DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 040 IR 014 408

TITLE	Oversight Hearing on the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). Hearing before the Subcommittee on Select Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, One Hundred First Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	14 Sep 89
NOTE	130p.; Serial No. 101-49. For the 1988 Hearing, see ED 305 368; for another 1989 Hearing, see IR 014 409.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Disadvantaged; Educational Finance; Educational Improvement; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Federal Programs; *Government Role; Hearings; High Risk Students; Information Dissemination; *Policy Formation; *Public Agencies; Public Schools; *Research and Development
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 101st; Department of Education; *Office of Educational Research and Improvement

ABSTRACT

This hearing was called as one of a series of hearings to address concerns related to the role of the Federal Government and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) in reaching the goal of providing equal educational opportunity to all in the United States. Arguing that significant inequalities in educational opportunities still exist, Major R. Owens (Representative from New York and chairman of the subcommittee) points out that these inequalities are most evident in the nation's inner cities and among minorities. He further argues that the federal government has a clear responsibility to provide leadership in the conduct and support of the scientific inquiry into the educational process that is necessary to achieve the goal of quality education. A major problem identified by Owens is the need for additional support for school systems that must provide effective educational programs for at-risk students. The primary concerns addressed by this hearing are the relevance of OERI and its activities to urban schools, at-risk populations, and minority populations; the scale of the long-term problems in education; and effective research and improvement strategies that can adequately respond to these problems. In addition to the opening statement and a prepared statement by Owens, this report includes testimony and prepared statements from six witnesses: (1) Robert A. Dentler, Professor of Sociology, University of Massachusetts at Boston; (2) Christopher Edley, Jr., Professor of Law, Harvard University; (3) Paul T. Hill, co-author of "Educational Progress: Cities Mobilize To Improve Their Schools"; (4) Gerald Jaynes, Study Director, "A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society"; (5) Lee Etta Powell, Superintendent of Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio; and (6) Wornie Reed, Director, Trotter Institute of Black Culture, University of Massachusetts at Boston. Also included is a prepared statement by Maria E. Torres-Guzman from Teachers College, Columbia University. (BBM)

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT [OERI]

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 14, 1989

Serial No. 101-49

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

23-927 = WASHINGTON : 1989

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
GLENN POSHARD, Illinois
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
JAIME B. FUSTER, Puerto Rico
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
JIM JONTZ, Indiana
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
PETER SMITH, Vermont
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

MAJOR R OWENS, New York, *Chairman*

MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
DONALD M PAYNE, New Jersey
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
AUGUSTUS F HAWKINS, California
(Ex Officio)

STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
PETER SMITH, Vermont

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC, September 14, 1989	1
Statement of:	
Dentler, Robert A., Professor of Sociology, University of Massachusetts at Boston	88
Edley, Christopher, Jr., Esquire, Professor of Law, Harvard University	32
Hill, Paul T., Co-author, "Educational Progress: Cities Mobilize to Improve Their Schools"	67
Jaynes, Gerald, Study Director, "A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society"	9
Powell, Lee Etta, Superintendent of Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio	75
Reed, Wornie, Director, Trotter Institute of Black Culture, University of Massachusetts at Boston	17
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Dentler, Robert A., Professor of Sociology, University of Massachusetts at Boston, prepared statement of	92
Edley, Christopher, Jr., Esquire, Professor of Law, Harvard University, prepared statement of	37
Hill, Paul T., Co-author, "Educational Progress: Cities Mobilize to Improve Their Schools", prepared statement of	71
Jaynes, Gerald, Study Director, "A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society", prepared statement of	12
Owens, Hon. Major R., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of	4
Powell, Lee Etta, Superintendent of Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio, prepared statement of	79
Reed, Wornie, Director, Trotter Institute of Black Culture, University of Massachusetts at Boston, prepared statement of	19
Torres-Guzman, Maria E., Ph.D., Teachers College, Columbia University, prepared statement of	118

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT [OERI]

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1989

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:02 a.m., in Room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Major R. Owens [Chairman] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Owens, Martinez, Payne, Jontz and Ballenger.

Staff present: Maria Cuprill, Wanser Green, Laurence Peters and Bob Tate.

Chairman OWENS. The hearing of the Subcommittee on Select Education is now in session.

We are pleased today to have these hearings, which are a part of the opening of the Congressional Black Caucus Weekend. There will be numerous discussions about education, as well as other topics, during this weekend. There will be symposiums, seminars, and workshops; however, none of those will be official, none of those will be on the record.

We determined that the subject is so important that we would like to have the persons who attend this weekend have an opportunity to be a part of an official Congressional hearing and have the numerous scholars and experts who come down have an opportunity to go on the record on a very important matter.

We have a President who calls himself—says he wants to be known as—the education President. We have a crisis in education in the country, and to take time out to address this very important question, I think, is quite fitting and proper.

Seventeen years ago the Congress established a distinct Federal office responsible for educational research and development. They have the following mission statement. which was in the original establishment of the office—as well as it continues in every revision of the statute.

"The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide every individual an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, national origin or social class."

Although the American educational system has pursued this objective, it has not attained this objective. Any qualities of opportunity to receive high quality education remain pronounced.

To achieve the goal of quality education requires the continued pursuit of knowledge about education through research, through improvement activities, data collection and information dissemination.

While the direction of American education remains primarily the responsibility of state and local governments, the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to provide leadership in the conduct and support of scientific inquiry into the educational process.

This hearing has been called as part of a series of hearings to draw renewed attention to this mission statement in the light of a continuing crisis in our ability as a nation to deliver on the promise of equal educational opportunity. The crisis is being felt first and foremost in the Nation's inner cities and among minorities.

We know that at-risk students are three times more likely to drop out than those from other groups. In 1980, less than nine percent of the students in the racially isolated high schools of Chicago both completed high school and could read at or above the National level for their cohorts.

Almost one out of four first graders entering public school this year lives in poverty. As the numbers grow, what can we really expect overburdened school systems to do with diminishing resources based on shrinking tax bases?

For some school districts such as Camden, New Jersey or Cambridge, Massachusetts the answer is the extraordinary and disruptive remedy whereby the school districts get taken over and they are put into a sort of educational receivership. For others the answer is continued fatalism and despair.

These districts are located in areas where, as one correspondent in the "New York Times" put it, "Kids are more likely to get stabbed than receive an education."

In almost every other nondefense Federal effort the resources go to those who are the neediest in our society, whether it be health in the Medicare/Medicaid programs, housing when the funds are properly directed, Social Security or educational assistance programs such as Chapter I or Head Start.

This is clearly not the case in the area of educational research and improvement. The new administration proposes to provide funds for magnet schools, which are decoupled from desegregation plans and rewards for excellent schools.

Their proposal indicates that the new president is intent on taking the Office of Educational Research and Improvement further in the wrong direction.

Rather than consulting with Congress on one of the most pressing problems facing the Nation—the effective education of the growing at-risk population—and working with the Congress to work out a long-term plan, the administration has advocated the same old shopworn rhetoric about choice.

Instead of immediately appointing an assistant secretary to head the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, this administration has yet to make an announcement and to forward a candidate to the Senate.

We have been waiting for nine critical months for a permanent Bush nominee to be sent up for confirmation. It is inexcusable to have this position vacant while an important competition of the regional laboratories and the National research centers is taking place, leaving the bureaucrats there to fumble around in search of priorities to guide our most important investment in research and improvement.

It is also important to note that the President has called an education summit with the governors of the states at the end of this month. All of this takes place without the Office of Educational Research and Improvement having an assistant secretary. It clearly indicates that this administration does not consider educational research and improvement very important. It follows the pattern of the Reagan administration, which downgraded that office also.

The primary concern at this hearing is, what is the relevance of OERI and its activities to urban schools? What is the relevance to at-risk populations, to minority populations?

If there were no OERI, if it were to close tomorrow, would that have any impact on what is going on in our schools in our inner cities? To what degree do scholars and experts, superintendents, administrators and teachers make use of ERIC, the information system which is part of OERI? To what degree do the nine regional laboratories provide assistance to the urban schools? To what degree do the twenty-one research centers provide any kind of assistance to our schools? Are they relevant? Have they been utilized? Have they been useful in terms of referring people for expertise and guidance?

Those are the concerns that are of primary concern to us today. I want to enter my full statement into the record, and in the interest of time I will not read any more of it. I hope that we will have a full discussion on these matters as we proceed.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Major R. Owens follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF MAJOR OWENS
CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION
HEARING ON THE RELEVANCE OF OERI TO URBAN SCHOOL PROBLEMS
SEPTEMBER 14, 1989

Seventeen years ago the Congress established a distinct federal office responsible for educational research and development, with the following mission statement:

> The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide every individual an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, national origin or social class. Although the American educational system has pursued this objective, it has not obtained this objective. Inequalities of opportunity to receive high quality education remain pronounced. To achieve the goal of quality education requires the continued pursuit of knowledge about education through research, improvement activities, data collection and information dissemination. While the direction of American education remains primarily the responsibilty of state and local governments, the Federal government has a clear responsibility to provide leadership in the conduct and support of scientific inquiry in the educational process.

This hearing has been called as part of a series of hearings to draw renewed attention to this mission statement in the light of a continuing crisis in our ability as a nation to deliver on the promise of equal educational opportunity.

The crisis is being felt first and foremost in the nation's inner cities and among minorities. We know that at-risk students are three times more likely to drop out than those from other groups. In 1980, less than 9 percent of the students in the racially-isolated high schools of Chicago both completed high school and could read at or above the national level for their cohort. Almost one out of four first graders entering public school

this year lives in poverty. As the numbers grow, what can we really expect overburdened school systems to do with diminishing resources based on shrinking tax bases? For some school districts such as Camden, New Jersey or Cambridge, Massachusetts, the answer is the extraodinary and disruptive remedy whereby the school district gets "taken over" and put into a sort of "educational receivership;" for others, the answer is continued fatalism and despair. These districts are located in areas where --as one correspondent of the New York Times put it--kids are more likely to get stabbed than receive an education.

In almost every other non-defense federal effort, the resources go to those who are the neediest in our society, whether it be health and the medicare/medicaid programs, housing (when funds are properly directed), social security, or educational assistance programs such as Chapter One and Head Start. This is clearly not the case in the area of educational research and improvement. The new administration proposals to provide funds for "magnet schools," which are decoupled from desegregation plans and rewards for excellent schools, indicate that the new President is intent on taking the Office of Educational Research and Improvement further in the other direction.

Rather than consulting with Congress on one of the most pressing problems facing the country--the effective education of the growing "at risk" population--and working out a long-term plan, the administration has advocated the same old, shop-worn rhetoric about "choice." Instead of immediately appointing an

Assistant Secretary to head the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the administration has yet to make an annoucement. We have been waiting now for nine critical months for a permanent Bush nominee to be sent up for confirmation. It is inexcusable to have this position vacant while an important competition of the regional laboratories and national research centers is taking place, leaving the bureaucrats to fumble around in search of priorities to guide our most important investment in research and improvement.

We cannot continue to wait for the administration to produce realistic proposals addressing the overwhelming problems of a 50% dropout rate in the cities and the inequities in educational opportunities for African-American students, as reflected in the recent National Research Council report, A Common Destiny. The waiting game is over. It has to be if we are going to have any chance at all of saving any significant number of next generation inner-city children. That is why I am announcing today a proposed timetable for the reauthorization of Sections 405 and 406 of the General Education Provisions Act which pertain to the federal commitment to school improvement within the context of research, development and dissemination.

There will be four more hearings this fall. During the first, scheduled for October, the Subcommittee will invite the administration to testify about its proposals to recompete the regional laboratories and centers. The second hearing will consider

new proposals for the establishment of a District Extension Agent program and a National Institute for the Education of the Disadvantaged. A third hearing will be dedicated to the consideration of proposals that address the priority-setting process of OERI to make it more responsive to national needs and concerns. A fourth hearing will invite public witnesses to comment on a Subcommittee final report. In 1990, the Subcommittee will introduce its legislative proposals.

Our process will be deliberative and inclusive. We will continue to consult with those interested in all aspects of the educational research, development and dissemination process. We must continue to insist that the adminstration not sit on the sidelines while schools continue to become more and more dysfunctional. We know that all children can be educated; we know that schools can function under the right conditions and circumstances. The challenge is to make the knowledge and information available, useable, and workable.

Today's witnesses will focus on the scale of the long-term problems we face, as well as effective research and improvement strategies that can adequately respond to the task ahead of us.

Chairman OWENS. I yield to Mr. Martinez for an opening statement. After his opening statement we will have to declare a brief ten-minute recess because we have to go to vote.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have no opening statement other than to state that I share your concern about what is happening in our nation's schools.

One of the things that really perturbs and frustrates many of us is that several years after the report was issued, "A Nation at Risk," we still continue to be a nation at risk. There is a definite cry for help from those school districts, such as the ones you mentioned in your opening statement, and we still continue to do nothing.

There are people in the Federal Government who believe that the only responsibility that the Federal Government has is to provide for defense and defense alone.

I say that if we had made a commitment to education—as the President has said he would—as we have to defense, we would not be a nation at risk. We would not have students that are performing below the level that they could be.

I think that a cry for help is definitely being heard, at least in Congress. I think that, hopefully in a bipartisan way, we will move toward providing the leadership that the declaration some years ago made in trying to provide an equal opportunity of education for every individual.

I think what needs to happen, though, is that the administration has to be made aware of the fact that it is not only minorities, blacks and Hispanics and Asians, that are suffering the lack of resources in their neighborhoods to provide equal opportunity to education. It is whites from low socioeconomic backgrounds in those same schools and neighborhoods that are there not through any choice of their own.

The President talks of choice. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about choice. How can there be choice when we have not provided for everyone?

When we provide for everyone equal opportunity education and insure that the quality of schools in every neighborhood is high, that the resources are spent to make sure that the teachers and the equipment and resources and the facilities are there to provide that education, then I think we can talk about choice, and not until then.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman OWENS. The subcommittee will recess for ten minutes.

[A brief recess was taken.]

Chairman OWENS. The hearing will please come to order.

The members of our first panel are Dr. Gerald Jaynes, the Study Director of "A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society," Dr. Wornie Reed, the Director of the Trotter Institute of Black Culture, and Mr. Christopher Edley, Jr., Esquire, Professor of Law, Harvard University.

Welcome, gentlemen. Your entire written testimony will be entered into the record. You may use as much time as you wish, but we do like to minimize the time for statements and maximize the time for discussion.

You may begin, Mr. Jaynes.

STATEMENT OF GERALD JAYNES, STUDY DIRECTOR, "A COMMON DESTINY: BLACKS AND AMERICAN SOCIETY"

Mr. JAYNES. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to speak with you this morning about the educational findings in our report, "A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society."

Overall, I think, in general terms the central message of the six hundred page report which we would like to distill into one simple sentence would undoubtedly be the following, that although better by a wide margin than it was some three or four decades ago, by nearly all objective aggregate measures the status of blacks relative to whites has stagnated or regressed since the 1970s.

Now, these two findings, one somewhat positive and the other negative, are also very representative of what has happened to the status of black Americans relative to whites in the area of education.

First, quite in a positive sense, substantial progress has been made toward the provision of high quality, equal and integrated education. This would be true whether the baseline period of comparison is the 1940s, 1950s, or even as recently as the mid 1960s.

The amount, achievement outcomes and group contexts, desegregated or segregated, of black schooling has greatly improved.

However, measures of educational outcomes, attainment and achievement reveal substantial gaps between blacks and whites, as one would expect on the basis of simply existing in our society.

Blacks on average enter the schools with substantial disadvantages in socioeconomic backgrounds and tested achievement, and the American schools do not compensate for these disadvantages in background.

On average, students leave the schools with black/white gaps not having been appreciably diminished. There remain persistent large gaps in schooling quality and achievement outcomes of education for blacks and whites. Segregation and differential treatment of blacks continue to be widespread in the elementary and secondary schools and in different forms in higher education.

Black high school dropout rates remain higher than those for whites and black performance on tests of achievement lag behind that of whites, although there have been small but persistent gains of blacks relative to whites on standard achievement tests for all of the elementary and secondary age ranges since the late 1960s and into the 1980s.

Blacks remain less likely to attend college and complete a college degree and, in fact, at the pinnacle of the educational process blacks' life opportunities relative to whites are demonstrated by the fact that the odds that a black high school graduate went to college within a year of graduation are less than half the odds that a white high school graduate will do so. This is based on mid 1980s data. Some decade ago those odds would have been much closer.

What factors are responsible for the continuing educational disadvantages of black students?

First, contrary to what many have said, we found that schools do substantially affect the amount of learning that takes place.

Differences in the schooling process as experienced by black and white students contribute to achievement differences. These differ-

ences are closely tied to teacher behavior, school climate and peer group influences as well as the content and organization of instruction.

Teachers frequently exhibit low expectations of academic performance for black students and the content and organization of instruction given students is often geared to these low expectations.

Black students often attend schools whose student bodies are predominantly black, with lower income and from educationally disadvantaged families.

Large differences in socioeconomic background between blacks and whites and the much lower resources invested in predominantly black schools are perhaps the most significant factors in accounting for these disparities.

Socioeconomic background differences account for significant percentages of the educational achievement and attainment differences between blacks and whites.

Many of the differences in learning among schools have been attributed to differences in social background of student populations.

For example, a special analysis done for our study found that for seventeen-year-old high school seniors in the mid 1980s the entire difference in black/white school dropout rates was attributable to differences in economic status of the households from which the students came.

Significant percentages of differences in achievement were also attributable simply to differences in the backgrounds of the households from which the students came, so in that sense we might argue that a solution to changing these gaps is going to ultimately have to be founded on solutions that society comes up with in decreasing the economic and other social attainment gaps between blacks and whites, but in fact there are and have been shown to be proven methods and programs that are directly aimed toward education itself which have helped decrease these differences in educational status among blacks and whites.

For example, we found that compensatory education programs, and particularly those that were aimed at the elementary schools, have been very successful in eliminating both attainment and achievement gaps between blacks and whites.

The large literature and studies that we looked at in particular pointed to great benefits throughout society, and not just for blacks but for other minorities and for disadvantaged white students, as well. The Head Start and Chapter I programs have been particularly beneficial.

School desegregation has proven to be a major means of decreasing the imbalance of low socioeconomic status student bodies in schools attended by blacks and whites, and it has been found that school desegregation modestly improves black performance and in particular reading performance. It has no substantial effect on the academic achievement of white students.

In the area of higher education, the very dismal reduction in enrollment rates which began in the mid to late 1970s for all students, but then picked back up for white students but continued to decline for blacks and, to a lesser extent, for other minority groups in the 1980s has—in our analysis it has been due primarily to the changes that have occurred in the granting of financial aid; that is,

basically aid to higher education has moved during that period from the PEL grant system or direct grants in aid to students from disadvantaged backgrounds to a system which has relied more and more heavily upon loans.

This reliance upon loans from the private sector but guaranteed by various government levels has, in fact, a rather detrimental effect on schooling desires or aspirations of students who come from poor households, because the economics of taking out loans when one is very uncertain about the return that that loan is going to have is rather devastating for an individual to think about taking out a $15 to $20 thousand loan to finance a four-year education when that student may come from a household where a year's income is less than $11, $12 or $10 thousand.

In fact, in the mid 1980s about half of black students enrolled in college in fact came from households whose incomes were less than $11 thousand.

So that transition from direct grants to loans has particularly affected the college going opportunities for students from poor households, and we found that a very quick way to turn around the college enrollment of black students and other students from disadvantaged households would, in fact, be to move back toward a system of direct grants rather than loans for the most disadvantaged students.

I would finish my oral statement with that point.

[The prepared statement of Gerald Jaynes follows:]

Statement of
Gerald D. Jaynes
Professor, Department of Economics and Program in African and African-American Studies, Yale University, and Study Director, Committee on the Status of Black Americans, National Research Council

Before the
Select Education Subcommittee
Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives
September 14, 1989

Good morning. I am pleased to be here to talk with you about the education aspects of our report, A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society. This report documents the unfinished agenda of a nation still struggling to come to terms with the consequences of its history of relations between black and white Americans. The report drew on the expertise of almost 100 individuals, including a 22-member committee, 18 others on five panels, and commissioned papers from 35 scholars.

Overall, if I had to distill the central message of our 600-page report into one sentence, it would undoubtedly be this one:

> Although better by a wide margin than it was in 1940, by nearly all objective aggregate measures, the status of blacks relative to whites has stagnated or regressed since the early 1970s.

These two major findings--one positive, one negative--are very clear in the field of education. First, the positive: Substantial progress has been made toward the provision of high-quality, equal, and integrated education. Whether the baseline period is the 1940s,

the 1950s, or even as recently as the mid-1960s, the amount, achievement outcomes, and group context (integrated or segregated) of black schooling have greatly improved.

Measures of educational outcomes--attainment and achievement--reveal substantial gaps between blacks and whites. Blacks, on average, enter the schools with substantial disadvantages in socioeconomic backgrounds and tested achievement. American schools do not compensate for these advantages in background: on average, students leave the schools with black-white gaps not having been appreciably diminished.

Second, the negative finding. There remain persistent and large gaps in the schooling quality and achievement outcomes of education for blacks and whites.

- Segregation and differential treatment of blacks continue to be widespread in the elementary and secondary schools.
- Black high school dropout rates remain higher than those for whites and black performance on tests of achievement lags behind that of whites.
- Blacks remain less likely to attend college and to complete a college degree.

At the pinnacle of the educational process, blacks' life opportunities relative to whites' are demonstrated by the fact that the odds that a black high school graduate will enter college within a year of graduation are less than one-half the odds that a white

high school graduate will do so. College enrollment rates of high school graduates, after rising sharply since the late 1960s, declined in the mid-1970s; while white enrollment rates have recovered, black rates in the 1980s remain well below those of the 1970s. The proportion of advanced degrees awarded to blacks has also decreased.

What factors are most responsible for the continuing educational disadvantage of black students? First, what the schools do substantially affects the amount of learning that takes place. Differences in the schooling process as experienced by black and white students contribute to black-white achievement differences. These differences are closely tied to teacher behavior, school climate and peer group influences, and the content and organization of instruction.

- Teachers frequently exhibit low expectations of academic performance from black students, and the content and organization of instruction given students is often geared to these low expectations.
- Black students often attend schools whose student bodies are predominantly black, lower income, and from educationally disadvantaged families.

The large differences in socioeconomic background between blacks and whites and the much lower resources invested in predominantly black schools are perhaps the most significant factors in accounting for these black-white disparities in educational status. When background differences are combined with such factors as

residential separation of blacks and whites, the cumulative impact is very great.

Socioeconomic background differences account for significant percentages of the educational achievement and attainment differences between blacks and whites--and virtually all of the difference in high school dropout rates. Furthermore, many of the differences in learning among schools has been attributed to differences in the social background of student populations. Blacks' much lower mean social status levels combined with high levels of school segregation (especially among lower status urban blacks) compounds the negative effects of low socioeconomic status on black attainment and achievement levels.

Thus, although substantial progress has been made toward the provision of educational resources to blacks, there remain persistent and large gaps in the schooling quality and achievement outcomes of education for blacks and whites.

The committee concluded that a number of government policies and programs have proven beneficial in redressing the educational disparities between blacks and whites.

- Compensatory education programs, for example, Head Start and Chapter I--have overall positive (although sometimes short-term) effects on the academic achievement of disadvantaged students. Programs for pre-school children have a number of positive and long-term effects on subsequent educational enrollment, achievement, and attainment.

- School desegregation has proven to be a major means of decreasing the imbalance of low socioeconomic status student bodies in schools attended by blacks and whites. School desegregation modestly improves black performance (in particular, reading) and it does not substantially affect the academic performance of white students. When several key conditions are met, intergroup attitudes and relations improve after schools are desegregated. And desegregation is most likely to reduce racial isolation as well as improve academic and social outcomes for blacks when it is part of a comprehensive and rapid desegregation plan.
- While we cannot conclude with absolute certainty that the cause of decreased black enrollment in colleges has been the decline in (real) financial aid grants to students, other reasonable hypotheses can explain only a negligible component of this change. Thus, an increase in direct grants in aid (as opposed to loans) would increase the ability of low income (and especially black) students to continue into college.

Chairman OWENS. We will come back with some questions I, and I am sure, others have.

Dr. Reed.

STATEMENT OF WORNIE REED, DIRECTOR, TROTTER INSTITUTE OF BLACK CULTURE, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT BOSTON

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am appreciative of this opportunity to appear before you today.

I am the director of an institute that conducts research concerning black Americans. For the past two years we have been conducting a study to summarize the status of black Americans in several areas of life. One of these areas, of course, is education.

We document a number of issues of concern for the education of blacks as well as other minority and economically disadvantaged groups. However, I will restrict my comments here this morning to research issues that we propose to be addressed, and these are issues that need to be addressed at the Federal level. These are issues that arise from this research.

Of course, we realize that education is both the major means by which the United States prepares itself for a technologically complex future. It is also a major means by which individual citizens achieve social mobility.

Minorities, especially blacks, have traditionally counted on educational opportunities to enable their fuller participation in American society. Today there are clear signs of educational regression, particularly so for minorities.

One of the issues that is quite unfinished for research and consideration is intradistrict inequalities in elementary and secondary education. What I mean by that is inequalities in resources and programs available to black and other minority students.

Governmental inquiries into intradistrict inequalities are seldom undertaken. About a decade ago Congress enacted a law requiring a formal study of intradistrict inequalities, but the law was not carried out.

We would propose that a nationwide study be conducted, or programs of study, to define the nature and extent of this inequality

We would also propose a research program to include some concern for whether—about the interaction between the inequalities in other activities occurring at the local school level. For instance, do these intradistrict inequalities supplant, replace or do they supplement more commonly cited factors in educational disadvantage?

To switch into another area that we would propose that needs some attention at a research and collection effort, is Title VI and minority participation in higher education.

Very little research has been done on the effect of Title VI. The Federal Government has done an inadequate job of collecting data on the implementation of public policy aimed at civil rights, and especially civil rights goals, particularly with reference to higher education.

The relevant policy question concerns the extent of the impact of Title VI, so in addition to the need for Title VI and the programs

of Title VI, with strong implementation goals and procedures, relevant data should be collected to assess the impact of the law—how well is it working, how does it work and related circumstances on why it did or did not work in some instances.

These are issues that we propose attention be given to and be given to at a level of Federal impetus for research.

Mentioned earlier by you, Mr. Chairman, was the high dropout rate for many students. We know that somewhere around a quarter of black students do not finish high school. That is another issue that we think requires extensive attention; that is, research and monitoring, trying to ascertain what it is that causes much of this dropout.

One of the issues that I might mention is that we know a number of consequences of uneducated youth, but also we know that traditionally in the past high school dropouts have constituted a disproportionate share of persons that became drug addicts, if we look at the drug addict population. So we need to update this kind of information. Of course, I say that only to push the urgency of attention to the issue of school dropouts.

In general, we recommend that specific strategies be employed to promote more research on racial and ethnic issues in education. Of course, we realize that attention to racial and ethnic issues will also include attention to issues of many disadvantaged populations including the economically disadvantaged.

These efforts must go beyond data collection and include the allocation of funds for equity-related research. For metropolitan school districts, where today the majority population is nonwhite students, school reform and school improvement activities should be monitored closely.

We do have some data being collected at various places about the positive effects of school improvement. We need to have some more attention to this—what are the kinds of approaches to school improvement?

We would also suggest that we include research evaluation plans that would evaluate the academic performance of students in these improvement efforts.

In conclusion, I would just say that few of our endeavors can be considered more important than our attention to the education of our youth. Consequently, there is a definite Federal role, and right here I have just limited my comments to the Federal role related to research that could help us, we hope, improve the education of our youth. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Wornie L. Reed follows:]

THE EDUCATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICANS:

SELECTED ISSUES

Wornie L. Reed, Ph.D.
William Monroe Trotter Institute
University of Massachusetts at Boston

Testimony prepared for hearing of Subcommittee on Select Education of Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, September 14, 1989.

Education is both a major means by which the United States prepares itself for a technologically complex future and a major means by which individual citizens achieve social mobility. Minorities, especially African-Americans, have traditionally counted on educational opportunity to enable their fuller participation in American society. Today, there are clear signs of educational regression, particularly so for minorities. This paper presents a brief summary discussion of some of the issues addressed in a current study of the status of African-Americans being conducted by the Trotter Institute at the University of Massachusetts at Boston.[1]

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Desegregation

Improved education for blacks was a major goal of the civil rights movement. In fact, the civil rights movement became the driving force for educational change in this country. Blacks and their allies in the movement demanded a series of changes, including elimination of the structures of segregation, the decentralization of educational policy-making, and eradication of racism from curriculum, instructional materials, teaching, distribution of school funds, and other areas of schooling.

The legal strategy of the civil rights movement was to challenge the inherent inequity of a dual system of education--one white and one black, separate and unequal. After this dual system was declared illegal by the courts, concern for equity and equality waned. Schools in large cities are now underfunded and overcrowded. Educational issues such as these should be priority items for research and for policy consideration.

Intradistrict Inequalities

In large city public school systems, poor and minority children are regularly shortchanged. In matters such as school facilities, teachers and other instructional personnel, curriculum, counseling and advisement, less is spent on them on a per-

student basis than on others. It was not until the mid-twentieth century that school enrollment ratios of black and white children were similar. Even now, however, systematically inferior schools are the lot of black children. This is common knowledge.

In the early 19 .0s, when strategy for the critical school segregation cases was being set, lawyers made a decision to challenge the mandatory separateness rather than the deliberate inferiority of black schooling. The Supreme Court thus had no basis for ruling on the latter. It has still not done so. Inferior schools for black and other poor and minority children have yet to be declared in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Researchers in the field of educational finance have all but ignored intradistrict inequalities. As a result of various legal proceedings, however, detailed documentation of significant variations in per-pupil expenditures is on record. City school systems involved include New York, Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., Chicago, and Hartford. Over 20 years ago the Coleman Report erroneously concluded that school-by-school differences in academic achievement could not be explained by similar differences in expenditure. It was stated that these latter differences were too insubstantial to make any significant difference. In fact, contrasts in per-student expenditures between schools were not studied in the report.

Governmental inquiries into intradistrict inequalities are seldom undertaken. About a decade ago Congress enacted a law requiring a formal study of intradistrict inequalities, but the law was not carried out. An adequate program on intradistrict inequalities requires:

- A nation-wide study to define the extent of inequality,
- A definitive statement of the educational costs of inequality,
- A plan to remedy the consequences of inequality,

- A congressional enactment that will declare intradistrict inequalities a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of equal protection, and
- A research program that will ascertain whether intradistrict inequalities supplant or supplement more commonly-cited factors in educational disadvantage.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Between 1980 and 1984 minority college enrollments rose slightly, from 16.1% of total enrollments to 17%. Since 1984 black enrollment has fallen, both as a percentage of total enrollments and in absolute numbers, while other minority groups increased slightly. The percentage of black high school graduates going to college fell between 1975 and 1980--from 32% to 27.8% of black high school graduates.

College enrollment for minority groups is related to family financial status. The higher, and rising, cost of higher education continues to represent a barrier to poor black and Hispanic students. From 1978 to 1982 the number of students from families with incomes under $10,000 enrolled in college for the first time decreased by 16.8%. This decrease affected blacks most severely; they experienced a 30.6% reduction in enrollment.

Minorities came to higher education after 1945 in two waves. The first was a result of the GI bills of World War II and the Korean War. Tens of thousands of black veterans came with benefits in hand. The second wave of minorities came in the late 1960s, largely as a result of civil rights laws, equal opportunity programs, and expanded federal student aid. Additionally, the late 1960s and early 1970s brought Vietnam veterans with GI bill benefits. Through the convergence of these forces, minority enrollments doubled from 600,000 to 1.2 million between 1960 and 1980.

Total enrollments more than tripled, however, rising from 3.7 million in 1960 to 12.1 million in 1980.

The momentum created by the civil rights legislation and Pell Grants continued until the mid-70s, when the representations of minorities in higher education began to decline. Since the mid-70s the cohort of 18- to 22-year-old minorities has grown dramatically, but a lower proportion of black high school graduates is enrolling in college. Today, there are fewer blacks on college campuses, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all undergraduates, than there were just a few years ago. In short, the gains of the 1960s have clearly been lost.

Given current demographic and population trends, the numbers and proportion of black students enrolled in college should be much higher than what they are today. Between 1977 and 1984, the number of black students who graduated from high school increase by 26%. As noted earlier, this situation was primarily due to the expanding age cohort of 18- to 24-year-old blacks. Unfortunately though, the proportion of blacks going to college decreased by 11% between 1975 and 1982. In 1976, blacks represented 9.6% of the total enrollment in college, compared to 8.8% in 1984. This decline of almost two percentage points for the 1.1 million black students in college represents, in effect, a decrease of 20% less black students in college than there were in the mid-1970s. Thus, rather than capitalizing on the increasing size of age cohort and the higher numbers graduating from high school, college participation rates of black youth have regressed significantly in absolute numbers and proportional representation on college campuses.

The evidence is clear: college enrollment for minority groups is related to family financial status. The cost of higher education represents a significant barrier to poor black and Hispanic students. More blacks tend to go to college when resources external to family finances are available to them. The GI bill and the Pell

Grant program were two such funding sources, and they are no longer as readily available. The doors opened by these programs are closing. When the American society was generous with grants and scholarships for blacks and other minorities, their numbers and proportions enrolled in college and universities increased; when such financial aid decreased, the proportion of minorities in higher education decreased. Other reasons for the declining number of black students in college include higher dr. ut rates in high school, inadequate elementary and secondary academic preparation, higher attrition rates in the first years of college, inadequate college counseling at the high school level, and the inability of many black students to view a college education as a worthwhile investment. All these are related to the pervasive atmosphere of inequality.

Graduation Rates

The percent of black undergraduate degrees never equals the group's proportional share of enrollment. Though blacks represented 9.4% of all students in higher education in 1976, they received only 6.4% of all bachelors degrees in higher education (59,100); in 1981 they represented slightly more than 9% of college enrollment but received 6.5% of the baccalaureate degrees awarded that year (60,700). Whites, on the other hand, represented slightly more than 80% of the total undergraduate enrollment and received more than 85% of the baccalaureates during those years.

Graduate and Professional Education

Perhaps as an outgrowth of heightened sensitivity during the civil rights movement of the 1960s among the graduate and professional schools of predominantly white institutions, a special effort was made to recruit and enroll significantly larger numbers of black Americans in graduate and professional schools. This effort was also facilitated by the implementation of a variety of affirmative action policies and procedures in higher education, the development of

special recruitment and special admissions programs, the allocation by the federal government of capitation grants, and the authorization of various forms of minority fellowship programs.

Enrollment of blacks in graduate schools of medicine, dentistry, law, pharmacy, engineering, and social work reached unprecedented levels between 1970 and 1976 In 1972, black students comprised 4.2% of total graduate school enrollment. By 1975, the black representation had increased to 6.4%. In the fall of 1976, the 65,338 blacks in graduate schools comprised 6.0% of the total of 1,079,307 graduate students matriculated. However, between 1976 and 1984, black graduate student enrollment declined by 22.4%. In the four-year period between 1976 and 1980, the decline in absolute numbers was from 65,338 to 59,976, some 15.4%. The precipitous decline continued between 1980 and 1984, dropping to 50,717 in 1984. By that year, blacks comprised only 4.8% of total graduate school enrollment. The failure to arrest that decline is disturbing to American educators and policy-makers committed to equity and access in American higher education.

The enrollment, retention, and graduation of black students depend upon six major factors: (1) recruitment or outreach programs, (2) flexibility in admissions requirements, (3) the availability of sound financial aid packages, (4) favorable institutional climates, (5) mentoring, and (6) positive attitudes of black students themselves. Whenever any of these conditions is not met, the enrollment and production of black professionals becomes problematic.

Our nation's graduate and professional schools are not recruiting, admitting, retaining, and graduating sufficient numbers of blacks with doctorates in any field, but the record is especially poor in the sciences and technology. In a society that has rapidly moved into an economy based upon high technology, the need to cultivate available talent is crucial if the nation is to remain competitive. We can no longer

afford to ignore the pool of talent represented by black Americans. Their recruitment and training is in the national interest, more so than ever before.

Faculty Positions

The 1983 Equal Employment Opportunities Commission data on full-time faculty revealed that the total number of positions available has increased by 5.5% since 1977. Blacks were the only group to show a decline in faculty positions. During this period full-time faculty positions held by blacks decreased from 19,674 (4.4%) to 18,827 (4%). This overall loss was caused by declines in black participation in faculty teaching positions at both four-year public (–6.2%) and four-year private institutions (–11.3%). The more severe reductions in full-time faculty positions held by blacks at four-year institutions compound the severity of under-representation at this level. Though the number of blacks teaching full-time at two-year colleges increased by 3.4% at public and 7.2% at private institutions, this does not offset the loss at four-year colleges.

Blacks are severely under-represented on faculties of predominantly white institutions. Of the 12,000 full-time faculty employed in traditionally black institutions, 8,200 are black. This fact has sobering implications for black faculty members' proportional representation in predominantly white institutions: overall representation of blacks in predominantly white institutions is only 2.3%.

Title VI and Minority Participation in Higher Education

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 required desegregation of public white colleges and enhancement of public black institutions so that they would attract students of all racial populations. The law also required that states develop plans to achieve meaningful and timely results. No federal or state administrative agency has taken up the responsibility of accomplishing Title VI goals.

A review of state plans, state compliance reports, and Office of Civil Rights (OCR) letters of finding (official responses to the compliance materials submitted) have consistently shown lack of effort, either to propose or to implement reasonable remedies for segregation. These same documents suggest lack of federal effort as well, for the documents were approved in most cases by federal officials, even though the documents were unclear and in many instances notably inadequate.

Other evidence of inadequate federal effort appears in OCR's failure to respond both to complaints of discrimination against individuals and in evidence of institution-wide discrimination contained in routine annual compliance reports. In 1986 alone, OCR received 2,648 individual complaints and initiated 196 compliance reviews. OCR issued only 27 notices of opportunity for hearing between 1981 and 1985, despite finding 2,000 violations of civil rights law. Over that same period it referred only 24 additional cases to the Justice Department. This pattern extends a policy of non-implementation which began in 1970 when the original *Adams* case was initiated.

The *Adams* case got the federal courts involved in pressuring the Office of Civil Rights at the U.S. Department of Education to implement Title VI. Favorable rulings since 1973 by the court provided almost the sole energy for sustained compliance with Title VI. Although the NAACP Legal Defense Fund (LDF) has appealed the recent decision regarding lack of standing by plaintiffs in *Adams*, the federal courts no longer monitor Title VI regulatory activities of the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Education. Without court oversight, the Department has been freed to arbitrarily release states from their civil rights responsibilities in higher education.

Little research has been done on the effect of Title VI. The federal government has done an inadequate job of collecting data on the implementation of public policy aimed at civil rights goals, particularly with reference to higher education. The relevant policy question concerns the extent of the impact of Title VI. So in

addition to the need for a Title VI with strong implementation goals and procedures, relevant data should be collected to assess the impact of the law and its related circumstances.

RESEARCH: THE FEDERAL ROLE

A number of issues are begging for programs of research. Two issues in elementary and secondary schools are intradistrict inequalities and school dropouts. Intradistrict school inequalities are discussed above, but we have mentioned only briefly the problem of high school dropout. An alarming number of minority youth are dropping out of schools, taking few skills with them. Some 25.9% of blacks between the ages of 14 and 34 dropped out of high school in 1981. Schools and families must play dominant roles in reversing this trend.

Research on minority issues has been spotty. Prior to World War II such issues were absent from the pages of mainstream educational journals and books. In the 1950s a minimal amount of historical and financial data on minority issues was collected. Prior to 1960, local school districts seldom employed education researchers; however, after 1960, the proliferation of litigation around the issues of desegregation stimulated the collection of race-related data.

The civil rights movement brought about a heightened interest in race-related research and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 precipitated a need for information on the part of school officials facing desegregation. A number of research contracts were signed, the National Institute of Education (NIE) was created, and over time equity concerns became a major interest of the organization. By the mid-1970s, the Desegregation Studies Unit of NIE was spending about one million dollars a year. By the mid-1980s NIE had all but disappeared; eventually no funds were available for research on desegregation.

In the absence of federal support for research the field tends to ignore the few studies to appear that are critical of local school districts. This tendency on the part of researchers and education officials to steer clear of such "controversial" studies, added to the "old" tendency to assign as causes of educational failure the background of the students, make it extremely difficult to effect meaningful change or improvement in educational settings.

We recommend that specific strategies be employed to promote more research on racial and ethnic issues in education. These efforts must go beyond data collection and include the allocation of funds for equity-related research. For metropolitan school districts, where today the majority population is non-white students, school reform and improvement activities should be monitored closely. And they should include research-evaluation plans formulated to measure the academic progress of students in a comparative manner. Equity and excellence are compatible and not in competition with reach other. The publication of more research by scholars who are concerned with issues of educational equality will prove that these principles can coexist.

Specific steps to change the situation in education research should include the following:

- Restoration by Congress of an adequate federally-funded research program on problems of minority education.
- Resumption of the federal publication of current racial-ethnic data in education and publication of related data withheld from publication during the previous administration.
- Initiation of state-financed programs of research on equity concerns as part of the state responsibility for common school education.

23-927 - 89 - 2

- Setting goals of school-district-wide equality of achievement as the paramount provisions of any school reform program, and developing a research-evaluation plan to monitor implementation.

NOTE

[1]See Willie, C., A. Garibaldi, and W. Reed. (1989). The Education of African Americans. Boston: William Monroe Trotter Institute.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. Mr. Christopher Edley, Jr.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR., ESQUIRE, PROFESSOR OF LAW, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. EDLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify here this morning on this glorious day, two days after the New York Primary.

I am here representing the Committee on Policy for Racial Justice, which is a group of thirty-five black scholars that meet from time to time under the auspices of the Joint Center for Political Studies.

We meet to discuss critical issues facing the Nation and black America in particular, and from time to time we issue essays, and my written testimony is excerpted from a relatively essay concerning the problem of education.

I want to put seven propositions on the table for you, six of which are drawn directly from the report and the seventh concerns really, I think, the principal focus of these hearings.

These six propositions are, if you will, somewhat ideological. That is to say, we developed them in an effort to try to influence the way in which the debate is shaped and the way in which education advocacy is carried out in the Nation. Some of them are controversial, but many, I hope, are not.

The first concerns human potential and responsibility. We hold this truth to be self evident: all black children are capable of learning and achieving. Others who have hesitated, equivocated or denied this fact have assumed that black children could not master their school work or have cautioned that blacks were not academically oriented.

The result: falsehoods that prop up an inequitable social hierarchy, blacks disproportionately represented in the bottom and schools absolved of their fundamental responsibility to educate all children.

Now, affirming the intellectual capability of black youth is a political act because the promise of equal opportunity and participatory democracy in the United States depends on an egalitarian view of human potential.

Issues of black academic ability, social justice, community empowerment are inextricably linked. Many people, Mr. Chairman, counsel despair concerning the problems of black education, minority education, but the wages of despair, I hope you will agree, would be disastrous to this principle of equal human potential, and without that principle there would be destruction of our hopes for true social equality.

Activism on behalf of better public education can provide a sense of purpose for black communities throughout the Nation. What we must demand is this: that the schools shift their focus from the supposed deficiencies of the black child to the barriers that stand in the way of academic success.

Scattered examples of effective schooling for poor and minority children, a few often unheralded intervention models and countless instances of individual accomplishments convince us that the es-

sential problem lies not with the academic potential of black children but with the unproductive institutional arrangements, the lowered expectations and the narrowed pedagogical processes that characterize the Nation's school systems.

So the basic principle, my first principle, is simply to affirm that all black children are capable of learning.

Second, the promise of American education is to take children as it finds them and educate them. It is the schools' responsibility to overcome those social barriers that limit academic progress.

Now, the late Ron Edmonds, a leader of the effective schools movement, wrote in 1979, "Repudiation of the social science notion that family background is the principal cause of pupil acquisition of basic school skills is probably a prerequisite to successful reform of public schooling for children of the poor."

We hardly concur. Black families, like all others, exert a critical influence on the development of their children's character, personalities and general orientation to life and learning, but education reform must respond to the concerns of all constituents. Schooling in a democratic society must embrace the least privileged as well as those who come to the classroom better prepared.

Edmonds once noted that "Schools teach those they think they must. When they think they needn't, they don't."

The black community must demand that its children receive the proper instruction and necessary resources to fulfill their potential. Excuses about social conditions simply will not do. The schools have their responsibility.

My next point concerns the institutionalizing and perpetuation of social inequalities. I want to mention three devices, three problems—stereotyping, tracking and testing.

One indisputable way in which schools institutionalize social inequalities is through the gross stereotyping of black children.

Mistaken notions about low income people and their lifestyles form the basis for low expectations and self-fulfilling prophesies and failure in school.

Research has revealed that teachers form negative, inaccurate and—this is most important—inflexible expectations based on such attributes as the race and perceived social class of pupils. These expectations result in different treatment of minority and white students. They affect the minority student's self concept, academic motivation, the level of aspiration and over time they influence more and more what is expected of them.

Now, the inflexibility of track placements, like the rigidity of teacher expectations, represents a problem of paramount proportion.

Black and other low income students are often imprisoned in the bottom tracks, shunted away from mainstream classroom participation. In fact, this is one of the major reasons that many black students fall further and further behind their peers academically as they advance through the grades.

Even most proponents of tracking, even proponents of tracking agree that students should be able to move up the academic hierarchy as their abilities dictate, yet most frequently black students are dropped into low ability groupings and frequently at a very early age and they are stuck there.

As James Rosenbaum said in his book "Making Inequality," he likened inflexible tracking to a sports tournament. "When you win, you win only the right to go on to the next round; when you lose, you lose forever."

Standardized tests along with tracking have been one of the most controversial educational topics in the past quarter century. Spurred by the excellence movement, state legislatures over the past few years have increasingly mandated testing for promotions and as a measure of determined public accountability.

The debate continues unabated, but in many ways we agree with the assessment offered by a report of the New World Foundation, and I quote: "Testing itself is not the core issue. The issues are whether the test used is valid for what it purports to measure; whether the test assesses performance or dictates performance [that is to say, dictates the performance of teachers and the institution]; whether the results are used to correct institutional deficiencies or to stratify students. By these criteria we have ample reason to challenge the extraordinary legitimacy now vested in standardized testing and competitive test scores."

Overall, serious questions must be raised about the validity of standardized testing and its effects, not only on black and minority children but on the quality of education for all.

We advocate the development and sensitive use of a variety of methods for assessing both school and student performance.

Standardized tests do have their place, particularly as research tools and comparative assessments of groups of students across classrooms and school districts and as criteria for public accountability, but we believe that to assess individual performance in order to decide on a school's academic program a variety of measures must be employed.

Contrary to the longstanding view that intelligence is a unitary phenomenon measurable by a single test, we believe and recent research confirms that all people are blessed with multiple intelligences which can be tapped through a variety of teaching means.

Only as schools expand their vision, gentlemen, of individual capacities and abilities will education become truly inclusive.

My fifth point concerns teachers and an emphasis on the importance of teaching.

Rather than increasing their presence in schools, black teachers are becoming an endangered species, dropping to as little as five percent of the teaching force at a time when black student enrollments are increasing.

Many reasons have been given for the declining number of black instructors, ranging from increasing use of standardized examinations of teachers to expanded opportunities for blacks in other areas, and surely a mix of many factors is involved.

Current efforts to transform teaching from an occupation into a respected profession can play a critical role in rectifying this problem.

Our point is two fold, however, first that reform of the teaching profession is a potentially important component in enhancing the achievement of black youth and, second, that increasing the number of black educators must be a central aspect of the overall

reform drive for education. Teachers can spark a spirit of inquiry in the minds of students.

My sixth point concerns early childhood. The point is a simple one, and I will not belabor it. Head Start and Chapter I work. It has been proven over and over again. Failure to support these programs represents criminally negligent social policy.

Sixth—no, that was sixth, I guess. Let me briefly summarize before mentioning my last point some of the recommendations concluded at the end of our report and the end of my remarks. The recommendations are fairly straightforward and the detail is included in our longer essay.

Black parents must become actively involved in the educational process and schools must welcome their participation. Schools must become less impersonal, not factories but nurturing environments, and we know how to do it. Schools must establish closer ties with other social services, again not to gainsay the ultimate responsibility of schools for taking children as they find them and doing the job, but that job must be done in conjunction with other social services, and we know how to do this.

Next, schools must recruit more black teachers. We must develop sensitive and precise testing measures for the diagnosis of student abilities and needs. Rigid systems of tracking and ability grouping should be abandoned. The curriculum must be expanded to reflect the lives and interests of black and other minority children.

Now, all of these points—and I think this bears special emphasis—all of these points have substantial bodies of economic research supporting them. Moreover, they have substantial examples of successful experiments and pilot programs throughout the country, and this leads me to my last, my seventh and concluding point, and it concerns the subject of this subcommittee hearing.

Our group believes that there must be increased recognition, if you will, of the political purposes of information and research. In all too many of our social problems the study shelves are full of reports, full of examples of what is being done that is positive around the country.

The difficulty, however, is in building the political consensus to accomplish the change—change that we know how to accomplish.

What I would urge is not simply that a few additional studies be undertaken to fill important gaps in the research, but that the attention of the Congress, the attention of OERI be refocused on the importance of translating this capital stock of information about how to do better into concrete action in local school districts around the Nation.

Let me take it a step further. The fact of the matter is that reports can be written and sometimes they will simply go on the shelves. Reports can also be written in a way and disseminated in a manner that galvanizes political action but focuses the attention of local communities, and indeed of the Nation, upon the need for concrete reforms.

The challenge, it seems to me, the overwhelming challenge, the principal challenge is not simply to identify another list of topics to research in the years ahead. We will always be able to do that. There will always be unanswered questions.

The challenge is to find out, of the things that we know how to do well, why can't we move ahead? Why can't we accomplish them? How can the information be disseminated so that progress is really accomplished?

The goal of the struggle to end segregation has been equal opportunity, quality education for blacks, but although economically successful black parents today can send their children to good desegregated schools, public or private, poor black children still do not have such options.

I must borrow from a slogan of the United Negro College Fund, which my father has run for the last fifteen years: "A mind is a terrible thing to waste."

There remain these children thirty-four years after Brown, racially isolated, largely segregated and subjected to inferior schooling. Consequently we must fight for decent education for black children wherever they are, whether in desegregated, integrated or all-black schools.

We can meet the challenge of insuring world class education for all of our children and a world class economy for our nation, but it will take all segments of the black community, all segments of society in order to galvanize the issue and make the message, the political message cut across lines of race and class, reverberating from neighborhoods to state capitals to Capitol Hill to the White House.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Christopher Edley, Jr., follows:]

TESTIMONY

CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR.

Professor, Harvard Law School
and
Member, Committee on Policy for Racial Justice,
of the Joint Center for Political Studies

before the

Subcommittee on Select Education
of the
House of Representatives

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of the Committee on Policy for Racial Justice (CPRJ), a group of 35 black scholars who meet under the Auspices of the Joint Center for Political Studies to discuss critical issues facing the black community and, indeed, all Americans.[1]

Introduction

We hold this truth to be self-evident: *all black children are capable of learning and achieving*. Others who have hesitated, equivocated, or denied this fact have assumed that black children could not master their schoolwork or have cautioned that blacks were not "academically oriented." As a result, they have perpetuated a myth of intellectual inferiority, perhaps genetically based. These falsehoods prop up an inequitable social hierarchy with blacks disproportionately represented at the bottom, and they absolve schools of their fundamental responsibility to educate all children, no matter how deprived.

Affirming the intellectual capability of black youth is a political act, because the promise of equal opportunity and participatory democracy in the United States depends on an egalitarian view of human potential. Issues of black academic ability, social justice, and community empowerment are thus inextricably linked.

Activism on behalf of better public education can provide a sense of purpose for black communities throughout the nation. And what we must demand is this: that the schools shift their focus from the supposed deficiencies of the black child -- from the alleged inadequacies of black family life -- to the barriers that stand in the way of academic success.

---

[1] A list of CPRJ members is attached as appended. This testimony is excerpted from our essay, *Visions of a Better Way: A Black Appraisal of Public Schooling* (Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political Studies, 1989), which was authored principally by Professor Sara Lawrence Lightfoot of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, assisted by her colleage Michael Fultz.

Since the concept of the "culturally deprived child" emerged in the early 1960s, far too much attention has been paid to the characteristics of black youth, particularly their deviations from mainstream norms, rather than to the structural mechanisms through which schools replicate the divisions of the broader society.[2] We do not discount the effects of poverty, racism, and segregation on individuals. Societal hostility and neglect have taken a tremendous toll upon our people; many of us have internalized social pressures as self-doubt or even in pathological responses, as scholars E. Franklin Frazier and Kenneth Clark and writers Richard Wright, Lorraine Hansberry, and James Baldwin have vividly shown.[3] Yet scattered examples of effective schooling for poor and minority children, a few -- often unheralded -- intervention models, and countless instances of individual accomplishments convince us that the essential problem lies not with the academic potential of black children but with the unproductive institutional arrangements, lowered expectations, and narrow pedagogical processes that characterize the American educational system.[4]

The late Ron Edmonds, a leader of the effective schools movement, wrote in 1979, "Repudiation of the social science notion that family background is the principal cause of pupil acquisition of basic school skills is probably a prerequisite to successful reform of public schooling for children of the poor."[5] We heartily concur. Black families, like all others, exert a critical influence on the development of their children's character, personalities, and general orientation to life and learning. But the promise of American education is to take children as it finds them and educate them. It is the school's responsibility to overcome those social barriers that limit academic progress.

We applaud the resurgence of concern about the state of American education in general. Certain aspects of the current educational reform movement, however, are troubling and potentially divisive. For example, higher standards are a laudable goal, but within the present context supportive structures must be created, and sufficient supportive structures must be created, and sufficient funds must be allocated, to ensure that those who have had difficulties in the past will be able to meet the new requirements. To sing a psalm of excellence while failing to attend to the plight of underachievers is to make a mockery of the goal of school improve-

---

[2] See Stephen S. Baratz and Joan C. Baratz, "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Winter 1970), pp. 31-50; Eleanor B. Leacock (ed.), *The Culture of Poverty: A Critique* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971); Caroline Hodges Persell, *Education and Inequality* (New York: The Free Press, 1977).

[3] See E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939); Kenneth Clark, *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

[4] See Ronald Edmonds, "A Discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling," Harvard University, undated, unpublished; James Comer, *School Power* (New York: The Free Press, 1980).

[5] Ronald Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," *Educational Leadership*, Oct. 1979, p.23.

ment for all. Likewise, to blame the idealism of the 1960s for the current problems in American education while cutting funds for programs assisting poor and disadvantaged students -- as the Reagan administration did -- is to debase the widespread impulse for social justice among the American people.[6] Educational reform must respond to the concerns of all constituents; schooling in a democratic society must embrace the least privileged as well as those who come to the classroom better prepared.

Edmonds once noted that "schools teach those they think they must and when they think they needn't they don't." The black community must demand that its children receive the proper instruction and necessary resources to fulfill their potential.

Barriers To Successful Schooling

Social Phenomena:

Despite the social and political accomplishments of blacks since the *Brown* decision, formidable barriers still diminish the education of many black children and adolescents. These obstacles include lingering "rumors of inferiority," as some have called the psychological dimensions of the problem, as well as bureaucratic and classroom practices that deny black children the necessary resources and opportunities to fulfill their potential.[7] The barriers to black educational achievement begin with the economic and social status of the black population. As is well-known and amply documented, schools often reinforce social inequalities rather than overcome them, and the perceived life chances of low-income students have been shown to inhibit their scholastic motivation.[8] Since vast segments of the black community in the 1980s suffer from a pervasive and widening economic depression characterized by a sharp decline in real income, high unemployment rates, a steep increase in the proportion of single-parent families, and a feminization of poverty, it is hardly surprising that students come to school with depressed expectations.[9]

These social phenomena influence patterns of schooling and educational attainment in a variety of ways. They are likely to lead to early parenting, with some 50 percent of teenage mothers failing to graduate from high school. Teen fathers

---

[6] See Henry M. Levin, "The Educationally Disadvantaged: A National Crisis," *Public/Private Ventures*, July, 1985; Bartain et al., *Choosing Equality* Children's Defense Fund, *A Children's Defense Fund Budget* (Washington, DC: 1987).

[7] See Jeff Howard and Ray Hammond, "Rumors of Inferiority," *The New Republic*, Sept. 9, 1985, pp. 17-21.

[8] See Lightfoot, *Worlds Apart*; Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist American* (New York: Basic Books, 1976); John U. Ogbu, *The Next Generation* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).

[9] For an overall perspective on these conditions, see William Julius Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

are 40 percent less likely to graduate than their nonparenting peers. In addition, the likelihood of graduation for both black males and females is closely linked to their mother's level of education.[10]

Children from poor families are three to four times more likely to forgo completing high school than those from more affluent families. (When family income is statistically controlled, black and white dropout rates are remarkably similar, interestingly enough, poor blacks have a slightly lower dropout rate than poor whites, 24.6 percent to 27.1 percent, respectively.)[11]

In the context of changes in the U.S. economy, the dropout problem among black youth is all the more devastating. In urban centers over the past two decades, job losses have been heaviest in fields that require less than a high school education, and job growth has been greatest in fields requiring at least some post-secondary education. Broadly speaking, cities have been changing from centers of goods processing and distribution to centers of information processing and higher-order service administration.

One indisputable way in which schools institutionalize social inequalities is through the gross stereotyping of black children. Mistaken notions about low-income people and their lifestyles form the basis for low expectations and self-fulfilling prophesies of failure in school. Research has revealed that teachers form negative, inaccurate, and inflexible expectations based on such attributes as the race and perceived social class of their pupils. These expectations result in different treatment of minority and white students and affect the minority students' self-concept, academic motivation, and level of aspiration as they conform, over time, more and more closely to what is expected of them.

Our concern is not with expectations per se; as observant parents and responsible educators well know, reasonable and logical inferences concerning pupil performance can be extremely helpful in determining learning goals and setting levels of instruction. Rather, the issue is the accuracy of expectations and especially the ability of educators to revise their expectations in light of new information on students progress. When teachers perceive a black child as a "low achiever" and regard this condition as permanent and unchangeable, the child is not likely to succeed. Moreover, as Eleanor Leacock notes in *Teaching and Learning in City Schools*, the apathy and lack of motivation that teachers decry in urban classrooms "is all too readily ascribed to lack of interest in learning derived from home back-

---

[10] Children's Defense Fund, *Black and White Children in America: Key Facts* (Washington, D.C.: 1985), p.99; Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged*, pp. 28, 61; Michelle Fine, "Why Urban Adolescents Drop Into and Out of Public High School," in Gary Natriello (ed.), *School Dropouts: Patterns and Policies* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1986), pp. 88-105; Children's Defense Fund, *A Briefing Book*, p. 10.

[11] Children's Defense Fund, *A Children's Defense Fund Budget, FY 1988* (Washington, DC: 1987), p. 139

grounds. In fact, however, this lack of interest and response can be seen as children returning to their teachers exactly what they have been receiving from them."[12]

Tracking:

Any discussion of low expectations for black and other minority youth must face the issue of tracking, i.e., ability grouping. Many teachers, administrators, and even parents defend tracking on several grounds -- that the academic needs of students are better served through homogeneous groupings, that less-capable students do not suffer emotional stress from competition with their brighter classmates, that teaching is easier. The research literature, however, reveals strikingly little evidence supporting any of these claims. Rather, study after study indicates: (1) that black and minority students are disproportionately placed in the lower-ability, non-college-bound tracks; (2) that the net effect of tracking is to exaggerate the initial differences among students rather than to provide the means to better accommodate them; and (3) that tracking results in an altered "opportunity structure" detrimental to those in the bottom tracks, because the nature and content of their instruction is systematically different from that of other students. In this regard, students placed in the low tracks have been shown to have less access to resources (including, in some cases, the school's best teachers); less instruction in higher-order thinking skills, with more emphasis placed on rote training and workbook lessons; and, overall, less time set aside for review of homework and other academic activities, with a greater stress on matters of mindless procedure and strict discipline.[13]

The inflexibility of track placements, like the rigidity of teacher expectations, represents a problem of paramount proportions. Black and other low-income students are often imprisoned in the bottom tracks, shunted away from mainstream classroom instruction. In fact, this is one of the major reasons that many black students fall further and further behind their peers academically as they advance through the grades. Even most proponents of tracking agree that students should be able to move up the academic hierarchy as their abilities dictate. Yet, most frequently, black students are dropped into low-ability groups, sometimes at a very early age, with little possibility of movement upward. James Rosenbaum, in *Making Inequality*, likens inflexible tracking to a sports tournament: "When you win, you win only the right to go on to the next round; when you lose, you lose forever."[14]

Standardized Tests:

Along with tracking, standardized testing has been one of the most controversial educational topics of the past quarter century. Opponents charge, among

---

[12] Eleanor B. Leacock, *Teaching and Learning in City Schools* (New York: Basic Books, 1969), p. 16. See also Ray C. Rist, "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (August 1970), pp. 411-451.

[13] See Jeannie Oakes, *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

[14] James E. Rosenbaum, *Making Inequality* New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1976), p. 40.

other things, that the tests discriminate against minorities ch proponents support their use for credentialing, track assignments, and other purposes. Spurred by the excellence movement, state legislatures over the past few years have increasingly mandated testing for promotions and as a measure to determine public accountability. The debate continues unabated. In many ways we agree with the assessment offered in a report by the New World Foundation:

> Testing itself is not the core issue. The issues are whether the test used is valid for what it purports to measure; whether the test assesses performance or dictates performance; whether the results are used to correct institutional deficiencies or to stratify students. By these criteria, we have ample reason to challenge the extraordinary legitimacy now vested in standardized testing and competitive test scores.[15]

Thoughtful critics of standardized testing have raised a number of concerns in addition to the issue of cultural bias, including: (1) that many tests classify students according to statistical procedures based on a bell-shaped curve, thus providing a rank order but not necessarily indicating the level of mastery that has been achieved; (2) that there is more to schooling and learning than simply how well students perform on time-restricted, multiple-choice tests and that a wide range of abilities and proficiencies are not tapped by these measures; (3) that the tests are typically used not as diagnostic tools for effective teaching and remediation but as punitive measures for labeling, tracking, promotion, and so on; and (4) that overemphasis upon standardized testing subverts true education, undermining the curriculum and eroding the quality of teaching.[16]

Overall, then, serious questions must be raised about the validity of standardized testing and its effects not only upon black and minority children but upon quality education for all. We advocate the development and sensitive use of a variety of methods for assessing both school and student performance. Standardized tests do have their place, particularly as research tools in comparative assessments of groups of students across classrooms and school districts and as criteria for public accountability (under strict guidelines for interpretation). But, we believe, to assess individual performance in order to decide on a student's academic program, a variety of measures must be employed. Contrary to the long-standing view that intelligence is a unitary phenomenon measurable by a single test, we believe -- and recent research confirms -- that all people are blessed with multiple intelligences, which can be tapped through a variety of teaching methods. Only as schools expand their vision of individual capacities and abilities will education become truly inclusive.[17]

---

[15] Bastian et al., *Choosing Equality*, p. 53.

[16] See Asa Hilliard, "Standardization and Cultural Bias Impediments to the Scientific Study and Validation of Intelligence," *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Winter 1979), pp 47-58; *Ability Testing*, Parts 1 and 2 (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1982).

[17] See Howard Gardner, *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (New York: Basic Books, 1983); Leon J. Kamin, *The Science and Politics of I.Q.* (Potomac, Md: Erlbaum, 1974).

Teachers:

Rather than increasing their presence in the schools, black teachers are becoming an endangered species, dropping to as little as five percent of the teaching force at a time when black student enrollments are increasing. Many reasons have been given for the declining number of black instructors, ranging from the increased use of standardized examinations of teachers to expanded opportunities for blacks and other minorities, especially women, in other professions. Surely a mix of these factors is involved. Current efforts to transform teaching from an occupation into a respected profession can play a critical role in rectifying this problem. Career ladders that freed teachers from performing the same tasks year after year might attract and retain ambitious, talented blacks as well as whites to the profession. Likewise, recruitment programs and other incentives can be improved. Our point is twofold: first, the reform of the teaching profession is a potentially important component in enhancing the achievement of black youth; and, second, increasing the number of black educators must be a central aspect of this reform drive.

Teachers can spark a spirit of inquiry in students only when they themselves feel a spirit of inquiry and development. Yet the burgeoning literature on teacher burnout vividly depicts the isolation, redundancy, and stress in many teachers' lives. Schools need to provide collaborative environments that support the intellectual development of teachers as well as students. They need to encourage creativity and risk-taking, challenging teachers to broaden their pedagogical repertoires and students to become academically engaged. Both black teachers and black students are alienated from the schools when the structure and the content of education is trivialized.[18]

Early Childhood:

Finally, one critical barrier to school success is the lack of early childhood education programs. Research findings consistently and unequivocally indicate that the Head Start and Chapter 1 (formerly Title 1) entitlement programs not only benefit low-income children but are a sound social investment as well. For every dollar paid for Head Start, it has been estimated that we save seven dollars in related social service costs, and an investment of $600 for a child for one year of Chapter 1 services can save $4,000 in costs for repeating a grade. Yet neither program has ever adequately served all who are eligible. Head Start, the most successful of the 1960s initiatives, reaches only 16 to 18 percent of the 2.5 million eligible children.

---

[18] See Joan C. Baratz, "Black Participation in the Teaching Pool," Paper for the Carnegie Forum's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, January 1986; Bernard R. Gifford, "Teaching -- From Occupation to Profession: The Sine Qua Non of Educational Reform," *New England Journal of Public Policy*, Summer/Fall 1985, pp. 60-75; Bernard R. Gifford, "Prestige and Education: The Missing Link in School Reform," *The Review of Education*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Summer 1984), pp. 186-198; *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group* (East Lansing, Mich.: Holmes Group, 1986); *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986).

When the Reagan administration reorganized Chapter 1 in 1981, the program was severely watered down. In 1985, only about 54 percent of the children eligible for Chapter 1 received the compensatory services to which they were entitled, down from 75 percent in 1980, and funding decreased by approximately 29 percent between 1979 and 1985. Mandates for parental participation were callously and arbitrarily weakened; several states were allowed to eliminate certain academic and preschool components; and, according to Children's Defense Fund estimates, approximately 900,000 potential recipients lost services. Failure to support these programs represents a criminally negligent social policy.[19]

• •

The effects of poverty, unemployment, racism, funding cutbacks, and the general conditions of life in poor communities seep into the schools in myriad ways. While we do not expect schools in and of themselves to solve the social woes of American society, neither will we tolerate their continued compliance in deflating the aspirations of black youth. The 1966 Coleman Report has been justly criticized, but one point raised by that study is appropriate in this regard: "equality of educational opportunity through schools must imply a strong effect of schools that is independent of the child's immediate social environment, and that strong independent effect is not present in American schools."[20] Until educational institutions accomplish this paramount task of overcoming social obstacles rather than recreating and reinforcing them, equality of educational opportunity for black children will elude us.

Improving Schools For Black Children

Research has identified five central characteristics of schools that successfully educate students: (1) strong administrative leadership, especially a principal and a core group of teachers who serve to bring together a consensus around school goals and purposes; (2) a positive climate of expectations that embraces all children; (3) an orderly and disciplined school atmosphere conducive to the academic tasks at hand; (4) a clear focus on pupils' acquisition of skills and knowledge as the fundamental school objective; and (5) frequent monitoring and assessment of pupil performance.[21]

---

[19] See "The Impact of Head Start on Children, Families and Communities: (Executive Summary), *Final Report of the Head Start Evaluation, Synthesis and Utilization Project* (Washington, DC: CSR, Inc., June 1985); Edward Zigler and Jeanette Valentine (eds.), *Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty* (New York: The Free Press, 1979); Children's Defense Fund, *A Briefing Book*, p.8.

[20] James S. Coleman et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 325.

[21] Ronald Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," *Educational Leadership*, October 1979; Edmonds, "A discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling"; Daniel U. Levine, Rayna R. Levine, and Eugene E. Eubanks, "Successful Implementation of Instruction at Inner-City Schools," *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol 54, No. 3 (1985), pp. 313-332; Michael Rutter et al., *15,000 Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979).

The effective schools literature of the last 10 to 15 years has also influenced other conceptions of school improvement. Mastery learning programs are an example of a recent initiative that considers the vast majority of students educable and fosters the view that it is the school's responsibility to serve all comers. These programs are grounded in the belief that 80 to 90 percent of all children can learn material if it follows a clear, logical sequence, if the students receive systematic rewards and reinforcement, and if the teaching strategies are designed to match the context. Black and poor children can learn, this set of studies indicate, when schools and society agree to ensure that they do so.[22]

A Developmental Perspective: Parental and Community Involvement:

The research literature on school improvement has also been deepened and enriched in recent years by analyses of the School Development Program initiated at the Yale Child Study Center by James Comer. Working with the New Haven Public Schools, Comer and his colleagues have focused on enhancing the social context for teaching and learning school by school, particularly by improving relationships among staff, students, and parents.[23]

Comer notes that the social distance between schools and the communities they serve has changed significantly over the past generation. We can no longer assume that parents and teachers share values, and in any case, children are exposed to a great range of information and conflicting views by television, videos, radio, and other sources as they attempt to make sense of their world. But Comer does not view the past nostalgically. He recognizes that schooling must change with the times. It is not enough to raise standards arbitrarily; we must also construct new patterns of interactions so that the powerful social networks that nurture and develop the child in the home and community are less alienated from the culture of the school. Too often, black parents are called upon by the school only for disciplinary troubles, or when their child has an academic problem. The process of building supportive relationships for black children, of creating a true learning community that respects diversity of cultures, languages, and learning styles just as it nurtures the life of the mind, naturally includes parents in substantive educational matters.

For although the society has grown increasingly complex, young children are no more innately intelligent or socially developed than they ever have been. They

---

[22] See Benjamin S. Bloom, *All Our Children Learning: A Primer for Parents, Teachers, and Other Educators* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980); Benjamin S. Bloom, "The Search for Methods of Group Instruction as Effective as One-to-One Tutoring," *Educational Leadership*, may 1984, pp. 4-17.

[23] The following discussion is drawn from: Jame Comer's *School Power: Implications of an Intervention Project* (New York: The Free Press, 1980); "Empowering Black Children's Educational Environments," in Harriette Pipes McAdoo and John Lewis McAdoo (eds.), *Black Children: Social, Educational, and Parental Environments* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1985); "Is 'Parenting' Essential to Good Teaching?" pp. 34-40; "Home-School Relationships as they Affect the Academic Success of Children, *Education and Urban Society*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (May 1984), pp. 323-337; "Parent Participation in the Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 67, No. 6 (Feb. 1986), pp. 442-446; "Education is the Way Out and Up," *Ebony*, August 1987, pp. 61-66.

still need consistent relationships with supportive adults to help them mediate their experiences and thus to learn how to understand and to control the world around them.

Yet, for a variety of reasons such supportive relationships between care givers and children frequently do not develop; instead, conflicts develop based upon class, race, income, or culture, and the skills and abilities that many children learn as useful outside of school do not help them achieve academic success. Mounting accusations and aggression then start to spiral out of control; children begin to respond to this negatively charged situation by acting out their rejection of the norms and values of the school, by losing confidence, or by inwardly withdrawing from a confrontation they sense they cannot win. Teachers and staff, in turn, see their attitudes and expectations confirmed and justified. As Eleanor Leacock notes:

> Deviations themselves are patterned, and supposedly deviant roles, such as not learning, can become widespread, institutionalized, and as intrinsic to the social structure as supposedly dominant norms. Most nonconforming behavior does not follow from a lack of ability to adjust, but is built into the system as integrally as "acceptable" behavior.[24]

Within this framework, the model of school intervention offered by the School Development Program has several key components. One is the creation of a "no-fault atmosphere," in which blaming and fingerpointing take a back seat to open discussions among administrators, staff, and parents around school and student needs. No single group is assumed to be at fault, and no single initiative, taken by itself, is seen as making a difference. The focus is on creating an interactive social and academic climate that makes the school a desirable place to be, to work, and to learn. The intervention program recognizes that just as teaching and learning are not mechanical processes, relationships supporting cooperation, nurturance, development, and achievement cannot be mandated. Thus, collaborative teams for governance, management, and mental health are created to energize the entire school. These teams, which include administrative leaders, teachers, parents, and specialists in child and adolescent development, work to create networks of communication in order to overcome the departmentalization and hierarchical fragmentation to turn schools into impersonal bureaucracies.

Collaboration and Activism:

Both the effective schools literature and the school development intervention model have shown that there are no quick-fix solutions or Band-Aid remedies that can be applied across the board. Consensus on educational purposes, a commitment to common goals, and a climate of expectations cannot be imposed on schools from without. Rather, they must come from the collaboration of active participants in the educational process. Thus, a common theme of these and other reform efforts has been reform at the building level -- that is, within individual schools.

---

[24] Eleanor B. Leacock, *Teaching and Learning in City Schools*, p. 17.

The results have been instructive. Teachers have been energized by their new and challenging role and have experimented with different types of question-asking and prereading activities, building upon and expanding the language competencies their students bring to school. Parents are seen as having valuable information that can make a difference in their children's learning. And black children perceive a greater continuity between home and school; their observations and answers no longer constantly corrected before they can complete an idea, they do not feel disparaged. They learn to identify the contexts in which different styles are appropriate, and they improve the language skills necessary for school success.[25]

Again, we are not naive about the complex processes that successfully improve schools. Surmounting the institutionalized patterns of beliefs and behaviors that have, on the whole, thwarted the education of black youth requires a collaborative, evolutionary perspective. As Sara Lawrence Lightfoot notes in her book *The Good High School*, "institutional invigoration and restoration is a slow, cumbersome process .... there are jagged stages of institutional development .... [and a] staged quality of goodness."

The black community must not wait for the educational millennium. It must have conscious efforts to achieve change through the empowerment of parents, teachers, and students.

Thus, we call for collective action to improve schooling for black children. Neither cynicism, nor despair, nor undue optimism is appropriate; all of these are comfortable indulgences that militate against constructive educational change. We do not deny that schools embody the bad as well as the good of society. But we will no longer accept that appraisal as an excuse for failure. We must all search for the common ground on which to build an academic foundation for this generation of black youngsters.

Recommendations

Our recommendations for progressive educational reform fall into three categories:

. recognizing the centrality of human relationships;
. eliminating barriers to effective teaching and learning;
. mobilizing physical and political resources.

Recognizing The Centrality Of Human Relationships

Black parents must become actively involved in the educational process, and schools must welcome their participation.

Schools have primary responsibility for the education of our children, but that does not absolve us of our own obligations to ensure that the schools are work-

---

[25] See Shirley Brice Heath, *Ways with Words* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983); J.L. Dillard, *Black English* (New York: Vintage Books, 1972); Geneva Smitherman, "What Go Round come Round": *King* in Perspective," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (February 1981), pp. 40-56.

ing. We cannot allow educators to blame black children and their families for the underachievement and apathy so prevalent in many urban school systems. Reaching consensus around academic goals and purposes must be seen as the starting point in developing positive relationships among all of the central actors in the educational scene -- teachers, students, administrators, and parents. The black community must also get involved in this process through political activism at the grassroots level. Only a united front can become an effective agent for educational achievement by black youth.

Schools must become less impersonal.

It is extraordinarily difficult for children to become engaged in their lessons, or for teachers to establish productive relationships with their students, in school buildings that resemble large factories.

The advantages of large schools with a great variety of programs, curricular offerings, laboratories, and technical resources must be balanced against human needs for connection and identification. The house system of organization, already in place in many suburban schools, might be replicated in urban areas so that students not only have a homeroom but also a relatively small network of students and staff with whom they can connect for guidance, support, and friendship. Parents as well as children are more likely to become involved when the school structures are more easily negotiable and less alienating.

Schools must establish closer ties with other social services.

We are advocating not that schools provide a full range of social services for black and low-income students but rather that our educational institutions provide a liaison to social services for parents and children requiring help. Schools are the only institutions in our society in which the acquisition and transmission of skills and knowledge are the primary focus, and we do not want to change this essential mission. But schools are necessarily a focal point for a variety of family problems that undermine this mission.

Eliminating Barriers To Effective Teaching And Learning

Schools must recruit more black teachers.

Low numbers of black teachers constitute a fundamental barrier to enhanced achievement by black students.[26] Until more children look into the eyes of teachers and see themselves reflected -- and until more teachers look into the eyes of children and see them reflected - many of those children will feel excluded from the educational enterprise. All educators must be able to perform the basic human act of acceptance and understanding, but undoubtedly it will be easier to achieve when the teachers' lounge is as multicultural as the curriculum and the classroom.

Develop sensitive and precise testing procedures for the diagnosis of student abilities and needs.

---

[26] See, for example, Baratz, "Black Participation in the Teaching Pool"; Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Black Teachers: A drastically Scarce Resource," *Phi Delta Kappan*, April 1987, pp. 598-605.

Overreliance on standardized testing distorts the educational process, determining what is taught in the curriculum rather than assessing student acquisition of an independently determined knowledge base.

We do believe that testing can improve education when used as one of several methods of student appraisal. The effective-schools literature has identified the frequent assessment of pupil progress as a key factor in improving instruction. Thus, although we remain concerned about cultural bias and the distorting influence of overtesting, we do not call for the abandonment of standardized testing in the schools. Rather, we believe tests must become more sophisticated and sensitive tools for measurement and diagnosis, which will ultimately help our children progress through their course work.

Rigid systems of tracking and ability grouping should be abandoned.

Research findings consistently indicate that inflexible track placements and rigid ability grouping segregate, stigmatize, and deny those in the bottom tracks the same access to quality education those in the upper tracks receive, we believe that these practices should be ended. It is well known that black and other low-income minority students are overrepresented in the lower-ability tracks in our nation's school systems, yet it is frequently overlooked that the differences in the kind of instruction across tracks makes it increasingly difficult for these students ever to climb up the academic hierarchy. In this way, low expectations and mindless bureaucracy crush the potential of thousands of black youth each year and limit their future opportunities. Staff development programs in multicultural education are an example of a readily available avenue that must be seized upon to address issues of diversity within regular classroom settings.

The curriculum must be expanded to reflect the lives and interests of black and other minority children.

Why must we continually fight for the validity of the black experience as a subject of schooling? It takes nothing away from Shakespeare or Emily Dickinson to include the dramas of August Wilson and the poetry of Langston Hughes as an integral part of the school curriculum. All children need to see people like themselves express the timeless concerns of humankind and to be symbolically represented in the classroom as worthy of discourse. "I, too, sing America," Hughes once wrote.

All black children must have the opportunity for a quality education.

The goal of the struggle to end segregation has been equal opportunity for quality education for blacks. But although economically successful black parents today can send their children to good desegregated schools, public or private, poor black children still do not have such options. The remain, 34 years after *Brown*, racially isolated, largely segregated, and subjected to inferior schooling. Consequently, we must fight for a decent education for black children wherever they are, whether in desegregated. integrated, or all-black schools.

Fund Head Start and Chapter 1.

The Children's Defense Fund's FY '89 "Preventative Investment Agenda" notes that in order for Head Start to reach just half of the eligible three-to five-year-old poor children in America, it will have to receive some $400 million in each of the next five years. For Chapter 1 to be extended to all those entitled to receive its services, its funding will have to be increased by $500 million over this same period. While these dollar figures might seem mind-boggling, it is instructive to realize that every year $12.4 billion in revenue is lost because capital gains on inherited corporation stock are not taxed.[27] Moreover, these demonstrably successful programs actually save the country money in the long run.

Effective education must lead to effective participation in the economy.

As long as substantial numbers of black youth come to the realistic conclusion, based upon the widespread unemployment around them, that schooling will not pay off in decent job opportunities, their motivation will suffer. Pervasive unemployment undermines those positive messages that do link education, success, and jobs. Meaningful employment opportunities, we are convinced, will demonstrate to black children that they have a place in our society and that persistence in school is worthwhile.

All segments of the black community must assume a greater responsibility for the education of black youth.

We call upon all black people to apply their skills and abilities aggressively on behalf of our youth. In the past, because of residential segregation and other factors, black Americans from a range of socioeconomic levels interacted daily. In recent years, the black population has itself become polarized. Understandably, many middle- and upper-income blacks have left the inner cities, the public schools, and thus the black communities to which they had belonged.

Middle-class black adults are still needed as positive role models for less fortunate black youth. These adults can work to strengthen community programs that identify and foster black talent.

The improvement of public education must be the principal objective of the black community in the next decade.

We can meet the challenge of ensuring a world-class education for our children only through political activism. All segments of the black community must demand that schools have the staff, policies, and resources necessary to their tasks. Quality education, as described in this essay, can and must be a political issue cutting across race and class and reverberating from neighborhoods to state capitals to the White House.

---

[27] Children's Defense Fund, *A Briefing Book on the Status of American Children in 1988*, pp. v-vi.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. I want to thank all of the panelists for excellent, informative testimony.

The Office of Educational Research and Improvement is the primary Federal investment in educational research and improvement. There is no other place where they are doing it. They spent a lot of money in the military on educational research, but no effort is made to disseminate that into the civilian area.

That effort has been greatly crippled over the last eight years. We are spending at this point less than $100 thousand.

Private industry spends one percent and generally agrees that one percent of the total budget of an activity should be devoted to research and development. The total educational budget in this country—not just the total Federal amount put in—is up around $300 billion, so one percent of $300 billion would be $3 billion.

There is a long gap between $3 billion and $100 thousand—$100 million, I am sorry. Then, of course, great cuts were implemented in the last eight years.

One of the problems that I have, and one of the questions that I want to ask you, is why the educational community—the community of researchers out there, scholars and community practitioners, superintendents, educational experts and administrators and teachers—has accepted this so quietly? Why do they accept this obviously unscientific, illogical allocation of resources, with so little money being devoted to educational research and development?

We are spending now on labs and centers about ninety-four percent of the OERI's budget, that part which is not devoted to the National Center for Educational Statistics.

In 1981 forty percent of NIE's budget was transferred over to labs and centers. In Fiscal Year 1988 the labs and centers received $38.6 million. In 1981 the total was $62.3 million, to show you some idea of the drop.

For example, the Learning Research and Development Center in Pittsburgh—one center—received in 1981 $3.5 million from the Federal Government. They are now getting around $1 million.

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education in 1981 received $7.6 million. They are now getting about $1 million.

The Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling in 1981 received $2.1 million.

There has been a great drop. I think for nine laboratories in Fiscal Year 1988 there was $20.8 million.

Those numbers are far too small. They are inadequate. And we are also talking about education dissemination, so ERIC—the Educational Research Information Center—is part of that.

That money is all too small an amount. What we find is that of the amount being spent, there is very little attention being paid to the mandate, the mission statement that I read before: "The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide every individual an equal opportunity and the inequalities of opportunity to receive high quality education remain pronounced. To achieve the goal of quality education requires the continued pursuit of knowledge about education through research improvement activities, data collection and information dissemination."

In other words, the Federal Government staked out that responsibility for itself with the emphasis being to help achieve equality.

We find no strain running through the centers and labs at present that shows that this is the number one priority.

However inadequate the present system is, have these questions you are talking about been addressed?

Dr. Reed, in particular, you indicated that a decade ago Congress enacted a law requiring a formal study of intradistrict inequalities, but that law was not carried out. Can you give us more information about that? Was that duty supposed to be carried out by a center or that study by a center or a lab? Can you tell us a little bit more about it?

Mr. REED. I am not sure exactly where the ball was dropped, but it was in the legislation and it was not carried out.

I think one of the problems might have been that by relying on centers, if that is not specifically dictated to a center, then it might not be done.

One of the things that——

Chairman OWENS. There are some funds available for independent educational research also?

Mr. REED. Yes, but I wonder whether or not it should be so overwhelmingly in favor of centers. I do not know. Others might have some points of view on that, but I think that might have something to do about the constituency that would be concerned when the funds began to be cut.

Another issue that I might want to make here is that, as was mentioned earlier, very little of this research has been kind of automatically implemented. There is not always a one-to-one relationship, so therefore we do not have the schools—this would be my point of view—automatically, the school systems asking for this data, because we have yet to establish a one-to-one relationship between the kind of research and development argument that you make, between the users and the persons who will be doing the research. I do not think we yet have that.

Chairman OWENS. But the labs were set up—the laboratories were supposed to be available to help implement research.

Mr. REED. I am not at all certain why that did not happen, but I do not think it happened.

Chairman OWENS. Would any of the other gentlemen care to comment on that?

Dr. Jaynes, you have laid out what the great study "A Common Destiny: Blacks in American Society," they dealt with the problems and laid out the problems and pinpointed and would do a great service in terms of establishing a base of knowledge.

I am going to ask you to go beyond that now and comment personally on the implementation part of tackling these problems. How do we—what kind of apparatus do you see effectively tackling these problems?

The present set-up, the present system—they do not call it a system, but that is what it really is—is centers, labs and information centers and some money available for independent research; however, inadequate funding for it. Should we continue to work through that system or should we look to some other mechanism or should we build on that system and add something to it? How can we begin to have the Federal Government carry out its own mandate? The mission statement says inequality, and the problems that

you have cited are what we set up OERI to address. It is not addressing it, to my knowledge. I can see no—we can find no evidence, so what would you propose?

Mr. JAYNES. Well, I think, to go back to your original question, which ties into this one, that the research community and the educational research community, as well. did not really sit all that quietly and watch these budget cuts occur. In fact, the research community was very vocal in the early 1980s, when the budget cuts began being made and were very severe, but that, in fact, afterwards most individuals in the research community as well as just about everywhere else in society—if you think about other cuts that were made in domestic programs where things were swept away by the momentum of the 1980s as the Reagan administration came in talking about less government, tax cuts, and then the budget deficits and Gramm-Rudman.

I think that any particular individuals or groups who attempted to move against that tide during the 1980s were not successful so——

Chairman OWENS. Let me correct you. The senior citizens were very successful. They are better off now than they were when Reagan came in.

Mr. JAYNES. That is one kind of example to that statement, but, in fact, still the case is that most individuals did not make, or most areas did not make much progress against that and the research community was not one of the more fortunate like the senior citizens, as you have pointed out, to do so.

Now, what does that mean? I would like to pick up on, as I tried to in my statement with what Professor Edley said, that in one sense we have got two things going on. We know that we have tremendous problems in education in the United States and that those problems are rooted throughout the system of education for the poor, the non-poor, the wealthy in some senses also, for whites, hispanics, blacks, Asian Americans, and that this is going to require a research effort trying to find out what new kinds of methods might work and might be implemented to, in fact, improve the educational system, but then secondly, along with Professor Edley I would say that we also have a past record of research. That is what our report was primarily concerned with.

What in our past record of research, in our past record of programs that have been implemented, showed promise of in fact having done something, and we outlined what some of those were. We do not need to go back into that.

What we need to be doing is, one, if we look at the set, if we broaden this slightly, not simply to talk about education that is occurring in the schools but in many senses and tied to that is the whole area of employment opportunities, which is obviously very strongly connected to the dropout problem and to the educational system itself, to perceptions and aspirations that students have about the value of education to them, there is the whole problem of employment training.

So we found also that things such as Job Corps, which is just one other step of furthering the educational system, were also very beneficial.

There were problems with the Job Corps. There were problems with Head Start and Chapter I, problems with every program that one could name that has been beneficial.

One component of research that we ought to be talking about is research that attempts to improve existing programs and policies so that money that would be implemented toward those would be more efficiently spent.

So we found that there was a very strong lack of that kind of research, that individuals were more concerned with did a program or did a policy work and not so much with trying to improve it.

Chairman OWENS. Mr. Edley, you seem to think that we basically have enough research, or we have a good supply. The biggest problem is that we do not appreciate the political purposes of information research and we do not use it to get change and to implement it.

First of all, I want to ask you, are you assuming that there are no basic disputes among scholars in education about some of the phenomena that you described, that they all would agree that all black children can be educated, all children can be educated? They would all agree that you can overcome the deficits in the home and the economic deficits that you talked about and still provide a first rate, an adequate education for youngsters?

One of the things that we politicians—public officials trying to use research and information and implement policies—run into is that there is not so much agreement all the time. There is still quite a number of people out there who say that the primary problem is the home and you just cannot expect the schools to educate children who do not come from middle class homes.

So, I do not want to get into that specific thing. Just in general, do you think that there is agreement among scholars and experts about this research, so that we do not have to waste time debating them when we start to try to implement some policies based on their research?

Mr. EDLEY. A complicated question, Mr. Chairman. I do think that there are some areas of research that—there are certainly many areas of research that deserve more attention, that need more attention.

I have a reasonable amount of confidence that the research community is going to see to it that the spigot is not completely turned off with respect to that.

What I was trying to do is really sort of do what economists do, which is draw distinction between stocks and flows. My point is that there is a large body of information out there. Yes, some more would be very helpful, but there is a large body of information out there. What I am asking is, where is the value added going to be? Where is the best return for our attention going to be?

My suggestion is that the committee pay particular attention to asking, how are you going to use that stock of knowledge that we already have and see to it that it is put to work? That is point number one.

Point number two is—I guess what I am saying is that there is not enough of a political constituency, if you will, for deploying, for exploiting that existing stock of information.

There is a constituency out there to continue to get grants for my research center, to continue to get grants for this graduate school of education program, et cetera. They are not as effective as the senior citizens, but at least there are people out there agitating for that.

What I am trying to urge is attention to this other agenda, deploying the stock of information we have, point number one.

Point number two, I said that I thought that some of my propositions were controversial and I believe that they are. While we might be able to get a substantial consensus among sound-thinking researchers, academics, about the educability of black students, I agree the reality is, the political reality is that there are a whole lot of people out there in America who have their doubts about it, which simply underscores my first point.

More studies will not do it. It is a political question. It is not a question of additional research on that.

Chairman OWENS. It would help if among scholars and educators there was agreement. I know there are a whole lot of people out there you will never convince, but at least among scholars and educators, do you think we could look forward to some agreement or research that might pin down some agreement?

Mr. EDLEY. Well, I submit, Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a reasonable consensus among—you are never going to get a hundred percent unanimity, but I think that there is a reasonable consensus among a lot of the propositions that I stated in my remarks among that research community.

The question is turning a research consensus, what is known by researchers, into something that has some political might. This is really the third point that I want to make.

When you ask about the value of research centers as opposed to other kinds of things that we or I might spend money on— let me talk about the Boston area, which is where I come from.

Now, I live in Cambridge and my child goes to the public school in Cambridge. I just want to correct your introductory remarks. It is the city of Chelsea whose schools are in receivership because they are so terrible.

The city of Cambridge—my kid has the best first grade teacher in the world and the best principal in the world, both of whom happen to be black. The difficulty is that most people in the metropolitan Boston area do not have the same reason or pride in their local schools that I do.

Now, what would make a difference? I believe that what would make a difference is a series of indicators, of studies of report cards, what have you, about what is wrong with the schools in Boston and what could be done to make them better, information that would be packaged and presented in such a way that it would have political impact.

The schools in Boston are not going to improve until school improvement becomes a vital political issue to the mayor, to city council members, to the governor, et cetera.

Making it a vital political issue requires disseminating information to the public about what the current conditions are and about what is possible, what is achievable.

Now, if that were the mission of OERI, to contribute from the outside a consensus expert, informed, wise, savvy assessment of what is achievable for all of the children in Boston, that very report, that bit of information could have political impact in Boston that would galvanize the political action that is necessary to do what we already know can be done, because we can see it in certain other communities around the country including in Cambridge.

So my suggestion is that I understand that there is a very important constituency for continued basic research in education. All that I am urging is that there must also be room in the agenda, if OERI is to live up to its statutory mandate, there must also be room in the agenda to go about the very difficult and challenging task of tying what we know to the political realities of accomplishing reform in school districts around the country.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. I want to conclude my questions by declaring my solidarity with Dr. Reed and his series of proposals on an adequate program on intradistrict inequalities. He says we need a nationwide study to define the extent of inequality, including the fact that state aid formulas which give aid to their localities on the basis of attendance rather than on the basis of enrollment are discriminating and they know it, and know the impact of it; a definitive statement of the educational cost of this inequality; a plan to remedy it; a Congressional enactment that will declare intradistrict inequalities in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of equal protection.

I congratulate you on that idea. My staff is preparing an amendment that—I want to replicate the practice of Adam Clayton Powell. He used to put a rider on every educational bill, on any others he could get the rider on, declaring that they could not receive any funds if they practiced discrimination at all.

I would like to see a rider go on every educational bill saying that if there is discrimination of state aid funds or discrimination from government entities, then the state should not be eligible for Federal funds.

There is widespread discrimination with state formulas, and everybody knows that when they have these formulas based on attendance instead of enrollment that they are going to get a result which will give more money to the suburbs and the other places in the state rather than the inner cities. They know that.

Of course, most of Federal legislation is geared toward population—the number of children of a certain age. We would like to see formulas across the country follow that practice, where the population figures guide the aid. So I congratulate you on those proposals.

We are going to have to go for another vote in about five minutes. I will let Mr. Martinez begin his questioning and then recess.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure that I want to ask some questions. I would rather enter into a dialogue.

You know, I think there is a lot of sympat between the members of the panel, the witnesses here, as to whether or not there have been enough studies.

I think there are enough studies. There certainly should be more and continuing research. Study should be something we all support.

The problem is that you can study something to death and never implement anything and you never get anywhere, and that seems to be what is happening here.

As far as systems that work, we have systems that work in different parts of the country. The problem is that what might work in Pennsylvania in one school district, the other school districts in Pennsylvania do not know about, and the one in California does not know about and vice versa, all over the country.

What we need is a networking system that the Department of Education should promote and could promote and could do. The basic information for building that network is already there and the computer system and everything else is already there. We just cannot get the administration to see where they could play a bigger role, even though the President says he wants to be the president of education.

What happens in this country, really, is that a great leader—not necessarily just the President, but a great leader in the country—can lead a movement. Martin Luther King was one of those great leaders who led a movement for civil rights and he caused public sentiment to come behind that effort and support it, and it came to a reality.

In the last administration, President Reagan's great crusade was defense: defense, defense and the heck with everything else. We spent billions of dollars. Monies that are going over to the Pentagon are sitting there waiting to be spent because the contracts are not being fulfilled fast enough to make the payments on those contracts. Now there is question of whether they are really the kinds of defense systems that we need and this, that and the other.

Meanwhile, important things like education are given a second or third or fourth priority and sometimes, I think, even no priority at all.

The problem that I see, unless there is a great leader to champion education, and quite honestly, like everybody else I really hoped that the President was sincere in his statement that he wanted to be the education president, but it does not seem to be forthcoming so far.

Unless there is a great leader like that that will champion education, it is going to be up to the public to create a groundswell that will create that pressure on the body politic that will force them to take the actions they need to take to implement some of these actions that we know would correct a lot of these problems.

The only other way—and on the Federal level you cannot do it but on the local level you can—is to create initiatives that will create thatpressure to act.

In the state of California, when the people got irritated at the property tax, they went out and passed Proposition Thirteen. And even though the body politic was moved by the public groundswell, they moved too slowly and the people did it for themselves through initiative. They did what the legislators should have done earlier.

On the Federal level it is a little more difficult to do that. You cannot do it by initiative, but you certainly can do it by public groundswell.

I thought when the report "Nation at Risk" came out that there would be that groundswell, because we are talking about the young

people of this country, not only the poor and not only the minorities. We are talking about all.

If you look at all the statistics that are provided for us here all the time, we are behind other great nations in education, some that are so-called enemies, as some people like to put it. I do not really believe we have that many enemies.

One thing that was mentioned here is the testing. The testing is what it results in. I have always been a proponent of testing at much earlier ages to find out what that learning deficiency is in that student, not in the twelfth grade when he is getting ready to graduate, but in the second and third and fourth grades, when he is still in the formative years where if you determine what his learning disability is or what his learning deficiency is you can put him in an intensive learning mode so that he can correct that by the time he gets to the twelfth grade so that he is on a level with everybody else graduating.

We are graduating functionally illiterate people today from high schools. The Army spent millions of dollars taking their recruits, who are required to be high school graduates now, training them to read at a ninth grade reading level—ninth grade, not twelfth grade, ninth grade reading level.

Now, that is a crime. When is the general public going to get so mad at the fact that their kids, although they are paying taxes, are not being educated to the extent that they should be educated?

I think we have got to get out there, and those of us that are leaders in Congress and elected officials and those in the educational field of minorities and nonminorities ought to get out there and start educating the public that they ought to start getting mad at their officials and watching the way they vote and voting them out of office.

Mr. EDLEY. Congressman, I could not agree with you more. I mean, I think that—we keep talking about the benighted city of Chelsea and its terrible schools, but the fact of the matter is that the president ought to go to Chelsea and tell those people that they deserve, that their children deserve an education every bit as good as the children at Kennebunkport, Maine.

Then OERI ought to be there with information to tell people in Chelsea, "Here is how you could do it. Now, you ought to elect people who will embrace this program, who will embrace this principle about educational opportunity, and if you have officials who will not embrace it you ought to vote the scoundrels out."

That is my point about linking the information to implementation. Now, it may be that the difficulty with "A Nation at Risk" is that it is a story about the Nation and it is a challenge for the Nation, but education, like politics is local. It may be that where the rubber meets the road in terms of moving ahead with education is a question of local community political will and local community information about how to move forward.

So the only other footnote that I want to add is that it may be that the way in which the networking and the way in which the information has to be disseminated by OERI is to focus on particular communities as kind of targets of opportunity.

At the risk of mentioning HUD in these days and times, it is the notion of a UDAG strategy, finding places where you can deploy

resources and galvanize public and private initiative for improvement rather than sitting back and just looking at the broad picture and getting broad descriptions of what needs to be done. It is focusing on solvable problems and in that way building a groundswell of—-

Mr. MARTINEZ. Focusing and targeting is the key.

Chairman OWENS. We are going to have to recess again for ten minutes, and then Mr. Martinez can continue. Mr. Payne will also.

[A brief recess was taken.]

Chairman OWENS. Mr. Martinez.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is another area that I would like to cover.

The Job Corps mentioned how effective that program is and a lot of other programs, how effective they are, and that there are problems with them.

Yes, there are usually problems, administrative problems, with almost all of the programs. Some have to be worked out, and there are differences in programs from area to area. Some are much more successful than others. There, again, it is how it is administered that matters.

I find there is a common problem to all programs, no matter how successful they are. That is their inability to reach the eligible population. That comes from underfunding, and that comes because people who love to get up and make speeches and wave the flag and say, you know, how they are committed to this and that and the other, and especially to education, are not really that committed and are not going to be until the public makes them.

The thing that I find worse than that is the fact that sometimes in Washington here politicians, whether it is the administration or Congress, many times hide behind the autonomy or local control, the autonomy of a local school board and local control.

Now, in the statement that Congress declared it said, "to provide leadership in the conduct and support of scientific inquiry in the educational process."

I would take that to mean also to conduct—to provide leadership as a result of that. You know, what is the good of providing leadership in that if you do not provide leadership as a result of that?

To then say "give guidance to," and especially through providing that network of information to all the schools. You know, we have done it in instances in a bilingual situation, and through court action. In Lau vs. the City and County of San Francisco, we determined that young people, if they have a language barrier, have a right to have that language barrier overcome by instruction to the point that they can get an adequate education.

I do not think we have fulfilled that to the degree we need to because even in the bilingual funding too little reaches the eligible population. We have people that are very down on that kind of a program, and I do not understand why. They say, well, they look at people and maybe, myself. I am a good example of it.

I spoke Spanish before I spoke English going into kindergarten. There were no bilingual programs at the time, although there was a program which I consider was a misnomer, because it probably was the first bilingual instruction program without a bilingual teacher. They called it speech correction class.

[Laughter.]

I guess it did some good, but I will tell you, in those primary years that are so important I struggled. I struggled very hard. A lot of my young student friends in school did not make it. They struggled and they failed and they dropped out.

You know, you learn English, but you can learn a playground English or an academic English. Most of my fellow students were learning playground English, not an academic English. If they learned the academic English it was through efforts on the part of the parents.

Earlier the responsibility of the parents was mentioned. This is what I would like each of you to respond to, because I find it is incongruous of us to say that the responsibility is with the family when we know that in many instances single family homes, people from low socioeconomic background, regardless of what ethnic background they come from, usually have a situation where it is not really conducive to the child going to school, to be able to be comfortable there, and to do what needs to be done and encouraged at home because the family life is in turmoil.

I remember meeting a young man in Job Corps. I said to him, "Oh, you are a high school dropout." He was in Job Corps completing his high school diploma so he could join the Marine Corps and go into a specialized training that he had signed a contract for. He would probably come out of the Marine Corps with the ability to provide a substantial living for himself.

He said, "No, I am not a dropout." I looked at him and I said, "You did not finish high school, did you?"

He said, "No, but I am not a dropout." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "I am a force out." I said, "What do you mean by a force out?"

He said, "My environment forced me out, my family life, the teachers in the school who did not have patience with me, my environment in the neighborhood where we had people that were trying to pull me into drugs and this and that and the other—my environment forced me out."

That is really true of almost every dropout. They are force outs. They are not dropouts. We ought to change that terminology of "dropout" to "force out," because it is our lack of responsibility in those areas that is actually causing these young people to fall out.

What I would like you to respond to is the responsibility of a school when there is not that responsibility in the home.

Chairman OWENS. Dr. Jaynes?

Mr. JAYNES. Well, I think that, in fact, much of the research literature that occurred in the 1960s and some into the 1970s absolved schools of responsibility for teaching. It is much to the same effect as you say, well, students come from poor backgrounds or have other kinds of disadvantages and schools say, "Well, we cannot—there is not much we can do about it because it takes a good family background to be able to learn."

We, in fact, know that that is not necessarily the case. It may take different teaching methods and a different kind of commitment from the teachers and the other individuals involved in the schools to do so.

In one sense I certainly would have an easier job if the dean came to me and said, "Gerald, when you are teaching microeconomics you do not have to worry about any of the students who did not get a 'C' or better in calculus, because they just do not have the right background and you are absolved from having to go that extra effort to make sure that they learn some economics before you let them out of that class."

I think that is much of what we have done. I have spent a lot of time in schools in various capacities; that is, in actual schools where children were attending, and you often hear teachers making precisely these kinds of statements.

The same point about the earlier question that Chairman Owens had asked about, is there a consensus about black children and, for that matter, hispanic children being able to learn in the academic community or in the research community.

I think that there is a reasonable consensus in the research community, but there is not among teachers themselves. That is where the bigger problem is. If we had that turned around the opposite we would have obviously a lot less problem, but it is not simply a case of students who come from poor backgrounds. It is an appalling situation in many cases.

I have a little story that just illustrates precisely how difficult a problem that is. I have a Jewish friend who was—I was looking for a place, my son wanted to transfer to a different high school in the city of New Haven, Connecticut, and we were talking about what school he ought to go to.

I had this Jewish friend who had a son who was a little older who I knew well. He had gone to a particular school and he was raving about the counselor in this school, who was an elderly Jewish woman, and how great a job she had done and I should send my child to this school, so I in fact did so.

This particular school has tracking and you have to take an examination to get into the better classes, so my son is over there, unfortunately alone, and he goes in to take the examination. This same counselor who had been so strongly recommended to me was the one who was taking charge of this. She did not know anything about him. He was just a black kid who walked in and was going to take the examination.

He passed the exam. He passed it rather high. When my wife walked in the counselor was making him retake it.

Now, in this day and age when you talk about affirmative action and quotas for blacks you would think from listening from the common story that they would be bending over backward trying to get blacks into these higher tracked courses. She was, in fact, sitting in the school posing as a very strong obstacle to that, simply because this woman could not believe that a black child could score that high.

I think that this is a common occurrence throughout.

Mr. MARTINEZ. You are absolutely right. In the movie—I do not know if you saw it—"Stand and Deliver," Jaime Escalante, a very dedicated teacher, took a group of young students and taught them advanced calculus for college credit, and then they had to take a test to qualify for the credit.

They took the test. Fourteen students had taken the class and fourteen students passed—passed high. Well, the automatic expression was "Not in this school, not with these kinds of students." They couldn't have done it—they had to cheat.

They accused them of cheating. Two of them stood firm, "Hey, we didn't cheat. We took it honestly. We are not going to retake it," but twelve decided to retake it.

The twelve took and they passed again even higher than they did the first time, with close scrutiny, which proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that initially all fourteen passed without cheating.

It was simply the idea, as you just stated, "Not from this school, not these kinds of students." They could not have done it.

That is a problem that we have. I have a daughter that had a very much similar experience. Her counselor told her—she wanted an academic course, she wanted college courses when she entered high school.

The first response from the counselor was, "No, no, you want homemaking." She said, "No, I want to go to college." He said, "You probably don't have the grade level to go to college."

She said, "Why, have you looked at my transcript from my intermediate and elementary school?" "No." "Then how do you know I don't?"

Well, she had a very high grade level for those. Then, the next thing, he said, "Well, even if you did have the grade level your parents probably could not afford to send you to school."

You know, this is an attitude, you are right. This is where we ought to be working to change those attitudes. This is where it takes national leadership and national policy, loud statements and especially from the President of the United States.

Mr. JAYNES. The attitudes extend to the students, as well. You have to keep that in mind.

My wife taught low achieving students in a totally black school in New Haven also at about the same time. She is a very dedicated, actually a brilliant teacher. She worked miracles with her particular class. She raised grade averages, like, two or three—she had students who went from fourth grade reading levels to tenth grade in one year, but it took a lot out of her.

Very early in the year, when she was really just bearing down hard on these students, making them work, the students looked at her one day and one of them said, "Mrs. Jaynes, why are you so stupid? Our parents, all the other teachers and the counselors know that we cannot learn. Why is it taking you so long?"

Mr. MARTINEZ. Exactly. One last thing. There is what I consider in a way a pervasive attitude that exists in this country today in that they feel that too many grants were given out to people that were undeserving, and so that there has to be a change and that in order for anyone to qualify for a grant of any kind they ought to do some kind of service, military or voluntary or civil service.

What do you think would happen as far as participation in the minority communities if they said to them, "Look, before you get any help in furthering your education—— "

Let me preface that by saying, in my own opinion, I think we have a mandatory K through 12 system and it should be K through four years of college, really. That should be mandatory, because

today, with technologies that are developing and the higher education that is needed to provide any kind of a decent standard of living for yourself and your family if you get married, you need that higher education. It should be all the way through.

Given that we have got a long way to go before we ever realize that, what do you think would happen among the minority communities if you said to them, "You have got to do four years of military or community civil service before you get one dime for any college education."

Chairman OWENS. Two years.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Two years?

Chairman OWENS. Yes, they are proposing two years.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Two years.

Mr. JAYNES. I, in fact, did my college education exactly that way and therefore, having gone through that particular route, I do not think it would be at all a very fair one. In some sense it is a penalty.

It also, in a sense, wastes national resources to say that every student who cannot afford to continue higher education at the age of seventeen or eighteen should be forced to do two years of service in the armed forces before they can continue to do so.

Now, for some students that probably would be a good idea. So, as an overall compulsory type program I think I would not approve of it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Do you think there would be a great participation by the minority communities or they would just be discouraged. They would just say, "I am not——"

Mr. JAYNES. First of all, we already have rather high participation in the armed services from minorities and I think that this probably would increase that participation level, so, yes, there would be higher participation but that does not necessarily make it a good one.

Second, there would be higher participation and it might not still reach the segments of the population where it is most needed.

Mr. MARTINEZ. That is the fear that I have, that it would not reach the really, truly needy.

Mr. JAYNES. Because one would presume that the military would have some say in who was getting in still under such a program, as well.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Dr. Reed?

Mr. REED. Yes, I would agree that it would have higher participation, but I think that it would really kind of have a disruptive effect on the way that education has been perceived in society.

Most people believe that society has a responsibility to provide education for its citizens, not just for its citizens' sake but for the country's sake.

The purpose of education is to train people to take their places in society to better society and themselves. It would have a disruptive influence on the perception of what the education is, in addition to having, I think, several kinds of negative effects in the black community because it begins to divide the country even further into official haves and have-nots.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I think you are absolutely right. One of the things that we know for a fact—the statistics have proved it ove

and over again—that lack of education leads to a lot of other social problems that we have to pay greater costs to.

The cost of incarceration is a lot greater than the cost of education, and it is a lot easier to educate and motivate than to incarcerate. That ought to be somebody's byword, but it is not.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. Mr. Payne was delayed and regretted the fact that he would not have a chance to question the panel. He said that he was very impressed with your presentations and wanted me to note that we very seldom get a panel of this quality and he appreciated your being here.

Mr. Ballenger.

Mr. BALLENGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I may apologize to you gentlemen for being late, I have with me a member of the British Parliament and we were trying to show him how this place operates, and so obviously I missed the beginning of this meeting.

I have just heard a little bit of the discussion. As a representative from a more rural district, in the largest town in my district is probably forty thousand. I wanted to point out that we have the same problems, but not to the extent.

The unemployment in western North Carolina is around three percent. We cannot afford dropouts. We need to do everything we can to keep students in school because we need educated students to enter the workforce. I guess it was in Brooklyn where the gentleman went to a class of students and said, "Look, I will guarantee you that if you will finish school I will pay for your college education."

We have four community colleges in my district doing the same thing. We have persuaded industry to come in and put $500, $1,000 in per student and promise the students that if they graduate from high school, the funds will be available to attend a local community college. we focus on students who are not likely to make it; in other words, students that have family problems, maybe a single mother, no income, no desire for higher education, no likelihood of getting higher education.

I am a businessman. In our area we are very selfish about it. We cannot afford to have dropouts because we need educated workers. We need these kids to finish school so they can go to work at the numerous plants and companies in western North Carolina.

I have often wondered why unemployed youth in Brooklyn or Washington, D.C. would not travel to locations where jobs are available.

For instance, I am on a study committee that has gone down to Miami. We have got 187,000 illegal Nicaraguans in Miami. I said that if these people could speak English we might be able to find them a job in North Carolina

I could probably take twenty-five thousand of them to western North Carolina, to my district, and give them a job tomorrow.

I realize that you are focusing on big city problems and so forth and I want to point out that we have some of the same problems in our area. I guess because of the lack of density we are more able to face the problem.

Has anybody followed up on the program started in New York?

Chairman OWENS. You are mentioning the "I Have a Dream" program. It was launched in Harlem by one gentleman. Now there

is the "I Have a Dream Foundation" and there are quite a number of schools that are in a similar program with a particular businessperson being responsible for each school.

Yes, it has been followed up.

Mr. BALLENGER. That is the program that we picked up. I guess we are just copying it. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. I just would like to quickly say that what you are suggesting has happened in the past. About fifty or sixty years ago—let's say, seventy or eighty years ago—three-fourths of black Americans lived in the rural. It was not too many decades after that when three-fourths lived in urban areas and they went primarily for jobs.

So it is not to say that—so this has happened. Now, maybe we are talking about pockets of instance, but when it was a monumental shift it did occur. So it is not to say that people will not go where the jobs are, because we had several generations of shift from the rural areas where the boll weevil had done in the cotton crops, so we have had that to occur.

I just wanted to make that point right here.

Mr. EDLEY. I had three brief points. One is that I was very heartened to hear your story about western North Carolina. During the presidential campaign I had occasion to travel quite a bit around the country. I was issues director for Mike Dukakis.

I can recall three rural communities in particular in which in meeting with teachers we heard the teachers complain that community leaders would not support increased investment in education because the experience had been that when we put more money into training our students and raising their expectations and their aspirations they leave—the brain drain from rural America. These teachers obviously expressed quite a bit of frustration with that.

So your counterexample, I hope, is a model, not an isolated one.

The second is that, to echo what Professor Reed was saying, while we have experienced these periods of migration as people look for jobs elsewhere when they hear of opportunities, I share your sense that as of now the mobility of the underclass is quite a bit lower than it has been in some other periods in our history, and the so-called mismatch of where the jobs are to where the people are and what the skills are that the people have is one of the most important challenges, policy challenges, in addressing the needs of the underclass.

The key point that I want to make for purposes of this subcommittee is that in appreciating the causes for dropouts, or "push outs," as perhaps Mr. Martinez would say, and the reasons for low expectations and aspirations, part of it is, as Professor Jaynes said, the question of the promise of economic opportunity.

What are the possibilities that students see when they are in ninth grade or in eleventh grade out there? If there can be a better way to hold out for them the promise of real economic success if only they will stick with it, then the possibility of making the education process a better one will be greatly enhanced, and I think OERI can help illuminate for school districts the successful models around the country of forging partnerships between local business-

es and school districts, so that the transition from school to work is a smooth one.

If that transition is a smooth one and people see that there is a way to get from high school into a good paying job, whether there is an apprenticeship program involved or whether there is some kind of a Big Brother program involved or whatever, then that will work.

The third thing I wanted to say is that this I Have a Dream program that Eugene Lang started—Eugene Lang is a dear friend of mine and I have heard a lot about this program over the years—stands for me as an example of what a single idea can do if it is combined with entrepreneurial energy from only a few people.

What Gene Lang was able to do, starting with his own elementary school and then going around and proselytizing and getting other people of good community spirit to do similar things in their areas, strikes me as one of the most hopeful things that we have seen on the educational front in many a year.

Government can assist people like Gene Lang, not by displacing them, not by necessarily saying that any idea needs to be in the form of a tax credit rather than in the form of private initiative and entrepreneurial energy and grass roots leadership. but rather can assist people like Gene Lang by noting what they are doing and encouraging it and helping in the proselytizing and explaining to other communities what the possibilities for change and progress really are.

Mr. BALLENGER. If I might add one more comment and then I will shut up. Because of the community college system in North Carolina, which is heavily underwritten by state government, you can go to our community college for $60 a quarter.

In other words, when I put $500 in the bank for a sixth grader I can guarantee the student four years of college because the community college system is inexpensive.

If the student gets another scholarship somewhere else, then the money is still sitting there for the next student to use.

We try to persuade business that each $500 put into the scholarship program will take care of one kid. But, the business must also make the commitment that it will take that kid, while he is still in grammar school and as he is in high school, and bring him to the plant. You will show him what you are doing. You will ask him how his grades are and ask him how everything is going and kind of act like a big brother I guess it is the same sort of situation.

It is kind of strange, I guess, since most of the students that we talk to are not necessarily black, and of course my part of North Carolina is not very heavily populated with blacks. Of course, the color of the student does not make any difference to us.

From the businessman's viewpoint, the fact is that we cannot continue to expand our businesses or grow at all with an unemployment rate of less than three percent for the last two years.

So anything we can do to increase the number of workers that we can find is obviously helping us and at the same time we are doing, I guess, good for mankind through Mr. Lang's idea. I am sure he was more idealistic than we are, but I hope we are accomplishing the same thing.

[Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I guess I would also say that we are almost in the same situation in the country, not because of a high employment rate or a low unemployment rate, but the country cannot stand what is happening right now.

The country cannot stand all of these push outs. The country cannot stand having the level of education really not being accelerated. We need an acceleration in the degree of education of our youth. The country cannot stand it, not even to maintain where it is relative to the world's economy, let alone become, maybe, again the leader.

So maybe the kinds of programs you have should be preached to other larger areas.

Mr. BALLENGER. I am preaching because I think it works. Our economic system, like you say—the Japanese are going to outdo us, everybody is going to outdo us because their education system is continuous, where in ours we are losing half of our people, twenty-five percent in some areas.

We just cannot—not only is it socially unacceptable but economically it is unacceptable. I agree.

Chairman OWENS. On that note, gentlemen, we will conclude this panel. I want to thank you again. Note that if you have any additional information or reports to submit, the record of this hearing will be kept open for ten days.

Some of my colleagues might want to forward some questions to you also to get answers from you in writing.

We appreciate your being here. Thank you very much.

Mr. EDLEY. Thank you.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Mr. JAYNES. Thank you.

Chairman OWENS. Our next panel. very patient people, consists of Dr. Paul T. Hill, who is the co-author of "Educational Progress: Cities Mobilize to Improve Their Schools;" Dr. Lee Etta Powell, the Superintendent of Schools from Cincinnati, Ohio; and Dr. Robert Dentler of the University of Massachusetts, Lexington, Massachusetts. Please be seated.

We have copies of your written testimony and your entire testimony will be entered into the record. We want you to summarize your remarks. We will not restrict you by time, but we like to leave maximum time for discussion.

We will begin with Dr. Paul T. Hill.

STATEMENT OF PAUL T. HILL, CO-AUTHOR, "EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS: CITIES MOBILIZE TO IMPROVE THEIR SCHOOLS"

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am Paul Hill, Senior Social Scientists at the RAND Corporation. I would like to talk about a study I completed last year of six urban school districts that had changed the basic direction of their performance and it had improved.

This was a study funded by the McDonald Foundation. Its purpose was to find cities that had started to improve their inner city schools and to document the processes by which they did it, so that other cities that were interested in improvement could be given ideas about how to begin. Our secondary goal was to help state and

national politicians and leaders see how they can help, or at least not hurt, locally initiated improvement.

Our method was to seek nominations from a national panel of cities that had started to improve in some important respects, improvement in attendance rates for children, test scores, return of the middle class to the schools, college attendance rates, curriculum and staff development, peace with the labor unions, tax levy support, all across the board. We were interested in any ways in which big city school districts had started to improve.

We winnowed down the list of about thirty cities nominated to have improved in some of these ways to six where there seemed to be the most comprehensive reform efforts underway, and we therefore studied Atlanta, Cincinnati, Memphis, Miami, Pittsburgh and San Diego.

About these six cities, we think there is ample warrant for thinking that they have begun to improve. None of them, however, has come to the point where the leaders there think that it is satisfactory. They are all struggling.

Further, there were other cities we might have included, but these, we think, gave us a good perspective in what was being done and what could be done.

We published a report in March and then I supplied some copies to the committee. There are others available, as well.

These cities we studied, about which I will tell you in a second, all started off in very bad shape in the early 1980s. All of them had had serious trouble with financing. Many had had repeated defeats in bond issues, serious dropout rates about forty percent in most cases, declining test scores, school board turbulence, racial unrest and the like.

So, when we say that these cities had started to improve their performance we are saying something important, that a serious downward trend had been reversed.

What we found in trying to understand how the cities got started was that the process was profoundly local, that each city had created its own process and its own program.

We concluded from this that there was no one cookbook, that there are some important threads and themes that we think that people in other cities ought to know about.

The most important one is that urban education is not a desperate situation. It is a very serious one, but progress can be made and has been made. The downward trend can be reversed.

From what we say, the key to at least beginning the process of improvement in urban education is local leadership. There is a role for almost everybody to play, but big cities have the intellectual and financial and political resources to start to improve their schools if they become determined to do so.

The key that we found was that in the cities that we studied education had become the number one civic priority. It was the business of almost everybody, the peak business organizations, the city fathers, the mayors and the educational establishment, to improve the schools. It became as important, for example, in Pittsburgh as redevelopment of the Golden Triangle or as it was in Cincinnati earlier to redevelop the physical aspects of the downtown. Education became the number one problem.

Peoples' motive in erecting education to that level of importance was not just altruistic. It was a question of survival. Big city business and political leaders as well as educational leaders understood that high dropout rates and very low ability graduates of the schools were not going to be effective workers, but, second, that no city can be a pleasant place to live when there are large numbers of unoccupied and unemployable adults. So it was civic survival that motivated this effort.

In effect, what happened in these cities is that education, which had for years been treated as a remote bureaucratic activity to be left to them, those guys whom we pay to run education—we, the politicians, the citizens and the like can sit back and criticize. but it is not our problem.

That trend was reversed and education once again became a community activity. The schools are the instruments whereby we educate our children. They are not just a bureaucratic entity like garbage collection and so on that we sit remote from.

The commitment that that generated on the part of everybody, business and political leaders as well as educators, was what energized the improvement.

In these cities the mark of the beginning of the improvement was when the city people created a citywide strategy for improvement of the schools. In almost every big city today there are hundreds of small efforts initiated by the school system, by businesses and the like, to do small things in particular places. There are hundreds of little programs, but together they do not constitute a strategy.

What happened in the six cities we studied was that the local leadership decided to create a centralized strategy for improvement of the schools, and for the most part what that involved was to target attention on the schools where the children were having the worst time.

The citywide improvement strategies were not Christmas trees where everybody got a little bit, but rather focused efforts to say, "We know there is a small number of high schools in this city and there are feeder elementary and junior high schools where the real problems of education are focused, and this is where we are going to put our energy."

Now, I do not have the time to go into the details of the improvement efforts, but I will even give away my book or sell it to those that want to buy it, but the point that is important is that in these cities no one believed they started off with a solution. There was not a belief in a silver bullet, in a magic curriculum.

Instead, what happened was that people understood that they had a serious, long-term problem to solve. They did not know how to solve it, but they believed that progress could be made. Everyone from the school superintendent to business leaders spent great deals of time over many years trying to find that solution, and they are still doing it.

There is not a belief that this can be solved quickly, rather that it has to be addressed over years and years and years of trial and error, and that therefore the bottom line we draw is that in the cities we studied there is a long way to go. There is real improvement made already. The future is going to be rocky because there

will be disappointments. The problems of educating very disadvantaged poor children are not easy to solve and they are not getting any easier with the continued decline of poverty families.

In many ways it is a continuing effort to find what is the best curriculum, what is the best approach now, understanding that it might not work so well in two years and you might have to find another one, but the long-term commitment of the cities to solving those problems and not just acting like it is an external problem to be solved by the school system is the key.

[The prepared statement of Paul T. Hill follows:]

Testimony of Dr. Paul T. Hill
Senior Social Scientist, The RAND Corporation

Before the Subcommittee on Select Education,
House Committee on Education and Labor

September 14, 1989

The views expressed in this testimony are those of the author, not of The RAND Corporation or its sponsors

During the 1987-88 school year, Arthur Wise, Leslie Shapiro, and I visited Atlanta, Cincinnati, Memphis, Miami, Pittsburgh, and San Diego, six cities that had reputedly started to improve their schools. They had reversed decades-long declines marked by tax levy defeats, teacher strikes, white flight, declining test scores, and soaring dropout rates. All still have major problems to solve, but they have made a beginning. Our goal in studying these cities was to give leaders in other cities a place to start. My testimony today is based on that study, and the resulting RAND report, *Educational Progress: Six Cities Mobilize to Improve their Schools*, which was published in March 1989.

Many big-city school systems are dead in the water, unable to improve their low test scores, high teacher and student absenteeism, and near-50 percent dropout rates. But some cities are making schools work for poor minority children. They are building strategies that marshal private and public resources, focus attention on the neediest schools, and topple the bureaucratic barriers separating schools from the community.

Local leadership, not state or federal initiative, is the key. Urban school improvement requires a broad community effort, led by the the business and community groups that in another era redeveloped the downtown or rebuilt the city's economic base. Coalitions led by CEOs, elected officials, clergy, neighborhood and anti-poverty group representatives, and college presidents have started a revolution from above, uniting to make education the No. 1 civic priority. School boards, administrators, and teacher leaders still have important roles to play. But the days are gone when educational policy could be created solely in negotiations among the school board and its employees.

Community leaders' motives are practical. CEOs and local politicians know that dropouts and graduates of bad schools become inadequate employees, and that companies cannot recruit talented newcomers to work in a city that is blighted by sullen unemployable young adults. Clergy and neighborhood representatives see the human toll of educational failure every day. They know that education is too important to be left to a bureaucracy. It is the community's only hope for survival.

Business contributes more than money. CEOs understand strategy-building and consensus-forming processes as few school superintendents or school board members do. In some of the six cities, presidents of major national companies have put in the time required to gain the trust of parents and educators, and have personally led citywide strategic planning processes to refocus and restructure the schools. As strategic planners they know that failing institutions must abandon comfortable routines and develop new services that meet their clients' needs.

The problems of disadvantaged urban youth are profound, and their solution requires a rethinking of the educational system, from preschool through young adulthood. Every city is trying its own approach--centralized curricula, school site planning, teacher reeducation, preschool education, college tuition guarantees. All have promise but all are under constant review and refinement. Community leaders in the six cities are too sophisticated to believe in a quick fix. They know that improvement will require many cycles of trial and error, and they expect to stay with the effort for a long time. Because they are motivated by the importance of the problem rather than a belief in a specific solution, their commitment can survive setbacks.

Business and civic leaders' patience does not extend to school officials who fail to uphold their end of the bargain. Community leaders are offering a negotiated agreement--sustained financial support and collaboration in return for leaner, less bureaucratic, and more child-centered schools. They are not content to be milked for donations. Business leaders threatened to abandon a compact in Boston because the schools hadn't made promised changes, the six cities we studied could face similar crises in the future.

The process will take many years. Increases in federal and state funding and relief from regulations will eventually be needed. The federal government can help by funding research and dissemination efforts, so that civic activists in other cities can learn how coalitions are formed and held together. In the long run the federal and state governments should consider waiving program regulations if they interfere with locally-created improvement strategies. But most

big cities already have the potential leadership, ideas, and funds needed for a start.

Once cities learn how to make good schools in bad neighborhoods, "choice" plans and radical decentralization will be possible. But as Owen Butler of Procter and Gamble has said, better schools will not just appear, communities must create them. Waiting for an easier solution to appear will only waste the lives of another generation of children.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. Dr. Powell, Lee Etta Powell.

STATEMENT OF LEE ETTA POWELL, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, CINCINNATI, OHIO

Ms. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to testify before you today regarding the uses of educational research and information sharing to improve the Cincinnati Public Schools.

I will describe just a few brief characteristics of our school district. We serve 52,000 students in eighty-two schools. A large percentage of our students are poor. They have families with an income below the poverty line. Fifty percent of our students are on free or reduced price meals.

Our culturally diverse population is particularly reflected in an enrollment of approximately sixty percent black students, forty percent white and in that white population we have a large percentage of Appalachian students. In summary, we have a significant at-risk population.

I need to speak a little bit about our school board, because it is a fiscally independent school board. We have prior to 1980 gone through a decade of inability to pass tax levies. There has been more success since 1980. That gives a sense of what the fiscal picture has been.

Also, in our last act by the legislature for this current biennium the funding of the urban school districts, the eight urban school districts in Ohio, was certainly not equal or even equitable to the kind of funding that we found that the suburban and rural districts were able to attain, so subsequently this continues to be an ongoing struggle that the urban school districts have bounded together to try to address, to make sure that there is greater equity in funding in the next biennium. We obviously then experienced many of the conditions prevalent in other urban school districts.

Given our fiscal picture, then I think it is very clear that there is very little money that we have for the kind of research and development that any corporation would have, and yet in Cincinnati we are among the ten largest employers in the city, a city that is the home of a number of corporations, the headquarters for a number of corporations.

If you looked at my colleagues, they do a lot, as was stated earlier, in R&D. We have very little of that, so subsequently OERI is very, very important to a school district such as ours.

However, we have moved forward to aggressively address the problems before us and we have done that in the traditional ways but, more importantly, one of the newer ways is the involvement of business.

In 1987 we organized what we called the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative. The purpose of that collaborative was to reduce the dropout rate, improve student performance and provide, last of all, college scholarship funding for our students.

We really determined that we needed more than just business and education working together That would not solve the problems of our youth.

What we determined was that we needed what we call a comprehensive collaborative. A comprehensive collaborative is one which

brings together those people w.. ..epre.. ..man services in the community so that the needs of fam... ..an be addressed, as well as the educational needs of students.

We determined as we looked at our own study of our dropouts that not only was it just education, but health, nutrition, medical care, recreation, employment, housing and education were all factors tnat were really causing our students to not be successful in school.

Subsequently our collaborative is attempting to attack all of those problems. That frees me up as an educator to focus on education and allows the other members of the collaborative to deal with the areas in which they have the greatest expertise.

Now, obviously the concept of collaborative is pervasive across the country. I think there are about twelve to fifteen cities that are doing the same thing. Here, I see, is a strong role for OERI.

OERI had wanted to become involved through the Urbar Superintendents' Network, but with the whole issues of funding, et cetera, they just did not have the res..rces to be able to get in on the front of this effort to provide the research that I think is crucial to determine really what are these collaborative efforts doing and what lasting effect will they have on urban education to help us to reach the goals that we are all seeking.

One other thing that it is important for you to know about Cincinnati is that we are the only school district in the United States that has an out-of-court desegregation settlement agreement, which allows us to determine how we will desegregate our schools consistent with the standard that was determined by the Federal judge.

We have determined, then, that we are doing this through open enrollment, limited pairing of schools but, more importantly, by offering a variety of alternative programs or alternative schools.

By offering alternative programs we have been able to maintain our middle class black as well as middle class white population, reduce white flight from the city, but also provide quality education.

Except for two schools, our School for the Creative and Performing Arts and an academic high school, there is no criteria for admission into our alternative programs, some of which are Montessori schools and K-6 schools after the Paideia approach. Mortimer Adler's research is being used for that program. There are foreign language programs in which a student can enter a foreign language program at kindergarten and take that language through twelve years. In fact, two of our valedictorians in 1989 had had twelve years of a foreign language.

The point, though, that is important is that without an entrance criteria for these programs we are seeking to prove that children, all children, can learn—poor children, minority children, black children, Appalachian children, children from single family homes.

We also find that as we look at our data from our schools the students who go into alternative programs tend to score better on standardized tests than the students who go into the traditional neighborhood schools. That revealed to us right away that we had a double standard in our district—alternative schools, because parents are sort of school oriented, were getting one experience. Subsequently through our school board and other efforts we are putting

forth a lot of effort into our neighborhood schools, which brings me now to some of the uses of research to improve the neighborhood schools.

Obviously there is a lot of research in early childhood education and in those schools we are taking advantage of that research to provide more early childhood programs and all-day kindergarten. In fact, in fifty-six of our sixty-one elementary schools we have gone to all-day kindergarten, only half of which is funded by the state.

NASBE also a couple of years ago had a panel on early childhood education in which they really did a lot—they commissioned a number of papers, did the research and came up with some great recommendations for early childhood education, some of which we are implementing.

Again, here was a role for OERI which had something of a peripheral role, but I would have liked to have seen them have a more definitive role because it was through their efforts that we get the dissemination out to all districts across the country.

There has been a lot of research on middle schools, and again looking at that research as well as what we know about the needs of urban youth now for having a significant adult to influence a child's experiences in school has led us to seeking from the community mentors and tutors and we have determined through our own study that those students who have a person working with them, those students tend to stay in school. They perform better. They graduate and then many of them go on to college.

So successful were we in one of our high schools, Aiken High School in particular, that had as a partner in education the General Electric Company, that that company granted that school $1 million payable over the next several years to expand that mentoring program.

Dropout prevention is on the minds and is one of the foremost efforts of all of our urban school districts, but we also know from the research that students tend to start dropping out in elementary school, not in secondary school, and we have determined that unless we have caught the youngster by grade three the chances of dropping out will be pretty profound.

We have also determined from the research that reading is the key. We have then developed, again with the use of the research, a new K-12 unified reading/communication arts program in the Cincinnati Public Schools which we implemented last year for the first time.

I might add that I went to Cincinnati in 1986, October of 1986, from a suburban school district, so my experiences in the city are extraordinarily different from my prior experiences, but I am also finding that we can bring to bear the fact that a cohesive program is the key to helping youngsters be successful early on, irrespective of the family background, and that if we capture that youngster early on and help that student feel successful, have someone with whom he or she can relate and deal with the self esteem and social skills, that we will reduce the number of dropouts.

The other thing we learned as we were working with our youngsters in reading that our parents said to us was that "I don't do too

well. I dropped out of school and I can't help my youngster, so will you help me also?"

We are now finding, then, that in some of our elementary schools we are beginning to place adult basic education or GED classes in the elementary school and in one of our pilot programs we have it in the elementary school with the youngsters so that the parents go to school with the kids and then, by their improving their skills, they feel that they can now work effectively with their youngsters and also encourage their child to stay in school.

Again, there would certainly be a good arena for some research around this whole issue, because I know that in my own experience, and I have been following this for many, many years, we really have not done a lot in that regard.

Again, I would just summarize by saying that there are two ways of looking at helping our youngsters in urban schools and those are the in-school efforts and the out-of-school efforts.

I would like to close by saying that we seek resources from anyplace where they are available. We have a dropout demonstration project that is funded partially by the Department of Labor. We have another alternative high school for at-risk students who we are recovering from dropout status or moving them in if they are at risk. Again, that is funded by the Department of Labor.

In my own experience I also know that there are other agencies that are working on educational issues. Congress, for example, authorized OTA to convene a panel on adolescent health which has great implications for what happens to youngsters in school.

If I suppose I had my "druthers" it would allow OERI to have an umbrella status over any initiatives that impact on education to come in on the research end so that we can assure the capturing in one single place of all of these initiatives that support education and then those of us who are practitioners in the field would only have one place that we can go for information, for replication projects, et cetera.

Lastly, I mentioned earlier that there is an Urban Superintendents' Network that is convened regularly by OERI, and we do share information, but because some of the programs and initiatives that are established across the country tend to be parochial in nature, they do not often have a research basis for them, so it is sometimes difficult to replicate something that has not been formulated in a way that would lend itself to easy duplication with perhaps some modification.

Again, thank you for this opportunity.

[The prepared statement of Lee Etta Powell follows:]

TESTIMONY . Subcor ittee on Select Education Committee on Education and Labor
U. S. House of Representatives
The Rayburn House Office Building
Room 2259
Washington, DC
September 14, 1989

I am Lee Etta Powell, Ed.D., Superintendent of the Cincinnati, Ohio, Public School District. I respectfully welcome the opportunity to testify before you today regarding the uses of educational research and information sharing to improve the Cincinnati Public Schools.

A brief description of our school district will further your understanding of the programmatic emphasis I will describe later. Cincinnati is located in Southwestern Ohio with Kentucky and Indiana as its bordering neighbors. The city has an area of 90 square miles. The school district serves 52,000 students in eighty-two schools. Our culturally diverse population is 60.74 percent black and 38.18 percent white, a large percentage of whom are Appalachian. Many of our students live in single parent households, and about fifty percent qualify for free or reduced price breakfast and lunch. We have a significant "at risk" population.

Our seven member, fiscally independent school board is elected at large. Forty percent of our revenue is derived from local sources through the issuance of tax levies. The Cincinnati schools experience many of the conditions prevalent in urban school districts. Some of these include limited fiscal resources, depressed achievement levels, high dropout rate (8.9 percent in June, 1989) and low post secondary school enrollment (40 percent in June, 1989). Through local reform efforts, restructuring the district, program improvements and tremendous support from the community we are aggressively addressing these conditions. Through the Chamber of Commerce we have an outstanding Partner in Education Program linking each school with a business. In 1987 the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative was formed to specifically address the dropout rate, improve student performance, and provide last dollar college scholarship funding. The Collaborative's founding Co-Chairs: J. Kenneth Blackwell, former Vice Mayor, Cincinnati City Council; John Pepper, President, Procter & Gamble Company, and Lee Etta Powell, Superintendent of Schools; organized this comprehensive collaborative under the theme "United For Youth." It brings together the efforts and resources of all youth serving agencies in the community to collectively respond to the needs of children and youth to enable them to reach their full potential. Documentation on the development and progress of the Collaborative and linkages with similar groups for the dissemination of information has been provided through the Ford Foundation and National Alliance of Business.

Cincinnati enjoys the distinction of being the only school district in the country with an out of court desegregation settlement agreement which allows the school district to determine the method to desegregate the schools to meet the standard set by the Judge of the U. S. District Court, Southern District of Ohio. The district has chosen to use alternative schools (Magnet), open enrollment and school pairings to achieve this standard. As a result, parents and students have both quality and choice in the selection of schools. Through the open enrollment policy a parent may select any school where the child's enrollment will help reduce racial isolation. Through alternative (Magnet) schools parents have a choice of over twenty-eight programs in over 40 locations. These programs represent a focus in a particular content area or a specialized method of instruction such as Montessori.

Meeting the unique needs of an urban population and meeting desegregation guidelines with a determination to provide quality educational programs call for a constant search for programs and methods that promise to be effective. Professionally, this argues for research based initiatives or other proven practices whose results warrant replication. In Cincinnati we have taken full advantage of this. Following are some examples:

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The High Scope Perry Preschool Project provides definitive research on the value and effectiveness of early childhood programs, particularly for students at risk. We have expanded all day kindergarten classes to 56 of our 61 elementary school.

In 1987-88 the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) convened a National Task Force on Early Childhood Education on which I had the pleasure of serving as a member. One of the primary themes in our conclusion was the critical need for developmentally appropriate instruction, the organization of an early childhood unit ages 4-8, and early childhood certification. It was felt that these promising practices would give students the needed strong early start in school and prevent later failures leading to dropping out of school. During the 1988-89 school year the Cincinnati Public Schools initiated a pilot project early childhood unit which would allow the four-year-olds to stay with the same teacher over several years. The project was funded by the Jennings Foundation through the Ohio State Department of Education. The findings of this pilot study will be shared with other school districts.

Over the past two years the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative has funded a program for three-year-olds housed in two different elementary schools utilizing the "Constructivist Approach to Early Childhood Education." A careful monitoring of this program is provided by staff from the University of Cincinnati.

DEVELOPING CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS

The National Alliance of Business in its 1987 publication The Fourth R: Workforce Readiness, cited the need for reasoning, analytical, creative, and problem-solving skills as a requirement for the workforce. We have responded with a K-12 Magnet program in critical thinking/Socratic method as proposed by Dr. Mortimer Adler in his book, The Paideia Proposal.

Additionally, over the past five years the school district has sponsored a National Thinking Skills conference drawing attendees from across the country and Europe.

The development of critical thinking skills is a thrust in all curricula areas.

MIDDLE SCHOOLS

Children between the ages of ten and fourteen experience dramatic changes in growth and development characterized by their passage through puberty. These emerging adolescents, neither boys nor men, girls nor women, need an educational environment that addresses their unique physical, social, emotional, and intellectual needs while also bridging the gap between the child-centered elementary school and the content-driven curriculum of the high school.

In the Cincinnati Public Schools, the middle school program consist of the following essential components:

1. Interdisciplinary teams
   A team of English, mathematics, science, and social studies teachers works with a specified group of students. Teachers and students are clustered in "houses" to provide a more personal environment. The team establishes common standards of behavior and expectations and works cooperatively to implement them.

2. Interdisciplinary Instruction/Core Academic Courses
   The curriculum specifies the knowledge and skills expected of each student and is directed toward producing students who think critically, are literate in mathematics and science as well as language, and who act as responsible citizens in a multicultural society. Interdisciplinary teams of teachers plan and conduct instruction that reflects "real life" integration of knowledge and skills from all disciplines. The team has a block of time for the core academic subjects to allow maximum creativity in developing instructional activities.

3. Adviser-Advisee Program
   Each teacher is assigned a group of students or "advisees" for whom he or she acts as counselor on academic, social, and career matters.

4. Specially Trained Teachers
   Middle school teachers have special training in the characteristics and behavior of pre-adolescents and use instructional strategies that are particularly effective with children of this age.

The middle school program comprised of these components relates learning directly to the developmental needs of students and is our response to the challenge of the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development to provide a "last best chance" to substantial numbers of American youth as published in Turning Points Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century and other studies on middle school education and adolescent psychologies.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS (HIGH SCHOOLS)

An analysis of student performance along with reports such as A Nation at Risk have led to the offering of academically challenging courses to more students. Our goal is for all students to take courses in algebra, the sciences and a foreign language beginning in the secondary grades. Many of our students currently have the opportunity to begin a foreign language in kindergarten with a choice of German, Arabic, Chinese, Russian, French, Spanish and Japanese. Two of our 1989 high school valedictorians had studied twelve years in their target language.

DROP OUT PREVENTION

The topic of "dropouts" and drop out prevention strategies is pervasive in research studies, in literature and on conference agenda. Cincinnati has responded in several ways:

Reading - It is well known that the key to success in school is closely if not identically related to the ability to read.

Students throughout the Cincinnati Public School System are involved in a bold new program designed to increase their communication skills. The Unified K-12 Reading/Communication Arts Program is based on the belief that the communication arts must be taught as integrated processes in which speaking, reading, writing and listening are used recursively and concurrently, with thinking as the undergirding thread, and not in isolation. In this way language skills are reinforced and extended. This approach emphasizes process-oriented instruction whereby teachers lead students to use all modes of communication in learning.

This specially designed program incorporates key findings from recent research on reading/communication arts, including the concept of emergent literacy, reference to students' prior knowledge, the use of thinking strategies, and the importance of teaching strategies that emphasize "whole to part."

Research has supported the relationship between background knowledge and reading comprehension. Several studies cited in Smith (1963) conducted over a period of years found that providing enriching experiences led to an improvement in reading. The Unified K-12 Reading/Communication Arts Program provides an enriched curriculum and experiences.

This new program utilizes the knowledge and experience of nationally known reading/communication arts experts, Cincinnati administrators, teachers, parents and students in establishing its goals, philosophy and curricular objectives. The key to understanding the scope and sequence is the interrelationship that exists among all the instructional objectives. Activities used to teach these objectives are integrated. Reading is learned through appropriate oral and written activities; writing is learned by reading with a writer's eye, paying attention to structure, syntax and word choice.

At the core of this exciting new program is an instructional delivery model centered around the concepts of the direct instruction model of teaching. The strategies that embody this concept are woven into a flexible instructional cycle which emphasizes whole class, small group, and individual phases. The selection of the direct instruction model was based on research. The effectiveness of direct instruction through the combination of whole-group, small-group instruction appears to produce highest achievement gains (California Sate Department of Education, 1977; Kean, Summers and Raivetz, 1979). Further, this combination of direct instruction produced a greater percentage of both student engaged behavior and happier and less disruptive behavior (Kean, et al, 1979; Fisher, et al, 1978; Brophy, 1980).

Pivotal to students success in the Reading/Communication Arts classroom is the inherent reliance on personal professional teacher judgment in determining the instructional focus for the whole class small group and independent activities.

MATHEMATICS

The Cincinnati Public Schools is now undergoing a review and revision of its K-12 mathematics program

The philosophy, goals, and objectives of the Unified Mathematics Program reflect the general trends in mathematics education today. They contain the key ideas as reflected in such documents as the Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics issued by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, March, 1989, and Everybody Counts, A Report to the Nation on the Future of Mathematics Education issued by the Mathematical Sciences Education Board, the Board on Mathematical Sciences, The Committee on the Mathematical Science in the Year 2000, and the National Research Council in 1989.

Everybody Counts: In response to the urgent national need to revitalize mathematics and science education, the National Research Council (NRC) has undertaken an examination of U.S. mathematics education from kindergarten through graduate study. Major studies being conducted for the NRC by the Mathematical Sciences Education Board, the Board on Mathematical Sciences, and their joining Committee on the Mathematical Sciences in the Year 2000 have the goals of identifying weaknesses in the present system as well as strengths to build on for the future.

Virtually every issue treated in Everybody Counts has roots in studies or reports of the past ten years. Some matters come directly from this literature; many other statements, however, are more the product of expert consensus than of documentable research. As a result, the reference to this report provide not so much a record of evidence as a resource for action.

Everybody Counts reflects the thinking of 70 leading Americans, among them classroom teachers, college and university faculty and administrators; research mathematicians and statisticians; scientists and engineers; mathematics supervisors; school principals, school superintendents; chief state school officers, school board members; members of state and local governments; and leaders of parent groups, business, and industry.

It also signals to the nation that--acting through the National Research Council--the National Academy of Science, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine are prepared to participate actively in the long-term work of rebuilding mathematics education in the United States.

NCTM Curriculum and Evaluation Standards: There is a close correspondence between the Cincinnati Philosophy/Scope and Sequence and the NCTM Standards in regard to active involvement of students, exploration and inquiry, and mathematical communication. Problem solving, reasoning, and communication are the major strands at each level (K-4, 5-8, 9-12) in the Standards report. Problem solving, thinking, communication and the interrelationships between them form the primary foci of the Cincinnati program.

In 1986, the Board of Directors of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics established the Commission on Standards for School Mathematics as one means to help improve the quality of school mathematics. The Curriculum and Evaluation Standards document, which is the product of the commission's efforts, contains a set of standards for mathematics curricula in North American schools (K-12) and for evaluating the quality of both the curriculum and student achievement. As school staffs, school districts, states, provinces and other groups propose solutions to curricular problems and evaluation questions, these standards will be used as criteria against which their ideas can be judged.

The Standards were drafted during the summer of 1987 and revised during the summer of 1988 by the members of four Working Groups, each representing a cross section of mathematics educators, including classroom teachers, supervisors, educational researchers, teacher educators, and university mathematicians. The revisions were based on copious and helpful reactions to the working draft of this document gathered during the 1987-88 school year. This final document is considerably stronger and more coherent because of the careful reviews and thoughtful suggestions that were provided by a large number of people.

The Standards is a document designed to establish a broad framework to guide reform in school mathematics in the next decade. In it a vision is given of what the mathematics curriculum should include in terms of content priority and emphasis. The Cincinnati Mathematics Program has been developed in accord with this vision.

COUNSELING/MENTORING

Traditionally counselors have been assigned to secondary schools, however, in recent years the focus on early intervention strategies and an awareness of problems experienced by Young Children led to the assignment of counselors to four, ten elementary schools; the largest number ever in the Cincinnati Public Schools.

The elementary guidance program is developmental and preventative in nature and stresses the personal/social development of all students, with emphasis on self-esteem and social skills building, career awareness and early identification of problems which may require immediate remediation.

DROP OUT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

With a grant from the U. S. Department of Education, a Drop Out Demonstration Project is being implemented in a high school and its feeder middle school. This program is a uniquely local project based on detailed study of the drop out problem in the Cincinnati Public Schools, Survey of Student Needs, and the long range drop out prevention goals as reflected in the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative's plan. Although there are many drop out prevention/demonstration projects around the country, very few of them have very good evaluation information on their effectiveness. Therefore, replication projects are not readily available. The literature was consulted however for ideas. Thus, an eclectic approach was used in selecting locally suitable elements of other programs.

Major components of the program include:

1. Additional instructional time after school.

2. Reallocation of time for instruction and problem courses during the school day.

3. Additional counseling services.

4. Financial incentives in the form of part-time jobs, job readiness skills and assistance in filling full-time jobs.

5. College readiness skills and assistance in college placement to students as incentives to complete their high school education.

6. Additional staff support for reduction of absenteeism.

7. Personal support services in the form of mentors, tutors and health services.

Anticipated outcomes of the program are:

1. Reduction in drop out rates.

2. Reduction in failure rates.

3. Increased number of graduates going to college.

4. Increased number of graduates finding career jobs.

The program serves two hundred students in grades 7-12.

PETER H. CLARK ACADEMY FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The Peter H. Clark Academy is a replication of the Redirection High School in Brooklyn, New York. This alternative high school receives partial funding from the U. S. Department of Labor. It is an alternative model high school for dropouts and high risk students. It served in its first year one hundred and fifty students and is expected to grow to five hundred students over a three-year period.

Major components of the program are:

1. Open admission to enrollment based on referral.

2. Separate location from regular high school.

3. Location in a poor neighborhood.

4. Special reading program called STAR.

5. Interdisciplinary curriculum.

6. On-site day care.

7. Limited extracurricular activities.

The anticipated outcomes of the program are:

1. To reduce the risk of dropping out from almost 100 percent.

2. Preparation of high risk students for jobs in college.

CAREERS MATCH PROGRAM

The literature from the business community speaks very strongly about the need to prepare young people for the workforce. This Careers Match Program is designed to prepare high school high-risk students for careers in college. Approximately two hundred students in grades 9-12 are served by the program. The program is funded with a grant from the U. S. Department of labor with funding provided for a period of five years. This program is based on the concepts developed by the National Alliance of Business regarding the importance of strong academi curriculum and work-readiness skills, John Goodlad's work and local research on dropouts.

Major components of the program include:

1. Structural changes: school within a school.
2. Interdisciplinarian curriculum.
3. High expectations and standards for high support such as counseling, mentoring, tutoring.
4. Work-readiness skills.
5. School to work transition.

The anticipated outcomes are:

1. Students who have a probability of dropping out at about 80% will complete high school education.
2. All of the students will go to either college or careers.
3. The business community will develop jobs for these graduates.

COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (BEETHOVEN PROJECT)

The Cincinnati School District is very much interested in the opportunity to replicate the Beethoven Project. This program designed to prepare children born in poverty for school would target one hundred and twenty children and their families. We feel the Beethoven Project provides a good research basis and model for replication.

Three inner-city elementary schools have been identified for this project starting in October, 1989, for five years if our Office of Educational Research and Improvement grant proposal is funded by the U. S. Department of Health an Human Services.

The Urban Superintendents Network Convened By The Office Of Educational Research and Improvement provides an effective vehicle for the sharing of information between urban school districts on common problems and approaches to solutions. One of this groups efforts was summarized in the publication Dealing With Dropouts: The Urban Superintendents' Call to Action (1987).

Listed above are only some examples of the efforts of the Cincinnati Public Schools to use research as the basis for the establishment of programs to meet the needs of its student population as well as efforts to replicate programs that have experienced success in other school districts.

Given the current status of urban education in the United States at this time, more needs to be done to develop and implement exemplary programs with the findings of research as the basis for these programs. Equally as important is the need to have a strong research component so that other school districts wishing to replicate the programs would be able to do so with great confidence.

Again, I welcome this opportunity to appear before your committee and hope that your deliberations will result in continued and increased support for public education throughout the United States, but especially in the urban school districts, where some of our neediest students must be educated.

* * * * * * * *

Lee Etta Powell
Superintendent of Schools
Cincinnati Public Schools
230 East 9th Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. Dr. Robert Dentler.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. DENTLER, PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT BOSTON

Mr. DENTLER. I appreciate the opportunity to attend this subcommittee's hearing. I first attended this Subcomm ttee on Select Education when I was ecting the Regional Educational Laboratory in New York City I first met you, Chairman Owens, when that Regional Laboratory went to work in Bedford-Stuyvesant training people to be survey researchers.

I would like to report that twenty young adults from Bedford-Stuyvesant in 1967 became full-time paid professionals in the world of survey research, and I hope they are still flourishing there today.

The hypothesis of my paper is that America's inner city schools can be improved significantly through certain kinds of Federal investments in educational research and development.

I would like to emphasize that improving inner city schools no longer is something that should be confined to the core of the great cities, but rather should be expressed in terms of schools that are based within metropolitan areas, well over two hundred and seventy of them, and who host large numbers of students who are at risk of failure and of diminished life chances generally by reason of poverty and minority status.

In other words, while we have extreme residential segregation of minority households in the United States, over the last twenty years it is the case that many, many smaller satellite cities and smaller suburban areas have come to host and their schools to educate or miseducate minority students.

Obviously, as James Coleman reminded this subcommittee last year, the concerns and needs of minority students depend on family, peer, neighborhood and mass media conditions which surround and shape the school experience, but I am assuming in my comments that improving schools represents the point of policy departure of the highest priority, that out-of-school concerns of the sort that Dr. Powell referred to are critical but school concentration and approach to meeting the needs of minority students through the schools is what I want to emphasize.

I will skip over much of the history. I will say from historical scholarship we can learn that the disintegration of the common school in America began after World War II, that all of the standards of the teaching and learning environment in the public sector began to degrade during the great depression and did not recover from that degradation after World War II

I have recently completed the study of that, trying to account for what I would call the miseducation of the baby boom generation in the 1950s and early 1960s.

By any standard, the baby boomers born after World War II were shortchanged in general, and therefore the impoverished and minority baby boomers in particular were denied the opportunity for anything approximating their birthright to a decent education.

Now, beginning with Sputnik, the Federal interventions based on Cold War ideologies began and some reconstruction of the broken

and disintegrated common school tradition began to be accomplished late in the 1950s and early in the 1960s.

From my point of view, before the 1960s we lacked a solid research and development foundation on which to base our educational strategies.

What we did know tended to be overwhelmed by the unmet educational needs of the years from 1946 to 1960. Before the Brown decision in 1954 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, public schooling in metropolitan areas was a hostage of residential real estate.

The findings of our research pioneers in the 1930s and 1940s, including such distinguished black educational researchers as Allison Davis, showed that public schooling in America before World War II was designed primarily to reinforce opportunities for middle and upper income white students and primarily for males among them.

These conditions did not begin to change significantly until the 1960s. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 transformed this national disgrace of miseducation and opportunity denied and it did so along with many other Congressional policies in the brief era from 1964 to what political scientist Gary Orfield estimates was the burning of Watts and the end of the transformation in 1968 and 1969.

We had a very brief window of opportunity. federally organized and funded educational R&D, in my view, had only the years from 1964 through 1968 in which to attempt to lay a foundation for the reconstruction of American public schools.

The initial work of all of the regional laboratories, that is all twenty of them at the time, and all of the R&D centers had deep and direct implications in those years for improving learning opportunities for minority children and the children of the poor.

As the political backlash grew and intensified the boards of these laboratories and centers and the top leadership of these new organizations struggled to revise their agendas and they moved ever more steadily toward a chameleon-like character and mode of operation.

Those that did not and those that suffered confusion in the course of signals rushing in from an increasingly conservative and timid Office of Education were terminated ruthlessly and mindlessly between 1969 and 1973.

Now, I brought along with me a couple of pages I did not yet put into my testimony, and it is about an example of some of the things that laboratories and centers did in those days.

Chairman OWENS. Without objection, that will be entered into the record if you will please submit it.

Mr. DENTLER. All right. I wanted to suggest that an example of ways in which this was carried out comes from——

Chairman OWENS. What was carried out? The ruthless terminations or——

Mr. DENTLER. No, the ways in which the aims of improving schools for inner city children were carried out historically, initially in the 1960s by the labs and centers, may be expressed in the short history, the nine-year history of the Center for Urban Education.

Without going over all of that history, I would like to remark that I recomputed the 1967 funding for the lab and center for the

Center for Urban Education at the time. Expressed in 1988 dollars, that budget coming from the Federal Government would have been in the $6 million range each year and the additional funds from state and local agencies would have brought us up over $10 million a year. That is what the Congress had in mind. That is what the authorizations were like in the initial years and the appropriations did not begin to get down to their pathetic levels until the Nixon administration took over and the backlash was secured.

What about the twenty years that have followed that period, a period when laboratories from coast to coast, including the southwest regional laboratory in Los Alamedos, including the Appalachian Regional Laboratory, had commitments to working on burning questions of school improvement bearing on poor and minority children.

What happened after those years? The R&D programs funded by Federal agencies to work on inner city school challenges were revised out of existence after 1968. NIE virtually from its creation became, and I have had close and intimate association with it and done a lot of work under its auspices, became what I would call a hall of noisy and blowing crosswinds of political contention, and most of its staff, its civil service professionals, were composed of what I would call the least competent, most burnt-out of civil servants who were discarded by the U.S. Office of Education. There were important exceptions, of course.

By the close of the 1970s no one was watching NIE with any fascination anymore. Educational R&D had gone out of fashion within five years of NIE's formation. Intramural struggles were killing off the funding and there were deep struggles between those who wanted to fund the surviving labs and centers and those who wanted to put the dwindling Federal funds on other horses.

NIE did not after a time even have staff which could remember the history of ESEA. It could not recollect what the mission had been for the labs and centers. I would call it the onset of a kind of bureaucratic Alz[illegible]'s syndrome. The short-term memory storage of what had [illegible]learned from the 1960s disappeared by the time we went int[illegible]1980s.

Now, all of the [illegible]ponents of ESEA 1964 were revamped. The Congress did cling [illegible]them in the 1980s, but even Chapter I is a diluted, diverted, disappointing reduction in the focus on what I have called here inner city schools, inner city children. The Congress did resist comprehensive elimination of the Federal educational support enterprise

So much for history. We have learned how to do applied research and development. We have built up a body of knowledge in the 1970s. Educational researchers and developers learned a great deal about how to help practitioners and co-plan to work on inducing positive change.

The effective schools movement is simply one of the illustrations of the possibilities that came up from consolidating our learnings from the 1960s and trying to mount an implementation and demonstration work in the 1970s.

In the 1980s some kind of dismal break in continuity with that tradition came up. Most of the laboratories were proscribed in 1984 from even conducting, carrying out assistance to public school dis-

tricts and they were obliged to follow what OERI called in its euphemism "indirect service strategies." These strategies also prevented laboratories from carrying out necessary research.

This morning in the first panel there was a suggestion, for example, that perhaps we have enough knowledge on the shelf and what we need to do is help implement it nationwide and we have to have a network.

Well, I for one have to speak to the point that not even in physics have we completed the research agenda, and that is the oldest, hardest, most exact science we have.

We have to keep redoing research. We have to revisit even the most glorious accomplishments of some of our best city schools, and in my research experience that includes some of what Dr. Paul has been talking about here today.

We have to keep revisiting. We need new research. The idea that laboratories cannot carry it out, the idea that they would not carry it out, is preposterous.

Obviously they have to be obligated to collaborate more closely with the research and development centers, but they know how to do that. I am saying that I think in the new competition of labs and centers OERI ought to be constrained by the Congress from requiring certain kinds of operations to be conducted by laboratories instead of allowing them to design their missions and to fulfill the Congressional statement of their mission, which you, Mr. Chairman, enunciated this morning. Intrusion into their board membership, intrusion into their generation of funding, intrusion into how they carry out their services, seems to me to all be part of not believing that research and development knowledge applications can, in fact, help transform the dangerous state of learning opportunities for minority children.

I believe, in contrast, that the 1990s present an opportunity for the revival of the laboratories and the centers, which Congress in its wisdom established in the first place, and I hope that the constraints that come on this time will be constraints on the range of concerns of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement and not constraints placed on universities, R&D centers or laboratories.

[The prepared statement of Robert A. Dentler follows:]

IMPROVING AMERICA'S INNER CITY SCHOOLS THROUGH EDUCATIONAL R&D

By Robert A. Dentler
Professor of Sociology
University of Massachusetts at Boston

Prepared as testimony upon invitation
from the Honorable Major R. Owens, Chairperson,
Subcommittee on Select Education,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Hearing of September 14, 1989

IMPROVING AMERICA'S INNER CITY SCHOOLS THROUGH EDUCATIONAL R&D

INTRODUCTION

The thesis of this testimony is that America's inner city schools can be improved significantly through the design and implementation of certain kinds of federal investments in educational research and development. Inner city schools are not confined to the core of the nation's largest central cities but rather are schools based within metropolitan areas that host large numbers of students who are at risk of school failure and who have diminished life chances generally because they are, at one and the same time, badly served by their schools and come from low-income, ethnic minority households.

Improvements are desperately needed in, but are not limited to, school buildings, classrooms, and programs. They are also needed in family, peer, community, and mass media conditions which surround, penetrate, and shape school experiences. But the improvement of schools constitutes a point of policy departure of the highest priority. Sound pursuit of this goal will lead inevitably over time into issues of improving the life chances of inner city students in more comprehensive ways.

Educational research and development, or simply R&D, includes the full spectrum of research from basic inquiry into theories and

methods to highly applied evaluation and implementation research. It also includes the design of innovations, field-testing of alternative practices and materials, co-planning with practitioners, training and technical assistance, knowledge exchange and dissemination, the conduct of information networks and collaboratives, demonstration projects, and the overall production and distribution of knowledge products and services of value to practitioners, parents, and students.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Public schools were in physical and programmatic shambles at the close of World War II and this condition persisted into the early 1960s. Extreme shortages of teachers, extreme overcrowding, underfinancing of local systems, and a poverty of ideas about how to reform school practices mired in customs and materials from the 1920s, miseducated the Baby Boom generation in general and shortchanged most extremely a generation of Black and other minority children in the cities (Dentler, 1988). The National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA), passed in cold war response to the perceived threat of Sputnik, represented the first federal governmental effort to assist states and localities in improving schools since passage of vocational education legislation after World War I and some funding of school construction projects during the Great Depression.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 went far beyond the NDEA in magnitude of funding, scope of programs, and the targeting of greatest needs. It was intended to serve as the cornerstone of both the civil rights reform embodied in the Brown decision and the Civil Rights Act and the War on Poverty. Its aims and resources were also strongly correlated with parallel efforts mounted in housing, social security, labor, community development, criminal justice, and other fields.

Educational R&D was central to the explicit thrust of the ESEA and it was supported simultaneously by funding from the U.S. Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Research Division of the Social Security Administration, NIH, NSF, Labor, Agriculture, and even the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Among other R&D features of the ESEA, its Title IV called for the establishment and funding under the auspice of the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) of a nationwide network of regional educational laboratories and research centers. The formative notion about the labs was that they would function rather like the great atomic R&D labs at Argonne, Brookhaven, Oak Ridge, and so forth. The planners envisioned setting up from four to six of them initially, and each was to be funded federally at between $20 and $30 million a year when figured in 1988 dollars. The centers were to be based at universities. There were to be ten to twelve of them, each funded at $5 to $15 million a year in 1988 dollars. While school improvements of many kinds were to be invented and tested by the labs

and centers, moreover, all of them were to focus on improvements that would benefit the nation's most deprived students - the children of the poor and minorities.

The USOE was poorly equipped to implement the ESEA. A weak and politically cross-pressured agency, it was expected overnight to administer multibillion dollar investments with professional expertise and to do so as if 99 percent of the power in public schooling were not lodged in the states and the 16,000 or more local school districts. It botched the creation and administration of the Title IV labs and centers almost from the start in 1965. It created 20 rather than four to six labs and underfunded all of them accordingly. It tried to insist upon adherence to a growing variety of self-devised guidelines governing structure, auspice, program aims and practices, at the same time it called for regional and local variations. It did not make sure that labs and centers concentrated on school improvements that would benefit poor and minority children. And, it presumed increasingly to tell labs and centers what kinds of activities it wanted to see carried out. In short, the USOE underfunded, overcontrolled, and misunderstood the very organizations it was directed by the Congress to support.

The tremendous potentiality of the labs and centers for stimulating and guiding school improvement was nevertheless established in the first years, those from 1965 through 1968. That value was manifested fully in the original labs, ranging from the

Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory (SWRL) in Inglewood and LosAlamitos, California, to the Center for Urban Education (CUE) in New York City. CUE began in 1965 as a consortium of eight colleges and universities devoted to identifying and developing solutions to the learning needs of Black and Puerto Rican students in the Tri-State Metropolitan Area.

Its 1967 budget included $6.1 million from USOE, about $3.4 million from state and local agencies, and another $1 from foundations and other sources, for a total of about $10.1 million a year expressed in 1988 dollars.

CUE recruited a full-time staff of about 80 professional educators and social scientists and about 40 support staff. Over a nine year period, they collaborated with nearly 400 faculty from the founding colleges who served as part-time consultants on projects. The R&D specialities of CUE included school desegregation, community participation and control, early childhood program development, Spanish bilingual instruction, social studies curriculum reform, community learning centers for neighborhood leaders in three low-income areas of New York City, survey research, and program evaluation research.

CUE also published two journals, one with a circulation of more than 15,000 in the metro area alone; developed and made widely available the books and services of a world-class library on urban education and urban life; produced and distributed educational and

training films; and conducted demonstration projects in hundreds of classrooms in early reading, mathematics, and science education. It also pioneered in planning for educational parks, magnet schools, and industry-school collaboration through career education programs. CUE also collaborated vigorously with ERIC and with those labs and centers whose programs augmented their own.

Political scientist Gary Orfield has dated the end of federally funded investments in the civil rights revolution and anti-poverty programs as coterminous with the advent of the political backlash that followed the burning of Watts. As this backlash contributed to the electoral victory of Richard Nixon over Hubert Humphrey, it extended deep into the efforts of the Nixon Administration to reduce those investments and dismantle those programs. The first few years of work of the labs and cent had accomplished tremendous progress into infant development, preschool education, learning styles, curriculum reform, bilingual instruction, vocational and career education, racial and ethnic equity reforms, instructional improvement, and improved technologies and materials. Under Nixon, the concern of the labs and centers with enhancing the learning opportunities of minority and poor children began to dissipate. The top leadership of the labs, with few exceptions, grew cautious and conservative and set forth programs that were distinguished only for their timidity or lowness of profile. Labs that did not follow this course and those who grew confused amidst the swirl of conflicting directives from USOE

were terminated ruthlessly and mindlessly between 1969 and 1973. Funding shrunk but the dollars were distributed among fewer units.

In the two decades since 1969, the R&D programs funded by federal agencies to work on inner city schoo' challenges have been shrunk, twisted, and revised out of existence. Substantial progress was made in the mid-1970s on conceptualizing how to disseminate new knowledge, how to plan and stimulate positive change in schools, and how best to link R&D with practice (Louis and Dentler, 1988). There were also a few programs mounted by the National Institute of Education that made memorable and enduring contributions to school improvement in these and other respects. In general, however, the periods from 1969 to 1976 and from 1981 to 1988 were periods of loss of resources, withdrawal and transfer of talent, and a paralysis of the educational research imagination. Federal disinvestments were also reinforced by trends in public education, where enrollment declines and tax ceilings combined to virtually decimate teacher education and colleges of education nationwide.

The Congress resisted the comprehensive dismantling of the federal educational support enterprise in the 1980s. It kept alive many of the labs and centers which had survived the 1970s in however diminished a form, although SWRL, located in the backyard of Congressman Augustus F.Hawkins, was the last of the original labs to lose its federal lab contract as recently as 1984. It lives on through its work in equity assistance, drug education, and other services,

however. As federal contributions declined in the 1980s, public interest in school improvement intensified. Between 1983 and 1985 some thirty national reports and some 300 state and local policy plans on school reforms were published. Public school conditions were becoming as deplorable as they had been in 1946 and 1958. The Secretariat of the U.S. Department of Education and the leadership of its Office of Educational Research and Improvement contributed to the outpouring of rhetoric about reform, but talent and expertise were lacking and the voices of reaction and know-nothingism toward educational R&D came to dominate within the department. Many federal officials after 1984 knew very little about the new R&D and cared even less. They took the nation backwards in time to a period of dogma, nostrums, and declaratory sentences about teaching and learning. Governors, state legislatures, and local school boards, meanwhile, called for reforms that often did not assist inner city students and sometimes added to their woes. The college-going rates of Black students plummeted after great gains in the years from 1967 through 1979. And, as another indicator of new setbacks, Black teacher production in the Deep South became a tragic trickle of graduates.

THE INNER CITY SCHOOL CHALLENGE IN THE 1990s

Black American, Hispanic American, and Asian American students will become statistical majorities in many of the nation's largest metropolitan area school districts during the 1990s. Not only will their numbers and relative proportions increase greatly as their younger households come to maturity, but their needs for housing, health care, day care, health services, public safety, and job opportunities will escalate substantially.

Many of those needs are closely similar to what they were in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, but some will become more complex as well as more pressing and critical in the decade ahead. School improvement in the inner city will therefore not turn on whether more and better mathematics and science instruction are required of high school students, worthwhile as this will become for many other reasons. It will turn instead on the extent to which inner city schools get better at doing what they do now and on the extent to which they incorporate new programs and services.

Inner city schools will have to become teaching and learning environments of a radically different sort from what they are today. They will have to become centers for child care on an extended day schedule, for example, or they have to be linked effectively with such centers as they multiply in locations close to work and home. Schools will have to become community centers at the middle and high school

levels. Outside work opportunities for students, moreover, will need to be generated by and guided and coordinated with curricular programs so that poor and minority students are neither denied work nor exploited and brain-dulled by out-of-school work in meaningless and robotic jobs. Inner city schools also need alcohol and drug education programs of high quality and great scope as well as tremendously improved counseling, social work, and referral assistance for the treatment of developmental problems. They will also need good sex education and parent education programs, family mediation services, and youth advocacy and abuse prevention services. These are all needs that must be added on to the standing list of well built, well maintained, and well equipped facilities, good faculties, good administrative leadership, and good cocurricular programs, of course. Other inner city agencies and institutions can and should share in providing all of these services, of course, but public schools are more numerous, closer at hand, more amenable to community participation, and more vital for children than most other agencies.

What can educational R&D contribute to meeting this formidable challenge ? It cannot provide direct programs or services, of course, except in instances of field and demonstration experiments, but it can make a crucial difference nonetheless: It can marshall and transfer older knowledge from research shelves to locations of practice. It can identify and prioritize needs and evaluate existing programs. It can collaborate closely with others to design new approaches and to select

from among them the best innovations for the future. It can observe, listen to, measure, and analyse the growth and behavior of teachers and learners and thus replace stereotypes and other forms of conventional ignorance with new understandings of what can be accomplished within and around public schools. And of course it can develop new techniques and materials and field-test them in collaboration with practitioners. R&D is also essential for the provision of information to policy makers about the conditions under which the various levels of government can mandate effective, positive changes.

These knowledge-building and exchanging activities must go on continuously. Old knowledge should be disseminated and put to use but new knowledge about changing times and students must be generated as well. Federal funding and leadership are essential, moreover, if the advantages of knowledge for the information rich are to be offset by particularly affirmative attention to the needs of the information poor.

SOME POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The educational R&D needs of the 1960s required, according to the best estimators of those years, an annual investment of at least one percent of the national annual expenditure in education. If we limit our concern to the approximately $21 billion a year currently expended

on education from federal government accounts, then the federal educational R&D outlay ought to be at least $210 million a year rather than the $124 million expended in 1988. Given years of underfunding and the resulting need for reconstruction of the R&D enterprise, a budget for OERI alone of $300 million would represent a minimum.

The centers and labs are gravely underfunded at present, whether we use the standard of what their funding was in 1967 as expressed in 1988 dollars or the standard of what it was ten years later in 1977. The average center grant in 1980 was for about $1.5 million a year, in contrast to about $1 million a year in 1989. Using the vision of the Congress in 1965 as a standard, labs in the 1990s should be funded at an average of about $20 million a year and centers at about $4 million a year.

Congress should establish as federal policy the number of labs and centers it wishes to fund during the 1990s. This number has been one of the setpieces of politicalization of federally sponsored educational R&D ever since 1970, concurrent with the periodic issue of designated missions. OERI has been preparing diligently during this year, for example, to change the numbers of centers, their levels of funding, and their missions for the grant competition in 1990, even though the network was turned on its ear, redefined, and twisted about and then underfunded as recently as 1985. R&D requires concentration of talent; it takes time to do well; and it cannot be well done on a politically jerky, fragmented basis.

There should not be some one, two, or three labs and centers funded to work on inner city school improvement. Indeed, the notion that there should be one center devoted to research on inner city education ignores the scale of the challenge, constrains resource allocations appropriate to that scale, and fails to stress the many ways in which all labs and centers located in regions with significant numbers of poor and minority students ought to give work on the needs of those students first priority. And a subset of labs and centers, a sizeable subset, ought to be expected to devote most of their resources to collaborative work on this challenge.

Brenda Turnbull (989) has surveyed the variety of approaches now in use in technical assistance and service centers receiving federal funds. She has noted that there are many effective strategies available for conducting this work and that there is no dectectable comparative desirability to be attributed to the "indirect service strategy" assigned by OERI to all of the regional labs in 1984. In this and related respects, federally funded labs should be liberated from OERI dicta about how to conduct their work. They must not be directed to function as the well-tamed lap dogs of state education agencies, some of which have much to offer inner city schools but many of which are either entangled in regulatory work, starved half to death, or intellectually asleep at the switch (Dentler, 1984).

Labs should not, contrary to the Laboratory Review Panel report to OERI (1989), be restrained from seeking non-federal funds

to carry on their work. Labs need a variety of enterprises, a variety of sponsoring sources, and a context of federal facilitation which will lead highly qualified, productive, and imaginative researchers and developers to want to continue to work in them during the challenging 1990s. Labs should not be controlled from OERI in the way regional post offices are controlled by the Postmaster General.

If labs and centers are to become free to focus firmly on improving the equity and quality of public schools for inner city students during the 1990s, Congress should insist upon an OERI which fosters such freedom. Obviously, the R&D community will need to meet a rigorous standard of performance accountability in response to such sponsorship. They should not be evaluated on the basis of how many state agencies they assist,however, or how many students are enrolled in their regions, and above all they should not be appraised in terms of how much they have helped students in the short run. These are standards appropriate to service delivery agencies but they have often been misapplied to centers and labs by USOE staff and others who are not themselves experienced in doing R&D. Different kinds of R&D activities and strategies call for diverse standards. These should be co-developed between lab and center professionals and independent evaluators funded from a five or six percent annual portion of each organization's federal contract. An additional relevant standard for appraising the quality of lab and center work might be the extent to which effective networking and collaboration has been achieved between

organizations working on overlapping missions.

When it comes to improving the connection between R&D and school practices, some planners and policy makers have advocated for the adoption of the agricultural extension agent model. There certainly need to be linking agents and they can be housed in universities, colleges, and a variety of other organizations in addition to labs and centers. The inner city school situation does not have a good fit to the extension agent model in several respects, however. The rural agents were basing their work on a quite unified combination of applied sciences, all targeted at a functionally homogeneous set of users - farmers, agribusiness merchants, and rural community officials. Only the terain, climate, crops, and technologies varied greatly from region to region, but the activity systems were the same. The entire arrangement was supported, moreover, by large and powerful land grant universities.

Inner cities, in contrast host extremely heterogeneous prospective users : parents, teachers, businesses, cultural agencies. and local and county government agencies of a great variety, to mention just a few. The science. that should apply to educational R&D are far less unified. And. urban campuses are often low on funding and not profoundly tied to their local constituencies. In spite of these limitations, the urban extension agent approach deserves to be tried experimentally. It has been discussed for twenty years; it has many parallels in educational dissemination work; and it could be fitted

into a number of the centers and labs with relative ease.

There is nothing intrinsically faulty with educational R&D itself as a set of science-based, organizational activities, nor with federal investments in such R&D. We have not limped through nearly twenty years of bleak and contradictory results because of flaws in either of these enterprises. The fault lies in the nature of the "non-system" which characterizes both the governance and the levels of American education. School practices grew up out of a pre-scientific era and they evolved in order to serve, with some occasional exciting exceptions, the interests of dominant social classes and ethnic groups. They did not begin to turn toward science to any serious extent until after World War II. By that time, the federal role in the intergovernmental partnership that guides the "non-system" was limited to a few major, noble interventions, no more.

Something very like the labs and centers had to be devised, along with many other investments and enterprises, in order to make the ESEA capable of deep, extensive, and long-lasting contributions. The challenge of the 1990s in the inner cities will be so great that new federal investments will have to be made, and there is no reason why we cannot build on what was accomplished in those few years during the 1960s and in the selection of worthwhile knowledge projects since. In order to accomplish this reconstruction, the resources and technical autonomy of educational R&D specialists must be greater by far than they have been for two decades. And, the federal agency that

manages their funding and accounts for them to the Congress must be competent and qualified to do the job. With extremely few exceptions, those able to manage educational R&D at the federal level were "drained out of the swamp" of Washington, to use the phrase President Ronald Reagan used eight years ago.

An advisory board for the OERI commissioned to depoliticize its activities is an excellent idea, but it is less urgently needed than is restaffing of the civil service complement of professionals who have earned familiarity with educational R&D - particularly with work on issues of equity and school improvement.

OERI should also formulate a mission statement for labs and centers which gives first priority to the principle of fostering socioeconomic, racial and ethnic, lingual, gender, and other forms of educational equity. Lip service to the idea of equal opportunity does not go far enough in this respect. The equity principle, moreover, should precede the part of the mission statement which formulates the quest for educational excellence.

Finally, in order to implement these principles, labs, centers, universities, and assistance centers should be liberated from the shackles of operating guidelines which have been fashioned by the NIE and then the OERI over the last seventeen years. Some centers may concentrate for a time on dissemination or demonstration activities, for example, while some labs may engage in long-term, applied research. Full-range, intellectually bold and autonomous labs and

centers are what are needed most to attack inner city school problems with the tools available to the applied sciences. The notion that OERI should or even can effectively dictate what tools should be used where and in what ways, that it should set the topical agenda for centers, is part of what has sapped the original efficacy of the vision of the ESEA.

REFERENCES

Dentler, Robert A. "The Education of the Baby Boom Generation," in Ronald G. Corwin, ed. RESEARCH IN SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION AND SOCIALIZATION, Volume 7, OUT OF SCHOOL, Greenwich, CT : JAI Press. 1988.

Dentler, Robert A. "Ambiguities in State-Local Relations," EDUCATION AND URBAN SOCIETY, Vol. 16, 1984, 145-164.

Louis, Karen S. and R.A. Dentler, "Knowledge Use and School Improvement," CURRICULUM INQUIRY, Vol. 18, No. 1, 1988, 33-62.

"Report of the Laboratory Review Panel on the Pending Laboratory Recompetition," OERI, April 28, 1989.

Turnbull, Brenda, "A Comparison of Service Modes in the Department of Education's Technical Assistance Programs," Washington, D.C. : Policy Studies Associates, April 1989.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. Again, you have presented us with some very rich testimony. You have been patiently waiting for a long time, so I will not drag out my comments and questions for too long, but I do have quite a number here.

Starting with Dr. Hill, would you elaborate a little bit on "desperate situation versus serious situation?" Are Chicago public schools desperate or serious? When do you cross the line between being a serious problem and being in desperation?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, that is what you get for not writing out your testimony and speaking it live.

The difference I was trying to—the distinction I was trying to make was between a situation that cannot possibly be improved and one that is very, very serious but can be improved. The situation that we saw in the six cities we visited had started to be in the early 1970s very, very serious, but obviously there were resources and ideas available to start turning it around, and I would regard that to be the same in Chicago, very serious indeed but——

Chairman OWENS. There are no desperate situations?

Mr. HILL. By the definition I tried to give you just now, no. I do not think there is any hopeless situation. It is clear that even in the cities that have made the greatest progress that we visited, for example Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, the situation of the poorest minority children is still totally unsatisfactory. It is just getting better. It is getting better because people are regarding it to be the number one priority, and I believe that continual trial and effort and putting the whole community's effort into the problem instead of making it a bureaucratic problem is the key to solution everywhere, not just in Pittsburgh and Cincinnati but in Chicago and Los Angeles, as well.

Chairman OWENS. Are you confident that in these cities there is going to be a process of dissemination of the best that has been done with inner cities—a consolidation of the best—to guarantee that when two or three key people resign or go to better jobs or the superintendant leaves things are going to continue? Is it an institutionalization of a process of improvement?

Mr. HILL. I am not one hundred percent confident anywhere. I think that——

Chairman OWENS. I will settle for fifty-five or sixty percent.

Mr. HILL. I think that in every case the improvement efforts that we saw were the results of coalition efforts where lots of people with different points of view and interests managed to coordinate their efforts for the time being and the art of keeping one of these together is maintaining a coalition, making sure that people—the teachers' unions, the school board, the business community——

Chairman OWENS. Is there some force or entity there that is likely to maintain that coalition?

Mr. HILL. I would say the key is local leadership.

Chairman OWENS. You show no role particularly for state and Federal Government?

Mr. HILL. I believe that in the long run state and Federal resources as requested by the local coalition will be very important, but I do not think that a Federal programmatic overlay that tells people at the local level how to run their own improvement efforts is a good idea at all.

Chairman OWENS. What about a Federal overlay which would guarantee that the coalition stays in place?

Mr. HILL. I do not think that is possible. I think that it is possible to provide funding, to provide R&D, to document what has been tried in various places and how it failed and how places that tried one effort and abandoned it in favor or another did that so that other places can learn from them.

I think all of those things are possible with Federal money, but ultimately the maintenance of a local coalition is a local problem and my only hope, which is a very strong hope, in fact, is that local civic and business leaders as well as education leaders like Dr. Powell understand that they need one another badly enough that they will not let their coalitions fly apart, and basically that nobody can afford to have this fail.

As Mr. Pepper of Proctor and Gamble in Cincinnati said, "We have to keep trying this because we have no alternative."

The understanding of that is the key to the beginning of improvement. I do not think that the civic and business leaders in every city have understood that vividly enough yet, but they have in some.

Chairman OWENS. Dr. Powell, continuing in the same vein, there is almost no experiment that has not been tried already in the area of educational improvement. I will not say that—there are a large number that have been tried already if you go back and review the history of projects and programs.

Some of the newest and brightest ideas that are being proposed—if you search around you will find that they have been tried somewhere in a school system in America.

From the time I came to New York City in 1958 to the present, I have seen all kinds of glowing experiments and programs that succeeded and then they disappear. For some reason they never get expanded to the whole city and then they just go out of business completely. I could cite a number of great programs.

A few of them I have investigated and I have found that the individuals responsible got promoted or the superintendant who came in did not like it, or the city fiscal situation was such that they pressured people to take care of traditional, routine, regular things instead of putting any money into special things.

Are we likely to have that in a place like Cincinnati? If you were promoted and wanted to move on, would that process of improvement stay in place? Your Comprehensive Collaborative—is there strength there or reasons to believe that the process would go on without you and that people are so enlightened now that they understand the necessity of maintaining the process no matter what happens?

Or the "I Have a Dream" approach that puts a significant adult—tries to put a significant adult—in the life of every kid? That is being tried widely now—not so widely, but in a number of places it is spreading.

Mr. Ballenger, who is a businessman, noted before that from selfish interest they do it, but the interest of the businessmen may change in two or three years. They may have a full employment situation or the plants may move to Korea and the businessmen

suddenly no longer are concerned because they do not have an employment problem.

So what I am really trying to get at, is there a Federal role somewhere in trying to sustain these things or create a set of conditions which nurtures continued improvement? Are there ways to isolate those components which have been of help to guarantee that the process goes on, no particular or special individual program, but a process of improvement keeps going? That is a long question.

Ms. POWELL. I think I have the essence of your question. I would have to concur with Dr. Hill that as it relates to collaboratives that are established in various communities it is so localized that the collaborative itself has to determine how it will perpetuate itself if the key characters on the scene currently were to be replaced.

In Cincinnati we have done that. We are planning for change, so that the people who make up the collaborative are identified not by virtue of their own personality but by virtue of the position that they represent, so that if there has to be a member of the city council to bring the city government into play, then it will be a city council member. Now, a person happens to represent the city council at a given time, but that person can be exchanged.

The same thing would be true if it were——

Chairman OWENS. So some of this is institutionalized. The seats that are filled by entities within the community?

Ms. POWELL. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. Not just individuals who volunteer?

Ms. POWELL. That is right. It is by position. A person who is head of the private industry council, for example, is a member, not because of who she is but because of her role in the community, so it is identified by roles.

I think where we are most vulnerable is at the level where we have the business component. Right now the chief CEO is John Pepper, but we are already planning now for John Pepper's removal from that role two years down the road, and we are trying to identify and groom or get enough interest in the corporate community that there will be someone ready to step in with the same commitment and vigor that he has brought to it.

That way we get broader community confidence, so that the collaborative does not become a collection of personalities, but it becomes a force that is coming together to make a change in the lives of children, and that way we feel that we are able to establish and maintain credibility for our goals and objectives.

Chairman OWENS. Is there any incentive from government or support from government or reward from government which will help to encourage that collaborative to stay together?

Ms. POWELL. Sure. I think there are rewards from government in two ways. One is through responses to collaboratives that seek to influence the Federal Government in its responses to educational needs, and then the other is a recognition that this is a viable way to do business.

Chairman OWENS. So you are confident that the continuity will go—will be—there is a good chance to keep continuing? The experiment, the support, the commitment will be going on even if you should decide tomorrow that you want to become commissioner of education of the whole country?

Ms. POWELL. There is a good chance. We are planning for that—not that I will become commissioner of education, but we are planning for change.

[Laughter.]

Chairman OWENS. I think you would be a great improvement.

The history that you gave, Mr. Dentler, was very useful. I have heard it in bits and pieces but I think you have summarized it in your testimony quite well.

Given that history and what you understand about it—how a set of political decisions ravaged the educational research and development effort—what would you propose to avoid that in the future?

More specifically, did you read the interim report of my subcommittee, the staff report that was done? I think you did. You referred to a couple of things which made me think you did.

Mr. DENTLER. Yes.

Chairman OWENS. We proposed certain structuring of OERI which would help to avoid that kind of political polarization in the future. I would like your comment on that.

We also made some proposals briefly—we intend to develop them further—on an approach which would seek to deal with the problem of dissemination, consolidation and institutionalization.

We propose that we take the example of American agriculture, which guaranteed a continuity and guaranteed that through Federal support the best research and development in agriculture was applied in our farms by going right down to the local level with a federally financed agent that was there to help stimulate that process. We wanted to see if a parallel was in order. I am going to ask the other two panelists to comment on this after you comment on it.

If not that, then what?

Mr. DENTLER. I was encouraged by the subcommittee's publication's focus on some aspects of OERI and its quest for some alternatives to the present circumstance.

I tried to suggest in my written testimony that I found the proposals concerning OERI were timid and respectful, excessively respectful for an agency whose leadership has invested in cultivating disbelief in the value of educational knowledge over the last decade, and especially over the last eight years.

We have to have done with that. We have got to take the one percent principle, investment principle, seriously if Cincinnati is going to be sustained, in my view, along with the other cities where there is hope.

The one percent investment estimate was carefully developed in the late 1960s and substantiated in the 1970s, and some of us have been waiting to see its advent ever since.

If we do not spend that much we cannot do it well and we are going to go under in competition with the Euro dollar and the Japanese anyway, so I would answer that it is time to ante up.

I look forward to an OERI that is not in control of that one percent. I would like to see it flowing out through a variety of other channels, as well. The Labor Department has a great tradition in this regard.

As for the extension model, I am intensely interested in dissemination. Research and design has been one of my concentrations for years.

In my written testimony I tried to point out some of the poorness of fit, places where the extension model does not apply to urban schools. I will not go over those for you because I am sure you are aware of them anyway.

I am terribly concerned that the production of black educators on public black campuses in the south has come to a halt, that if an extension agent program were going to start it would have to include an Alabama A&M, an Alabama State, a North Carolina A&T—in other words, these historic land grant bases would have to be involved. There are urban mission universities nowadays but they are land grant universities.

The whole state of Georgia, all of its institutions turned out in 1986 two hundred and seventy black teachers. There were more teacher recruiters from the north seeking out teachers in Georgia than there were graduates.

Chairman OWENS. That is one for every metropolitan area.

Mr. DENTLER. Right. At Alabama State University, where I have worked and consulted over the last six years, the education faculty is being decimated by new state policies preventing black students from having the opportunity to major in education and to begin to prepare to teach.

What I am getting at is that the extension agency idea could be outfitted, could work as a role universities could play that is vital in knowledge coordination and knowledge exchange, but there are some more fundamental things that would have to happen before that.

I do not want to see the extension program in Alabama located at Auburn University for the simple reason that they are not qualified professionally at that university or at the University of Alabama to dispense the information and to help coordinate the programs that would benefit minority children.

So there are deep policy issues that would hold this back that were not there in the farm case.

Nevertheless, parts of it would be worth experimenting with and investing in. The vision of the urban extension model is a vision whose time is overdue.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. Would either one of the other two like to comment on that particular question? Did you read our proposal for the revamping of OERI in terms of its policy making, how its policy making could be carried out with an advisory board, and also one proposal in terms of paralleling the agricultural extension program with district education agents to help with the process of dissemination and consolidation and institutionalization of the educational improvement process?

Mr. HILL. I do think the extension agent idea is a very good one. I think from my experience in the six studies I studied, however, that the amount of awareness of the relevant educational research in the central school board and particularly in the person of the superintendant—in San Diego Tom Paisant, and in Pittsburgh Richard Wallace, in Cincinnati Lee Etta Powell, in Atlanta Alonzo

Crimm—these people are very considerable scholars in their own right and they know the research.

It is important to understand that, although sometimes it is frustrating to see how little research gets used, on the other hand it is important to understand the quality of the people we have in some of the school systems and how well they know it.

So if we do have an extension agent model, I think this should be someone who works very closely with the school superintendant and the board, because the assets that already exist are very important.

One and a half points I would like to make about OERI. One, the unfortunate situation in the last few years that Dr. Dentler talked about is in large part from the point of view of an organizational analyst, as I am, the result of starvation.

Organizations collapse on themselves when their funding goes away. It is very hard for them to do much except the marginal little activities and otherwise try to survive, so that I am very optimistic that an OERI that is refunded and refloated can be an effective organization, but then I would make a recommendation about its mission.

In my view the problems of urban education, of big city education, are certainly not the only ones in America, but they vastly overshadow all the others.

From a demographic point of view, almost all of the additions to our labor force in the beginning of the next century are going to be black and hispanic children and about forty percent of all black children are in eleven central cities. Over fifty percent of all hispanic children are in five cities which overlap with the eleven.

We have a national problem, meaning we have a problem of national scope, but it is very localized. If you could turn around education in New York, in Los Angeles, in Chicago—I mean, that is not trivial, but if you could do it you would have a national impact of tremendous proportions.

In my view the purpose of the Department of Education ought to be to facilitate that. The purpose of OERI certainly should be to the degree that R&D is useful for the improvement of urban education, and I cannot guarantee to what degree but it is going to be to some degree.

That should be what OERI does. OERI might have to bow in the direction of a few other things, but if it only does that and succeeds it will be one of the most useful organizations in the Federal Government.

I hope that is its mission in the next five years.

Chairman OWENS. Thank you. Dr. Powell?

Ms. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would beg your indulgence just to speak a little bit further on the previous question, because I think I left it too optimistic in terms of the future of collaboratives.

I want to be more global, because as we look across the country in most instances in the cities they were funded through grants, some from Ford Foundation, some from the National Alliance of Business.

As those grants then are terminated, then the chance or the risk of them retaining is questionable, so we may have an aberration.

Again, this is why I said earlier that it would have been very, very desirable to have had an educational research organization such as OERI looking at these very carefully to determine, is there something of value here? What are they able to attain and is this something that the Federal Government then should have a role in perpetuating once the grant money is finally consumed? I would say that I have some doubts that they will all remain.

The other factor that is important here is the whole issue of governance of education. Who is in charge of education in America and how do these collaboratives interface with what should be occurring?

You know, if you read Dennis Doyle's book "Winning the Brain Race," you can see some threads of threats in there—you know, collaboratives are fine. In business you work with schools, but if schools do not measure up to what the external expectation is then there is a threat of a takeover.

I live in a community where we have seen mergers and buyouts, et cetera, and we say in our collaborative that it is not a merger and it is not a takeover, but it is a collaboration, but we have to work hard to make sure that it continues to be a collaboration.

I would say that even, in my own city, unless our school district shows significant, definitive progress in the children's attainment and reduction in the dropout rate, then the collaborative is not going to exist because the businesses and the other donors who provide money to maintain just the organizational structure of it will not continue to contribute.

Chairman OWENS. The point is well taken. Again, you have been an excellent panel. We were quite fortunate to have two excellent panels today. We have learned a great deal from your testimony.

I might want to submit some questions in writing to either one, or all three of you. We invite you to submit any reports or additional comments within the next ten days for the record. Thank you again for appearing.

The hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:16 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows.]

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SELECT EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Maria E. Torres-Guzman, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor for Bilingual/Bicultural Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
September 14, 1989

Chairman Owens and members of the Subcommittee, I would like to thank you for the invitation to provide comments on how research issues affecting minority children are consistently omitted for the nation's research agenda, and the consequences of such actions for the effective education of inner-city youth from racial and ethnolinguistic groups. Unfortunately, I was unable to appear before you due to illness. I was grateful for the opportunity to provide written comments.

My understanding of research and my evolving research perspective stem from both professional experiences and personal background. My longstanding professional interest and experiences have focused on the education of Latino youth, particularly in the areas of bilingual/bicultural education, culture and instruction, and community and parental involvement. This professional experience itself is embedded in my personal background as an inner-city

working class Latina growing up in Detroit, Michigan and in Puerto Rico.

As a child spoke only Spanish at home while facing an English-only environment at school. By age 11, upon my family's return to Puerto Rico, I was English-dominant and had to be reintegrated into a fully Spanish-speaking environment. The process was reversed when I migrated back, at the age of 19, to the United States. Both "entry" and "re-entry," with their requisite adaptations, were difficult adjustments. But these experiences, I believe, have strengthed my understanding of linguistic, cultural, and socio-economic issues in education.

I have a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from Stanford University and was formerly a Title VII Bilingual/Bicultural Education Fellow. I have been directly involved in work with Latinos in education in Michigan, California, Texas, Massachusetts, Illinois, Ohio, and New York. I have been involved in two research projects funded by the National Institute of Education; one on parent involvement and bilingual/bicultural education with the Institute of Finance and Governance, Stanford University, and the other on teacher reflective thinking with the Teacher Development and Organizational Change Project at the Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University. I am presently the Director of the Program in Bilingual/Bicultural Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, and have recently completed an ethnographic

study on an alternative high school for Latino youth in New York City, funded by the Hispanic Policy Development Project, which in turn is a Carnegie-funded organization.

I would like to address the agenda of the hearing by focusing on two main topics: the definition of the population under study and the definition of the socio-cultural context of education.

Definition of the population. In the development of policy and implementation of programs, ill-conceived definitions of the populations and their educational needs have often resulted in ineffective responses.

In recent years, policy-makers, educators, and educational researchers have echoed the Reagan and Bush administrations' labeling of the population as "disadvantaged." The following are a few examples of the widespead use of this label.

> .One of the featured articles in the June-July 1989 Educational Researcher, a bimonthly publication of the American Education Research Association, was entitled "The Changing Nature of the Disadvantaged Population: Current Dimensions and Future Trends."
>
> .The title of the center first page article in the August 2, 1989 issue of Education Week by William Snider was "Voucher Plan for Disadvantaged Pursued in Kansas City Lawsuit."
>
> .The Office of Educational Research Improvement has recently funded a Center on the Study of the Education of the Disadvantaged Student.

Not too long ago the term disadvantaged was practically interchangeable with "culturally deprived." Both labels were widely applied to populations of students who were underachieving and failing to finish school. The

"disadvantaged" student lived in poverty and came from one of the following racial and ethnic groups: Blacks, Latinos, Native-Americans, and Asian-Americans. Invidious comparisons with the White middle-class led to the assumption that the disadvantaged student had no culture worth validating and preserving; thus, the term "culturally deprived." By design, the educational interventions sought to eradicate these "worthless" cultures and to superimpose a White middle-class one. In reality, however, these efforts resulted in stigmatizing students and did little to change the educational outcomes.

In a recent study, Pallas, Natrielo, and McGill (1989) identify five indicators associated with being disadvantaged:

(1) minority racial/ethnic group identity,

(2) living in a poverty household,

(3) living in a single-parent family,

(4) having a poorly educated mother, and

(5) having a non-English language background.

While the above authors do not equate the terms disadvantaged and culturally deprived, the conception of the population still leaves room for confusing the two. The danger is that the perception of the populations as "disadvantaged" rather than as distinct cultural groups with specific needs will revive the cultural deprivation mentality. Subsequent delineation of the educational problems will remain faulty and incomplete.

There is also a conceptual and methodological problem with the term "disadvantaged." A generic label obscures the differences between groups and specific needs become invisible. Let me illustrate this with an example of an evaluation of the Drop-out Prevention Programs in an urban setting on the East Coast. During the first year, the evaluation team completed a description of the population. They identified 53% of the drop-out population as speakers of other than English at home. While this was, in my estimation, an important finding that emerged from the dataset at their disposal, further analysis in this and subsequent reports failed to disaggregated the data to probe exactly how speaking a language other than English at home was associated with the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of drop-out prevention strategies. Drop-outs were conceptualized as a homogeneous population under the assumption that school leavers behave in a certain way and that these behaviors mean the same thing for all the sub-groups under study.

A recent study by Fernandez & Shu (1988) shows the advantage of starting from the assumption that the drop-out population is heterogeneous. The authors analyzed disaggregated data from the larger High School & Beyond dataset in order to examine how dropping-out behaviors differ among sub-groups of Latinos. They found that the descriptors of the school leavers commonly reflected in the literature are insufficient explanations for the Latino who

drops out of school. They concluded that the reasons for dropping-out among Latinos are possibly very different from those of other groups.

Failure to acknowledge the differences among groups can exacerbate tensions in how they approach educational reforms. I was a signatory to an intervention suit filed in the Bradley vs. Milliken case in Detroit and the chief evaluator for the Lorain, Ohio City Schools desegregation order, which looked at the issues facing Latino children. In the first case Blacks predominated and in the second the largest group affected was Latino. But in both cases tensions emerged between Black and Latino community leaders because each felt their efforts were being undermined. Each group was advocating an educational response that was different because their concept of the population differed: Blacks emphasized integration as a solution to problems of equal access and treatment while Latinos stressed the need for a critical mass to establish special language programs. Recognizing that the "disadvantaged" population is heterogeneous is a necessary first step in addressing their needs.

Definition of Socio-cultural Context. Schools are social institutions that reflect the values and goals of our society. As such they can be studied as social sites. But schools also constitute environments of their own. Educational research needs to analyze what happens at both

levels, that is, to identify the community of learners and the particular learning environment.

Federally funded research on the needs of ethnolinguistic student populations has been limited and ill-conceived. Much of the research affecting the Latino population, for example, has taken the form of large scale quantitative studies that are designed to meet the concerns of federal policy makers and their perceptions of what may be problematic. For example, funds have been allocated to find out whether bilingual education "works." Very few studies, if any, have responded to issues of concern to the populations being served. For example, what role do language and culture play in different bilingual education settings? How can school learning environments be organized to promote diversity? How can teachers, counselors, and administrators from various backgrounds be prepared to work in multicultural environments? How is good teaching defined in different cultural settings?

These questions are key to improving instruction and schooling for racial and ethnic inner-city youth. While the convensional wisdom asserts that "good teaching is good teaching," this is not always the case. For example, at the Kamehameha School in Hawaii a team of researchers and educators found that the reading scores of the Hawaiian students improved when the reading instruction was organized around "talkstory," a linguistic event of importance in the Hawaiian culture. The Kamehameha Reading Program

exemplifies how learning can be enhanced by culturally relevant instruction. Despite this success, however, when others tried to superimpose the model in a different multicultural context, it failed to produce similar results.

Researchers involved in these educational interventions have concluded that teaching and learning cannot be studied in the abstract. As Au (1989) points out, "Teaching is good within a particular context and with reference to a community of learners." If we start from this premise, the kind of research needed to best address the educational needs of inner-city youth is very different from what has occurred in the past or what is being proposed by the center on the study of the disadvantaged student. The educational concerns of ethnolinguistic groups are unlikely to be addressed in any depth by this center. Also the creation of the center, which coincided with the closing of the Center for Language Education and Research (CLEAR), reverses a trend to focus concerted attention on these issues. By eliminating CLEAR, the federal government has eliminated its only mechanism to develop and pursue a research agenda on the relationship between language and cultural diversity and learning.

Mr. Chairman, it would be important for this Subcommittee to monitor the focus of the new center to ensure that relevant distinctions between groups are made and all groups are adequately served. In addition, the

decision to discontinue a research center on language and culture should be seriously reconsidered.

References Cited

Au, K. (1988). Comments of Respondents. In Nelson-Barber, S. (Ed.) "Thinking Out Loud." Proceeding of the Teacher Assessment Project Forum on Equity in Teacher Assessment (pp. 28-30). Stanford, California: Teacher Assessment Project, Stanford University.

Fernandez, R. R. & Shu, G. (1988). School Dropouts: New Approaches to an Enduring Problem, Education & Urban Society, 20: 363-386.

Pallas, A. M., Natriello, G., & McDill, E. L. (1989). The Changing Nature of the Disadvantaged Population: Current Dimensions and Future Trends. Educational Researcher, 18: 16-22.