DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 282 UD 015 320

AUTHOR Katz, Lee
TITLE Social Policy Paper on Education of K-12 Low Income Urban Youth.
PUB DATE Dec 71
NOTE 33p.; Two tables (illustrative material) on pages 16 and 17 of this document may not be clearly legible on reproduction

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Educational Administration; Educational Needs; *Educational Policy; Educational Problems; *Federal Government; *Interagency Coordination; Kindergarten; Low Income; Program Proposals; Public Policy; Secondary Education; *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

The stated purposes of this paper are: (1) to explore the character of the Kindergarten through 12 (K-12) educational system in urban centers consisting of populations in excess of 1,000,000; (2) to evaluate existing institutional arrangements at the national level to solve the identified problems; and, (3) to make recommendations regarding possible national policy to solve the problems. It is noted that, often, the urban school bears striking resemblance to the urban environment; its value structure often parallels the lower class subculture. In summation, the following organizational recommendations are proposed: (1) that an interagency systems management bureau within the Office of Education be created reporting directly to the Commissioner; (2) that the interagency systems management bureau be empowered to draw upon the professional expertise that exists within each of the bureaus relating to low income urban youth; and, (3) that the interagency systems management bureau have responsibility for defining major urban areas requiring integrated K-12 services; generate concepts, for possible critical mass impact programs for identified urban sites; sub-contract with relevant bureaus in order to secure appropriate expertise for mounting the comprehensive impact programs; and evaluate both process and product outcomes of funded projects. (Author/JM)

TITLE: SOCIAL POLICY PAPER ON EDUCATION OF K-12 LOW INCOME URBAN YOUTH

SUBMITTED BY: Dr. Lee Katz

HOME ADDRESS: 1050 Wall Street
Apartment 4f
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

UNIVERSITY ADDRESS: (Effective September 1, 1975)
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
University of Michigan-Dearborn
4901 Evergreen Road
Dearborn, Michigan 48128

DATE COMPLETED: December 1971

Table of Contents

NATIONAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1960's ushered in an era of almost frenzied national reform efforts in the field of elementary and secondary education directed specifically at improving the social, economic and educational conditions of low income youth in our metropolitan centers. The proliferation of legislative mandates during this period has resulted in a series of unintegrated federal programs administered out of complex Bureaus, Divisions and Branches within the Office of Education in Washington, D. C.

This unwieldly administrative organization has generated fragmented programs at the local level that have failed in large measure to accomplish the goal of moving our low income youth into the mainstream of American society.

The following organizational recommendations are proposed in an effort to meet the need for integrated programs that will have optimum impact on elementary and secondary youth in urban educational centers:

1. THAT AN INTER-AGENCY SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT BUREAU WITHIN THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION BE CREATED REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE COMMISSIONER.
2. THAT THE INTER-AGENCY SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT BUREAU BE EMPOWERED TO DRAW UPON THE PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE THAT EXISTS WITHIN EACH OF THE BUREAUS RELATING TO LOW INCOME URBAN YOUTH.
3. THAT THE INTER-AGENCY SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT BUREAU HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR:

    (a) defining major urban areas requiring integrated K-12 services.

(b) generating concepts for possible critical mass impact programs for identified urban sites.

(c) sub-contracting with relevant bureaus in order to secure appropriate expertise for mounting the comprehensive impact programs.

(d) evaluating both process and product outcomes of funded projects.

I. Statement of the Problem

The profound problems associated with educating the urban poor and the large masses of disenfranchised black ghetto populations exploded on the national scene approximately a decade ago. It followed on the heels of the Sputnik era when much of the educational research, training, and demonstration was dedicated to the principles of excellence in the schools for an elite population of youth capable of maximizing its teaching-learning environment. The future it was felt, would depend upon a generation of youth equipped to contribute toward scientific and technological progress as part of the United States' national defense effort and international race for scientific advancement.

A dramatic shift occurred, however, in the mid-1960's when it became patently clear that at the same time that the schools were nourishing a population of elite youth who embodied the nation's cherished cultural, social, and intellectual values, it was failing a large segment of its lower income urban youth who were rejecting these same nation's ideals and who were ill-equipped to enter the mainstream of American life. The full measure of that failure was made evident in the report of the White House Conference, "To Fulfill These Rights," convened by President Johnson in 1966. The conference report declared that "...education has failed to meet the challenge of rapid technological, social, and population change, and by reason of this failure has gravely aggravated the disadvantaged position of the Negro. Until the educational system is strengthened to provide every child with basic, saleable, and citizenship skills as well as relevant personal experience of the open society, the Negro cannot take his rightful place in American life." (1)

(1) Charles A. Quattlebaum, Federal Educational Policies, Programs, and Proposals: A Survey and Handbook, U. S. Government Printing Office December 1968, pg. 89.

President Nixon, in his message to Congress on "Education for the 1970's," asserted that American education is in urgent need of reform. He called for a searching reexamination of our entire approach to learning and stressed the need for redirection of our efforts to compensate for the educational deficiencies among the poor. He urged the public to recognize the disjointed and often abortive efforts of the government to deal with the problem and encouraged the nation to consider structural reform.(2)

These past two decades have marked a time of radical transition and rapid growth toward an altered state of our nation--one in which our cities are in ferment and our youth are rejecting the social and educational arrangements that exist to move them into the mainstream of society. A need exists for social policy of major dimensions that will have an impact on the problem of urban education particularly as it relates to elementary and secondary school children and one which will deal squarely with the problem of the disenfranchised Blacks who comprise a significant majority of the urban poor.

The purpose of this paper will be to (a) explore the character of the K-12 educational system in our urban centers (consisting of populations in excess of 1,000,000), (b) evaluate existing institutional arrangements at the national level to solve the identified problems, and (c) make recommendations regarding possible national policy to solve the problems.

(2) President Nixon, Message to Congress, "Education for the 1970's: Renewal and Reform," The White House, March, 1970.

The Urban Setting

James Conant challenged the nation in 1961 when he predicted the growing social dynamite of our major cities. He warned the United States that the school and the decaying cities were inseparable and that any attempt to deal with them as independent entities would lead to policies that would, "...wreak havoc with the lives of children." (3) The specific character of that social dynamite was clearly illuminated in a recent New York Times article on Newark, New Jersey, in which Newark was described as, "...a study in evils, tensions, and frustrations that beset the central cities of America. It is a city of 375,000--an estimated 61 percent Negro, 11 percent Puerto Rican. It is a city with an overall unemployment rate of 14 percent (25 to 30 percent among Blacks and Puerto Ricans); around 25 percent of those who are employed work only part-time, and there are virtually no summer jobs and few programs for the city's 80,000 school children who now roam the streets. As a result, one of every three Newarkers is getting some form of public assistance. There are by conservative estimates 20,000 drug addicts in the city, and only 7% of them are being treated. Newark has the highest crime rate of any city in the nation; the highest percentage of substandard housing, the highest rate of venereal disease, new tuberculosis cases and maternal mortality; and it is second in infant mortality." (4)

While this capsule profile of Newark, New Jersey, provides a somewhat descriptive sketch of a central city, it's patterns of central city disorganization can be substantially documented on every level--percent of non-white unemployment rates, housing conditions, incidence of poverty--in most urban centers of the United States.

(3) James B. Conant, Slums and Suburbs, The American Library, 1969.
(4) Fred Cooke, New York Times, "A Study in Evil", July 25, 1971.

The preponderance of non-whites and the correspondingly high rate of poverty referred to in the New York Times analysis of Newark is made evident in the 1968 U. S. Office of Education report on Profiles in Fifty American Cities cited below.

Table I---Central City Poverty Profile

Metropolitan Area	Non-White Families Percent/Central City	Non-White Families Percent/Poverty Area	Percent Below Poverty Level
Milwaukee	99.0	83.3	30.4
Chicago	92.3	75.7	29.3
New York	90.6	71.1	25.6
Cleveland	97.5	73.2	27.8
Washington	86.3	61.3	26.0
St. Louis	72.6	86.9	42.1
Buffalo	84.2	78.7	34.3
Baltimore	87.8	77.1	35.3
New Orleans	88.1	92.6	51.1
Boston	80.0	69.2	28.4
Philadelphia	79.8	71.5	30.7

Source: U. S. Office of Education: Profiles of Fifty Major American Cities, May 1968, page 4.

In the 1970 U. S. Department of Labor Manpower Report of the President, additional data is provided regarding unemployment rates in six major cities as well as indices of educational occupation, and income attainment by color in six major cities. (See Tables II and III following on pages 5 and 6).

Table II. Unemployment Rates and Labor Force Status in Poverty Areas of Six Cities, by Color,[1] July 1968–June 1969

Poverty area and color	Unemployment rate				Percent of household heads aged 20 to 64 who—				Percent of households with female heads
					Were not in the labor force		Did not work full time year round		
	Total	Men, 20 years and over	Women, 20 years and over	Teenagers, 16 to 19 years	Men	Women	Men	Women	
Atlanta									
Total	8.6	2.9	9.5	28.6	9.2	28.6	27.5	45.7	43.0
Negro	9.4	3.0	10.0	29.4	9.3	27.3	27.3	49.2	44.7
White	5.3	2.6	6.9	25.0	8.8	28.6	28.1	36.1	38.0
Chicago									
Total [2]	8.6	4.2	7.3	31.1	7.9	59.5	18.8	39.2	38.1
Detroit									
Total	12.2	6.8	12.5	36.4	13.3	47.7	37.4	56.2	35.2
Negro	13.5	5.9	14.2	40.0	11.9	51.5	36.1	57.7	38.0
White	9.1	7.8	7.[illegible]	18.2	16.0	35.5	40.0	54.5	29.9
Houston									
Total	8.3	3.5	8.7	30.2	7.1	22.8	27.6	47.0	33.6
Negro	9.5	4.1	9.7	37.5	7.2	20.0	30.3	47.8	39.0
Mexican American [3]	6.5	1.5	7.4	20.0	3.6	37.5	21.8	50.0	16.4
Other white	5.0	4.2	3.8	14.3	11.6	23.1	30.8	30.0	31.3
Los Angeles									
Total	10.3	6.2	8.6	31.8	11.7	50.6	25.8	47.9	34.0
Negro	15.2	10.1	12.9	45.5	15.6	56.6	32.3	56.0	40.5
Mexican American [3]	6.1	4.0	4.9	15.8	8.9	40.0	21.4	36.8	26.9
Other white	7.7	7.1	-------	33.3	8.3	40.0	20.0	33.3	35.7
New York [4]									
Total	6.8	5.1	5.4	25.3	12.5	47.3	21.0	38.8	44.8
Negro	6.5	4.8	5.3	23.1	12.9	43.4	22.2	39.5	49.1
Puerto Rican [3]	9.6	7.0	9.7	30.4	11.9	60.9	18.4	39.5	35.2
Other white	4.5	2.9	4.1	25.0	11.6	37.2	21.0	31.9	39.8

[1] Data for Negroes include a relatively small number of members of other races.

[2] Population in the Chicago CEP area is 98 percent Negro.

[3] Data are for Spanish Americans, most of whom are of Mexican origin in Houston and Los Angeles, but of Puerto Rican origin in New York.

[4] The survey area in New York includes additional neighborhoods outside the CEP area.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor Manpower Report of the President Government Printing Office, March 1970, page 132.

Table III. Education, Occupation, and Income in Poverty Areas of Six Cities, by Color,[1] July 1968–June 1969

Poverty area and color	Percent of population aged 18 and over with—		Men nonfarm laborers as percent of employed men aged 20 and over	Women service workers as percent of employed women aged 20 and over		Percent of household heads aged 16 to 64 earning less than $65 for full-time week		Percent of families with incomes—			Median family income
	8 years of school or less	12 years of school or more		All service workers	Private household workers	Men	Women	Under $3,000	Under $5,000	Over $10,000	
Atlanta											
Total	41.2	29.3	17.4	56.0	27.5	9.0	54.1	31.7	50.9	11.6	$4,900
Negro	40.2	29.4	20.1	63.5	32.5	9.2	58.6	33.3	54.0	9.2	4,700
White	43.5	29.0	8.0	21.8	4.5	------	16.7	22.4	38.7	20.4	6,200
Chicago											
Total[2]	34.7	31.6	15.0	24.2	5.5	4.3	26.0	18.8	32.1	25.0	7,200
Detroit											
Total	38.1	30.0	15.3	46.2	14.1	3.9	25.0	26.8	39.6	20.1	6,300
Negro	37.3	28.3	17.2	52.4	19.0	2.0	38.1	27.8	40.8	19.6	6,200
White	39.7	33.7	11.4	31.0	1.8	7.7	36.4	26.2	39.3	21.4	6,300
Houston											
Total	40.1	28.6	20.9	58.8	27.4	8.4	69.6	28.9	47.2	12.0	5,200
Negro	34.9	32.0	24.5	68.0	35.0	7.1	75.0	35.3	53.2	9.2	4,700
Mexican American[3]	55.4	13.4	20.9	34.4	6.4	7.0	(4)	16.7	36.7	15.0	6,000
Other white	40.5	33.6	7.8	30.1	5.2	8.0	(4)	19.5	34.1	19.5	6,600
Los Angeles											
Total	37.9	33.5	11.2	24.5	8.8	1.8	15.4	21.8	37.9	19.9	6,200
Negro	26.9	42.4	10.5	37.7	14.8	------	16.7	25.4	44.3	20.5	5,800
Mexican American[3]	45.0	24.0	12.7	12.8	3.5	------	15.4	17.1	32.5	10.5	6,500
Other white	35.3	39.2	4.6	10.5	1.0	------	--------	26.3	42.1	21.1	5,750
New York[5]											
Total	37.1	32.7	7.8	34.3	13.6	5.5	15.5	26.7	43.3	16.4	5,500
Negro	33.7	35.3	8.7	41.9	18.2	4.2	15.6	26.0	41.8	17.1	5,750
Puerto Rican[3]	47.0	19.2	6.2	12.6	.5	7.2	18.5	28.8	49.5	9.7	5,000
Other white	37.6	40.8	6.8	13.8	1.1	6.2	14.3	26.4	39.3	23.9	5,600

[1] Data for Negroes include a relatively small number of members of other races.

[2] Population in the Chicago CEP area is 96 percent Negro.

[3] Data are for Spanish Americans, most of whom are of Mexican origin in Houston and Los Angeles, but of Puerto Rican origin in New York.

[4] Percentage not shown in Houston where percentage base is below 1,000.

[5] The survey area in New York includes additional neighborhoods outside the CEP area.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor Manpower Report of the President, Government Printing Office, March 1970, page 131.

The inner city crisis is made even more evident in an analysis of the Manpower Report study of poor families both in and outside metropolitan areas. (See Table IV).

Table IV. Poor Families in and Outside Metropolitan Areas, 1968 [1]

[Numbers in thousands]

Type of area	Number below poverty level		Percent below poverty level		Families headed by year-round, full-time workers			
					Number below poverty level		Percent below poverty level	
	All races	Negro	All races	Negro	All races	Negro	All races	Negro
Total	5,047	1,363	10.0	29.3	1,353	356	4.0	14.2
Metropolitan areas	2,477	777	7.6	22.8	544	167	2.5	8.6
Areas of 1,000,000 or more	1,211	438	6.9	20.5	234	65	1.9	5.4
In central cities	748	358	9.9	20.7	125	45	2.6	4.7
Outside central cities	463	80	4.6	19.9	108	19	1.5	7.7
Areas of under 1,000,000	1,266	339	8.4	26.7	312	102	3.1	14.0
In central cities	716	260	9.9	25.9	172	87	3.7	14.7
Outside central cities	550	79	7.1	29.8	139	16	2.6	11.6
Outside metropolitan areas	2,570	586	14.3	47.1	809	188	7.1	33.1
Nonfarm	2,108	492	13.6	45.2	537	145	5.5	29.1
Farm	462	94	19.3	60.6	270	43	16.0	60.6

[1] See footnote 1, table 3.

Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor Manpower Report of the President Government Printing Office, March 1970, page 33.

A similar pattern emerges in the housing area and is discussed in 1970 HEW Urban Task Force Report on the Urban School Crisis.(5) (See Table V below).

Table V.—SUBSTANDARD HOUSING IN 11 OF THE LARGEST U.S. CITIES—1960

City	Percentage of nonwhite occupied housing units classified as deteriorating or dilapidated, 1960	Percentage of nonwhite occupied housing units classified as deteriorating or dilapidated or sound, but without [illegible] plumbing, 1960
New York	33.8	[illegible]
Chicago	[illegible]	[illegible]
Los Angeles	[illegible]	[illegible]
Philadelphia	[illegible]	[illegible]
Detroit	37.0	[illegible]
Baltimore	30.5	35.7
Houston	[illegible]	[illegible]
Cleveland	29.9	33.9
Washington, D.C.	19.2	27.9
St. Louis	[illegible]	[illegible]
San Francisco	21.3	31.0
Dallas	[illegible]	[illegible]
New Orleans	41.3	[illegible]
Pittsburgh	[illegible]	[illegible]

Source: Report of The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Washington, D.C., March, 1968, p. 247.

Adapted from the U. S. Commission report on Civil Disorders, the point is made that the 25% national rate of substandard housing is generally exceeded by non-whites.

(5) HEW Urban Education Task Force, Urban School Crisis, Washington Monitoring Service by the Editors of Education, U.S.A., January 5, 1970, page 28.

An examination of crime rates in central cities reveals an anticipated pattern. The Office of Education report on Profiles in Fifty Major American Cities indicates that the largest number of crimes per unit population is highest in the large metropolitan centers and in those areas where populations are growing the fastest. Cities with a rise of over 100 percent in the crime rate between 1961-1966 were listed as follows:

City	Percent Change in Crime Rate, 1961-1966
Buffalo	151.3
Baltimore	136.7
New York	134.0
Cleveland	126.1
Detroit	106.1

Source: Op Cit Table I

The data listed above merely serves to reinforce the words of alarm that were uttered by James Conant in his analysis of schools in slum areas. It is against the backdrop of these festering cities that the urban school and the urban student must be viewed. Since learning refers to all those activities both in and outside the school that tend to modify behavior, the role of the community, in the education of our youth cannot be overlooked.

The Urban School

Often the urban school bears striking resemblance to the urban environment. Physically, it offers the same neglected, unattractive and overcrowded conditions as its community. Its value structure often parallels the lower class subculture and emphasizes authoritarian role relationships, task oriented communication patterns, limited verbal exchange, and pragmatic immediate goals and objectives.

In Death at an Early Age, Jonathan Kozol provides a description of the inner-city school in which he achieved his first teaching assignment:

> The school plan itself is inadequate and antiquated. The school building program...is creeping along at a slow clip. There are no school libraries in the 175 elementary and junior high schools. School Department records show Boston students score badly on nationally standardized tests. Students at only three of the city's 16 high schools score above average as a group. Guidance and pupil adjustment functions are desperately understaffed. Until last year, just ten pupil adjustment counselors covered 17 junior high and 158 elementary schools. That comes to one counselor for every 8,500 students. (6)

Dr. Carl J. Dolce, a superintendent from an inner-city urban school confirms this point of view and indicates that "schools tend to be older because ghettos generally form in older areas of the cities. They tend to be overcrowded because of the higher population denisty and greater proportion of children per family in the ghetto." (7) He also makes reference to the lower tax base for financial support of the school as a result of the flight of the middle class to the surrounding suburban areas.

(6) Jonathan Kozol, Death at An Early Age, Houghton, Miflin Co. New York, October 1967, pg. 51

(7) Dr. Carl J. Dolce, "The Inner City--A Superintendent's View," Saturday Review of Literature, January 1969, pg. 36.

A similar profile of the urban school is provided in the Health, Education and Welfare report on Equal Education Opportunity. (See Tables VII and VIII following on pages 11 and 12).

The data listed in Tables VII and VIII makes it abundantly clear that the urban school, when analyzed along a series of indices related to school plant, falls considerably short of its suburban counterpart.

While the Coleman report revealed a very low correlation between student achievement and adequacy of school resources, it would appear that deteriorated physical settings offer limited support for the sense of failure and entrapment that prevails in the inner city environment.

Table VII —Percent (except where average specified) of pupils in secondary schools having the school characteristic listed in the stub, by [illegible]

Characteristic	Whole Nation						Nonmetropolitan						Metropolitan									
							North and West		South		South [illegible]		North [illegible]		Mid [illegible]		South		[illegible]		[illegible]	
	M-A	PR	I A	O-A	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj
Age of main building:																						
Less than 20 yrs	48	40	49	41	60	53	61	35	79	52	76	44	18	61	93	43	71	84	73	47	82	79
20 to 40 yrs	40	34	35	32	26	29	15	26	13	33	22	46	41	29	35	37	15	11	15	50	15	15
At least 40 yrs	11	28	15	26	12	18	21	38	3	15	3	10	39	15	29	20	3	6	12	3	3	3
Average pupils per room	32	33	29	32	31	31	27	30	35	28	22	20	[illegible]	27	31	33	32	35	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Auditorium	57	68	49	66	49	46	32	27	21	36	56	68	77	72	51	51	79	69	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	45
Cafeteria	72	80	74	81	72	65	55	41	65	78	78	97	88	53	55	54	77	97	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Gymnasium	78	88	70	83	61	74	51	52	38	63	71	71	93	90	75	76	82	83	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Shop with power tools	96	88	96	98	89	96	97	96	85	90	88	91	67	95	93	100	85	9	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	1
Biology laboratory	95	81	96	96	93	94	99	87	85	88	93	96	88	91	100	99	95	10	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Chemistry laboratory	96	91	99	99	91	98	98	97	85	91	92	95	99	88	100	100	91	100	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Physics laboratory	90	83	90	97	80	91	80	90	63	83	71	93	92	90	91	93	83	10	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	1
Language laboratory	57	45	58	75	49	56	32	24	17	32	38	19	47	79	68	57	83	8	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Infirmary	65	77	77	69	70	75	47	56	53	45	23	47	96	93	70	83	83	8	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Full time librarian	81	93	85	98	87	83	53	58	69	76	67	61	55	99	99	94	96	53	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Free textbooks	74	79	78	88	70	62	42	53	51	43	91	92	94	91	67	39	58	84	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Sufficient number of textbooks	92	89	90	96	85	95	99	99	79	91	97	100	94	99	98	100	69	97	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Texts under 4 yrs. old	58	68	65	55	61	62	77	56	64	51	73	66	35	50	51	67	56	65	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Average library books per pupil	8.1	6.2	6.4	5.7	4.6	5.8	4.5	6.3	4.0	6.1	8.1	14.8	8.8	5.3	8.5	4.8	4.5	5.7	5.6	3.7	5.5	6.3
Free lunch program	66	80	63	75	74	62	58	51	89	88	61	82	64	32	71	61	79	79	89	52	37	54

Source: U. S. Government Printing Office, Equal Educational Opportunities, Washington, D. C., 1966, pg. 10.

Table VIII - Percent (except where average specified) of pupils in elementary schools having the school characteristic named at left

Characteristic	Whole Nation						Nonmetropolitan						Metropolitan									
	M-A	PR	I-A	O A	Neg	Maj	North and West		South		Southwest		Northeast		Midwest		South		Southwest		West	
							Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj	Neg	Maj
Age of main building:																						
Less than 20 yrs.	59	57	66	61	63	60	48	51	72	31	73	40	31	59	28	63	77	75	52	89	76	80
20 to 40 yrs.	18	18	20	20	17	20	35	13	21	43	17	28	23	23	18	18	11	20	27	10	14	9
At least 40 yrs.	22	24	13	18	18	18	17	32	4	20	9	29	43	18	53	18	12	4	21	1	7	7
Average pupils per room	33	31	30	33	32	29	25	28	31	26	21	31	33	30	31	30	30	31	39	26	37	31
Air conditioning	20	31	18	21	27	19	3	5	16	40	14	19	56	40	27	10	20	21	11	1	17	12
Cafeteria	39	43	38	30	38	37	41	33	46	64	47	51	41	45	24	22	34	32	48	38	34	14
Gymnasium	19	27	20	14	15	21	9	8	15	31	15	21	46	49	36	19	6	5	13	17	0	8
Library	59	62	61	77	71	68	52	52	49	44	38	39	74	90	71	79	81	76	59	48	93	96
Full-time librarian	22	31	22	24	30	22	4	13	32	22	5	11	46	43	22	15	38	50	11	12	19	13
Professional books	80	82	80	85	84	75	73	56	70	73	99	98	100	98	72	51	81	82	83	65	98	100
Free textbooks	90	87	91	93	81	96	97	99	76	94	97	96	90	97	97	99	74	98	82	84	95	90
School by sufficient number of textbooks	66	68	60	52	67	61	66	51	60	60	47	85	57	56	67	59	71	91	76	53	77	77
Test under 4 yrs. old	69	71	72	83	73	72	44	58	74	77	48	75	83	89	57	70	79	69	59	33	81	95
Central school library	61	73	66	52	74	59	61	50	87	91	83	70	50	43	42	48	90	85	71	82	65	47
Free lunch program																						

Source: U. S. Government Printing Office, Equal Educational Opportunities, Washington, D. C., 1966, pg. 11.

The urban school, despite its obvious need for more resources, receives less financial support than its surrounding suburban schools. Alan K. Campbell in his article on the "Inequities of School Finance" reports that---"for the thirty-seven largest United States Metropolitan areas, the average per capita expenditure for education in the central cities is $82; the same expenditure in the suburbs is $113. On a per student basis, the comparable figures are $449 for the cities and $573 for the suburbs.(8) Dr. Campbell concurs with the HEW prediction that the gap between the central city and the suburb will continue to intensify as disparities in financial support for schools further accelerate the educational distance between the urban and suburban school.

(8) Op Cit. Saturday Review, pg. 44.

The Urban Student

The dramatic failure of the urban school is nowhere more evident than in its wholesale rejection by inner city youth. The urban student is far more likely to read below grade level, perform in the lower academic quartile, function below anticipated potential and to drop out of school.

Edgar Friedenberg, educator and lecturer, asserted in a New York Times Book review that "within the past few years the urban schools have been failing to achieve even their own norms in teaching lower status and especially black pupils, the basic skills middle class pupils learn in school. Such pupils characteristically fall further and further behind normal achievement levels for their age, may never learn to read, and make on the average lower and lower I.Q. scores as they progress--if progress it be--through schools." (9)

Several major reports serve to document Friedenberg's serious allegations against the schools. Notable among these is the Coleman report on Equal Educational Opportunities. In it Coleman provided data that revealed that the degree of deficiency on standardized tests among low income minority populations tended to increase at progressively higher grade levels in school.

TABLE IX

Nationwide Median Test Scores for First and Twelfth-Grade Pupils

Test	Racial or Ethnic Group					
	Puerto Ricans	Indian-Amer.	Mexican Amer.	Oriental Amer.	Negro	Majority
First Grade:						
Nonverbal	45.8	53.0	50.1	56.6	43.4	54.1
Verbal	44.9	47.8	46.5	51.6	45.4	53.2
Twelfth Grade:						
Nonverbal	43.3	47.1	45.0	51.6	40.9	52.0
Verbal	43.1	43.7	43.8	49.6	40.9	52.1
Reading	42.6	44.3	44.2	48.8	42.2	51.9
Mathematics	43.7	45.9	45.5	51.3	41.8	51.8
General Information	41.7	44.7	43.3	49.0	40.6	52.2
Average of the 5 tests	43.1	45.1	44.4	50.1	41.1	52.0

Source: U. S. Government Printing Office, Equal Educational Opportunities, Washington, D. C., pg. 15.

(9) Edgar Z. Friedenberg, "N.Y. Times Book Review," September 14, 1969, Section 7, page 351.

Coleman's data appears consistent with the information secured by the Office of Programs for the Disadvantaged in HEW. Their analysis of the correlation between poverty and numbers of dropouts provided the following information on the six most populated states.

Table X - Students Not Graduating, 1965-66

States	(difference between 10th grade and graduating class)	Rank	Total Poor	Rank	Urban Poor	Rank
New York	45,905	(51)	2,319,400	(50)	1,922,900	(50)
California	21,479	(44)	2,199,440	(49)	1,812,300	(49)
Pennsylvania	27,130	(48)	1,880,500	(48)	1,234,000	(48)
Illinois	30,919	(49)	1,446,000	(44)	1,033,100	(47)
Ohio	24,200	(47)	1,508,500	(46)	994,600	(46)
Texas	40,709	(50)	2,970,300	(51)	1,981,400	(51)

Source: U. S. Office of Education, State Profile on School Dropouts, Juvenile Delinquents, Unemployed Youth, 1966, pg. 3.

In addition, time series data on non-white populations assembled by O.D. Duncan from periodic Census Bureau reports, provides supplementary data on the educational status of non-whites over time.

Table XI - Educational Status of Non-Whites Over Time

Period:	1948-50	1951-53	1954-56	1957-59	1060-62	1963-65
School Enrollment percent of Males 14-17 (non-white)	70.7	75.5	83.1	86.2	88.8	92.4
(white)	84.5	87.2	89.6	91.7	92.9	94.6
Percent High School Graduates Male Labor Force (non-white)	(NA)	15.1	(NA)	21.7	27.3	32.3
(white)	(NA)	42.1	(NA)	49.4	53.5	56.0

Source: Bertram M. Gorss, Social Intelligence for America's Future, Allyn, Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1969, page 389.

The above data makes the disparity between the white and non-white quite clear although it offers some hopeful indicators of a decreasing difference. In President Johnson's message to Congress in 1965, he made the relationship between student non-performance and our urban centers perfectly clear. He affirmed that, "In our 15 largest cities, 60 percent of the 10th grade students from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school." Of course, these figures do not speak to the issue of those who never even reached 10th grade.

On a much more personal level, Daniel Schreiber, in his article 700,000 Dropouts, offers a thumb-nail sketch of the failing student.

> At first you don't realize you are going to fail. You sit in class while the teacher is explaining things and you just don't understand what she is talking about. You ask a question or two and the teacher gives you the answer, but you still don't understand. So you think you will find out from some of your friends what it's all about, because you fee like you're kind of dumb. I remember the first time I asked the kid next to me a question about the work, the teacher became angry and said that I should stop fooling around an pay attention... You know there ought to be some time in school when you could get together with the other kids in your class and talk about the things you would be afraid or ashamed to ask the teacher." (10)

While the interview referred to above could apply to any failing child, it is unfortunately the common experience of a large percentage of our urban youth.

Summary

In 1965-66 Harry Passow, Columbia University, contracted with the Board of Education, District of Columbia, to undertake a comprehensive educational survey that would culminate in a "model" urban school system. That study presented the following general findings that Dr. Passow agrees exist to a greater or lesser degree in other large cities.(11)

(10) Daniel Schreiber, 700,000 Dropouts, American Education, June 1968, pg. 6.
(11) A. Harry Passow, Toward Creating a Model Urban School System: A Study of the Washington, D. C. Public Schools, Teachers College, Columbia University; New York, N. Y., 1970, pg. 3.

--A low level of scholastic achievement as measured by performance on standardized tests.

--Grouping procedures which have been honored in the breach as often as observed in practice.

--A curriculum which, with certain exceptions, has not been especially developed for or adapted to an urban population.

--A "holding power" or dropout rate which reflects a large number of youth leaving school before earning a diploma.

--An increasing de facto residential segregation for the District as a whole, which has resulted in a largely re-segregated school system.

--Staffing patterns which have left the schools with large numbers of "temporary" teachers and heightened the District's vulnerability at a time of national teacher shortage.

--Guidance services which are unable to reach the heart of the personnel welfare needs of the pupil population.

--Inadequate evaluation and assessment procedures together with limited use of test data for diagnosis and counseling.

--Inservice teacher education programs which fall far short of providing adequately for the continuing education essential for professional growth.

--A promotion system which has lacked the basic ingredients of career development and training for supervisory and administrative leadership.

--Patterns of deployment of specialists, such as supervisors and psychologists, which tend to limit their effectiveness.

--A "reacting school system" rather than an initiating one insofar as innovation, long-range planning and program development are concerned.

--A central administrative organization which combines overconcentration of responsibilities in some areas and proliferation and overlap in others.

--Budgetary and business procedures which are needlessly complicated and cumbersome.

--Substantial numbers of school buildings which are less than adequate for conducting a full educational program and in which the maintenance program lags badly.

--Poor communication between the schools and the communities they serve.

--A Board of Education whose operating procedures appear to be unusually cumbersome so that an inordinate amount of time is spent on repetitive debate and on administrative detail rather than policy leadership.

--Relationships with other youth-serving agencies which are less than optimal.

II. Existing Institutional Arrangements to Solve the Problem

National efforts to deal with the K-12 educational crisis in our urban centers were initiated largely during the Johnson administration. President Johnson urged the nation to "push ahead with the No. 1 business of the American people--the education of our youth..." The 89th Congress was responsible for the great alliance between the federal government and the schools and committed itself to the arduous task of experimentation, demonstration, and change. Several major pieces of legislation were enacted during this period and included such well-known measures as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act. In excess of two dozen measures were passed during the first and second session of the 89th Congress and were attempts to deal directly or indirectly with the educational crisis that beset the nation.

In spite of these vigorous national efforts to cope with the problems identified in Part I, limited progress has been made toward the goal of providing every child with basic saleable and citizenship skills articulated by President Johnson in 1966. While numerous speculations can be offered as possible causes for this limited progress, one area in particular appears to require special analysis--specifically--the organizational structure at the national level as a vehicle for administering and implementing K-12 educational programs for low income urban youth that in large measure defines the character of the educational program at the local level.

The Organizational Structure

The Office of Education, a constituent agency of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, bears major responsibility for the administration of programs at all levels that are designed to have an educational impact on urban low-income youth. (See attached Office of Education Table of Organization). The Office of Education Table of Organization reveals the relatively complex bureaucratic structure that exists at the national level to administer programs for an equally fragmented K-12 educational structure at the local level.

The United States Commissioner of Education, assisted by his Deputy Commissioners, is responsible for educational administration, program planning and policy development for the Office of Education. The Office of Education is organized into bureaus and functions through its various administrative branches and divisions. Approximately 3,000 professional and clerical staff provide the manpower support that is necessary for system maintenance. Within the heirarchial structure there exists the Office of Programs for the Disadvantaged, organized regionally, with chief responsibility for coordinating the various bureaus and other staff offices for long range planning. They are assisted by the National Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (periodically appointed by the President) to serve as an evaluation arm of programs that are designed to meet the expressed needs of urban youth.

Given the alarming state of our K-12 educational problems in urban areas, it would appear that the existing national organization is inadequate to deal with the problems identified in Part I for the following three major reasons:

1. No single body--internal or external to the Office of Education--bears unique responsibility for the planning,

research and development related to K-12 urban education. At the present time programs aimed at educating the low income population are scattered widely throughout the various bureaus and divisions of the Office of Education and related agencies. For example; Head Start programs that are designed to prepare educationally and economically deprived children for elementary school are administered by the Office of Child Development. The Education Professions Development Act is designed to train educational personnel to work more effectively with K-12 urban children and is administered by the Bureau of Educational Professional Development. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is designed to provide educational aid to low-income elementary and secondary children and is administered by the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. Upward Bound is designed to prepare secondary school youth for college and is administered by Office of Educational Opportunities, an independent agency. A variety of programs with significant secondary school educational components such as Neighborhood Youth Corp, Job Corps, etc. are administered ouside of the Office of Education. In addition, programs designed to reach handicapped low-income urban K-12 youth are administered by the Bureau of the Handicapped. These illustrations could be extended to include other independent agencies such as the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation all of which contain legislative madates that directly or indirectly focus upon education of K-12 low-income youth in urban centers.

Since no single office is charged with the broad responsibility for planning administration and research in K-12 urban education, programs that are designed at the local level tend to reflect the parameters of well defined federal bureaucratic authority structures rather than comprehensive and overlapping human needs. Small wonder that the National Advisory Council, in 1966, reported that "For the most part, however, projects are piecemeal fragmented efforts at remediation or vaguely directed enrichment. It is extremely difficult to find comprehensive programs for change." (12)

2. A related problem concerns the potential for integration of resources for effective service delivery within the Office of Education structure as given. Programs aimed at human growth and development do not package neatly into discrete bureaus with segmented service potential. Yet educational programs that were developed in the mid 1960's were scattered widely throughout the various Office of Education Bureaus. The bureaus having attained certain distinct responsibilities and perogatives for decision making, tend to coalesce their forces in order to maintain existing power arrangements. As a result, innovative programs that conceive effective methods for comprehensive integration of K-12 educational services are often discarded in favor of those programs that conform to the existing authority structures for funding. Individuals with responsibility for securing outside support for local educational programs quickly learn that Bureaus jealously guard their

(12) Report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D. C., 1900 E. St., N. W., November 25, 1966, pg. 26.

perogatives and tend to avoid the complexities of contract management that are inherent in coalition type programs involving more than one Bureau. The guidelines, the processes for program review, the mechanisms for program support, and the nature of quality control vary from bureau to bureau and attempts to link these bureaus in joint efforts for comprehensive funding is rarely achieved. When translated into programs at the local level it often means inadequate and fragmented program offerings. Thus while the Office of Programs for the Disadvantaged theoretically offers a mechanism for coordination of educational programs dealing with the disadvantaged, its ability to integrate legislative funding agencies to achieve coordinated programs is sharply curtailed by the nature of the legal and legislative funding patterns of the bureaus.

3. The fragmented treatment of urban K-12 education programs discussed above results in diffused efforts by pressure groups to secure federal dollars for urban education. The needed leverage to pressue for comprehensive and integrated K-12 educational programs in urban areas is obviously diminished when splinter groups organize to secure funding for educational measures that are concealed in multi-dimensional legislative mandates. The 1969 Committee on full funding of educational programs stated that the government authorized 9 billions of dollars with its laws, but delivered only 3 billions with its budgets. Thus the urban educational plight, in spite of its pervasive character and impact on all aspects of human life, has no visible symbol within the Office of Education that can serve as its advocate. A newly ordered

structure is needed that will encourage K-12 urban educational programs throughout the government agencies and consolidate them within a single agency that can focus its total efforts upon the urban elementary and secondary educational system.

Proposed Policy

Previous Recommendations:

One of the most comprehensive and definitive H.E.W. Task Force reports on urban education was formulated in 1964 under the leadership of Wilson C. Riles, Director of the Division of Compensatory Education in the state of California at the direction of former H.E.W. Secretary Robert H. Finch. The report surfaced in the Congressional Records of January 1969 and while it received limited distribution, it was one of the most substantive and thoughful reports in my judgment to have been developed on the problems associated with urban education. The major policy recommendation that emerged after the task force's careful deliberation dealt with the creation of an Urban Education Act. They suggested that the proposed legislation---the Urban Education Act---provide a comprehensive master plan for urban education and stated "This section should make provision for duly constituted agencies and groups--to develop comprehensive master plan proposals for the redesign of educational programs and the supportive services with special emphasis on inner city and suburban students who are impoverished." (13) The report called for a restructuring of authority on all levels, federal, state,municipal and community as well as for a new definition of roles at every level. It also recommended the creation of an Office of Education Bureau of Urban Education.

This recommendation, while significant in terms of it's recognition of the need for consolidation and unification of urban education, did not in my judgment address itself directly to the issue of bureaucratic control that the Office of Education would inevitably continue to exercise upon the proposed new Bureau. Contained within the Office of Education, the Bureau would be subject to the same interlocking

(13) Urban Education Task Force Report, "Urban School Crisis", Washington Monitoring Service, 1969.

constraints that act upon all other bureaus under its auspice.

More recently of course President Nixon--in his March 1970 message--proposed that Congress create a National Institute of Education. President Nixon recommended in the report that the National Institute of Education "begin the serious systematic search for new knowledge needed to make educational opportunity truly equal." (14) The general thrust of his recommendation was on securing measurements of output from students, promoting the concept of accountability related to educational performance, and obtaining productivity in schools throughout the nation. His message stressed three components: compensatory education, the right to read and television and learning.

This proposal, though keyed into the urgent need for education reform, focussed on higher education and also hinted at either the transfer or elimination of existing categorical aid programs within the Office of Education. As a result it has met with a murky reception among educators in general.

A modified version of the National Institute of Education under consideration in Congress is the National Foundation of Education. The Administration recently proposed an initial investment of 100 million in the Foundation for the purpose of carrying out the functions traditionally performed by philanthropic foundations. While the National Foundation is not urban specific it would undoubtedly provide grants to stimulate experimental efforts in urban educational areas. At a conference on Federal Projects sponsored by the National Graduate University on October 3, 1971, Executive Deputy Commissioner, Peter Muirhead revealed that the proposed National Foundation had achieved support in the Senate but was encountering obstacles in the House. Once again the possible conflict of interest with the

(14) President Nixon's Message to Congress "Education for the 1970's: Renewal and Reform," The White House, March 3, 1970.

Office of Education is under debate. In addition this proposal, though broader in concept, is focussed upon higher education.

The above recommendations clearly indicate that a need exists to circumvent the bureaucratic process of the Office of Education in order to allow for the creative integration of educational services for elementary and secondary school children. Thus the following policy recommendations are proposed:

1. THAT AN INTER-BUREAU SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT AGENCY WITHIN THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION BE CREATED REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE COMMISSIONER.

   An Inter-Agency Bureau reporting directly to the Commissioner will be effective in creating a system for by-passing the usual division and bureau chiefs within the Office of Education. Elementary and Secondary Education Policy and program needs that require coordination and cooperation will achieve an opportunity for immediate and direct hearing with the appropriate decision maker. Locating the Inter-Agency Bureau within the Office of Education will assure it the required support from H.E.W. professional personnel. This recommendation is made in light of the bureaucratic forces that have opposed the creation of the National Institute and National Foundation for Education (to be located outside the Office of Education).

2. THAT THE INTER-AGENCY BUREAU BE EMPOWERED TO DRAW UPON THE LATENT AND EXPERTISE THAT EXISTS WITHIN EACH OF THE BUREAUS RELATING TO LOW-INCOME

URBAN YOUTH.

Each of the Bureaus within the Office of Education has developed manpower capability in selected aspects of urban elementary and secondary education. It is important that their years of involvement and experience be brought to bear on proposed experimental and demonstration programs in urban centers. By involving them in a new setting (inter-agency bureau) it will be possible to unleash them from legal constraints that influenced their ability to apply their accumulated knowledge and skills in creative new ways.

3. THAT THE INTER-AGENCY BUREAU HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR:

(a) DEFINING MAJOR URBAN AREAS REQUIRING INTEGRATED K-12 SERVICES.

(b) GENERATING CONCEPTS FOR POSSIBLE CRITICAL MASS IMPACT PROGRAMS FOR IDENTIFIED URBAN SITES.

(c) SUB-CONTRACTING WITH RELEVANT BUREAUS IN ORDER TO SECURE APPROPRIATE EXPERTISE FOR MOUNTING THE COMPREHENSIVE IMPACT PROGRAMS.

(d) EVALUATING BOTH PROCESS AND PRODUCT OUTCOMES OF FUNDED PROJECTS.

The Inter-Agency Bureau will serve as a think tank operation, free from legislative and legal program constraints. Their special mandate will be that of defining untried possibilities for "getting it together" (a need stated recently by Commissioner Muirhead at the

50 year celebration of the University of Michigan School of Education). They will be concerned primarily with conceiving integrated elementary and secondary education programs for urban centers that will have maximum impact on meeting total human needs. With the support of the Commissioner of Education they will have the necessary authority to release personnel from each of the bureaus for purposes of mounting inter-agency projects.

It is expected that the creation of an Inter-Bureau System's Management Agency will be effective in (a) providing a vehicle for coordinating and unifying segmented legislative program mandates that presently exist with the selected bureaus, and (b) implementing integrated programs that draw upon existing latent in a non-threatening way, (c) identifying models for change that will ultimately reflect back upon the sponsoring organizations, thus reinforcing the need for integrated efforts, and (d) providing a mechanism for exchange of ideas among bureau representatives who typically function in isolated role relationships.

In my judgment the Inter-Agency Bureau will open channels of communication among appropriate agency personnel and will create the needed baseline of experience for ultimate reorganization of the Office of Education.