(20 U.S.C. 900) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 504(a), 86 Stat. 346, 347.

ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES PROGRAMS

SEC. 902. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, public and private nonprofit educational agencies, institutions, and organizations to assist them in planning, developing, establishing, and operating ethnic heritage studies programs, as provided in this title.

(20 U.S.C. 900a) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 504(a), 86 Stat. 347.

[1] Sec. 402(a)(4) of P.L. 93-380 provides that no appropriation may be made for this section in any fiscal year during which funds are available for the purposes of this section under the provisions of subsection 402(a) (The Special Projects Act).

AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES

SEC. 903. Each program assisted under this title shall—

(1) develop curriculum materials for use in elementary or secondary schools or institutions of higher education relating to the history, geography, society, economy, literature, art, music, drama, language, and general culture of the group or groups with which the program is concerned, and the contributions of that ethnic group or groups to the American heritage; or

(2) disseminate curriculum materials to permit their use in elementary or secondary schools or institutions of higher education throughout the Nation; or

(3) provide training for persons using, or preparing to use, curriculum materials developed under this title; and

(4) cooperate with persons and organizations with a special interest in the ethnic group or groups with which the program is concerned to assist them in promoting, encouraging, developing, or producing programs or other activities which relate to the history, culture, or traditions of that ethnic group or groups.

(20 U.S.C. 900a–1) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92–318, sec. 504(a), 86 Stat. 347; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93–380, sec. 111(b), 88 Stat. 513, 514.

APPLICATIONS

SEC. 904. (a) Any public or private nonprofit agency, institution, or organization desiring assistance under this title shall make application therefor in accordance with the provisions of this title and other applicable law and with regulations of the Commissioner promulgated for the purposes of this title. The Commissioner shall approve an application under this title only if he determines that—

(1) the program for which the application seeks assistance will be operated by the applicant and that the applicant will carry out such program in accordance with this title;

(2) such program will involve the activities described in section 903; and

(3) such program has been planned, and will be carried out, in consultation with an advisory council which is representative of the ethnic group or groups with which the program is concerned and which is appointed in a manner prescribed by regulation.

(b) In approving applications under this title, the Commissioner shall insure that there is cooperation and coordination of efforts among the programs assisted under this title, including the exchange of materials and information and joint programs where appropriate.

(20 U.S.C. 900a–2) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92–318, sec. 104(a), 86 Stat. 347.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 905. (a) In carrying out this title, the Commissioner shall make arrangements which will utilize (1) the research facilities and personnel of institutions of higher education, (2) the special knowledge of ethnic groups in local communities and of foreign students pursuing their education in this country, (3) the expertise of teachers

in elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education, and (4) the talents and experience of any other groups such as foundations, civic groups, and fraternal organizations which would further the goals of the programs.

(b) Funds appropriated to carry out this title may be used to cover all or part of the cost of establishing and carrying out the programs, including the cost of research materials and resources, academic consultants, and the cost of training of staff for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of this title. Such funds may also be used to provide stipends (in such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner) to individuals receiving training as part of such programs, including allowances for dependents.

(20) U.S.C. 900a–3 Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92–318, sec. 104(a), 86 Stat. 347, 348.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 906. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Council on Ethnic Heritage Studies consisting of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary who shall be appointed, serve, and be compensated as provided in part D of the General Education Provisions Act.

(b) Such Council shall, with respect to the program authorized by this title, carry out the duties and functions specified in part D of the General Education Provisions Act.

(20 U.S.C. 900a–4) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92–318, sec. 104(a), 86 Stat. 348.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 907. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1978. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law unless enacted in express limitation of this sentence, remain available for expenditure and obligation until the end of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

(20 U.S.C. 900a–5) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92–318, sec. 104(a), 86 Stat. 348; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93–380, sec. 111(a)(1), 88 Stat. 513.

INDIAN EDUCATION ACT

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Indian Education Act."

Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92–318, sec. 401, 86 Stat. 334.

PART A—REVISION OF IMPACTED AREAS PROGRAM AS IT RELATES TO INDIAN CHILDREN

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 874, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

* * * * * * *

(NOTE.—These provisions are contained in Title III, P.L. 874 at p. 211)

* * * * * * *

PART B—SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS TO IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIAN CHILDREN

AMENDMENT TO TITLE VIII OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

* * * * * * *

(NOTE.—These provisions are contained in Title VIII of the ESEA at p. 143)

* * * * * * *

SEC. 421(b) (2). For the purposes of titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and part B of title VI of Public Law 91-230, the Secretary of the Interior shall have the same duties and responsibilities with respect to funds paid to him under such titles, as he would have if the Department of the Interior were a State educational agency having responsibilty for the administration of a State plan under such titles.

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS OF INDIAN CHILDREN

SEC. 422. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to and enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, Indian organizations, and Indian tribes for the purpose of preparing individuals for teaching or administering special programs and projects designed to meet the special educational needs of Indian children and to provide in-service training for persons teaching in such programs. Priority shall be given to Indian institutions and organizations. In carrying out his responsibilities under this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships and traineeships to individuals and to make grants to and to enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, Indian organizations, and Indian tribes for cost of education allowances. In awarding fellowships and traineeships under this section, the Commissioner shall give preference to Indians.

(b) In the case of traineeships and fellowships, the Commissioner is authorized to grant stipends to, and allowances for dependents of, persons receiving traineeships and fellowships.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of this section.

(20 U.S.C. 887c-1) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 632(c), 88 Stat. 586.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR INDIAN STUDENTS

SEC. 423. (a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, the Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed two hundred fellowship to be used for study in graduate and professional programs at institutions of higher education. Such fellowships shall be awarded to Indian students in order to enable them to pursue a course of study of not less than three, nor more than four, academic years leading toward a professional or graduate degree in engineering, medicine, law, business, forestry and related fields. In addition to the fellowships authorized to be awarded in the first sentence of this subsection, the Commissioner is authorized to

078 O - 75 - 11

award a number of fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this subsection but vacated prior to the end of the period during which they were awarded, except that each fellowship so awarded shall be only for a period of study not in excess of the remainder of the period of time for which the fellowship it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

(b) The Commissioner shall pay to persons awarded fellowships under this subsection such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence of such persons and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

(c) The Commissioner shall pay to the institution of higher education at which the holder of a fellowship under this subsection is pursuing a course of study, in lieu of tuition charged such holder, such amounts as the Commissioner may determine to cover the cost of education for the holder of such a fellowship.

(20 U.S.C. 887c–2) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93–380, sec. 632(c), 88 Stat. 586, 587.

Part C—Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians

AMENDMENT TO THE ADULT EDUCATION ACT

Note.—These provisions are contained in section 314 of the Adult Education Act at p. 292.)

Part D—Office of Indian Education

OFFICE OF INDIAN EDUCATION

Sec. 441. (a) There is hereby established, in the Office of Education, a bureau to be known as the "Office of Indian Education" which, under the direction of the Commissioner, shall have the responsibility for administering the provisions of title III of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as added by this Act, section 810 of title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by this Act, and section 314 of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, as added by this Act. The Office shall be headed by a Deputy Commissioner of Indian Education, who shall be appointed by the Commissioner of Education from a list of nominees submitted to him by the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.

(b) The Deputy Commissioner of Indian Education shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for, and shall be placed in, grade 18 of the General Schedule set forth in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, and shall perform such duties as are delegated or assigned to him by the Commissioner. The position created by this subsection shall be in addition to the number of positions placed in grade 18 of such General Schedule under section 5108 of title 5, United States Code.

(20 U.S.C. 1221f) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92 318, sec. 441, 86 Stat. 343.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INDIAN EDUCATION

SEC. 442. (a) There is hereby established the National Advisory Council on Indian Education (referred to in this title as the "National Council"), which shall consist of fifteen members who are Indians and Alaska Natives appointed by the President of the United States. Such appointments shall be made by the President from lists of nominees furnished, from time to time, by Indian tribes and organizations, and shall represent diverse geographic areas of the country. Subject to section 448(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, the National Council shall continue to exist until July 1, 1978.

(b) The National Council shall—

(1) advise the Commissioner of Education with respect to the administration (including the development of regulations and of administrative practices and policies) of any program in which Indian children or adults participate from which they can benefit, including title III of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as added by this Act, and section 810, title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by this Act and with respect to adequate funding thereof;

(2) review applications for assistance under title III of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as added by this Act, section 810 of title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by this Act, and section 314 of the Adult Education Act, as added by this Act, and make recommendations to the Commissioner with respect to their approval;

(3) evaluate program and projects carried out under any program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in which Indian children or adults can participate or from which they can benefit, and disseminate the results of such evaluations;

(4) provide technical assistance to local educational agencies and to Indian educational agencies, institutions, and organizations to assist them in improving the education of Indian children;

(5) assist the Commissioner in developing criteria and regulations for the administration and evaluation of grants made under section 303(b) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress); and

(6) to submit to the Congress not later than March 31 of each year a report on its activities, which shall include any recommendations it may deem necessary for the improvement of Federal education programs in which Indian children and adults participate, or from which they can benefit, which report shall include statement of the National Council's recommendations to the Commissioner with respect to the funding of any such programs.

(c) With respect to functions of the National Council stated in clauses (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b), the National Council is authorized to contract with any public or private nonprofit agency,

institution, or organization for assistance in carrying out such functions.

(d) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 400(d) of the General Education Provisions Act which are available for the purposes of section 411 of such Act and for part D of such Act, the Commissioner shall make available such sums as may be necessary to enable the National Council to carry out its functions under this section.

(20 U.S.C. 1221g) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 442, 86 Stat. 343, 344; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 505(a)(2), 88 Stat. 562; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 845(d), 88 Stat. 612.

PART E—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 451. (This section is an amendment to Title V of the HEA of 1965 and is included at p. 375).

SEC. 452. (This section is an amendment to Title VII of the ESEA of 1965 and is included at p. 133).

DEFINITION

SEC. 453. For the purposes of this title, the term "Indian" means any individual who (1) is a member of a tribe, band, or other organized group of Indians, including those tribes, bands, or groups terminated since 1940 and those recognized now or in the future by the State in which they reside, or who is a descendant, in the first or second degree, of any such member, or (2) is considered by the Secretary of the Interior to be an Indian for any purpose, or (3) is an Eskimo or Aleut or other Alaska Native, or (4) is determined to be an Indian under regulations promulgated by the Commissioner, after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Indian Education, which regulations shall further define the term "Indian."

(20 U.S.C. 1221h) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 453, 86 Stat. 345.

TITLE VII—EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID[1]

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the "Emergency School Aid Act."

Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 701, 86 Stat. 354.

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 702. (a) The Congress finds that the process of eliminating or preventing minority group isolation and improving the quality of education for all children often involves the expenditure of additional funds to which local educational agencies do not have access.

(b) The purpose of this title is to provide financial assistance—

(1) to meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools;

[1] Title VII of P.L. 92-318.

(2) to encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students; and

(3) to aid school children in overcoming the educational disadvantages of minority group isolation.

(20 U.S.C. 1601) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 702, 86 Stat. 354.

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

SEC. 703. (a) It is the policy of the United States that guidelines and criteria established pursuant to this title shall be applied uniformly in all regions of the United States in dealing with conditions of segregation by race in the schools of the local educational agencies of any State without regard to the origin or cause of such segregation.

(b) It is the policy of the United States that guidelines and criteria established pursuant to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and section 182 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 shall be applied uniformly in all regions of the United States in dealing with conditions of segregation by race whether de jure or de facto in the schools of the local educational agencies of any State without regard to the origin or cause of such segregation.

(20 U.S.C. 1602) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 703, 86 Stat. 356.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 704. (a) The Assistant Secretary shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, carry out a program designed to achieve the purpose set forth in section 702(b). There are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this title, $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $1,000,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1976.[1] Funds so appropriated shall remain available for obligation and expenditure during the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which they are appropriated.

From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year, the Assistant Secretary shall reserve an amount equal to 13 per centum thereof for the purposes of sections 708 (a) and (c), 711, and 713, of which—

(A) not less than an amount equal to 4 per centum of such sums shall be for the purposes of section 708(c); and

(B) not less than an amount equal to 3 per centum of such sums shall be for the purposes of section 711.

(20 U.S.C. 1603) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 704, 86 Stat. 355; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 641(a) 88 Stat. 587; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 642(a), 88 Stat. 587.

[1] Section 641(b) of P.L. 93-380 provides as follows:
"(b) With respect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, the authorization level for the Emergency School Aid Act shall, for the purposes of section 414 of the General Education Provisions Act, be equal to the amount appropriated for the purposes of the Emergency School Aid Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

APPORTIONMENT AMONG STATES

SEC. 705. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 704(a) which are not reserved under section 704(b) for any fiscal year, the Assistant Secretary shall apportion to each State for grants and contracts within that State $75,000 plus an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as to the number of minority group children aged 5–17, inclusive, in that State bears to the number of such children in all States except that the amount apportioned to any State shall not be less than $100,000. The number of such children in each State and in all of the States shall be determined by the Assistant Secretary on the basis of the most recent available data satisfactory to him.

(2) The Assistant Secretary shall, in accordance with criteria established by regulation, reserve not in excess of 15 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection 704(a) for grants to, and contracts with, local educational agencies in each State pursuant to section 706(b) to be apportioned to each State in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(3) The Assistant Secretary shall reserve 8 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection 704(a) for the purpose of section 708(b) to be apportioned to each State in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(b) (1) The amount by which any apportionment to a State for a fiscal year under subsection (a) exceeds the amount which the Assistant Secretary determines will be required for such fiscal year for programs or projects within such State shall be available for reapportionment to other States in proportion to the original apportionments to such States under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any such State being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Assistant Secretary estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reapportioned among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amounts reapportioned to a State under this subsection during a fiscal year shall be deemed part of its apportionment under subsection (a) for such year.

(2) In order to afford ample opportunity for all eligible applicants in a State to submit applications for assistance under this title, the Assistant Secretary shall not fix a date for reapportionment, pursuant to this subsection, of any portion of any apportionment to a State for a fiscal year which date is earlier than sixty days prior to the end of such fiscal year.

(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragrapph (1) of this subsection, no portion of any apportionment to a State for a fiscal year shall be available for reapportionment pursuant to this subsection unless the Assistant Secretary determines that the applications for assistance under this title which have been filed by eligible applicants in that State for which a portion of such apportionment has not been reserved (but which would necessitate use of that portion) are applications which do not meet the requirements of this title, as set forth

in sections 706, 707, and 710, or which set forth programs or projects of such insufficient promise for achieving the purpose of this title stated in section 702(b) that their approval is not warranted.

(20 U.S.C. 1604) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318. sec. 705, 86 Stat. 355, 356.

ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 706. (a)(1) The Assistant Secretary is authorized to make a grant to, or a contract with, a local educational agency—

(A) which is implementing a plan—

(i) which has been undertaken pursuant to a final order issued by a court of the United States, or a court of any State, or any other State agency or official of competent jurisdiction, and which requires the desegregation of minority group segregated children or faculty in the elementary and secondary schools of such agency, or otherwise requires the elimination or reduction of minority group isolation in such schools; or

(ii) which has been approved by the Secretary as adequate under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 for the desegregation of minority group segregated children or faculty in such schools; or

(B) which, without having been required to do so, has adopted and is implementing, or will, if assistance is made available to it under this title, adopt and implement, a plan for the complete elimination of minority group isolation in all the minority group isolated schools of such agency; or

(C) which has adopted and is implementing, or will, if assistance is made available to it under this Act, adopt and implement, a plan—

(i) to eliminate or reduce minority group isolation in one or more of the minority group isolated schools of such agency,

(ii) to reduce the total number of minority group children who at in minority group isolated schools of such agency, or

(iii) to prevent minority group isolation reasonably likely to occur (in the absence of assistance under this title) in any school in such district in which school at least 20 per centum but not more than 50 per centum, of the enrollment consists of such children, or

(D) which, without having been required to do so, has adopted and is implementing, or will, if assistance is made available to it under this title, adopt and implement a plan to enroll and educate in the schools of such agency children who would not otherwise be eligible for enrollment because of nonresidence in the school district of such agency, where such enrollment would make a significant contribution toward reducing minority group isolation in one or more of the school districts to which such plan relates; or

(E) which will establish or maintain one or more integrated schools as defined in section 720(7) and which—

(i) has a sufficient number of minority group children to comprise more than 50 per centum of the number of children in attendance at the schools of such agency, and

(ii) has agreed to apply for an equal amount of assistance under section (b).

(2)(A) The Assistant Secretary is authorized, in accordance with special eligibility criteria established by regulation for the purposes of this paragraph, to make grants to, and contracts with, local educational agencies for the purposes of section 709(a)(1).

(B) A local educational agency shall be eligible for assistance under this paragraph only if—

(i) such agency is located within, or adjacent to, a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area;

(ii) the schools of such agency are not attended by minority group children in a significant number or proportion; and

(iii) such local educational agency has made joint arrangements with a local educational agency, located within that Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, and the schools of which are attended by minority group children in a significant proportion, for the establishment or maintenance of one or more integrated schools as provided in section 720(6).

(b) The Assistant Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or contracts with, local educational agencies, which are eligible under subsection (a)(1), for unusually promising pilot programs or projects designed to overcome the adverse effects of minority group isolation by improving the academic achievement of children in one or more minority group isolated schools, if he determines that the local educational agency had a number of minority group children enrolled in its schools, for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which assistance is to be provided, which (1) is at least 15,000, or (2) consistutes more than 30 per centum of the total number of children enrolled in such schools.

(c) No local educational agency making application under this section shall be eligible to receive a grant or contract in an amount in excess of the amount determined by the Assistant Secretary, in accordance with regulations setting forth criteria established for such purpose, to be the additional cost to the applicant arising out of activities authorized under this title, above that of the activities normally carried out by the local educational agency.

(d)(1) No educational agency shall be eligible for assistance under this title if it has, after the date of enactment of this title—

(A) transferred (directly or indirectly by gift, lease, loan, sale, or other means) real or personal property to, or made any services available to, any transferee which it knew or reasonably should have known to be a nonpublic school or school system (or any organization controlling, or intending to establish, such a school or school system) without prior determination that such nonpublic school or school system (i) is not operated on a racially segregated basis as an alternative for children seeking to avoid attendance in

desegregated public schools, and (ii) does not otherwise practice or permit to be practiced, discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in the operation of any school activity;

(B) had in effect any practice, policy, or procedure which results in the disproportionate demotion or dismissal of instructional or other personnel from minority groups in conjunction with desegregation or the implementation of any plan or the conduct of any activity described in this section, or otherwise engaged in discrimination based upon race, color, or national origin in the hiring, promotion, or assignment of employees of the agency (or other personnel for whom the agency has any administrative responsibility);

(C) in conjunction with desegration or the conduct of an activity described in this section, had in effect any procedure for the assignment of children to or within classes which results in the separation of minority group from nominority group children for a substantial portion of the school day, except that this clause does not prohibit the use of bona fide ability grouping by a local education agency as a standard pedagogical practice; or

(D) had in effect any other practice, policy, or procedure, such as limiting curricular or extracurricular activities (or participation therein by children) in order to avoid the participation of minority group children in such activities, which discriminates among children on the basis of race, color, or national origin;

except that, in the case of any local educational agency which is ineligible for assistance by reason of clause (A), (B), (C), or (D), such agency may make application for a waiver of ineligibility, which application shall specify the reason for its ineligibility, contain such information and assurances as the Secretary shall require by regulation in order to insure that any practice, policy, or procedure, or other activity resulting in the ineligibility has ceased to exist or occur and include such provisions as are necessary to insure that such activities do not reoccur after the submission of the application.

(2) Applications for waivers under paragraph (1) may be approved only by the Secretary. The Secretary's functions under this paragraph shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not be delegated.

(3) Applications for waiver shall be granted by the Secretary upon determination that any practice, policy, procedure or other activity resulting in ineligibility has ceased to exist, and that the applicant has given satisfactory assurance that the activities prohibited in this subsection will not reoccur.

(4) No application for assistance under this title shall be approved prior to a determination by the Secretary that the applicant is not ineligible by reason of this subsection.

(5) All determinations pursuant to this subsection shall be carried out in accordance with criteria and investigative procedures established by regulations of the Secretary for the purpose of compliance with this subsection.

(6) All determinations and waivers pursuant to this subsection shall be in writing. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House

of Representatives shall each be given notice of an intention to grant any waiver under this subsection, which notice shall be accompanied by a copy of the proposed waiver for which notice is given and copies of all determinations relating to such waiver. The Assistant Secretary shall not approve an application by a local educational agency which requires a waiver under this subsection prior to 15 days after receipt of the notice required by the preceding sentence by the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

(20 U.S.C. 1605) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 706, 86 Stat. 356-358; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, secs. 643(a) and (b), 88 Stat. 587.

AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES

SEC. 707. (a) Financial assistance under this title (except as provided by sections 708, 709, and 711) shall be available for programs and projects which would not otherwise be funded and which involve activities designed to carry out the purpose of this title stated in section 702(b):

(1) Remedial services, beyond those provided under the regular school program conducted by the local educational agency, including student to student tutoring, to meet the special needs of children (including gifted and talented children) in schools which are affected by a plan or activity described in section 706 or a program described in section 708, when such services are deemed necessary to the success of such plan, activity, or program.

(2) The provision of additional professional or other staff members (including staff members specially trained in problems incident to desegregation or the elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation) and the training and retraining of staff for such schools.

(3) Recruiting, hiring, and training of teacher aides, provided that in recruiting teacher aides, preference shall be given to parents of children attending schools assisted under this title.

(4) Inservice teacher training designed to enhance the success of schools assisted under this title through contracts with institutions of higher education, or other institutions, agencies, and organizations individually determined by the Assistant Secretary to have special competence for such purpose.

(5) Comprehensive guidance, counseling, and other personal services for such children.

(6) The development and use of new curricula and instructional methods, practices, and techniques (and the acquisition of instructional materials relating thereto) to support a program of instruction for children from all ra[illegible]thnic, and economic backgrounds, including instruction in l[illegible]nguage and cultural heritage of minority groups.

(7) Educational programs using shared facilities for career education and other specialized activities.

(8) Innovative interracial educational programs or projects involving the joint participation of minority group children and other children attending different schools, including extracurric

ular activities and cooperative exchanges or other arrangements between schools within the same or different school districts.

(9) Community activities, including public information efforts, in support of a plan, program, project, or activity described in this title.

(10) Administrative and auxiliary services to facilitate the success of the program, project, or activity.

(11) Planning programs, projects, or activities under this title, the evaluation of such programs, projects, or activities, and dissemination of information with respect to such programs, projects, or activities.

(12) Repair or minor remodeling or alteration of existing school facilities (including the acquisition, installation, modernization, or replacement of instructional equipment) and the lease or purchase of mobile classroom units or other mobile education facilities.

In the case of programs, projects, or activities involving activities described in pargraph (12), the inclusion of such activities must be found to be a necessary component of, or necessary to facilitate, a program or project involving other activities described in this subsection or subsection (b), and in no case involve an expenditure in excess of 10 per centum of the amount made available to the applicant to carry out the program, project, or activity. The Assistant Secretary shall by regulation define the term "repair or minor remodeling or alteration".

(b) Sums reserved under section 705(a)(2) with respect to any State shall be available for grants to, and contracts with, local educational agencies in that State making application for assistance under section 706(b), to carry out innovative pilot programs and projects which are specifically designed to assist in overcoming the adverse effects of minority group isolation, by improving the educational achievement of children in minority group isolated schools, including only the activities described in paragraphs (1) through (12) of subsection (a), as they may be used to accomplish such purpose.

(20 U.S.C. 1606) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92–318, sec. 707, 86 Stat. 359, 360.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

SEC. 708. (a)(1) Amounts reserved by the Assistant Secretary pursuant to section 704(b)(2), which are not designated for the purposes of clause (A) or (B) thereof, or for section 713 shall be available to him for grants and contracts under this subsection.

(2) The Assistant Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, State and local educational agencies, and other public agencies and organizations (or a combination of such agencies and organizations) for the purpose of conducting special programs and projects carrying out activities otherwise authorized by this title, which the Assistant Secretary determines will make substantial progress toward achieving the purposes of this title.

(3) The Assistant Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, one or more private, nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations, for the conduct, in cooperation with one or more local

educational agencies, of special programs for the teaching of standard mathematics to children eligible for services under this Act through instruction in advanced mathematics by qualified instructors with bachelor degrees in mathematics, or the mathematical sciences from colleges or other institutions of higher education, or equivalent experience.

(b)(1) From not more than one-half of the sums reserved pursuant to section 705(a)(3), the Assistant Secretary, in cases in which he finds that it would effectively carry out the purpose of this title stated in section 702(b), may assist by grant or contract any public or private nonprofit agency, institution, or organization (other than a local educational agency) to carry out programs or projects designed to support the development or implementation of a plan, program, or activity described in section 706.

(2) From the remainder of the sums reserved pursuant to section 705(a)(3), the Assistant Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations (other than local educational agencies and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools) to carry out programs or projects designed to support the development or implementation of a plan, program, or activity described in section 706.

(c)(1) The Assistant Secretary shall carry out a program to meet the needs of minority group children who are from an environment in which a dominant language is other than English and who, because of language barriers and cultural differences, do not have equality of educational opportunity. From the amount reserved pursuant to section 704(b)(2)(A), the Assistant Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with—

(A) private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations to develop curricula, at the request of one or more educational agencies which are eligible for assistance under section 706, designed to meet the special educational needs of minority group children who are from environments in which a dominant language is other than English, for the development of reading, writing, and speaking skills, in the English language and in the language of their parents or grandparents, and to meet the educational needs of such children and their classmates to understand the history and cultural background of the minority groups of which such children are members;

(B) local educational agencies eligible for assistance under section 706 for the purpose of engaging in such activities; or

(C) local educational agencies which are eligible to receive assistance under section 706, for the purpose of carrying out activities authorized under section 707(a) of this title to implement curricula developed under clauses (A) and (B) or curricula otherwise developed which the Assistant Secretary determines meets the purposes stated in clause (A).

In making grants and contracts under this paragraph, the Assistant Secretary shall assure that sufficient funds from the amount reserved pursuant to section 704(b)(2)(A) remain available to provide for grants and contracts under clause (C) of this paragraph for implementation of such curricula as the Assistant Secretary determines

meet the purposes stated in clause (A) of this paragraph. In making a grant or contract under clause (C) of this paragraph, the Assistant Secretary shall take whatever action is necessary to assure that the implementation plan includes provisions adequate to insure training of teachers and other ancillary educational personnel.

(2) (A) In order to be eligible for a grant or contract under this subsection—

(i) a local educational agency must establish a program or project committee meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B), which will fully participate in the preparation of the application under this subsection and in the implementation of the program or project and join in submitting such application; and

(ii) a private nonprofit agency, institution, or organization must (I) establish a program or project board of not less than ten members which meets the requirements of subparagraph (B) and which shall exercise policymaking authority with respect to the program or project and (II) have demonstrated to the Assistant Secretary that it has the capacity to obtain the services of adequately trained and qualified staff.

(B) A program or project committee or board, established pursuant to subparagraph (A) must be broadly representative of parents, school officials, teachers, and interested members of the community or communities to be served, not less than half of the members of which shall be parents and not less than half of the members of which shall be members of the minority group the educational needs of which the program or project is intended to meet.

(3) All programs or projects assisted under this subsection shall be specifically designed to complement any programs or projects carried out by the local educational agency under section 706. The Assistant Secretary shall insure that programs of Federal financial assistance related to the purposes of this subsection are coordinated and carried out in a manner consistent with the provisions of this subsection, to the extent consistent with other law.

(20 U.S.C. 1607) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 708, 86 Stat. 360, 361, amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 644, 88 Stat. 588.

METROPOLITAN AREA PROJECTS

SEC. 709. (a) Sums available to the Secretary under section 708 for metropolitan area projects shall be available for the following purposes:

(1) A program of grants to, and contracts with, local educational agencies which are eligible under section 706(a)(2) in order to assist them in establishing and maintaining integrated schools as defined in section 720(6).

(2) A program of any grant to groups of local educational agencies located in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area for the joint development of a plan to reduce and eliminate minority group isolation, to the maximum extent possible, in the public elementary and secondary schools in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, which shall, as a minimum, provide that by a date certain, but in no event later than July 1, 1983, the percentage of minority group children enrolled in each school in the

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area shall be at least 50 per centum of the percentage of minority group children enrolled in all the schools in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. No grant may be made under this paragraph unless—

(A) two-thirds or more of the local educational agencies in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area have approved the application, and

(B) the number of students in the schools of the local educational agencies which have approved the application constitutes two-thirds or more of the number of students in the schools of all the local educational agencies in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

(b) In making grants and contracts under this section, the Assistant Secretary shall insure that at least one grant shall be for the purposes of paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(20 U.S.C. 1608) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 709, 86 Stat. 361, 362; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-370, sec. 642(b), 88 Stat. 587; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 222, 88 Stat. 519.

APPLICATIONS

SEC. 710. (a) Any local educational agency desiring to receive assistance under this title for any fiscal year shall submit to the Assistant Secretary an application therefor for that fiscal year at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Assistant Secretary shall require by regulation. Such application, together with all correspondence and other written materials relating thereto, shall be made readily available to the public by the applicant and by the Assistant Secretary. The Assistant Secretary may approve such an application only if he determines that such application—

(1) in the case of applications under section 706, sets forth a program under which, and such policies and procedures as will assure that, (A) the applicant will use the funds received under this title only for the activities set forth in section 707 and (B) in the case of an application under section 706(b), the applicant will initiate or expand an innovative program specifically designed to meet the educational needs of children attending one or more minority group isolated schools;

(2) has been developed—

(A) in open consultation with parents, teachers, and, where applicable, secondary school students, including public hearings at which such persons have had a full opportunity to understand the program for which assistance is being sought and to offer recommendations thereon, and

(B) except in the case of applications under section 708(c), with the participation of a committee composed of parents of children participating in the program for which assistance is sought, teachers, and, where applicable, secondary school students, of which at least half the members shall be such parents, and at least half shall be persons from minority groups;

(3) sets forth such policies and procedures as will insure that the program for which assistance is sought will be operated in con-

sultation with, and with the involvement of, parents of the children and representatives of the area to be served, including the committee established for the purposes of clause (2)(B);

(4) sets forth such policies and procedures, and contains such information, as will insure that funds paid to the applicant under the application will be used solely to pay the additional cost to the applicant in carrying out the plan, program, and activity described in the application;

(5) contains such assurances and other information as will insure that the program for which assistance is sought will be administered by the applicant, and that any funds received by the applicant, and any property derived therefrom, will remain under the administration and control of the applicant;

(6) sets forth assurances that the applicant is not reasonably able to provide, out of non-Federal sources, the assistance for which the application is made;

(7) provides that the plan with respect to which such agency is seeking assistance (as specified in section 706(a)(1)(A) does not involve freedom of choice as a means of desegregation, unless the Assistant Secretary determines that freedom of choice has achieved, or will achieve, the complete elimination of a dual school system in the school district of such agency;

(8) provides assurances that for each academic year for which assistance is made available to the applicant under this title such agency has taken or is in the process of taking all practicable steps to avail itself of all assistance for which it is eligible under any program administered by the Commissioner;

(9) provides assurances that such agency will carry out, and comply with, all provisions, terms, and conditions of any plan, program, or activity as described in section 706 or section 708(c) upon which a determination of its eligibility for assistance under this title is based;

(10) sets forth such policies and procedures, and contains such information, as will insure that funds made available to the applicant (A) under this title will be so used (i) as to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for the purposes of the program for which assistance is sought, and for promoting the integration of the schools of the applicant, and for the education of children participating in such program, and (ii) in no case, as to supplant such funds from non-Federal sources, and (B) under any other law of the United States will, in accordance with standards established by regulation, be used in coordination with such programs to the extent consistent with such other law;

(11) in the case of an application for assistance under section 706, provides that the program, project, or activity to be assisted will involve an additional expenditure per pupil to be served, determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Assistant Secretary, of sufficient magnitude to provide reasonable assurance that the desired funds under this title will not be dispersed in such a way as to undermine their effectiveness;

(12) provides that (A) to the extent consistent with the number of minority group children in the area to be served who are enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools which are operated in a manner free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin, and which do not serve as alternatives for children seeking to avoid attendance in desegregated or integrated public schools, whose participation would assist in achieving the purpose of this title stated in section 702(b) provides assurance that such agency (after consultation with the appropriate private school officials) has made provision for their participation on an equitable basis, and (B) to the extent consistent with the number of children, teachers, and other educational staff, in the school district of such agency enrolled or employed in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools whose participation would assist in achieving the purpose of this title stated in section 702(b) or, in the case of an application under section 708(c), would assist in meeting the needs described in that subsection, such agency (after consultation with the appropriate private school officials) has made provisions for their participation on an equitable basis;

(13) provides that the applicant has not reduced its fiscal effort for the provision of free public education for children in attendance of the schools of such agency for the fiscal year for which assistance is sought under this title to less than that of the second preceding fiscal year, and that the current expenditure per pupil which such agency makes from revenues derived from its local sources for the fiscal year for which assistance under this title will be made available to such agency is not less than such expenditure per pupil which such agency made from such revenues for (A) the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year during which the implementation of a plan described in section 706(a)(1)(A) was commenced, or (B) the third fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which such assistance will be made available under this title, whichever is later;

(14) provides that the appropriate State educational agency has been given reasonable opportunity to offer recommendations to the applicant and to submit comments to the Assistant Secretary;

(15) sets forth effective procedures, including provisions for objective measurement of change in educational achievement and other change to be effected by programs conducted under this title, for the continuing evaluation of programs, projects, or activities under this title, including their effectiveness in achieving clearly stated program goals, their impact on related programs and upon the community served, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services, and including, where appropriate, comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs or projects; and

(16) provides (A) that the applicant will make periodic reports at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Assistant Secretary may require by regulation, which regulation may require at least—

(i) in the case of reports relating to performance, that the reports be consistent with specific criteria related to the program objectives, and

(ii) that the reports include information relating to educational achievement of children in the schools of the applicant, and (B) that the applicant will keep such records and afford such access thereto as—

(i) will be necessary to assure the correctness of such reports and to verify them, and

(ii) will be necessary to assure the public adequate access to such reports and other written materials.

(b) No application under this section may be approved which is not accompanied by the written comments of a committee established pursuant to clause (2)(B) of subsection (a). The Assistant Secretary shall not approve an application without first affording the committee an opportunity for an informal hearing if the committee requests such a hearing.

(c) In approving applications submitted under this title (except for those submitted under sections 708 (b) and (c) and 711), the Assistant Secretary shall apply only the following criteria:

(1) the need for assistance, taking into account such factors as—

(A) the extent of minority group isolation (including the number of minority group isolated children and the relative concentration of such children) in the school district to be served as compared to other school districts in the State,

(B) the financial need of such school district as compared to other school districts in the State,

(C) the expense and difficulty of effectively carrying out a plan or activity described in section 706 or a program described in section 708(a) in such school district as compared to other school districts in the State, and

(D) the degree to which measurable deficiencies in the quality of public education afforded in such school district exceeded those of other school districts within the State;

(2) the degree to which the plan or activity described in section 706(a), and the program or project to be assisted, or the program described in section 708(a) are likely to effect a decrease in minority group isolation in minority group isolated schools, or in the the case of applications submitted under section 706(a)(1)(C)(iii) or under section 706(a)(1)(E) the degree to which the plan or activity and the program or project, are likely to prevent minority group isolation from occurring or increasing (in the absence of assistance under this title);

(3) the extent to which the plan or activity described in section 706 constitutes a comprehensive districtwide approach to the elimination of minority groups isolation, to the maximum extent practicable, in the schools of such school district;

(4) the degree to which the program, project, or activity to be assisted affords promise of achieving the purpose of this title stated in section 702(b);

(5) that (except in the case of an application submitted under section 708(a)) the amount necessary to carry out effectively the

0 - 75 - 12

project or activity does not exceed the amount available for assistance in the State under this title in relation to the other applications from the State pending before him; and

(6) the degree to which the plan or activity described in section 706 involves to the fullest extent practicable the total educational resources, both public and private, of the community to be served.

(d) (1) The Assistant Secretary shall not give less favorable consideration to the application of a local educational agency (including an agency currently classified as legally desegregated by the Secretary) which has voluntarily adopted a plan qualified for assistance under this title (due only to the voluntary nature of the action) than to the application of a local educational agency which has been legally required to adopt such a plan.

(2) The Assistant Secretary shall not finally disapprove in whole or in part any application for funds submitted by a local educational agency without first notifying the local educational agency of the specific reasons for his disapproval and without affording the agency an appropriate opportunity to modify its application.

(e) The Assistant Secretary may, from time to time, set dates by which applications shall be filed.

(f) In the case of an application by a combination of local educational agencies for jointly carrying out a program or project under this title, at least one such agency shall be a local educational agency described in section 706(a) or section 708 (a) or (c) and any one or more of such agencies joining in such application may be authorized to administer such program or project.

(g) No State shall reduce the amount of State aid with respect to the provision of free public education in any school district of any local educational agency within such State because of assistance made or to be made available to such agency under this title.

(20 U.S.C. 1609) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 710, 86 Stat. 362-366; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec 643(c), 88 Stat. 587.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

SEC. 711. (a) The sums reserved pursuant to section 704(b)(2)(B) for the purpose of carrying out this section shall be available for grants and contracts in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) (1) The Assistant Secretary shall carry out a program of making grants to, or contracts with, not more than ten public or private nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations with the capability of providing expertise in the development of television programing, in sufficient number to assure diversity, to pay the cost of development and production of integrated children's television programs of cognitive and effective educational value.

(2) Television programs developed in whole or in part with assistance provided under this title shall be made reasonably available for transmission, free of charge, and shall not be transmitted under commercial sponsorship.

(3) The Assistant Secretary may approve an application under this section only if he determines that the applicant—

(A) will employ members of minority groups in responsible positions in development, production, and administrative staffs;

(B) will use modern television techniques of research and production; and

(C) has adopted effective procedures for evaluating education and other change achieved by children viewing the program.

(20 U.S.C. 1610) Enacted June 23, 1972. P. L. 92-318, sec. 711, 86 Stat. 366.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 712. (a) Upon his approval of an application for assistance under this title, the Assistant Secretary shall reserve from the applicable apportionment (including any applicable reapportionment) available therefor the amount fixed for such application.

(b) The Assistant Secretary shall pay to the applicant such reserved amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with established practice, as he may determine.

(c)(1) If a local educational agency in a State is prohibited by law from providing for the participation of children and staff enrolled or employed in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools as required by paragraph (12) of section 710(a), the Assistant Secretary may waive such requirement with respect to local educational agencies in such State and, upon the approval of an application from a local educational agency within such State, shall arrange for the provision of services to such children enrolled in, or teachers or other educational staff of, any nonprofit private elementary or secondary school located within the school district of such agency if the participation of such children and staff would assist in achieving the purpose of this title stated in section 702(b) or in the case of an application under section 708(c) would assist in meeting the needs described in that subsection. The services to be provided through arrangements made by the Assistant Secretary under this paragraph shall be comparable to the services to be provided by such local educational agency under such application. The Assistant Secretary shall pay the cost of such arrangements from such State's allotment or, in the case of an application under section 708(c), from the funds reserved under section 704(b)(2)(A), or in case of an application under section 708(a), from the sums available to the Assistant Secretary under section 704(b)(2) for the purpose of that subsection.

(2) In determining the amount to be paid pursuant to paragraph (1), the Assistant Secretary shall take into account the number of children and teachers and other educational staff who, except for provisions of State law, might reasonably be expected to participate in the program carried out under this title by such local educational agency.

(3) If the Assistant Secretary determines that a local educational agency has substantially failed to provide for the participation on an equitable basis of children and staff enrolled or employed in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools as required by paragraph (12) of section 710(a) he shall arrange for the provision of services to children enrolled in, or teachers or other educational staff of, the nonprofit private elementary or secondary school or schools located within the school district of such local educational agency, which services shall, to the maximum extent feasible, be identical with the serv-

ices which would have been provided such children or staff had the local educational agency carried out such assurance. The Assistant Secretary shall pay the cost of such services from the grant to such local educational agency and shall have the authority for this purpose of recovering from such agency any funds paid to it under such grant.

(d) After making a grant or contract under this title, the Assistant Secretary shall notify the appropriate State educational agency of the name of the approved applicant and of the amount approved.

(20 U.S.C. 1611) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 712, 86 Stat. 366, 367.

EVALUATIONS

SEC. 713. The Assistant Secretary is authorized to reserve not in excess of 1 per centum of the sums appropriated under this title, and reserved pursuant to section 704(b)(2), for any fiscal year for the purposes of this section. From such reservation, the Assistant Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with State educational agencies, institutions of higher education and private organizations, institutions, and agencies, including committees established pursuant to section 710(a)(2) for the purpose of evaluating specific programs and projects assisted under this title.

(20 U.S.C. 1612) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 713, 86 Stat. 367.

REPORTS

SEC. 714. The Assistant Secretary shall make periodic detailed reports concerning his activities in connection with the progr authorized by this title and the program carried out with appror tions under the paragraph headed "Emergency School Assistanc the Office of Education Appropriations Act, 1971 (Public Law 380), and the effectiveness of programs and projects assisted under title in achieving the purpose of this title stated in section 702(b). Such reports shall contain such information as may be necessary to permit adequate evaluation of the program authorized by this title, and shall include application forms, regulations, program guides, and guidelines used in the administration of the program. The report shall be submitted to the President and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. The first report submitted pursuant to this section shall be submitted no later than ninety days after the enactment of this title. Subsequently reports shall be submitted no less often than two times annually.

(20 U.S.C. 1613) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 714, 86 Stat. 368.

JOINT FUNDING

SEC. 715. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced under this title, and by one or more other Federal agencies for any project or activity funded in whole or in part under this title, any one of such Federal agencies may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, any such

agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize (1) the use of any funds appropriated under this title for any purpose not authorized herein, (2) a variance of any reservation or apportionment under section 704 or 705, or (3) waiver of any requirement set forth in sections 703 through 711.

(20 U.S.C. 1614) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 715, 86 Stat. 368.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 716. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity, consisting of fifteen members, at least one-half of whom shall be representative of minority groups, appointed by the President, which shall—

(1) advise the Assistant Secretary with respect to the operation of the program authorized by this title, including the preparation of regulations and the development of criteria for the approval of applications;

(2) review the operation of the program (A) with respect to its effectiveness in achieving its purpose as stated in section 702(b), and (B) with respect to the Assistant Secretary's conduct in the administration of the program;

(3) meet not less than four times in the period during which the program is authorized, and submit through the Secretary, to the Congress at least two interim reports, which reports shall include a statement of its activities and of any recommendations it may have with respect to the operation of the program; and

(4) not later than December 1, 1973, submit to the Congress a final report on the operation of the program.

(b) The Assistant Secretary shall submit an estimate in the same manner provided under section 400(c) and part D of the General Education Provisions Act to the Congress for the appropriations necessary for the Council created by subsection (a) to carry out its functions. Subject to section 718(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, such Council shall continue to exist until July 1, 1975.

(20 U.S.C. 1615) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 716, 86 Stat. 368, amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 845(e), 88 Stat. 612.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 717. (a) The provisions of parts C and D of the General Education Provisions Act shall apply to the program of Federal assistance authorized under this title as if such program were an applicable program under such General Education Provisions Act, and the Assistant Secretary shall have the authority vested in the Commissioner of Education by such parts with respect to such program.

(b) Section 422 of such General Education Provisions Act is amended by inserting "the Emergency School Aid Act;" after "the International Education Act of 1966;".

(20 U.S.C. 1616) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 717, 86 Stat. 369.

ATTORNEY FEES

SEC. 718. Upon the entry of a final order by a court of the United States against a local educational agency, a State (or any agency thereof), or the United States (or any agency thereof), for failure to comply with any provision of this title or for discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States as they pertain to elementary and secondary education, the court, in its discretion, upon a finding that the proceedings were necessary to bring about compliance, may allow the prevailing party, other than the United States, a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs.

(20 U.S.C. 1617) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 717, 86 Stat. 369.

NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

SEC. 719. Nothing in this title shall be construed as requiring any local educational agency which assigns students to schools on the basis of geographic attendance areas drawn on a racially nondiscriminatory basis to adopt any other method of student assignment.

(20 U.S.C. 1618) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 719, 86 Stat. 369.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 720. Except as otherwise specified, the following definitions shall apply to the terms used in this title:

(1) The term "Assistant Secretary" means the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education.

(2) The term "current expenditure per pupil" for a local educational agency means (1) the expenditures for free public education, including expenditures for administration, instruction, attendance and health services, pupil transportation services, operation and maintenance of plant, fixed charges, and net expenditures to cover deficits for food services and student body activities, but not including expenditures for community services, capital outlay and debt service, or any expenditure made from funds granted under such Federal program of assistance as the Secretary may prescribe, divided by (2) the number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agency provided free public education during the year for which the computation is made.

(3) The term "elementary school" means a day or residential school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

(4) The term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, and includes all other items necessary for the provision of educational services, such as instructional equipment and necessary furniture, printed, published, and audiovisual instructional materials, and other related material.

(5) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(A) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

(C) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree; or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;

(D) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(E) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner for the purposes of this paragraph.

(6) For the purpose of section 706(a)(2) and section 709(a)(1), the term "integrated school" means a school with an enrollment in which a substantial proportion of the children is from educationally advantaged backgrounds, in which the proportion of minority group children is at least 50 per centum of the proportion of minority group children enrolled in all schools of the local educational agencies within the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, and which has a faculty and administrative staff with substantial representation of minority group persons.

(7) For the purpose of section 706(a)(1)(E), the term "integrated school" means a school with (i) an enrollment in which a substantial proportion of the children is from educationally advantaged backgrounds, and in which the Assistant Secretary determines that the number of nonminority group children constitutes that proportion of the enrollment which will achieve stability, in no event more than 65 per centum thereof, and (ii) a faculty which is representative of the minority group and nonminority group population of the larger community in which it is located, or, wherever the Assistant Secretary determines that the local educational agency concerned is attempting to increase the proportions of minority group teachers, supervisors, and administrators in its employ, a faculty which is representative of the minority group and nonminority group faculty employed by the local educational agency.

(8) The term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or a federally recognized Indian reser-

vation, or such combination of school districts. or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools, or a combination of local educational agencies; and includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school and where responsibility for the control and direction of the activities in such schools which are to be assisted under this title is vested in an agency subordinate to such a board or other authority, the Assistant Secretary may consider such subordinate agency as a local educational agency for purpose of this title.

(9)(A) The term "minority group" refers to (i) persons who are Negro, American Indian, Spanish-surnamed American, Portuguese, Oriental, Alaskan natives, and Hawaiian natives and (ii) (except for the purposes of section 705), as determined by the Assistant Secretary, persons who are from environments in which a dominant language is other than English and who, as a result of language barriers and cultural differences, do not have an equal educational opportunity, and (B) the term "Spanish-surnamed American" includes persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Spanish origin or ancestry.

(10) The terms "minority group isolated school" and "minority group isolation" in reference to a school mean a school and condition, respectively, in which minority group children constitute more than 50 per centum of the enrollment of a school.

(11) The term "nonprofit" as applied to a school, agency, organization, or institution means a school, agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(12) The term "secondary school" means a day or residential school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(13) The term "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area" means the area in and around a city of fifty thousand inhabitants or more as defined by the Office of Management and Budget.

(14) The term "State" means one of the fifty States or the District of Columbia, and for purposes of section 708(a), Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be deemed to be States.

(15) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law for this purpose.

(20 U.S.C. 1619) Enacted June 23, 1972, P.L. 92-318, sec. 720, 86 Stat. 369-371; amended August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 843(d), 88 Stat. 587.

EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1974

(P.L. 93-380)

* * * * * * * *

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS [1]

PART A—POLICY STATEMENTS AND WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

NATIONAL POLICY WITH RESPECT TO EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 801. Recognizing that the Nation's economic, political, and social security require a well-educated citizenry, the Congress (1) reaffirms, as a matter of high priority, the Nation's goal of equal educational opportunity, and (2) declares it to be the policy of the United States of America that every citizen is entitled to an education to meet his or her full potential without financial barriers.

(20 U.S.C. 1221-1) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 801, 88 Stat. 547.

POLICY WITH RESEPECT TO ADVANCE FUNDING OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 802. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to implement immediately and continually section 411 of the General Education Provisions Act, relating to advance funding for education programs, so as to afford responsible State, local, and Federal officers adequate notice of available Federal financial assistance for education authorized under this and other Acts of Congress.

(20 U.S.C. 1223) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 802, 88 Stat. 597.

POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO MUSEUMS AS EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 803. The Congress, recognizing—

(1) that museums serve as sources for schools providing education for children,

(2) that museums provide educational services of various kinds for educational agencies and institutions and institutions of higher education, and

(3) that the expense of the educational services provided by museums is seldom borne by the educational agencies and institutions taking advantage of the museums' resources,

declares that it is the sense of the Congress that museums be considered educational institutions and that the cost of their educational services be more frequently borne by educational agencies and institutions benefiting from those services.

(20 U.S.C. 1221-2) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 803, 88 Stat. 597.

[1] Title VIII of P.L. 93-380.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

SEC. 804. (a) The President is authorized to call and conduct a White House Conference on Education in 1977 (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Conference") in order to stimulate a national assessment of the condition, needs, and goals of education and to obtain from a group of citizens broadly representative of all aspects of education, both public and nonpublic, a report of findings and recommendations with respect to such assessment.

(b)(1) In carrying out the provisions of this section, participants in conferences and other activities at local, State, and Federal levels are authorized to consider all matters relevant to the purposes of the Conference set forth in subsection (a), but shall give special consideration to the following:

(A) The implementation of the policy set forth in section 801.

(B) The means by which educational systems are financed.

(C) Preschool education (including child care and nutrition programs), with special attention to the needs of disadvantaged children.

(D) The adequacy of primary education in providing all children with the fundamental skills of communication (reading, writing, spelling, and other elements of effective oral and written expression) and mathematics.

(E) The effectiveness of secondary education in preparing students for careers, as well as for postsecondary education.

(F) The place of occupational education (including education in proprietary schools) in the educational structure and the role of vocational and technical education in assuring that the Nation's requirements for skilled manpower are met.

(G) The structure and needs of postsecondary education, including methods of providing adequate levels of student assistance and institutional support.

(H) The adequacy of education at all levels in meeting the special educational needs of such individuals as handicapped persons, economically disadvantaged, racially or culturally isolated children, those who need bilingual instruction, and gifted and talented children.

(I) Ways of developing and implementing expanded educational opportunities for adults at the basic and secondary education equivalency levels.

(J) The contribution of nonpublic primary and secondary education in providing alternate educational experiences for pupils and a variety of options for parents in guiding their children's development.

(2) Participants in conference activities at the State and local levels are authorized to narrow the scope of their deliberations to the educational problems which they consider to be most critical in their respective areas, but shall be encouraged by the National Conference Committee (established pursuant to subsection (c)) to consider such problems in the context of the total educational structure.

(c)(1) There is established a National Conference Committee (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Committee"), composed of not more than thirty-five members, fifteen of whom shall be appointed by the President, ten of whom shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and ten of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Committee shall at its first meeting select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman.

(2)(A) The Committee shall provide guidance and planning for the Conference and shall make a final report (and such interim reports as may be desirable) of the results, findings, and recommendations of the Conference to the President and to the Congress not later than December 1, 1977.

(B) The Committee is authorized to provide such assistance as may be necessary for State and local conference activities in preparation for the National Conference.

(3) The Commissioner shall support the activities of the Committee by providing technical assistance, advice, and consultation.

(4) Members of the Committee shall serve without compensation, but may receive travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while employed in the business of the Committee away from their homes or regular places of business.

(5) The Committee is authorized to appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Conference Director and such professional, technical, and clerical personnel as may be necessary to assist in carrying out its functions under this section.

(d)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (e) the Commissioner is authorized to make a grant to each State, upon application of the Governor thereof, in order to assist in meeting the costs of that State's participation in the Conference program (including the conduct of conferences at the State and local levels).

(2) Grants made pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be made only with the approval of the Chairman of the Committee.

(3) Funds appropriated for the purposes of this subsection shall be apportioned among the States by the Commissioner in accordance with their respective needs for assistance under this subsection, except that no State shall be apportioned more than $75,000 nor less than $25,000.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitations, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section; and sums so appropriated shall remain available for expenditure until June 30, 1978.

(f) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(20 U.S.C. 1221–1 note) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93–380, sec. 804, 88 Stat. 597, 599.

PART B—EDUCATIONAL STUDIES AND SURVEYS

STUDY OF PURPOSES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 821. (a) In addition to the other authorities, responsibilities and duties conferred upon the National Institute of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Institute") by section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act and notwithstanding the second sentence of subsection (b) (1) of such section 405, the Institute shall undertake a thorough evaluation and study of compensatory education programs, including such programs conducted by States and such programs conducted under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Such study shall include—

(1) an examination of the fundamental purposes of such programs, and the effectiveness of such program in attaining such purposes;

(2) an analysis of means to identify accurately the children who have the greatest need for such programs, in keeping with the fundamental purposes thereof;

(3) an analysis of the effectiveness of methods and procedures for meeting the educational needs of children, including the use of individualized written educational plans for children, and programs for training the teachers of children;

(4) an exploration of alternative methods, including the use of procedures to assess educational disadvantage, for distributing funds under such programs to States, to State educational agencies, and to local educational agencies in an equitable and efficient manner, which will accurately reflect current conditions and insure that such funds reach the areas of greatest current need and are effectively used for such areas;

(5) not more than 20 experimental programs, which shall be reasonably geographically representative, to be administered by the Institute, in cases where the Institute determines that such experimental programs are necessary to carry out the purposes of clauses (1) through (4), and the Commissioner of Education is authorized, notwithstanding any provision of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, at the request of the Institute, to approve the use of grants which educational agencies are eligible to receive under such title I (in cases where the agency eligible for such grant agrees to such use) in order to carry out such experimental programs; and

(6) findings and recommendations, including recommendations for changes in such title I or for new legislation, with respect to the matters studied under clauses (1) through (5).

(b) The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children shall advise the Institute with respect to the design and execution of such study. The Commissioner of Education shall obtain and transmit to the Institute such information as it shall request with respect to programs carried on under title I of the Act.

(c) The Institute shall make an interim report to the President and to the Congress not later than December 31, 1976, and shall make a final report thereto no later than nine months after the date of sub-

mission of such interim report, on the result of its study conducted under this section. Any other provision of law, rule, or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding, such reports shall not be submitted to any review outside of the Institute before their transmittal to the Congress, but the President and the Commissioner of Education may make to the Congress such recommendations with respect to the contents of the reports as each may deem appropriate.

(d) Sums made available pursuant to section 151(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be available to carry out the provisions of this section.

(e)(1) The Institute shall submit to the Congress, within one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a plan for its study to be conducted under this section. The Institute shall have such plan delivered to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session. The Institute shall not commence such study until the first day after the close of the first period of thirty calendar days of continuous session of Congress after the date of the delivery of such plan to the Congress.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

(A) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die; and

(B) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the thirty-day period.

(20 U.S.C. 1221e note) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 821, 88 Stat. 599, 600.

SURVEY AND STUDY FOR UPDATING NUMBER OF CHILDREN COUNTED

SEC. 822. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, expand the current population survey (or make such other survey) in order to furnish current data for each State with respect to the total number of school-age children in each State to be counted for purposes of section 103(c)(1)(A) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. Such survey shall be made, and a report of the results of such survey shall be made jointly by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Congress, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Commerce shall study the feasibility of updating the number of children counted for purposes of section 103(c) of title I of the Act in school districts of local educational agencies in order to make adjustments in the amounts of the grants for which local educational agencies within a State are eligible under section 103(a)(2) of the Act, and shall report to the Congress, no later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the results of such study, which shall include an analysis of alternative methods for making such adjustments, together with the recommendations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Commerce with respect to which such method or methods are most promising for such purpose, together with a study of the results of the expanded population survey, authorized in subsection (a) (including analysis of its accuracy and

the potential utility of data derived therefrom) for making adjustments in the amounts paid to each State under section 144(a)(1) of title I of such Act.

(c) No method of making adjustments directed to be considered pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) shall be implemented unless such method shall first be enacted by the Congress.

(20 U.S.C. 241c note) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 822, 88 Stat. 600, 601.

STUDY OF THE MEASURE OF POVERTY USED UNDER TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

SEC. 823. The Assistant Secretary shall supervise, with the full participation of the National Institute of Education and the National Center for Education Statistics, a thorough study of the manner in which the relative measure of poverty for use in the financial assistance program authorized by title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 may be more accurately and currently developed. The study of the relative measure of poverty required by this subsection shall be adjusted for regional, climatic, metropolitan, urban, suburban, and rural differences and for family size and head of household differences. The study required by this section shall consider—

(A) the availability of data more current than the decennial census including data collected by any agency of the Federal Government which are relevant except that data so collected shall not disclose the name of any individual or any other information customarily held confidential by that agency, but shall include aggregate information to the extent possible;

(B) the availability and usefulness of cost of living data;

(C) the availability and usefulness of cost of housing data;

(D) the availability and usefulness of labor market and job availability data;

(E) the availability and usefulness of data with respect to prevailing wage rates, unemployment rates, and income distribution; and

(F) the availability of data with respect to eligibility criteria for aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act.

(2) The Assistant Secretary is authorized and directed to prepare and submit to the Congress not later than one year after the effective date of this Act a report of the study conducted under this subsection including recommendations with respect to the availability of data designed to improve the relative measure of poverty for the program of financial assistance authorized by title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Whenever the Assistant Secretary determines that data specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection are not available or that it is impractical to obtain data for each relevant area or category, the report shall contain an explanation of the reasons therefor.

(20 U.S.C. 241a note) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 823, 88 Stat. 601.

STUDY OF LATE FUNDING OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 824. (a) The Commissioner shall make a full and complete investigation and study to determine—

(1) the extent to which late funding of Federal programs to assist elementary and secondary education handicaps local educational agencies in the effective planning of their education programs, and the extent to which program quality and achievement of program objectives is adversely affected by such late funding, and

(2) means by which, through legislative or adminstrative action, the problem can be overcome.

(b) Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall make a report to the Congress on the study required by subsection (a), together with such recommendations as he may deem appropriate.

(20 U.S.C. 241a note) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 824, 88 Stat. 602.

SAFE SCHOOL STUDY

SEC. 825. (a) The Secretary shall make a full and complete investigation and study, including necessary research activities, during the period beginning upon the date of enactment of this Act and ending June 30, 1976, to determine—

(1) the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of crime in elementary and secondary schools in the States;

(2) the number and location of schools affected by crime;

(3) the per-pupil average incidence of crimes in elementary and secondary schools in urban, suburban, and rural schools located in all regions of the United States;

(4) the cost of replacement and repair of facilities, books, supplies, equipment, and other tangible objects seriously damaged or destroyed as the result of crime in such schools; and

(5) the means by which crimes are attempted to be prevented in such schools and the means by which crimes may more effectively be prevented in such schools.

(b) Within thirty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall request each State educational agency to take the steps necessary to establish and maintain appropriate records to facilitate the compilation of information under clauses (2) and (3) of subsection (a) and to submit such information to him no later than seven months after the date of enactment of this Act. In conducting this study, the Secretary shall utilize data and other information available as a result of any other studies which are relevant to the objectives of this section.

(c) Not later than December 1, 1976, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report on the study required by this section, together with such recommendations as he may deem appropriate. In such report, all information required under each paragraph of subsection (a) of this section shall be stated separately and be appro-

priately labeled, and shall be separately stated for elementary and secondary schools, as defined in sections 801 (c) and (d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(d) The Secretary may reimburse each State educational agency for the amount of expenses incurred by it in meeting the requests of the Secretary under this section.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(20 US.C. 241a note) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 825, 88 Stat. 602.

STUDY OF ATHLETIC INJURIES

SEC. 826. (a) The Secretary shall make a full and complete investigation and study to determine—

(1) the number of athletic injuries to, and deaths of male and female students occurring in athletic competition between schools, in any practice session for such competition, and in any other school-rated athletic activities for the twelve-month period beginning sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) the number of athletic injuries and deaths occurring (for the twelve-month period under clause (1) at each school with an athletic trainer or other medical or health professional personnel trained to prevent or treat such injuries and at each school without such personnel.

(b) Within fifty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall request each school to maintain appropriate records to enable it to compile information under subsection (a) and shall request such school to submit such information to the Secretary immediately after the twelve-month period beginning sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act. Not later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall make a report to the Congress on the study required by subsection (a), together with such recommendations as he may deem appropriate. In such report, all information required under each paragraph of subsection (a) shall be stated separately for the two groups of schools under clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (c), except that the information shall also be stated separately (and shall be excluded from the group under clause (2)) for institutions of higher education which provide either of the two-year programs described in section 801(E) (3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term "school" means (1) any secondary school or (2) any institution of higher education, as defined in section 8 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(d) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $75,000 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(20 U.S.C. 241a note) Enacted August 21, 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 826, 88 Stat. 603.

* * * * * * *

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR STATE EQUALIZATION PLANS

SEC. 842. (a) (1) Any State desiring to develop a plan for a program of financial assistance to local educational agencies in that State to assist such agencies in the provision of free public education may, upon

application therefor, be reimbursed for the development or administration of such a plan in accordance with the provisions of this section. Each plan developed pursuant to, or which meets the requirements of, this section shall be submitted to the Commissioner not later than July 1, 1977, and shall, subject to the provisions of this section, be consistent with the guidelines developed pursuant to paragraph (3). Such plan shall be designed to implement a program of State aid for free public education—

(A) which is consistent with such standards as may be required by the fourteenth article of amendment to the Constitution; and

(B) the primary purpose of which is to achieve equality of educational opportunity for all children in attendance at the schools of the local educational agencies of the State.

(2) The Commissioner shall develop guidelines defining the principles set forth in clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1). Not later than April 1, 1975, the Commissioner shall publish such guidelines in the Federal Register and submit such guidelines to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(3) During the sixty-day period following such publication, the Commissioner shall provide interested parties with an opportunity to present views and make recommendations with respect to such guidelines. Not later than July 1, 1975, the Commissioner shall (A) republish such guidelines in the Federal Register, together with any amendments thereto as may be merited and (B) publish in the Federal Register a summary of the views and recommendations presented by interested parties under the preceding sentence, together with the comments of the Commissioner respecting such views and recommendations.

(4)(A) The guidelines published in accordance with paragraph (3), together with any amendments, shall, not later than July 1, 1975, be submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. If either the Senate or the House of Representatives adopts, prior to December 1, 1975, a resolution of disapproval of such guidelines, the Commissioner shall, prior to December 15, 1975, publish new guidelines. Such new guidelines shall take into consideration such views and policies as may be made in connection with such resolution and shall become effective thirty days after such publication.

(B) A resolution of disapproval under this paragraph may be in the form of a resolution of either the Senate or the House of Representatives or such resolution may be in the form of a concurrent resolution of both Houses. If such a resolution of disapproval is in the form of a concurrent resolution, the new guidelines published in accordance with the second sentence of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall be consistent with such policies as may be established by such concurrent resolution.

(C) If each of the Houses adopts a separate resolution with respect to guidelines submitted in accordance with this paragraph for any year and in connection therewith makes policy statements which differ substantially, then such differences may be resolved by the adoption of a concurrent resolution by both Houses. Any such concurrent resolution shall be deemed to be adopted in accordance with subparagraph (B).

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 391 EA 007 316

AUTHOR	Corbett, Anne
TITLE	Innovation in Education -- England. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France). Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
REPORT NO	80.547; CERI-EI-71.06
PUB DATE	28 Jun 71
NOTE	47p.; Related documents are ED 069 572 and EA 007 313-316
AVAILABLE FROM	OECD Publications Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 (Free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; *Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Educational Innovation; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Government Role; Organizational Change; School District Autonomy
IDENTIFIERS	*England

ABSTRACT

This publication is one in a series of case studies dealing with educational innovation in various western European countries and the United States. This particular report discusses educational innovation in England. Because the British central government is much less involved in educational matters than are many other governments, English educational innovations originate from diverse sources and tend to be very pragmatic in approach. For this reason, the author devotes much of her analysis to examining who the innovators are in English education, what they are trying to change, and where the obstacles to educational change lie. Three examples of recent innovations are described to illustrate different approaches to educational innovation in England. (JG)

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Centre for Research and Innovation

CERI/EI/71.06

Technical Report

Paris, 28th June, 1971
Or. Engl.

INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

- ENGLAND -

by

Anne Corbett

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The following case study is one in a series of five dealing with innovation in education. All the studies are descriptive in nature and, as the work of five different authors writing in their personal capacity, they represent five quite individual syntheses and interpretations of vast amounts of information. Yet the confusion that might be expected from this method does not result. What emerges from these studies is instead a reasonably coherent statement of educational responses to the post-war demands of many more people for more and better education.

Perhaps it is not remarkable that the demands have been exerted so consistently on such a variety of nations, nor that the response to them has for the most part been so quick and positive. The nations examined in this book are remarkably similar in that all have a long and honourable tradition of public education, an industrialised economy and a high standard of living. At first glance it even appears that their solutions to the problems posed by recent educational demands are unusually similar: structural reform, curricular reform, compensatory and/or individualised learning systems - examples of each are easy to find in any setting. Yet a closer reading of the five case studies reveals wide and interesting variations: in priorities, in perceived solutions, in strategies evolved or developed to implement them.

Such variety of course reflects to a large extent differences in 'national climate', that peculiar combination of values, objectives, aims and administrative tradition which, aside from language, makes a nation distinctive. The explication of these differences is thus a hidden theme of the five case studies taken as a whole, and an understanding of this hidden theme is necessary to illuminate the more obvious themes of change and growth.

An explanation of this point can be found by comparing, even superficially, Scandinavian countries such as Norway and Sweden on the one hand and the United States of America on the other. At least from the viewpoint of the outside observer, Norway and Sweden have much in common. Both relatively small in terms of population, they can also claim a remarkably unified social and value structure. Furthermore, their style - if such a generalisation can be made - seems to be to have a clear idea of goals and then to set about methodically reaching them. This process is aided by the existence of strong central governments which are able to plan and to legislate with a reasonably clear assurance that what they propose will be achieved. Thus there exists in Norway the National Council for Innovation in Education whose mandate it is to make reality of reform laws passed by the central Parliament. The Parliament, concerned in recent years with "large questions of the role of schools in Society", and sure enough of its constituency, has concerned itself largely with structural reform and new curricula - on a national scale.

The situation in the United States is quite different, even if the question of relative size of total population is ignored. The American federal government is based on a system of checks and balances so fine that it is often hard to determine either the source of impetus or its ultimate manifestation. The situation is further complicated by the well-protected existence of states' rights - particularly the control of education - and, once the issue of taxation is raised, by municipal and regional claims as well. Perhaps more important, the rich diversity of the American population inevitably means conflicting social and ethnic interests, values, and views of national priorities. The past decade of American life has indeed been one of fast-changing goals and objectives and of massive social upheaval. Much of the upheaval has connected itself to education and made demands accordingly: in the light of this political and social background, it is not surprising that American education responded by producing such a variety of innovations in every area and at every level that the final array can be quite bewildering, whilst at the same time providing a vast reservoir of experience for others.

England and the Federal Republic of Germany likewise provide differences quite distinctly their own. Writing of her own country's approach to recent educational change, the author of the English case study notes

> ".....the English style is distinctive. You can seize on it instantly. There is no acceptance of common objectives, except in the most general sense which inspired the last major education act: the need to widen opportunities and eliminate the poverty both of individual children and of the public provision of education (1). There is no national plan for education, no law which specifies where development is necessary as in some OECD countries. There is almost no theory. The point is characteristically made in a recent major report on education (2): 'We invited the help of a number of distinguished educationists and professors of educational philosophy ... They all confirmed the view that general statements of aims were of limited value and that a pragmatic approach to education was likely to be more fruitful.'"

The reference to "two decades of non-reform" in German education, a phrase coined by Professor S.B. Robinsohn, is slowly becoming eroded, especially during the last two years, which have been marked by fundamental changes in many parts of the school system. With increasing co-operation between the Länder and with the initiatives of the new Ministry for Education and Science, the need for a more systematic approach to educational reform, and especially to educational experimentation, seems more important in Germany today than in many other countries.

Despite these differences in background and style, the five country studies do show one overriding problem in common: the need to change and improve their educational systems. Furthermore, as their experience increases, they all face the reality that explicit measures to facilitate the management of educational change are necessary, that innovation and improvement cannot be haphazardly left to chance.

PART I

INTRODUCTION

English education is full of changes. Primary education is being made much freer. Secondary education is being reorganised to break down the old divisions between academic and practical schools for pupils who were supposed to be distinguishable at the age of eleven. Post-school education in universities and local authority colleges is being energetically expanded. Much of the curriculum for students of all ages and all levels of intelligence is being reappraised. Teachers and administrators are facing more urgently than ever before new challenges on what to teach and how, in the light of new knowledge, new appreciation of the way children learn and new demands from society about what children should learn.

The aims of those involved in changing English education are the same as change-makers in countries the world over. Socially they want to widen opportunities. Educationally they want to emphasise learning rather than teaching. And where appropriate they want to update the content of the curriculum.

The English style of change is, however, distinctive. Within the school system, the subject of this report, you can seize on two characteristics. First, innovation (meaning consciously introduced change) comes from many sources. Individual teachers have the freedom - as professionals they are encouraged - not to let the content or method of education ossify. This is a real freedom. Individual local authorities have much scope to organise their schools and may develop strategies for influencing the content of schooling too. But, central government, in contrast with government in many OECD countries, is relatively weak at instituting change and only spasmodically involved. Change may also come through a whole network of interests: universities, teacher-training institutions, professional associations, parents and employers, and indeed through the only compulsory inmates of the education system, the pupils and students.

Secondly, the approach is pragmatic. There is in English education no acceptance of common objectives or priorities, except in the most general sense which inspired the last major education act(1): the need to widen opportunities and to counter the poverty within the system. There is no national plan for education, no law, as in Norway which specifies where development is necessary. There is almost no theory of change. The English approach was summed up in a recent report on education(2). "We invited the help of a number of distinguished

---

(1) Education Act 1944. See New Law of Education, sixth ed. George Taylor and John B. Saunders. Butterworths 1965, p.3.

(2) Children and Their Primary Schools (The Plowden report) H.M.S.O. 1967, para. 501.

educationists and professors of educational philosophy .... They all confirmed the view that general statements of aims were of limited value and that a pragmatic approach to education was likely to be more fruitful."

Such a decentralised approach has obvious disadvantages: change is uneven and the reasons for particular successes or failures are often not appreciated. But the immediately obvious solution of more direction and more centralisation has, where it has been tried, been resisted. And, I would argue, rightly. English-style innovation has two great strengths. It is expected to be diverse. And it relies on the active involvement of those in the classroom as much as, or more, than of those in committees. The people who institute change may well be those who have thought it out in the first place.

Educationists, who want to make the process of change less time-consuming and less wasteful of individual effort need -to quote one man who has been intimately involved, Geoffrey Caston(1)-to discover how "to boost professional self-confidence in a pluralistic setting." They should not be concerned merely with producing strategies, models of change and all the stock in trade of the methods men. They need, so an English argument runs, to devise institutions which can support without directing.

In an international context the most interesting aspect of English innovation is thus likely to centre on the experience of two bodies created to stimulate innovation and development, the Schools Council and the National Council for Educational Technology. The Schools Council is concerned with school examinations and curriculum, the National Council works with industry as well as schools. This report looks at some of their school-directed work.

But since they do not monopolise the means of change, even in their areas of special interest, this report also looks at who the innovators are in English education, what they are trying to change and where the obstacles are. Three examples are given to show the current variety. The primary education example shows the most traditional form of innovation: coming from the local education authority and the schools. It also shows a particularly thorough appreciation that change in content needs to be expressed in a change in method. The secondary reorganisation example is the most political and shows the central government at its most active. It is largely organisational. The curriculum development example, shows innovatory strategy at its most developed in English terms.

A final point: one of the other distinguishing features about English educational innovation is the lack of documentation. This is therefore a largely personal report.

---

(1) Journal of Curriculum Studies, May 1971.

PART II

STRUCTURES AND STRATEGIES

This part deals with the status and function of the various bodies involved in educational innovation and their relationship.

There are three main points to note: (1) that, historically, change has been rooted in the schools, or at any rate the local education authority, (2) that attempts at centralised initiative have not been successful and tendencies to centralisation have been resisted, (3) that the new strategy is a central servicing operation to assist local initiative.

First, therefore, in this section is the local level: the teaching profession and the local education authorities. The national level follows: the Department of Education and Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools (the HMIs) and then the National Council for Educational Technology, and the strategies they use: in-service training and the teachers' centres. Last come those who have had a long standing role in the promotion of ideas: the research bodies, the teacher training institutions (universities and colleges of education) and government advisory committees.

The Local Roots

1. Teachers

The freedom of teachers is part of an English legend. The legend has some substance. Schools are not directed by local or central government as to either what or how they should teach (with the exception that they have to provide religious education).

But freedom of ordinary teachers to decide on organisation and curriculum depends on the head. The head teacher decides how the school should be organised, what books and equipment should be used and what should be the relationship with parents. The head has wide areas of discretion.

The head in turn is subject to a number of restraints: the pressure of exams, competition to get a university place, parental disquiet. The local authority's chief education officer may apply pressure if he feels that a head is being inefficient. But there is little to threaten a head's security: he is almost impossible to sack. Nor does the head expect to feel threatened. There is generally a free and easy relationship between heads, their governors and the authority's advisors.

At its best, the teachers' use of their freedom can be reflected in an astonishing degree of change. A famous and well documented example of a revolution in learning which was entirely school based is the "progressive movement" of the 1920s and 1930s(1). More recently, individual teachers have not only changed the whole content and method of their pupils' education, but have, through books and lecturing, started changes which have gone a long way beyond their own schools(2).

Some of the teachers professional associations have been active. The Science Masters Association and the Modern Language Association were instrumental in securing much of the early curriculum development funds for their own subjects. The National Association for Teaching English has established an international reputation.

The converse, of course, operates: the teacher can be a barrier to change. Much innovation, particularly in the curriculum, threatens teachers. Where traditionally they have been the source of authority, they increasingly find themselves as one among many with a view to contribute. They face all the challenges as the sociologist, Basil Bernstein, points out of having to move from a "given" to an "achieved" role(3). On top of all this they have to try to reduce innovation to a communicable level in terms of management and organisation.

The teacher in the most critical position, potentially the greatest barrier, is the head; though the position of the head in the primary school may be less vulnerable than the head in the secondary school. The primary school head is likely to be one generalist teacher among many. He can exert an immense authority within the school; he is expected to go into every classroom. The secondary school larger, more hierarchic, is potentially more bureaucratic. It is likely to be compartmented by its specialisms and the head less able, therefore, to exert control over the content or method of colleagues' approaches.

2. Local education authorities

The structure of English education is often defined as a national system locally administered. True, there are national legal obligations on authorities to provide education and some national regulations about the way they provide it: uniform pay scales for teachers and officials, centrally-defined cost limits for buildings, national systems of examinations. Yet local education authorities are free to organise their schools as they wish. They administer the system, they spend the money. In many cases they take the initiative. What happens may depend on their political complexion, their traditions, the accident of geography, and indeed their size(4).

---

(1) The Educational Innovators. W.A.C. Stewart.

(2) Examples are Sybil Marshall and David Holbrook.

(3) New Society, 14 September 1967.

(4) There are at present 163 local education authorities. The smallest has a total population of 30,000, the largest outside London a population of over one million. A Royal Commission on Local Government recommended in 1969 that authorities should fall within a population range of 200,000 to 500,000. On their recommendations this would reduce the numbers of authorities to 58.

They certainly vary. Authorities have different ages of transfer from primary to secondary schooling, different forms of secondary schooling and many differences on discretionary provision - the scale of nursery education, allowances for books and equipment, the numbers of teachers above the minimum. They have approached new developments at notably different speeds. Some of these local education authorities have started the primary school revolution in Britain, and some have paved the way for the government to adopt a non-selective secondary education system.(2)

Local advisers or inspectors

Most local education authorities have teams of promoted teachers as advisers, the range and degree of specialisation usually depending upon the authority's size. Advisers' (or inspectors') work consists largely of visiting schools and of running in-service training courses and generally trying to improve mediocre teaching. They also influence the system through the active part they play in the promotion of heads.

Increasingly, however, they are being called on to interpret significant new developments in teaching. In certain cases in primary education they have been notably influential. For just as in the primary school the head has easy access to different classes and teachers, so the primary adviser has easy access to the head. The advisers seem to have been more successful with maths than languages, with science than humanities. Teachers' centres offer them new opportunities of development work with teachers.

As new curriculum projects proliferate, the rôle of the advisers as necessary guides and interpreters may become still more important.

Teachers' centres

The idea of local development centres for teachers comes from the Schools Council. There are 500 or so now in existence most have been set up and are run by the local education authorities; a few have been set up by universities or colleges of education.

Basically, teachers' centres are intended to be "very local, very accessible centres where teachers can meet, regularly and informally, to test, display, to devise and to discuss their own work and the work of others. If we are having a curriculum revolution, this is how we hope to achieve it. It is at these centres that teachers, teacher educators, local authority staffs and university workers come together - with sometimes those of the youth service, or the employers or the other users of education. The promise of these centres is that they will reflect what can succeed in this town and this village".(1) It may be in a teachers' centre that pressure for a national curriculum project first builds up. It should certainly be there that the results of a national project are evaluated and interpreted through some sort of in-service training. The centres should also stimulate their own development work.

---

(1) Joslyn Owen quoted in Curriculum Innovation in Practice by J. Stuart Maclure, H.M.S.O., 1968.

(2) See p.36 for the effects of a change of government

Their potential is obvious, their achievement less so. Many are recent. They vary in subject coverage and accessibility. They vary in the interest or control that the local authority tries to exercise. They vary in their activities. At a recent Schools Council conference it was discovered that at many centres the emphasis was almost entirely on open discussion and exchange of views and not on devising specific contributions to teaching within certain subject areas. To quote Owen again (1): "As long as the lecture/seminar/discussion group methods of traditional in-service training are regarded as the principal methods appropriate to curriculum development, teachers seem unlikely to provide and to work within their own framework of activity."

The Centre

1. The Department of Education and Science

It is the duty of the Secretary of State for Education and Science (or Minister for Education until 1964) to promote the education of the people of England and Wales and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose. The Education Act of 1944 specifically charges the Secretary of State with the duty "to secure the effective execution, by local authorities under his control, and direction of the national policy for providing a varied and comprehensive educational service in every area."

The Secretary of State's part in directing national policy has, on the whole, been determined in close co-operation with the local education authorities. This is practical politics. To operate smoothly, policies need the support of many of the 163 authorities, a large number of whom will differ from the government in political outlook.

The central government has, however, made a number of important policy decisions since 1944. The system now looks very different from what it was when the act was passed. Thus the all-age elementary schools have disappeared, small rural schools are going, secondary schools are becoming non selective; teacher-training courses have been lengthened from two years to three; unqualified teachers are being edged out of the schools; a local authority sector of higher education has been created, headed by the polytechnics; a great expansion of higher education, including the universities, is taking place.

Mostly the central government influence on the education system is exercised through its control of costs. Some of this control is exercised directly, for example, with the school building programme, with school meals and the number of places in teacher training. Some of it is more indirect but nevertheless quite close. For though most of the current costs of education are met by local authorities, and though the government contribution to those costs is in the form of a general grant, government funds are given on the basis of detailed estimates.

---

(1) Joslyn Owen quoted in Curriculum Innovation in Practice by J. Stuart Maclure, H.M.S.O. 1968.

The interest for this report is that in some of these areas the department has branched out from supervision to development. The policing function - seeing that standards are maintained and that finance is controlled - is no longer its sole one. School building is an example. Here the department's architects branch is behind much of the excellent development work on school design, working in association with local education authorities.

But the content of education is one area where the department has never effectively moved from its supervisory role. The reasons why it has not done so reveal a great deal about the English attitudes to innovation.

In this area, the Secretary of State has two responsibilities: to maintain standards, and to co-ordinate the national provision of examinations. Both are generally delegated: examinations to the Schools Council (see page 18); maintaining standards to the central inspectorate, to Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools.

Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools

There are 550 HMIs. They have four functions. They are required to inspect, assess and report on all schools and on other educational institutions which the government aids financially, except the universities; they give advice and in-service training to the staffs of schools and colleges; they encourage educational development; and they form a link between the Department of Education, the local education authorities and the Schools Council.

The HMIs are in a unique position to know what is going on. They are organised on both a regional and a subject basis with responsibilities extending over most of the education system departments. They can use this unrivalled view of the system to disseminate successful practice, especially through the large number of their in-service training courses. Take their management course for heads, a fairly recently established course. Head teachers involved in secondary reorganisation are likely to face much larger schools, mixed schools where they have been used to single sex, and a much wider range of ability among their pupils. How can they be helped with the much more demanding administrative job? The inspectorate will have seen ways in which some schools manage successfully, and others which have found the usual pitfalls. This experience can be reflected in their courses.

Increasingly they are publishing surveys based on local inspections, which can bring good practice to the notice of an even wider audience. Recent examples include surveys of language laboratories, children with cerebral palsy, home-school relations and organising middle schools for children of 8 to 12 or 9 to 13.

Sometimes individual HMIs become national educational figures. One HMI took on almost single-handed the job of making primary schools aware of new approaches to maths(1). She took the view that it was no

(1) Mathematics in the Primary School, H.M.S.O. 1965.

good just telling teachers about it, they must be involved. Her courses up and down the country became development courses run by teacher training institutions. Another case is mentioned in the primary education chapter.

These examples are typical in that inspectors tend to get caught up individually in innovation. There is no question of the inspectorate taking on the task of introducing widespread change through some institution of its own. It is not charged with the in-service training should be associated with a curriculum development project. Nor it involved in a very obvious manner (except through the Schools Council, see page 18) in planning future curriculum development.

It may well strike an outsider as odd: if HMIs are in such a good position to identify trends, why do they not take a stronger developmental role on behalf of the department? This was tried once - and as a government-based strategy it failed.

The curriculum study group

The boost that the Russian sputnik is said to have given American curriculum development in 1957 took a bit of time to cross the Atlantic. But by 1962-63, there were a number of educationists wondering what should be done in England. The Nuffield Foundation was already considering financing a science development project.

Quite independently the Department of Education was thinking about creating a ministry group (analogous with the development group of architects) to stimulate the renewal or redevelopment of school curricula. It appeared to have ready-made resources with the expertise of the HMI's to back up its officials. At the same time the Department had a recommendation from its advisory committee on examinations (the Secondary Schools Examinations Council) that it should devise a new secondary school examination (the Certificate of Secondary Education). It was logical to link exam work with curriculum.

So the Curriculum Study Group was set up, with a dozen or so members and a brief to cover curriculum and examinations. Apart from one academic with a special interest in evaluation, all were officials or HMIs, some of whom had been attached to the Minister's Secondary Schools' Examinations Council. Working with the SSEC, in a very short life the group generated a mass of ideas. It set up the Certificate of Secondary Education, a revolutionary concept in English examinations because it can be school-based if teachers choose so. It worked out priorities for curriculum development projects (it was able to lean on the Nuffield Foundation for ideas on how to run a development project). It formulated a strategy for dissemination and local development through teachers' centres (working, it suggested, to a regional organisation).

But none of this was public knowledge at the time. For the Curriculum Study Group, though potentially creative like the Architects and Buildings Branch development group, ran into almost immediate trouble. In part it may well have been the victim of a larger dispute: the Minister of Education was already quarrelling with the teachers' and local authority organisations on teachers' pay machinery. The CSG was thus a handy extra weapon. Local education authorities and teachers alike were up in arms at the idea of a government department "ursurping"

their responsibilities. The charges stuck. Correspondence in an educational journal at the time immortalised the opposition: "We've fought two world wars only to be faced with this."

Within a few months of the establishment of the Curriculum Study Group, the Minister of Education agreed to its abolition and that instead there should be machinery for the development of schools curricula and examinations representative of all education interests: teachers, local authorities, voluntary bodies and the universities. A working party(1) was established to devise such machinery. This move signalled the end of the Curriculum Study Group and the beginning of the Schools Council for the Curriculum and Examinations.

So the Group was a failure. Or was it? In fact it seems that it failed only on the most limited interpretation. It failed as a ministry group. One of the civil servants involved (the late Derek Morrell), who within a few months of the establishment of the Curriculum Study Group was instrumental in getting the Schools Council working party set up, viewed it differently. In the long term, he argued, the Curriculum Study Group was unlikely to be as effective as the architects' development group; it was not because of its methods, but because it was attached to the wrong power base. With school building there was no doubt of the minister's control: he held the purse strings. But with the curriculum at that stage no one quite knew whether teacher control was a myth or not. It was only when the Curriculum Study Group was set up that it became clear from the reactions to it that control of the curriculum genuinely rested in an area occupied by teachers and local education authorities. It became obvious then that the Curriculum Study Group should be the servant of other masters.

The methods of the Curriculum Study Group, as Morrell suggested, have been triumphantly vindicated in getting curriculum development work moving in England. When the CSG moved in as the strong secretariat for the newly created Schools Council it moved in with ideas for development and ideas for putting them into operation, and gave it the sort of boost that would never have come just with evolution.

Research

After the experience of the Curriculum Study Group, the Department of Education seems likely to revert to a more indirect role in curriculum innovation. But this is potentially important, especially where research is concerned (see page 23 for other research bodies). The DES research budget has grown from £20,000 in 1962-63 to nearly £370,000 in 1967-68, by which time more than £2 million was committed on 135 projects. The DES generally aims to link grants to projects with policy implications. Nevertheless this is, by continental standards, a half hearted dirigisme.

The best known example is the support for an "action-research" project into educational priority area programmes, which the DES finances

---

(1) The Lockwood Working Party which produced the Schools Curricula and Examinations, H.M.S.O. 1964.

together with the Social Science Research Council with a three year grant of £175,000. This research project is under the direction of Dr. A.H. Halsey of Nuffield College, Oxford. It is aimed at finding ways and, to some extent, evaluating methods of improving the attainment of children in impoverished circumstances, of encouring their teachers and of linking home and school. The project is also experimenting with a pre-school language programme. It is, in English terms, a breakthrough to assert that reforms in social policy may be conducted through social science experiment: though at this stage it is too early to say whether the faith pinned on the research will be justified.

The New Style Innovators

The Nuffield Foundation, the Schools Council and the National Council for Educational Technology have an aim in common. They are committed to stimulating self-conscious and coherent change. Nuffield and the Schools Council, both primarily concerned with curriculum development, also share a method. Though the Schools Council's functions range wider than Nuffield's, they have both concentrated their support on curriculum development teams working to an elaborate and seemingly efficient procedure. This section describes them and discusses the strategies. NCET is mainly concerned with the management of innovation and I shall consider that separately.

1. The Nuffield Foundation

English curriculum development owes the Nuffield Foundation a great debt, for it pioneered the idea of curriculum development on a national scale while at the same time maintaining the principle that teachers should play a large, if not dominant, role in development. It started by taking up some of the ideas of the teachers' specialist associations and offered to finance and organise full-time development work.

The Nuffield Foundation is a charitable trust which was set up in the 1940s Its interests extend across the social services and to scientific and medical research. But education, and particularly curriculum development, has in the last few years absorbed a sizeable part of its budget. Each of the Nuffield projects, claimed the then director, Brian Young, arose from a growing concern among teachers all over the country that the teaching approach in classroom and laboratory needed to be reviewed in the light of recent advances in knowledge, current views on the nature of learning and a new emphasis on the active part that the pupil should play in the learning process. There seemed in the early 1960s to be general agreement that something more was needed than a mere redrafting of syllabuses. The Nuffield curriculum projects were therefore designed to give outstanding teachers the time and the facilities to reappraise their aims and methods in a way which would not be possible while teaching a full programme. Each scheme has aimed to provide "a distillation of what lively teachers are doing to revitalise the classroom presentation of their subject." The Nuffield Foundation has tried to ensure by appropriate examinations that testing (as well as teaching) is directed at acquiring a working understanding of the subject instead of just accumulating facts about it.

The strategy of development is essentially co-operative, with teachers playing a dominant role. The range of Nuffield-supported activities and the fact that these share so many characteristics with the Schools Council's approach (described on page 16) shows how much groundwork had been done before the Schools Council was set up.

Nuffield started with science for secondary school children and then branched out into mathematics and modern languages; later it extended its support to projects for the primary-secondary age range and to projects in linguistics. It was beginning to work in the humanities when the Schools Council was established; and it had moved still further afield with, for instance, its Resources for Learning Project - a study of ways of organising work in schools to make the best possible use of teachers' skills and of new developments in methods and equipment (using machines to help children to learn to read, for example, and designing a correspondence course for sixth formers in subjects where there is a great shortage of specialist teachers).

The programme has diminished since 1967, the time when the Schools Council was getting into its stride. From that time, Nuffield stopped commissioning projects and started to share sponsorship of a number of its projects with the Schools Council. Between 1961 and 1967, it had set up 16 development projects. For much of that time it was in a position of unrivalled influence on curriculum development.

It could have been unhealthy. As Derek Morrell put it(1): "A wrong decision might easily have been made. Had the development work been carried out by a small group of backroom boys without forging close links with many different schools, universities and examining boards, application of the results would have been slow and difficult. In fact application is likely to be rapid."

Nevertheless, Nuffield-sponsored curriculum work has in one sense gone off at a tangent which it is unlikely that any representative body would have followed. Nuffield drew its bright teachers and its trial schools predominantly from the public schools (i.e. the most elite of the independent schools) and thus development work was geared to the special curriculum of these schools. For example the science projects worked on separate chemistry, physics and biology, with courses leading to examinations (i.e. the Ordinary and Advanced Levels of the General Certificate of Education).

Curriculum projects more appropriate to the comprehensive school have been slower to develop, though the science teams, having worked their way through G.C.E. 'A'-level, are now working on combined sciences for the whole of the twelve-year-old age group. The Nuffield public schools bias has also meant that their projects tended not to be of much use to the groups who were quite possibly in the greatest need; the pupils who have disliked school so much that they drop out at the first opportunity but who will have to stay an extra year from 1972-73 when the school leaving age goes up.

---

(1) Derek Morrell: Education and Change. Joseph Payne Memorial Lectures to the College of Preceptors, 1966.

2. The Schools Council

The Schools Council epitomises the most systematic of the English approaches to school innovation. Its novelty lies in an organised approach which is still consistent with the decentralised structure of the English educational system. Having been set up to solve two problems (one professional, one political), the Council has evolved in its solutions to those problems as an important institutional device. It is a force for variety and for greater professionalism in education.

History

Politically the Schools Council had to appease the educational organisations which felt threatened by the Curriculum Study Group. Its complicated constitution is designed to make it a truly representative body, representing all the major education interests and giving teachers a majority on all but its finance committees. Members are nominated by organisations. They cover the spectrum of teachers unions, teacher training and further education interests, the voluntary bodies as well as the local education authorities, the Department of Education and the HMIs.

Its secretariat is also representative. Of its three joint secretaries one is seconded from the Department of Education, one from the HM Inspectorate and one from a local education authority. The joint secretaries are supported by a research team under a research director, field officers responsible for keeping in touch with schools and a large information section.

The professional problem to be overcome was described in 1963 by the Lockwood committee (which devised the Schools Council's constitution and terms of reference (see page 15) as "basically one of inadequate co-ordination where different areas of responsibility touch or overlap", such as insufficient co-ordination between the development of curriculum content or teaching techniques and policy on examinations. These were influences, the committee argued, which could in time seriously diminish the responsibility of schools for their own work.

The Lockwood committee was conditioned by traditional English beliefs about where innovation really takes place: "We note it has long been accepted in England and Wales that the schools should have the fullest possible measure of responsibility for their own work, including responsibility for their own curricula and teaching methods, which should be evolved by their own staff to meet the needs of their own pupils. We reaffirm the importance of this principle and believe that positive action is needed to uphold it .....

"The responsibility placed upon the schools is a heavy one. If it is to be successfully carried the teachers must have adequate time and opportunity for regular reappraisal of the content and methods of their work in the light of new knowledge and of the changing needs of pupils and society. A sustained and planned programme of work is required, going well beyond what can be achieved by occasional conferences and courses or by the thinking and writing of busy teachers in their spare time.

"We concluded therefore that there was no need to define a new principle in relation to the schools curricula and practice. Our task was to examine how far the existing principle is being realised in practice and whether new arguments are needed to uphold and interpret it."

Function

The Lockwood committee provided the following terms of reference for a Schools Council for the Curriculum and Examinations:

"The objects .... are to uphold and interpret the principle that each school should have the fullest possible measure of responsibility for its own work with its own curriculum and teaching methods based on the needs of its own pupils and evolved by its own staff; and to seek through co-operative study of common problems to assist all who have individual or joint responsibilities for or in connection with the schools curricula and examinations to co-ordinate their actions in harmony with this principle.

"In order to promote these objects the Council will keep under review curricula, teaching methods and examinations in primary and secondary schools including aspects of school organisation so far as they affect the curriculum and will draw attention to difficulties arising in these fields which appear to merit consideration by other appropriate authorities."

In particular the Council will:

(1) discuss with the schools the ways in which, through research and development and by other means, the Council can assist the school to meet both the individual needs of their pupils and the educational needs of the community as a whole;

(2) ascertain the views and interests of the schools on all matters falling within the Council's terms of reference, represent those views and interest in discussion of such matters with any bodies or persons concerned directly or indirectly with education in all its aspects; and will be free to publish its findings and recommendations at its own discretion;

(3) carry out all the functions hitherto undertaken by the Secondary Schools Examinations Council, and such other functions as the Minister, acting in his capacity as central co-ordinating authority for secondary school examinations, may remit to the Council;

(4) offer advice on request to any member interested and so far as practicable to any other bodies and persons concerned with the work of the schools."

Action on the curriculum and examinations

(1) Research and development. These activities, but particularly curriculum development, account for the major part of the Schools Council effort. Of its budget of about £1.5 million annually (provided

by the Department of Education and the local education authorities), a large part goes on curriculum development projects.

These activities are intended to provide a focus for change. Most involve the production of new materials in print, film or on tape. And since to an increasing extent it is believed by curriculum developers that the projects present teachers with the need to change attitudes as well as the need simply to update the content of the curriculum, some in-service training is regarded as an essential element.

Most projects work to a similar pattern. A proposal for development is put to the Schools Council. A director is appointed. He or she chooses a team which is likely to include seconded teachers and an evaluation officer. They should clarify the aims of the project. Then, three to five years are spent devising and trying out materials in selected trial schools. The material, and possibly the methods, are revised in the light of the schools' comments. The evaluator should be contributing at this point too. Then, generally, key teachers or teacher trainers are brought together to ensure that they understand the implications of the project and can train others in the use of the new materials.

Since curriculum development implies a threat to teachers' existing practice the subjects chosen for study have been predominant that teachers have wanted. Hence the Schools Council moved swiftly to establish a number of projects in preparation for the raising of the school leaving age to 16, in 1972-73, in linguistics and modern languages. But in the sixth form teachers have often been unwilling to experiment with pupils whose higher education chances depend on examination results. The sixth form, exam centred, hence syllabus - and teacher - dominated, tends to be a block in the cycle of development. For a cycle is apparent. On the whole it seems to be trying to combine the best of the child-centred approach of the primary school with the seminar methods of the university, instead of categorising styles of learning by institution.

The early Nuffield projects had started with the belief that the content of the curriculum needed changing. They even called the work curriculum "renewal" and concentrated on the "useful" subjects such as sciences and modern languages. They also tended to concentrate on a limited group of pupils.

But some of the later Nuffield work and more particularly a number of Schools Council projects have been more concerned with the attitudes of teachers and pupils. These innovators begin to realise, as Derek Morrell put it(1) "That what they need to be concerned with is the manner in which schools and teachers intervene to modify the child's learning and with the questions on what authority and by what methods they are entitled and can realistically expect to do so." For the fact is that children will learn something from their experience of school whatever a teacher does. They may enjoy learning; they may learn only to hate it. In all cases what children learn is bound to be affected by their relationship with their teachers.

---

(1) Derek Morrell: Education and Change. Joseph Payne Memorial Lectures to the College of Preceptors, 1966.

Much curriculum development is a form of research. Increasingly teams set out with hypotheses to be tested and expect that their work should be evaluated as the project goes on. According to the research director of the Schools Council, Jack Wrigley, "most of us in the Schools Council do not believe that there is a very clear division between curriculum development and research."(1)

Nevertheless the Schools Council make some money available specifically to research, on condition that the research is compatible with the Council's policy, that it illuminates some aspect of curriculum development or of examinations and that it has some possibility of improving classroom teaching. Research commissioned by the Schools Council includes a study of attitudes of pupils, teachers and parents affected by the decision to raise the school leaving age, and a number of studies related to classroom organisation or learning theory, for example, the formation of scientific concepts. Much of the research is directed at examinations.

(2) Recommendations on behalf of schools. This, in fact, the Schools Council seems not to have done. It is one consequence of a delegated membership (and one consequence of a strongly held belief in pluralism) that there are few issues on which the Council would speak unanimously. For example, when the Government in 1968 postponed the raising of the school leaving age to 16, the Council did not feel in any position to condemn the move, despite the numerous projects committed to the programme for raising the leaving age.

(3) Examinations. Work on examinations rates in importance with work on the curriculum though with examinations the Schools Council is in a different relationship to the Government. Generally it is advisory to all its member interests. On examinations it is advisory to the Secretary of State.

It is logical that the same body should be concerned with development work on both curriculum and examinations. So far, however, there has been little exam reform which has grown out of curriculum development, except in the General Certificate of Education Ordinary level science papers. But because examinations generate much more public interest, the Schools Council work on examinations is much better known than its work on curriculum. The Schools Council's predecessor, the Secondary Schools Examination Council, was responsible for developing a radically new examination for 16 year olds (the Certificate of Secondary Education) designed for pupils of average ability and above who would not be suited to the General Certificate of Education. The Schools Council has been responsible for assessing the examinations' reliability and validity.

The Schools Council has also had sub-committees trying to devise a new pattern of sixth form examinations, which would be suitable for the non-university oriented pupils who increasingly stay on at the schools. But so far the Council has not approved any proposals.

---

(1) From a paper by Jack Wrigley on the Schools Council and Research to be published in a forthcoming volume of Research in Education.

(4) Advice and publicity. The Schools Council does not have direct contact with the schools nor necessarily with teachers centres, despite projects' contacts with their trial schools. So at the most basic information level it produces an attractive and informative termly broadsheet, Dialogue. It has, additionally, a vast publishing programme (contracted out to commercial publishers) for working papers and field reports. It is also responsible for the publication of project materials.

So far, few project materials have been published. Two were published in 1969; a dozen more are scheduled for 1970-71. So far it is not clear whether the fact of publication, with the Schools Council approval, invests the material with an unusual authority compared with its commercial counterparts. Nor is it clear how far publication will fossilise development in the area concerned.

3. The National Council for Educational Technology

The Schools Council interest in innovation has broadened, as the preceding section shows, from a primary concern with curriculum development to a related concern with research and the training of teachers. But the Schools Council has not concerned itself with the management of innovation - with suggesting how changes in content need to be integrated into a teaching method.

These are however the concern of a newcomer to the educational scene, the National Council for Educational Technology. The Council was set up in 1967, a modified Government response to a recommendation for a National Centre for Educational Technology. The centre was intended by those who put forward the suggestion(1) to be a focal point for future research and development. NCET's remit is to act as a central agency for promoting research, co-ordinating training and disseminating information on educational technology. NCET has also to advise bodies, including government departments concerned with education and training in industry and the service, on audio-visual media and on the most appropriate and economical ways of using them.

Educational technology is interpreted as comprising "the process of applying available knowledge in a systematic way to problems in education and training."(2) NCET is a long way from being a body which merely suggests the best buy for teaching machines or overhead projectors. At school level, it sees its job as helping to solve problems with the aid of technology. For instance how can a teacher give individual attention to every student in a class of widely spread attainments, how to select the most appropriate resources for a particular topic at a particular level, how to locate and obtain these resources quickly and easily, how to provide compensatory techniques - whether for deprived children or say, a student who has been out of school for some time.

---

(1) Audio-Visual Aids in Higher Education. Brynmor Jones report: H.M.S.O, 1966.

(2) Towards More Effective Learning, NCET, 1969.

One recently started NCET project is aimed at helping deprived children between the ages of four and eight with audio-visual materials, particularly television, which they are likely to have at home. Another to use various media for mathematics courses - maths being the subject with the most severe teacher shortage. NCET is also trying to develop a course for non-specialists who have a grounding in maths, producing special materials which the pupil can use largely by himself. These are aimed at many sixth form and first year university students. NCET wants to encourage work on computer based learning. But in each case it is dependent on funds being made available from outside since it has no development budget of its own. It is a melancholy situation.

Despite its wider remit, covering higher education and industry and the services, NCET's method of work is similar to that of the Schools Council. Ideally, NCET claims, it should attempt "to provide a skeletal framework which could be reinforced at the regional level and finally built on at the local level." The Council therefore has kept closely in touch with regional development (especially where expense and the users' requirements have already stimulated regional co-operation, e.g. closed circuit television). It is in contact with teachers' centres.

There is clearly a place for NCET. But will it be given the funds to enable it to fill it?

On the Fringe

The institutions discussed so far have been involved in the whole process of innovation: research and development, diffusion and adoption. But there are a number of institutions which need to be mentioned which are involved in particular aspects only of the innovatory process. At the research and development end, there are most notably the universities, the National Foundation for Educational Research and the Social Science Research Council. At the diffusion end of the process are the teacher training institutions (again universities, but also the colleges of education). Government advisory bodies also have some part to play: in general theirs is a diffusing function, though occasionally a committee will put up suggestions which form the basis for action of a new sort.

The National Foundation for Educational Research

The NFER's research has a practical bias. It was set up in 1947 by the Department of Education and the local education authorities to complement the usually more fundamental research of the universities. About a quarter of its work it funds itself, the rest is commissioned. In the early days much of its effort went into devising intelligence tests and until recently the projects have been strongly biased towards educational psychology. Vocational guidance research, and research on examinations and tests are still an important part of its work, but it is notable that many of the recently established projects are concerned with curriculum or environment. It has not, however, undertaken any research on the economics of education.

Among its current major studies are an evaluation of the Schools Council primary French project, a series of projects on teaching young

children to read, a part in the International Evaluation of Achievement, and an investigation of the organisation of comprehensive schools.

Indeed the recently appointed director of the NFER argues strongly for an extension of the NFER's involvement in innovation, particularly in the curriculum. In discussing the work of the Schools Council(1) he has written of his anxiety that the Council has not pursued curriculum evaluation with the same enthusiasm as curriculum reform. "Let it be made clear," he says "that curriculum evaluation must be a much more comprehensive exercise than many tend to assume. Its purpose is to discover how far the detailed aims of the curriculum have been achieved. Now when we list the aims of our curricula and do this - as, in my view, is essential - in terms of behavioural change in pupils, it will be found that the aims go beyond the relatively simple matter of acquiring information and skills, and they inevitably lead into the field of attitudes. Many (probably the majority) of such attitudes are the product of the method of teaching rather than the content of teaching. (No amount of curriculum development will reduce the importance of the good teacher). If curriculum evaluation is to provide an effective validatory function for curriculum change we shall need the full co-operation of educational researchers and psychometricians in order to produce adequate measuring instruments of attitude and motivation as well as attainment."

It is a plea which takes its place in a long, long English story - the story of English teachers' reluctance to accept the importance of research.

The Social Science Research Council

The SSRC is the new arrival among the public bodies which finance educational research. With a budget of about £2.5 million for all the social sciences, it acts in part as a conventional research agency, giving grants in response to applications. After three full years of activity it is now beginning to refine its strategy. It now sponsors some programmes of research, and has set up research units on wide-ranging topics, such as race relations.

As far as education is concerned, the main beneficiary has been an action research programme on educational priority area policy(2). The intention of the project is not to try and produce an evaluation of compensatory education techniques (impossible in the three-year timetable and with the £175,000 available from the SSRC and the Department of Education and Science) but merely to demonstrate the possibilities of a particular approach in a variety of circumstances, concentrating particularly on pre-school experience and on various means of strengthening links between schools and a community. The project is trying to establish guidelines for government policy, i.e. whether intervention works, whether there needs to be a particular

---

(1) Stephen Wiseman in Research in Education, May, 1969, University of Manchester.

(2) This is the project directed by Dr. A.H. Halsey referred to above (page 15).

kind of intervention for deprived children.

There has been some controversy as to whether the SSRC should have sponsored this project or whether its role should be to support fundamental research. There are signs that with a new chairman the future emphasis will be more on basic research.

Universities

In the early stages of curriculum development and in contrast with a number of countries, the universities had little direct involvement in school innovation. Their contribution has been more in the (expected) direction of fundamental research, chiefly in the sociology and philosophy of education. There is some work on theories of learning and intelligence, and recently universities have taken a lot more interest in the economics of education(1).

The universities' interest now looks like becoming much more direct. Sussex, for example, has an educational technology centre. The University of London has a unit working on linguistics. Increasingly curriculum developments are being sited in universities. The modern languages project is based at York, Nuffield science at London, the Nuffield-Schools Council Humanities project has just moved to East Anglia, another Schools Council Humanities project is based at Keele. Increasingly, also, universities are recognising curriculum development as a permanent feature, by creating professorships in the curriculum.

One university, Manchester, has pioneered curriculum development regionally, using a very different approach from most of the Schools Council projects. It acts as a servicing agency for local teachers to help them devise new courses for raising the school leaving age and has given an unusually academic flavour to development. To start with, teachers spent many months hammering out objectives for themselves (an approach which has produced some difficulties and confusion). The Manchester strategy is also distinctive. It has effectively linked teachers' centres in a number of neighbouring local education authorities in a common effort with the university, whereas most Schools Council projects have created their links direct with schools. The Schools Council is now aiding the project

---

(1) Some examples, invidious though it is to choose. Sociology: A.H. Halsey and Jean Floud of Oxford on education and opportunity; Stephen Wiseman, then of Manchester, on education and environment; J.W.B. Douglas of London on a follow-up study of 5,000 children born in 1946; William Taylor of Bristol on schools and teacher training; Basil Bernstein of London on language use and social class. Philosophy: Richard Peters of London. Intelligence and learning theories: Cyril Burt and H.J. Eysenk of London; G. Peel of Birminghan; Liam Hudson of Edinburgh; J. Fitzpatrick of Manchester; and P.E. Vernon. Economics of education: John Vaizey of Brunel; Mark Blaug of London.

This co-operation between teachers and academics is hopeful. Curriculum development will be more effective for a dialogue about its aim and methods. It could also help to overcome the hostility which seems to be the much more usual response to universities showing interest in what is happening in schools. For instance when a group of London academics recently produced a book evaluating the Plowden report(1) it was more widely regarded as an attempt to destroy a "progressive approach" than as a contribution to discussion.

The education and training of teachers

This section concerns the universities and colleges of education. Universities are involved in two ways. They provide within departments of education training courses for graduates. Most are one-year courses taken after a student's subject degree. A few universities are experimenting with "concurrent" courses - i.e. students do their teacher training at the same time as they are working for a degree. Most universities also run institutes of education. These are responsible for the academic content of courses in colleges of education. The majority of colleges of education concentrate on three "general" training courses. (There are a few for art colleges and for domestic science teaching). The general courses may be biased towards primary or secondary teaching but share a common pattern of concurrent training. A recent innovation is the introduction of degree courses, involving usually a year tacked on to the existing three year course.

Manchester's department has been famous for its work on educational psychology. Bristol is strong on the administration of education and in-service training. But universities have only recently become involved in development work on behalf of schools, as curriculum projects have been attached to universities and as professorships in curriculum have been established.

The common complaint about university department and institute involvement in innovation is the old one: that they do not do much to lessen the gap between theory and practice. It is possibly significant that a university whose vice-chancellor is an ex-schoolmaster (and where the professors too were teachers) has done most to bridge this gap. It is York which has joint appointments with the local education authority: to the university they are part-time tutors, to the local education authority part-time advisers.

The colleges have been diffusers of change rather than developers. One of their problems has been having to work to so many masters. They are maintained by the local education authorities or voluntary bodies; their courses are developed in conjunction with the university institutes of education (through area training organisations); and their numbers are controlled by the Secretary of State for Education who is responsible for the supply of teachers and, over the last ten years, priority has been given to expansion.

On the Secretary of State's behalf, the Department of Education has on the whole resisted attempts to diversify the system of teacher training. The colleges, though larger than they were, remain monotechnic. Five teacher training departments have been set up experimentally within technical colleges. But they have not been able to break out of the university orbit, responsibility for the content of their courses

(1) Perspectives on Plowden, ed. Richard Peters, 1969, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

remaining with the university institutes of education. In theory these departments and the colleges of education themselves could get their degree courses approved by the Council for National Academic Awards. a degree-awarding body for non-university institutions. In practice, there has been little encouragement for students in colleges to work for degrees other than university-awarded B.Eds.

However the colleges have established themselves as an important element in the cycle of innovation. They have been largely responsible for diffusing ideas of informal primary education. Aided by the vast turnover of teachers (four fifths of women teachers leave within five years of starting to teach) and by their own history of preparing teachers for elementary and later primary schools, they have been able to make their views clear to schools.

Few colleges have branched out into development. A reason is suggested by Professor William Taylor(1), Their values, says Taylor, have been oriented towards social and literary romanticism: "The romantic-infra-structure has shown itself as a partial rejection of the pluralism of values associated with conditions of advanced industrialisation; a suspicion of the intellect and the intellectual, a lack of interest in political and structural change; a stress upon the intuitive and the intangible, upon spontaneity and creativity; an attempt to find personal autonomy through the arts; a hunger for the satisfactions of inter-personal life within the community and the small groups and a flight from rationality." There has not been much opportunity for the "creative non-conformity" that might have enabled the colleges to advance significantly in the quality of their work and its effect upon the educational system in general. But with the worst of the strains of expansion now over, and a government enquiry set up in 1970 to consider their future, the colleges have a chance to disprove Taylor's judgement.

Government Advisory Bodies

The government advisory bodies include Central Advisory Councils for Education, one for England and one for Wales. Over the past ten years or so they have been given an area of the system to consider and have been able to make wide ranging proposals. For example the Crowther Council was concerned with the education of fifteen to eighteen-year-olds(2), the Newsom Council with secondary children of average and less than average ability(3), and the Plowden Council with primary education(4).

A committee set up by the Prime Minister, the Robbins Committee, had a similar job to do on higher education. Teacher education and training in the 1950s and early 1960s was influenced by the National

---

(1) Society and the Education of Teachers, Faber and Faber, 1969.

(2) 15 to 18, H.M.S.O.1959.

(3) Half Our Future, H.M.S.O. 1963.

(4) Children and Their Primary Schools (The Plowden report) H.M.S.O. 1967.

Advisory Council on the Supply and Training of Teachers.

Some of these committees have been quite influential, aiding innovation in two ways. They have commissioned research, which has not only added weight to their recommendations but has provided ammunition for continued lobbying (as in the case of the Crowther evidence of the waste of ability among the early school leavers). They have also been important agents in diffusing progressive ideas. The needs of lower ability children have had attention focussed on them as a result of the Newsom Report. Modern developments in primary education have been stimulated by the Plowden committee's accounts of the pioneering then taking place. The Robbins committee on higher education created acceptance for the idea that a vast expansion of higher education was inevitable.

But councils have not been commissioned consistently to consider policy. A central advisory council was never, for instance, asked to consider the merits of comprehensive education. Nor has there been an expected correlation between specific terms of reference and their innovatory effect. The Crowther committee ha the most strategic terms of reference: how to implement the unfulfilled recommendations of the 1944 Education Act. In effect this meant how should the school leaving age be raised and how should the act's provision for compulsory part-time education to 18 be put into operation. But the Government shelved most of the report. The Plowden council was asked to consider primary education "in all its aspects". Yet it made two suggestions of great innovatory importance. The educational priority area programme of Government discrimination in favour of deprived areas is being partially adopted. An action research programme is in progress(1) and the Government gives some priority to EPAs in building programmes and in extra pay for teachers. Plowden also suggested a reform of the school starting system to allow for an extension of nursery education and a more flexible start to schooling.

(1) This is the project directed by Dr. A.H. Halsey referred to above (page 15).

PART III

CHANGE IN ACTION

Change in Primary Education

Primary education is changing and much of that is due to the local education authorities. This section will therefore be concerned with the relationship of the local education authority and the schools in innovation.

Primary education covers the five to eleven age range. Children may voluntarily go to nursery school before that, though the demand for places outstrips the supply. The English system is unusual in that it has been accepted for a century that children up to the age of six or seven need quite different treatment from older boys and girls. So until then, they are educated in infants' schools (with their own head teacher) or infants' departments (under the same head as the junior school). The junior stage lasts until eleven.

And then there has been the great hurdle: the selection examination for secondary education, known as the 'eleven plus'. Its purpose is to separate off the 20 per cent or so brightest children in each area for grammar school. As the Plowden committee remarked, "the 'eleven plus' is as firmly fixed in Englishmen's minds as 1066". It has been prominently fixed in the minds of junior schools. With that sort of responsibility many junior schools have felt forced to direct most of their efforts to formal teaching, often dividing the children into ability groups. In contrast with the freedom, the diversity of experiences and the generally child-centred approach of the infant school, the junior school has been a serious and uncreative place. Now there are changes, especially where secondary education is no longer selective. How have those changes come about?

Background

There have been two cycles of experimentation and development in the recent history of primary education. In the 1920s the experiment was mostly sparked off by individuals with their own schools: Susan Isaacs at the Malting House, A.S. Neill at Summerhill, Dora Russell at Beacon Hill. Their method of starting from the child and its motivations instead of imposing education, was given wide publicity in 1931 by an official report on primary schools, the Hadow report(1).

Hadow strongly recommended progressive practices. "We are of the opinion that the curriculum of the primary school is to be thought of in terms of activity and experience rather than of knowledge to be

---

(1) The Primary School, H.M.S.O. 1931, and reprinted.

acquired and facts to be stored." But unfortunately for primary education, some of the radical edge of this theme was blunted. For alongside its plea for progressive methods Hadow argued for a practice that was bound to be inconsistent with it - streaming children by ability. In that, it did of course reflect its time. Contemporary British psychological opinion held strongly to the view that differences in intelligence between children made such division necessary.

Nevertheless the child-centred ideas were taken up at a key point in the cycle - in teacher training colleges. They have had two characteristics which made them effective diffusers of the Hadow ideas. In the first place, until 1947 they were training teachers exclusively for elementary education: thus they did not have to resolve within the single institution conflicts between child-centred primary and subject-centred secondary methods. Nor did they have much contact with the universities which would have been likely to stress content rather than method. This emphasis, though modified, has continued since the restructuring of teacher education after the war when universities institutes were given responsibility for approving college courses. Also since the war student-teachers have nearly all been young women going into teaching for a few years before raising families. The turnover has been enormous. But so has the opportunity for the introduction of ideas, even though students going into their first job start at the bottom of the school hierarchy.

Nevertheless it is the continuing relationship between the local education authorities and the schools which is more likely to have determined the extent to which primary schools have changed. After the war and in the 1950 s, schools throughout certain authorities were transformed. Bristol, Leicestershire, Cumberland, the West Riding of Yorkshire and Oxfordshire are some of the most notable. The Hertfordshire architect, Stirrat Johnson-Marshall, revolutionised primary school building with the development of the CLASP system. These local education authorities are to the 1960 s and 1970 s what Susan Isaacs and A.S. Neill were to the 1930 s and 1940s. Their approach has been similarly given impetus by another official report, the Plowden report; colleges of education are still feeding vast armies of girls into the primary schools.

But this time there are three other factors which are likely to make the child-centred schools the rule rather than the exception. First, is the Government decision that secondary education should no longer be selective; this is freeing the junior schools from the thrall of the 'eleven plus' in areas which had not already gone comprehensive. Secondly, there is a much greater awareness of the importance of the early years of schooling. Thirdly, Schools Council projects provide stimulus on a national scale.

Change in one local education authority

Primary schooling is widely recognised as the show piece of British education. The section that follows looks at the primary school achievement of one local education authority, Oxfordshire. This authority - with Bristol, Leicestershire and the West Riding of Yorkshire - led the way in making primary education notable, with a consistently high standard among its schools.

In Oxfordshire a school playground may seem conventional enough. Inside, the successful schools, whether they are in new buildings or old, have broken with tradition. Gone are the dark blank corridors, the row of desks, the children grouped by ability, all doing the same thing at the same time. The schools are now light, colourful and very obviously alive. You are likely to see a fair number of children moving between classrooms. In old schools some of the walls between rooms have been knocked through and the corridors used too. In some of the new schools the corridors have almost become the school - expanded and with activity bays leading off them. Each base or class is largely self sufficient. In infant classes you see dressing up corners, climbing frames, a cookery corner, sand. In the junior classes there is likely to be a shop. All from five through to eleven have their areas for maths, for reading and for painting and some sort of construction, their plants and often their animals. They all have sets of objects for their number work, very often things the children have collected themselves: pebbles, chestnuts and buttons as well as rods and blocks and manufactured equipment. They all have their carpeted reading corners. The old sets of textbooks have been replaced. Instead there will be a mixture of stories and books (chosen by the teachers) that children can use for reference. These may cover anything from spaceships to old English churches. They are often expensive and nearly always well looked after. It is the walls rather than the layout of the room which give you some clue to the children's ages. For the rooms are decorated with the children's work: in number, writing, project work. Often in the shared areas like the school hall there is a display: some twigs, a pheasant's feather, some tie and dye textiles, a piece of pottery which the teachers use to stimulate childrens' thought, and which acts as a starting point for their enquiry and learning. The approach seems consistently to bring about higher standards in the basic skills, particularly reading. The children clearly benefit from the greater relevance of the teaching approach to their developmental stage and from the extent to which learning is recognised as individual.

Strikingly, the freedom of such schools very often appears to be combined with a great degree of self-discipline, even among children of five and six. The children nearly all work individually or in twos and threes from the moment they reach school in the morning. They go to the teacher when they want help or possibly to another adult: a local mother attached to the class as an infant helper, or a college of education student on teaching practice. But, where the school works well, one notices over a day a teacher keeping quite a check on what goes on: steering children who have spent the morning dressing up and playing at doctors and nurses into writing: talking to a child who has been on his own for a period, absorbed in making a model; as well as dealing with the children perpetually demanding her attention. She brings the children together a certain amount: for a story at the end of the morning; or if there is something she thinks several are confused about which might be aided by general discussion; or maybe she starts them off on something new, such as classroom mural, by talking together.

The organisation of the class varies with the teacher and the school. Some group their classes by age; others take a span - in one school covering four years. In a few and decreasing number of schools the children are grouped by ability. In most, teachers cope effectively with a span ranging from very bright to educationally subnormal. The measure of the school's achievement is the high degree of involvement

by the children, and the astonishing achievement in some of their work: creative writing, painting, ingenious constructions.

The changes have been evolving over a period since the war, when A.R. Chorlton was appointed director of education. The overwhelming impression just after the war was of dinginess and isolation. Very often a school's sole teacher would have lived out her life in the same place, starting as a pupil, going on to pupil teacher, and finally taking charge. Even in 1945 the schools were just as they were when built in the 1890 s, down to coke stoves and water from a pump. It was not a difficult job to analyse what should be done to improve the physical shape of the schools, and break down the professional isolation and stagnation among teachers. It was a different matter to act especially at a time when all authorities were under immediate pressure to plan for universal secondary education. Oxfordshire was among a small number of authorities which provided the conditions to enable primary schools to change, so that by 1969 three-quarters of the schools were in buildings that had either been constructed since the war or had been greatly extended.

But an authority seldom tries to exert such direct control over what happens in a classroom. Oxfordshire played the classic role of forward-looking English authorities: encouraging but not directing.

The history of the change has been to some extent a history of the people involved, and has been aided by the fact that the key figures were together for nearly 20 years. But nevertheless the change has happened within a well-defined institutional structure, with the director of education supported by the elected members of the authority on the education committee and given professional assistance by a team of advisers. Advisers are usually promoted teachers and their job is to go round schools making suggestions and helping with difficulties: there is no question of their being able to instruct. When the head and the adviser are working together, they are in primary schools an almost irresistable combination. The advisers in Oxfordshire, working with heads have been able to effect numerous schemes to give schools greater support. Some of the two and three class schools in an area are linked. Some share minibuses so that the children may share in activities or a teacher with a special skill at one school may go into the other schools in the group as well. Schools in particular difficulties may be helped by a task force of advisory seconded teachers.

The first adviser after the war, Edith Moorhouse, provided a common link for these isolated schools. She could advise as building money came up and heads retired, where to expand, where to contract. The adviser was able to bring teachers together out of school: courses were a revolutionary concept in the 1940 s. As their confidence built up, together the advisers and the heads embarked on development: they started to "unstream", to "family group", to introduce an "integrated day". Gradually the advisory structure was strengthened by the appointment of regional advisers. Their responsibilities run from nursery school through to secondary, enabling them to produce a different perspective for development.

In Oxfordshire from the mid-1950 s, the HMI (Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools) was also actively involved. An HMI, a link man between the authority and the central government department, has many

more schools to see than a local adviser. His development role is very much what he makes of it. Oxfordshire was fortunate to have Robin Tanner, an artistic and sensitive man who was very much in sympathy with any attempt to cut down on dinginess. He was also a person who insisted on high quality, especially in encouraging children's response to their environment. His enthusiasm affected teachers and local authority officials. Many of the schools still show traces of his influence in their italic writing and their attention to display.

The four key forces in Oxfordshire - the director of education, the primary adviser, the HMI and the heads - were aided by others, such as the colleges of education. Not only do schools take in students on teaching practice, some of the teachers lecture in colleges (some are promoted to their staffs). Now teachers' centres provide a new base for development, where all those interested can come together.

But while change may be initiated fairly systematically, the attempts to evaluate and then diffuse the practice are generally much more idiosyncratic, depending largely on the professional judgements of those involved. HMIs are traditionally inspectors. In Oxfordshire's case the HMI was too deeply involved to be objective. The Plowden committee's support of the Oxfordshire approach was a form of evaluation. But it is typical of the English approach that there has been nothing more external. Evaluation on the whole tends to be a matter between the teachers, advisers and administrators concerned. Their measure of success tends to be how far any stimulus or expertise can be shared in order to provide a spring for the next round of development.

Secondary Reorganisation

In common with many countries, England is changing its pattern of secondary schooling, by abolishing the selection tests by which the bright go to the grammar schools (in a few areas, the next brightest go to central or technical schools) and the rest are dismissed to the secondary modern schools. The schools are being replaced by comprehensive schools whose common characteristic is that they do not select their entry. They aim to take all the children - and in theory cover the entire ability range.

Looked at as a national exercise in innovation, the reorganisation of secondary education is more notable for the protracted hope behind it than for systematic planning. Looked at locally - where it all began - there are instances of creative development and long term planning, although subject to delay and confusion when central government and local education authorities have had different objectives. The effectiveness of the change as far as the schools are concerned is always dependent on teachers' attitudes. Belatedly, organisational change is stimulating in curriculum and methods.

Background

The original impetus for comprehensive schools grew out of the pressure for universal secondary education, which dated from the beginning of the century. But the case for a common secondary school made little headway for a number of years. A series of influential official reports from the Consultative Committee (Hadow, 1926 (1), the Spens

(1) The Education of the Adolescent - not to be confused with The Primary School, see footnote (1) on page 29.

report, 1938; the Norwood report, 1944) all upheld the case for selective education, i.e. that innate differences in intelligence required children to be differentiated according to ability. This view was pressed with much firmness by the Norwood report, which claimed that the education system had "thrown up" three "rough groupings" of children with different types of mind. Contemporary cynics lost no time in pointing out that this seemed to be the Almighty benevolently creating three types of children in just the proportions which would gratify educational administrators. And the psychologists, such as Sir Cyril Burt, whose work was supposedly being drawn on to support the Norwood committee's conclusions, claimed that the committee had produced a theory as outdated as phrenology.

Then came the 1944 Education Act with its commitment to secondary education for all. Claims had already been made for common secondary schooling as a counter to social divisiveness; the Norwood report was thoroughly criticised. Even so, the government (a coalition one) was prepared to do no more than be ambiguous about the form of secondary schooling. In the end all the act said was that "children shall be educated according to their age, ability, and aptitude." There was no mention of types of school.

How then has the move to comprehensive education worked out? Let us look at each of the main bodies involved - central government, local education authorities, schools and Schools Council.

Central government

Under the 1944 Act (1), local education authorities had to get government approval for development plans for secondary education plans. And the government's advice was precise. It claimed that it was "inevitable" in the light of different abilities, and the existing layout of schools, that authorities should think in terms of three types of secondary school: grammar, technical and modern.

Yet the government at the time (1945-1951) was Labour. Given that comprehensive education had been a lively political issue in the 1930s and 1940s, it now seemed surprising that a Labour government was not more enthusiastic about the issue. It was prepared to approve comprehensive or multilateral (i.e. all types of education separately organised) schools only if they would take at least 1,600 pupils: large enough to contain an adequate share of top as well as middle and lower ability children. It approved in principle long-term plans for large purpose-built comprehensives (e.g. London and Coventry). It rejected plans for immediate transformation to a comprehensive system (e.g. Middlesex) on the base of existing buildings. It accepted a number of schemes for individual comprehensives especially after 1947 (e.g. in Westmoreland and in the West Riding of Yorkshire). These included some interim comprehensives merging the second-best selective schools (central schools) with modern schools (e.g. in London).

Then from 1951-1964 a Conservative government was in control. It proclaimed itself willing to allow limited experiments and then proceeded to draw the limits quite tight. Thus a scheme for a London purpose-built comprehensive which would have involved incorporating a grammar school was rejected at the last moment (on the grounds that the public were against it since there had been protest marches). In

1955 a new minister condemed the "assassination" - incorporation - of grammar schools. In 1958 the Conservatives issued a policy statement(1) in view of the great demand for academic grammar-type education. This recognised that the pool of ability was much larger than previously supposed. It argued not for comprehensive schools but for a policy of overlap - advanced courses in the secondary modern schools. As more and more authorities, convinced of the inadequacies of selection, produced schemes for comprehensive schools the government built up a convention: schools could be approved where they did not threaten existing (grammar) schools. In practice this meant comprehensives were established on new housing estates and in rural areas. Nevertheless, over 160 comprehensives had been established by the end of the Conservative government's period of office. More crucial, the then Conservative minister (Edward Boyle) stated in 1962 that a Conservative government would not expect local education authorities to build any more grammar schools. Boyle also helped to convince his government that the minimum school leaving age should be raised to 16, aided by a much quoted statement of his in the foreword to the Newsom report that "all children should have an equal chance of acquiring intelligence and of developing their talents and abilities to the full." Secondary education for all thus moved further towards realisation than might have been expected under a Conservative government.

Then the Labour government came to power in 1964 with a commitment to make secondary education comprehensive. Within a couple of months the Secretary of State for Education (Michael Stewart) had justified this as in the national interest, arguing that the selection procedures were inefficient, and that the errors made at eleven could not be adequately remedied later and that it was all but impossible to find an appropriate place for the secondary modern in a selective system. "It will do a great evil to our country if the gap in understanding between the more and the less intellectual is allowed to widen, and one of the great merits of the comprehensive is that it can promote this mutual understanding."

The government acted as though it was in exactly the same position in 1964 as it had been in 1947 when it requested development plans for secondary reorganisation, largely to conform with its own guidance. The 1964 government's line that it was not dictating was fortuitiously aided by the fact that no special funds were allocated to reorganisation. The government also allowed a wide degree of choice within fairly vague objectives.

The circular took its objectives from a Parliamentary motion:

"That this House, conscious of the need to raise educational standards at all levels, and regretting that the realisation of this objective is impeded by the separation of children into different types of secondary schools, noted with approval the efforts of local authorities to reorganise secondary education on comprehensive lines which will preserve all that is valuable in grammar school education for those children who now receive it and make it available to more children; recognises that the

---

(1) Secondary Education for All, H.M.S.O., 1958.

"method and timing of such reorganisation should vary to meet local needs; and believes that the time is now ripe for a declaration of national policy."

Local education authorities were not restricted, they had a choice of any of the current variants of comprehensive organisation - 11 to 18 schools, two-tier schools (11 to 13 or 11 to 14 followed by 13 to 18 or 14 to 18 schools) or sixth form colleges with transfer at 16. Experiments with middle schools straddling the primary-secondary school division at 11 would also be allowed (later on approval was given more freely). Authorities were even in the short term to be allowed to go for a form of organisation which merely postponed selection for a couple of years by allowing children to transfer at the age of 13 or 14 to a grammar type education if their parents wanted it (and were backed up by the teachers).

But the 1947 analogy does not hold. The government had to toughen its approach slightly one year later in a further circular (Department of Education circular 10/66) which stated that the Department would only approve secondary school building plans for comprehensive schemes. Again it was not fully effective; the circular carried only the force of recommendation, and a determined authority has been able to resist (as Surrey did) to the point where the government had to give in or see children without a school place.

So the Labour government belatedly decided it ought to legislate. It had meanwhile set back reorganisation badly by postponing the raising of the school leaving age and with it £100 million worth of building programmes which many authorities were using to aid reorganisation. Early in 1970, near the end of its life, the government introduced a bill to give the force of law to the 1965 circular.

But the legislation, which came to nothing because parliamentary time was too short, would anyway have been a blunt instrument. It might have been used against the few recalcitrant local education authorities, but it could not tackle the real hold-ups: the individual schools that LEAs would not try and draw into the scheme or the schools themselves which were able to stand out against reorganisation (such as the voluntary grammar schools which are maintained by the State but have a majority of independent governors) or the direct grant schools which the government had commissioned advice on from the Public Schools Commission.

Nevertheless the threat of legislation had been enough to break the political consensus on education. The Conservatives, who won the 1970 general election came to power promising to "end compulsion" in education. One of the new Secretary of State's first actions was to send out a circular (Department of Education circular 10/70) withdrawing the Labour circular and suggesting henceforward "educational considerations in general, local needs and wishes in particular and the wise use of resources to be the main principles determining the local pattern."

What happened since goes to show that there is no very clear correlation between government action and local authority reaction. The Labour circular, which officials now say was sent out with their fingers crossed, was in fact taken up by most authorities (partly

thanks to those same officials' coaxing.) Over 26 per cent of children were in comprehensives by 1970 and, but for postponing the raising of the school leaving age, the figure would have been much higher. And as authorities have gradually managed to rebuild some of their secondary schools they are continuing to plan them as comprehensives. Since the Conservative government came in, even some of the "rebel" authorities have submitted plans. The momentum for change is even more firmly in local hands since the Conservatives came into office.

Local education authorities

As with the central government, local education authorities immediately after the war do not appear to have made their educational plans on particularly political grounds. Thus, in London, the Conservative opposition agreed to the experiments the Labour-controlled council put forward. The Conservatives in Coventry created no trouble. One of the earliest comprehensive schemes in the country was proposed by a Conservative authority: the West Riding of Yorkshire. Equally there were many Labour controlled authorities, particularly in the north of England and the midlands which were totally opposed to any scheme which threatened the grammar school: the grammar school had, after all, through the scholarship system given these working class Labour councillors their chance. They saw merit, not money, as the biggest gateway to opportunity. The Leicestershire proposals in 1957 came from a Conservative authority. Most of the comprehensive proposals during the 1950s did however come from Labour councils.

Then in 1960 Labour took control of the majority of local councils and the Labour party headquarters advised its councils to introduce comprehensives or at least modify the harshness of the selection system. The advice was secret but the results were noticeable. Between 1961 and 1964 a quarter of the country's local education authorities modified their selection system and among those making plans for comprehensives were some of the most important in the country, including Manchester and Liverpool. Despite the pace of reorganisation, the introduction of comprehensive schools - or rather the retention of grammar schools - is still a lively local issue.

London

London (the old London County Council and now the Inner London Education Authority) in 1945 looked to American experience when planning its secondary education. It argued that the old selective system was an accident of history. Comprehensive schools it suggested would provide "flexibility of organisation, variety of choice of the subjects which are the vehicles of education and superior general amenities." It therefore proposed the development of over 100 comprehensive schools. It was not a totally comprehensive pattern: the Council at that time had no power to make grants to the voluntary schools (which happened to be grammar schools). It therefore planned to build its own schools nearby to take the rest of the ability range: these were known as "county complements".

Since even with immediate building approval none of the new comprehensives would be ready until the early 1950s, it also proposed that interim comprehensives be formed from central and secondary modern schools. The first purpose-built comprehensive with its six science

laboratories, nine housecraft centres, five gymnasia and 16 acres of playing fields was opened in 1954 under a cloud; at the last moment the government, by then Conservative, refused to allow the incorporation of a grammar school. Nevertheless, the first comprehensives were an immediate success, aided by their buildings, their novelty and a bulge in the London school population.

Numbers grew over the decade. By the time the Labour government circular was sent out, over 50 per cent of London secondary school children were in comprehensives (including the "county complements": the distinction was abandoned in the 1950s). All took the full age range: 11 to 18. Most were large. Most had evolved from secondary modern schools. By then London included schools with varied organisations: house systems, form systems, highly streamed, some with mixed ability groups for certain activities. In response to the circular, the Labour-held council submitted a plan for 113 comprehensives by 1970, leaving 46 grammar schools, 13 modern schools and one technical school. But London shelved the problem of the voluntary aided grammar school which fiercely opposed any connection with a comprehensive system. This grammar-comprehensive divide became more overt when the Conservatives won control of the council in 1967 and re-submitted the plan, having taken out most schemes which involved the incorporation of grammar schools. In 1970 therefore reorganisation had not gone as far as it would have done under Labour. There were only 85 comprehensives, and still 67 grammar schools, 40 "evolving" comprehensives, 28 modern and 3 technical schools. Under their plan, 128 comprehensives, 41 grammar, 12 "evolving" comprehensives and 9 modern schools are scheduled to exist in 1975. Over 15 per cent of London children are still in grammar schools, a number intended to drop to 10 per cent by 1975. This number includes, it must be supposed, a very large proportion of top ability children (figures are not released).

The authority operates a complicated sharing scheme, known as banding, to try and ensure that the comprehensives get a fair share of those who apply to them. Children are tested anonymously at the age of 10 and a formula is worked out to show (with some area variations) the share that secondary schools are entitled to accept. Over 85 per cent get their first choice, over 95 per cent their second choice. But only a handful of comprehensives get a full share of top ability children: most of whom are still in nearby grammar schools.

London's success (in common with many big cities) therefore has to be measured in modified terms. Many of the schools are now in modern buildings (though many have shared sites). They have a wide range of facilities (London did not push many of its extra resources into primary schools in the 1950s and early 1960s). Many of the comprehensives have genuinely opened up opportunities - or at least attracted their consumers. Over half the London children staying on for a sixth year over the school leaving age are children who are not attempting the conventional sixth year advanced work. But the system is still vitiated by selection.

Bristol

Bristol has many totally non-selective areas. There was some great forethought on the part of the Chairman of the Education Committee and the Chief Education Officer immediately after the war when rebuilding

was planned. Bristol, badly bombed, decided to redevelop with large housing estates on the outskirts of the city. The education committee reserved large (50 acres) sites in the middle of each estate, feeling that it was difficult to predict a pattern of secondary education to last the lifetime of those houses. It needed flexibility.

Bristol had in 1946 thought of two types of school - academic and vocational - but by 1951 modified its earlier proposals to argue that all secondary school resources for each area should be concentrated in one place. The great period of school building was during the 1950's while Labour held the council. Schools which were initially planned to serve the neighbourhood were all scheduled to become comprehensive schools of six or nine form entry (i.e. 1,000 to 1,500 pupils). They were mostly started as bilateral: schools had some unselected local children and some selected coming in through the eleven plus procedure.

Though Labour lost the council from 1960 to 1963, it came back pledged to remove the eleven plus. The outer areas with comprehensives were able to abolish selection straight away (parents who did not want their children to go to their local school can opt for another comprehensive school). The outer areas of Bristol are now truly neighbourhood schools - with the advantages and disadvantages. But in the centre of Bristol are a number of academically highly selective direct grant schools and some secondary modern schools which cannot easily be brought in with the comprehensive system. One-third of its secondary schools are not comprehensive.

The West Riding of Yorkshire

The West Riding is a pioneer with a number of forms of comprehensive schooling and a long history of no eleven plus (it used teachers' assessments from 1955). Its comprehensives date from 1946, its first purpose-built one from 1956. The authority had been highly dubious about the Hadow report and downright sceptical about the Norwood report. It took advice from psychologists on the impossibility of selecting children by ability. "We must not allocate children blindly", the education committee said at the time. Instead "we must by experiment discover the needs of children of eleven plus and differentiate our school gradually according to our discoveries". Its first comprehensive was approved by a Conservative authority. Its progress to comprehensive organisation has been complicated by its constitution; it is one of the country's largest authorities (population of over two million compared with London's 800,000). It devolves a lot of planning to divisional executives. They have varied in their enthusiasm. There are now different plans for different areas including 18 schools and a kind of sixth form college, a "mushroom" sixth form on the "stalk" of a grammar school which takes in pupils from the local secondary moderns who want extended courses. The college is physically almost separate from the grammar school but can share staff and resources. It also leaves the options open if there is pressure on the secondary moderns to develop their own sixth form. Since 1962 the West Riding has been working towards a middle school scheme for many of its areas. (The age span runs from 5 to 9, 9 to 13, 13 to 18).

Its approach is characteristic of the way it has innovated. Its chief education officer, one of the most famous in the country, Sir Alec Clegg, uses his teachers. A number were consulted about various

schemes for comprehensives and asked what they felt about the age of selection. They favoured changes in the transfer age for secondary selection to 13 and also breaking the barriers between primary and secondary. The middle school scheme is having a number of useful consequences. Schools are forced to co-operate over curriculum planning: the middle schools introduce subjects which may be unfamiliar in the primary school. They have virtually all had to learn how to teach French for example, and this has been done by groups of teachers from the secondary schools and a country adviser. It has brought the teachers - even in the West Riding where there is a very strong tradition of in-service training - unusually close together, breaking down the isolation between types of school.

Leicestershire

Many of the schemes have one great disadvantage: they do not abolish selection over an entire area, often because the existence of voluntary and grammar schools puts it out of the authority's control. London illustrates the predicament. Many authorities have put their priorities, instead, on abolishing selection for individual schools. Leicestershire has worked the other way round and, with one of the best planned schemes of all, became in 1969 the first county in England to abolish selection totally.

After the war the authority had accepted the Hadow arguments for a system of grammar, technical and modern schools. It shared in the widespread dislike of "monster" comprehensive schools. But during the 1950 s its director, Stuart Mason, grew uneasy about the errors in selection, about parents' opposition to the eleven plus and the fact that selection was ruining the junior schools and even some infant schools, by forcing children to learn by rote. Leicestershire was Conservative-held but the chairman and committee were in favour of Mason's plan for a new comprehensive experiment. In 1957 the authority proposed a "two-tier" scheme: that all children should go to the same "high" school at 11 and then all parents who wanted to could transfer their children to an "upper" school at the age of 14, provided they kept them there till 16 at least. The scheme was a success locally, the central (Conservative) government went out of its way to bless it. It was gradually extended to other areas.

The primary schools benefited immediately (and became famous). The high schools enjoyed the full range of pupils, graduate staff and better equipment than in their secondary modern days. Examination pressures were confined to the upper schools, though these schools have gradually become more comprehensive. And initially the schools remained small - able to use the existing buildings though the upper schools have gradually been enlarged to take 1,000 to 1,200 pupils.

The chief problem of the scheme has been in the high schools - left with the children who did not transfer at the age of 14, often a demoralising element. The local education authority therefore introduced automatic transfer in each area as soon as 80 per cent transferred voluntarily. The high schools may be strengthened further in the future. The authority is now planning to make them four-year schools, taking pupils from the age of 10. This is to be tried in the first areas in 1970.

40

The Leicestershire scheme seems to some extent to have been a victim of politics. Two-tier schemes, which looked as if they would be very popular with authorities making plans after the government's circular in 1965, were attacked by the political left for not being genuinely comprehensive. Parental choice or guided parental choice was seen (justifiably) as a form of selection: it was still the grammar-type middle class children who went on to the upper school.

It is too often forgotten that the Leicestershire scheme was built on the strengths of existing schools. A number of other authorities have disregarded the schools for the sake of a plan and have ended up with a much less comprehensive system.

Cumberland

The authorities mentioned so far have guided government policy. Cumberland is typical of many of the rest: it had not resisted the idea of comprehensive schools, given the opportunity for building, but it actually had few comprehensive schools when the government sent out its circular. For those authorities the circular has been basically a push to an inevitable process. Cumberland is however among the authorities which have taken this policy forward with great care in a difficult situation. It is a rural area, much of it remote and much of it with a static or declining population.

Cumberland, under its director, Gordon Bessey, had in the 1950s gone much further than many authorities to build up its secondary modern schools. The ones which had particularly strong sides - in art or domestic science for example - were encouraged to build up extended courses and take in children over 15 from other secondary moderns for their 'speciality'.

When there was the opportunity, comprehensive schools were set up. One example shows the very positive conception of the authority. A new school was needed in 1964 for an atomic energy station. It could have been built in the station and drawn predominantly on the middle class research workers. In fact it was sited at a point where it also could draw on the farms and iron and coal mining communities and provide for adults as well as children. It is a flourishing community centre too, housing local clubs as well as classes for adults (this is still fairly rare in England).

A two-tier scheme is being adopted for many of the other areas in the country. Transfer at 13 (as opposed to 14 in Leicestershire) depends on "guided parental choice" for the normal grammar school curriculum. Thus the scheme is subject to the sort of criticism that were made of Leicestershire. But its flexibility should not be underestimated, as long as children are not deterred from transferring to the upper school. As pressure for transfer builds up and the teachers in the lower schools become experienced in teaching children over the whole ability range, the age of transfer can be raised. By starting in a limited way it builds on existing resources.

Others

Reorganisation has inspired a number of other schemes, linking schools and further education for example (in different ways in Devon

and Oxfordshire). Although most authorities have gone for 11 to 18 schools - the original conception - many of the more recent plans propose middle school schemes, two-tier and sixth form colleges. Several combine different schemes. That seems a measure of maturity and an opportunity to concentrate on what goes on inside the schools.

Schools: Organisation and Curriculum

Given the English context, the Department of Education in vetting plans is really concerned with two features only. Is the intake non-selective? Do schools provide a sufficient range of advanced courses to justify regarding them as more than secondary modern schools?

This may well be the limit of the local education authority's concern too. It is only very recently that an official report (on the direct grants schools(1))argues that local education authorities should be more positive. It suggests ten criteria for schemes; for example that they should ensure that children of all abilities are educated in such a way as to develop their talents to the highest possible degree: that children are not segregated before the statutory school leaving age into separate schools; that the schools do provide opportunities to go on to further or higher education; that schools are not placed in a hierarchy of esteem; that schools are not socially one-class establishments; that there is close collaboration over curriculum and methods between schools in tie[illegible]rrangements.

Had local authorities come [illegible] terms with those arguments publicly, it would probably have been a great boost for flexible methods in the secondary school at a much earlier stage. Local education authority action, limited or not, is the key. Once the authority decides to reorganise, the way is open for schools to decide how far they are going to relate - in the phrasing of the American educationalist, Professor John Goodlad - the function of the school to its form. In other words, once the structure of the school has been decided, how far will its curricula and organisational functions be consistent with it?

Nearly all the debate - about forms of grouping, streaming, the place of the gifted child and the slow learner, the extent to which there can be a common curriculum, overlap with further education - comes from the schools themselves(2) though it is conditioned by examination pressures (from the examination boards and the universities) and more recently by the Schools Council.

Significantly the Schools Council's involvement in secondary education was not stimulated by reorganisation. Worry about science programmes for bright children started curriculum reform for the secondary school. The government decision to raise the school leaving

---

(1) Public Schools Commission, Second Report, H.M.S.O., 1970.

(2) The dialogue among innovating schools is effectively monitored in Forum, a journal edited by Professor Brian Simon. Simon is also co-author with David Rubinstein of The Evolution of the Comprehensive School, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969, on which this section draws.

age (RSLA) extended the Schools Council's involvement. The materials from some of the RSLA projects will undoubtedly stimulate many of the non-innovating schools into much more conscious concern about the implications of non-selective schooling. But it does take a long time.

Conclusion

To sum up: reorganisation has gone far enough to acquire its own momentum so that the change of government has not had any marked effect. But if you ask how soon reorganisation is going to change all children's experience of school, then the limitations are obvious. First, without special funds there is the lengthy period needed for the change. Second, there will not be a 100 per cent changeover to comprehensives without a government deciding to use a force which would change its relationship to local education authorities. Third, there is no institutional way of ensuring that changes in the organisation of schools stimulate a reassessment of curriculum and methods. But this is happening, because of the Schools Council and because more pupils stay voluntarily. This is typical. Change in English education relies very heavily on the individual professionals - administrators and head teachers - knowing how to draw the threads together.

PART IV

CONCLUSIONS

Does the experience of children in schools change and for the better? It is a focus which may get lost when there is much activity on curriculum development, educational technology or teacher education. But it is one good consequence, at least, of the decentralised English approach that much innovation involves schools right from its beginnings.

Of the examples in this report, curriculum projects arise from the dissatisfaction of teachers and pupils with the existing situation. The changes in primary education activities, an untimetabled day and varied forms of grouping, have grown directly out of individual schools' experiments. The changes in secondary education are probably much less effectiv just because they are initiated from higher up the system.

However it would be foolish to suggest that the English education system is particularly receptive to change. One barrier might be apparent to foreign readers. There is no clear chain of control or communication in the English system. A minister cannot snap his fingers, devise a policy and expect it to be implemented by the 163 local education authorities, 23,000 primary schools or 3,000 secondary schools. Nor at the other extreme is there any guarantee that a school which tries to innovate gets the necessary support.

Formally, control is exercised by the Secretary of State for Education and the Department of Education, with local education authorities below them and school governors down at the grass roots. Universities exercise some control over the education of teachers, and the churches exercise some control over some schools. But that control is mediated by a number of pressures of which the strongest are the degree of the teachers' professional interest and involvement, and the interests of local education authorities themselves as developers. Noticeable pressure can also be generated by students, parents, examination bodies, educational publishers and employers. The Department of Education itself generally occupies a relatively limited regulating role.

The system can be more accurately described as a net rather than a chain, a net traditionally kept at tension point by powerful pressure groups, the teachers and the local education authorities especially. Recently the Schools Council and the National Council for Educational Technology have been superimposed as development bodies. Their success depends on how far they can work through the various key groups.

Obviously not all in the net are developers. Individual local education authorities give the lie to the remarkably creative work of

such authorities as Bristol, Cambridgeshire, Cumberland, Devon, Leicestershire, Oxfordshire and Yorkshire West Riding. Individual teachers or local teachers' organisations can shut themselves in their classroom out of earshot of progressive ideas. The strategy for innovators is thus likely to take one of two forms. Either they try and involve all those in the net. Or they so alter the structure as to produce a chain for innovation.

In theory the central government's control could be far more effectively exercised through the HMIs, many of whom are regionally based. But HMIs have spent most of the last 50 years shaking off their purely inspectorial functions. Not surprisingly they are not keen to revive the ancient rivalries between central and local government that inspection would bring. They regard their development work as far more productive. And at present they would be too small a force - there are only 550 of them - to cover the country's schools.

In theory too, the Department of Education could go for an alternative. It could get local education authorities to show good reasons for not developing. This would leave intact the necessary and valuable development function of local education authorities. The department is neither physically nor psychologically equipped to do this. It was a major exercise getting in development plans after the 1944 education act. It has been an equally mammoth effort to get local education authorities to submit plans for secondary reorganisation.

The government has gone as far as it would be likely to go in its recent evidence to the Royal Commission on Local Government. It identifies the problem of many authorities as being too small to perform the functions expected of a forward looking unit of government. They have neither the budget nor the quality of staff for development work: they either do not run or run few in-service training courses, they are less likely to have an advisory staff with enough specialised experience to be useful. They are less likely to set up teachers' centres or experiment with school design.

Many authorities have themselves voluntarily made efforts to counteract the disadvantages of smallness. Most have gone into consortia for school building and equipment. A few (around Manchester, together with the university; and also three north-western counties) have joined together in curriculum development. Five local education authorities are working with Sussex University's Centre for Educational Technology. But the rationale of the building consortia has been essentially economic: local education authorities have foregone their development functions. It is significant that there are few examples of authorities working together in curriculum development or educational technology.

The Schools Council and the National Council for Educational Technology offer an alternative device. They do not alter the control of curriculum and development. They are essentially central servicing agencies which leave the local options open. They try to spread through the whole net. They operate in the belief that power and responsibility in education must be dispersed and that there should be a variety of ways of responding to change. The Schools Council is undoubtedly a powerful force for decentralisation and pluralism in English education, giving power to individuals by organising for them access to research

information which is only likely to be available centrally, and encouraging changes but not imposing them. It is a highly ingenious solution with an additional merit; it recruits into temporary service teachers, and sometimes administrators, who are committed to change, not just the stage armies of academics and educational politicians in the educational organisations.

The fruits of this work are just beginning to appear with the publication of materials of some of the early projects (and about a dozen more are scheduled for 1970-71) and with the attempts to modify examinations in response to new curriculum and social needs.

To some extent the success of the Schools Council is measured in the activities of teachers centres, the demand for related in-service training and the sales of materials. But evaluation of the new curriculum is only marginally more apparent than evaluation of the old. The Schools Council appropriately is backing a number of horses. It has given funds to a university team to evaluate Project Technology. It is helping to finance a Nuffield investigation of the effects of the science project in schools and industry. The National Foundation for Educational Research is evaluating the primary French project. But many teachers and some of the innovators feel that long-term evaluation takes too long to be useful, many local education authorities put its claim for funds low down on their list of priorities. Yet curriculum reform is becoming big business: it needs validating. And more information about the attitudes of teachers and pupils to innovation is urgently needed if new projects are not to start off from the same level of ignorance as the early developers inevitably faced.

In general terms the answers are known. Teachers convinced by the old methods are more effective than teachers unconvinced by the new. So the urgent problem for innovators must lie in preparing teachers for a new and usually less didactic role.

The Schools Council does a certain amount in key areas. Many of the most demanding of its projects have funds for in-service training which they use for, say, 100 teacher-trainers and teachers in especially influential positions. But in-service training is also in the hands of the HMIs, the local education authorities (who provide the bulk of it) and the universities and colleges of education. There are 500 bodies concerned. It is also on a comparatively small scale. Expenditure is only one-twentieth of what is spent on the initial training of teachers (just over £5 million annually compared with £100 million) and most of that goes on one-term and one-year courses for a mere 2,000 teachers. There is a more serious criticism of in-service training: that it is not tied in with what teachers need. A recent survey(1) shows that there was a great unmet demand for courses connected with innovation - on comprehensive schooling, on school organisation, on audio-visual aids and educational television and a surplus of courses on physical education and the initial teaching alphabet. Nor is there any attempt yet to co-ordinate the pattern of in-service training; although the Department of Education did, as a preliminary, announce at the end of 1969 that it would give special grants to certain university institutes of education to expand their activities.

It might be thought that the Schools Council would be the obvious co-ordinating body since it could ensure that the projects are put

(1) H.E.R. Townsend, Statistics of Education, Special Series 2, H.M.S.O. 1970.

across to teachers. But there is no enthusiasm for this among local education authorities who regard it as their job and some of whom feel that they already have to hand over funds to the Schools Council which otherwise they would be able to use for their own development. It looks as if the Department of Education will be encouraging the university institutes and areas training organisations to take a more active role. But there is still a case for the more systematic application of the projects' results to initial training. The colleges can be very effective agents of diffusion.

Will English innovation continue to be enlivened by a device of the Schools Council sort? Can it continue (to quote again one of its administrators, see page 8) "to boost professional self-confidence in a pluralistic setting?" Put another way, can it continue to operate without effecting any change in the control of education? As the scale of innovatory effort rises there may well be a temptation for local authorities singly or in groups to want development decisions pre-empted, where they involve investment on the scale of an educational television service or materials which cost far more than the standard text books.

And can school innovation continue to be linked so closely with the schools? There are signs that development work signals a one-way route out of schools to universities and colleges of education, administration and advisory work. A two-way mobility needs to be encouraged by the career and salary structures. For there is no doubt that the strength of English education has come from developing upwards. It should not lose the roots from which it has grown.