DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 263 UD 030 177

AUTHOR Burnett, Gary; And Others
TITLE The Unfulfilled Mission of Title 1/Chapter 1 Programs. Urban Diversity Series No. 105.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jul 94
CONTRACT RR93002016
NOTE 70p.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Clearinghouse Products (071)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Basic Skills; *Compensatory Education; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Change; Educational Equity (Finance); Educational History; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Government; Government Role; *High Risk Students; Local Government; Minority Groups; Models; National Programs; Poverty; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Resource Allocation; State Government; Supplementary Education; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Hawkins Stafford Act 1988

ABSTRACT

Critics of the Federal Title I and Chapter 1 compensatory education programs to increase the academic skills of disadvantaged children suggest that the return for the Federal investment has been small and that designers have not created programs that work. When the compensatory education programs were conceived, their promise was immense. During its 30-year history, the Federal initiative has been affected by regulatory structures and by demographic and educational changes in the nation. Although program goals were fairly clear, the program has become increasingly intricate and often confusing. Particular aspects of pull-out, add-on, in-class programs, and schoolwide projects are examined, along with program impacts on curriculum and instruction, parent participation, teacher education, and the education of minority students. Suggestions for the improvement of the Title I and Chapter 1 programs center on restoring their original goals and returning to the idea of improving education to the point at which compensatory programs are no longer needed at all. (Contains 66 references.) (SLD)

The Unfulfilled Mission Of Title I/Chapter 1 Programs

Gary Burnett, Erwin Flaxman, and Carol Ascher

ERIC®
Clearinghouse on Urban Education

THE UNFULFILLED MISSION OF TITLE I/CHAPTER 1 PROGRAMS

Gary Burnett, Erwin Flaxman,
and Carol Ascher
Teachers College, Columbia University

Urban Diversity Series No. 105
ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
July 1994

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Box 40, Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
212/678-3433
800/601-4868
212/678-4048

Director: Erwin Flaxman
Assistant Director: Larry R. Yates
Managing Editor: Wendy Schwartz

This publication was produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education, under contract number RR93002016, and from Teachers College, Columbia University. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

Copies are available from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Copies are also available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), 7420 Fullerton Road, Springfield, VA 22153, 1-800-443-ERIC, both on microfiche and paper. Contact the Clearinghouse or EDRS for full ordering information.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE UNFULFILLED MISSION OF TITLE I/CHAPTER 1 PROGRAMS

THE PROMISE OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

In an indictment of the failure of the Federal Title I and Chapter 1 compensatory education programs to increase the academic skills of disadvantaged children, Jendryka (1993) fired this sardonic salvo: "If Chapter 1 were a business, it would be in Chapter 11." The U.S., he went on to suggest, having spent $135 billion (in real 1992-93 dollars) to help disadvantaged children make and hold onto the academic gains they need for success in school, has "little to show for it" (p.77). But it is not only the students who have failed, he suggested: the designers also failed; they were unable to develop and implement a compensatory education program that works, and now have only bankrupt ideas.

This is a far cry from the promise of compensatory education in the 1960s and 1970s when Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 first provided Federal funds for the sole purpose of educating low achieving students in poverty schools throughout the Nation. Title I was the centerpiece of a panoply of Federal programs—Head Start, Upward Bound, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Manpower Development and Training, and Teacher Corps, to name a few—designed to improve the education and social opportunities of disadvantaged children and youth in the United States. When these programs were created, a bankruptcy of ideas was the last fear in anyone's mind.

The Title I/Chapter 1 Share in Compensatory Education

The purpose of the Federally-supported compensatory education program is deceptively simple. From its beginnings as Title I, the program was funded "to provide financial assistance to local education agencies servicing areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their education programs by various means...which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived students" (Public Law 89-10, cited in Commission on Chapter 1, 1992). The Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, which tried to radically rethink the Federal role in compensatory education, did not, in fact, substantially change any functions of the program designated in the original legislation, nor were they subsequently significantly altered by the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments to the reauthorization of the law in 1988.

Title I/Chapter 1, predicating a strong link between the economic status of the students attending a specific school and their achievement, deemed that funds should be allocated according to the average poverty level of a school's students, not according to the low achievement status of the students, since research has shown that the longer a child experienced family poverty, the greater the likelihood that he or she would fall behind in grade level (Kennedy, Jung, & Orland, 1986). Further, such students usually attend schools with high concentrations of other poor students, a condition that multiplies the deleterious impact of poverty on their academic achievement (Puma, Jones, Rock, & Fernandez, 1993). Much of the government's monitoring, and the accountability of the states and local educational agencies in implementing the program, then, has been to determine whether the money flows to schools designated as most needy. How the programs would function was left to the discretion of the local

and improve their educational programs by *various means*" (emphasis added; Public Law 89-10, cited in Commission on Chapter 1, 1992).

Compensatory Education Program Design

In 1970 Passow enumerated all the compensatory and other strategies that educators and policy makers believed necessary to change the lot of poor children in American schools. It is instructive to examine the various assumptions about students, curriculum and instruction, and schools to understand the share of Title I/Chapter 1 programs in the national effort—it cannot really be called a coherent strategy—to improve the education of poor children.

In reviewing these assumptions, Flaxman (1983) noted that from the start compensatory education had a broad mandate to achieve an acceptable distribution of educational outcomes to counter the influences causing different educational results for children from different social and cultural backgrounds. The mandate included:

- enrichment for children before they enter elementary school;
- remediation for students at risk of failure in elementary and secondary school;
- nondiscriminatory educational processes and school organization to ensure an equitable education for students of all races, social classes, and cultures;
- special language instruction for limited English speaking students; and
- the involvement of the parents of disadvantaged students, who were alien to and alienated from the schools.

Preschool

The preschool and early childhood programs, designed to prevent cognitive and social deficits in the young child, became the prevalent strategy to break the cycle of deprivation caused by growing up in a poor social environment. Thus, the Head Start and Follow Through programs were comprised of three basic models:

(1) a pre-academic or academic model that concentrated on teaching elementary language skills;

(2) a cognitive model for developing the child's learning readiness and problem-solving skills; and

(3) a conceptual/affective model aimed at developing the child's self-concept, attitudes, and other social and emotional characteristics, as well as cognitive development.

A number of preschool compensatory efforts were also direct interventions in the home or in experimental programs to alter the mother's childrearing practices. It was thought that by making the child's development more cognitively complex and socially and emotionally supportive, the programs could make the child ready to perform academically in the early elementary grades and, thus, could prevent later failure.

Instruction

Because educators and policy makers recognized that many children were coming to school unable to make continuous academic gains, programs were designed to augment what the students were already receiving. These remedial programs were less experimental and engendered fewer educational innovations than the preschool compensatory education programs. They had four basic goals:

(1) to ameliorate the academic problems leading to school failure in

the elementary grades, and subsequently to prevent school leaving in the secondary grades;

(2) to prepare promising youth for higher education through intensive instruction and extra financial resources;

(3) to provide vocational education and work experience to nonacademic students; and

(4) to offer "second chance" basic education and pre-employment programs to school dropouts and other poorly prepared older students.

Except for the precollege programs, most of these programs provided students with only basic skills instruction—colloquially dismissed as "skills and drills"—and tutoring, with little variation in instructional methods or classroom organization. Typically, however, the teacher-student ratio was kept lower in classrooms with low achieving disadvantaged students by employing teacher aides and specially trained professionals. In addition, teachers of these students were offered special staff development opportunities.

Some schools also altered their practices to provide a more equal education to disadvantaged children through heterogeneous groupings, limited tracking, mainstreaming of students considered learning disabled, the retraining of teachers of students with diverse learning styles, the development of culturally-specific curriculum materials, and alternatives to standardized intelligence tests. But most significantly, efforts were made to desegregate schools to achieve a better mix of students with respect to social class and race, because it was thought that many of the educational problems of the disadvantaged children stemmed from the social isolation of their early environment and schooling. School desegregation was a form of scholastic desegregation because it had been shown that racial minority, lower class, and possibly low achieving students could achieve better in mixed, heterogenous classrooms than they could in segregated classrooms.

Providing a more equitable education, then, became a way of ending a cycle of academic failure by changing the school environment which contributed to it.

Language Remediation

Many compensatory education programs provided special remedial language instruction for language minority students. The students, many of whom had limited English proficiency because they came from homes where English was not the first language, or were immigrants themselves, received special English instruction either within or outside their regular classes. Also, through transitional bilingual education, they could be partially instructed in their native language in the preschool and elementary grades, and could therefore reach a level of competence in their native language and subject matter before learning a second language. Eventually, instruction in the native language was to be phased and totally replaced with instruction in English. These interventions were considered compensatory rather than pluralistic, because their goal was to remediate language problems that interfered with and limited children's academic gains, not to maintain the child's language as a vehicle of instruction in a spirit of cultural diversity.

Parent Involvement

Finally, a compensatory strategy of many programs involved parents and the community in the schooling of their children. These programs had three basic purposes:

(1) to train parents to take an active role in their children's academic development, as did many preschool programs that worked with mothers to improve their childrearing practices, and to help them become their children's first teacher by reinforcing at home the skills taught in school;

(2) to give parents a shared role in planning and management decisions in the schools, frequently as a way of gaining their support for reforms; and

(3) to provide services and support to families (e.g., after-school programs for working parents, referrals to social services, and adult education), with the school building sometimes used as a community center.

Such efforts, it was believed, would help establish a better environment for the growing child, which in turn would bring about changes in the family to help resolve existing problems that affected the child's academic achievement and to prevent others from occurring.

THE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION CONTEXT

During its thirty-year history, Title I/ Chapter 1 has been affected both by distinct regulatory structures created by the Federal program itself and by a number of critical demographic and educational changes in the Nation. Regulatory structures critical to the operations of Title I/Chapter 1 programs, such as funding structures and systems of assessment and evaluation, evolved in response not only to the conditions of schools or the apparent educational needs of poor children, but to the changing political climate, Congressional pressures, and an entropy perpetuated by the levels of bureaucracy that administer the program. In addition, increased poverty and poverty concentration in many urban and rural areas (particularly among minorities), the worsening financial straits of schools and school districts, and evolving theories about how to educate children (especially new cognitive theories about learning styles) inevitably profoundly changed schooling and the requirements for compensatory education.

The Flow of Funds and Accountability in Chapter 1

Like its predecessor, Title I, Chapter 1 divides program responsibilities among the Federal government, state education agencies (SEAs) and local school districts (LEAs). The ***Federal government*** allocates funds to states, as well as establishes, interprets, and enforces requirements governing the use of Federal dollars. The ***states*** then distribute funds to school districts, approve local applications, monitor local projects for compliance, provide technical assistance, and run special state programs. Finally, ***school districts*** are responsible for designing and carrying out the Chapter 1 programs. In theory, this means that they have wide latitude to decide on grade levels, subject areas, kinds of services, teaching methods, classroom settings, and types of staff. However, as shall be shown below, due to funding and accountability requirements, there has been relatively

little variation or experimentation in Chapter 1 programming at the local level.

The funding of Chapter 1 has been based on both student poverty and low student achievement, with poverty the first to be considered in allocating funds. The procedures by which Federal funds are distributed are quite complex. Briefly, the Federal government allocates grants via the states to the county level, primarily using the number of poor school-age children (aged 5-17) from the last decennial census. To compensate for differences in the cost of education across states, county allocations are adjusted using average state per-pupil expenditures. States then sub-allocate these funds to school districts depending on rates of participation in the subsidized lunch program, and other proxy data to indicate the number of low-income families. Within districts, the formula combines measures of poverty and achievement.

Chapter 1 grants to local school districts (LEAs) have been allocated through two formulas: Basic Grants and Concentration Grants. Basic Grants, which have remained the same since the early 1970s, distribute roughly 89 percent of the funds, and are allocated in proportion to each county's share of the Nation's number of eligible children. (These children include those living in families below the poverty line, in families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children, in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, and in foster homes supported by public funds.) However, a hold-harmless provision guarantees that each county receives at least 85 percent of its preceding year's allocation, even if its population changes. In addition, the 1988 Amendments add a state minimum guarantee (Anderson, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

Concentration Grants, which were added in the 1978 Amendments, and which distribute the remaining 11 percent of Chapter 1 funds, provide

additional money to counties with very high numbers or percentages of poor children. Counties receive Concentration Grants when their population of eligible children exceeds either 6,500 children or 15 percent of children aged 5-17. Although there is a state minimum guarantee for Concentration Grants, there is no hold-harmless provision. Moreover, because these grants allocate so little of the Chapter 1 funds, they have had little influence on equalizing the funding available to students in districts with high poverty concentrations (Anderson, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1993). Not surprisingly, the recent spate of evaluations of Chapter 1 has prompted the recommendation that Concentration Grants be increased from 11 percent to 75 percent of all funding (Moskowitz, Stullich, & Deng, 1993).

Within a district, schools are eligible for Chapter 1 if their attendance area has a poverty rate that is relatively high for the district. To receive their Chapter 1 allocations from the state, school districts combine Basic and Concentration Grants. In general, districts select the schools that rank highest on measures of poverty, but the law allows several exceptions. These include a "grade span" option, by which districts can limit services to designated grades; a "no wide variance" option, by which districts can serve all schools if the range of poverty rates is narrow; and a "25 percent option," by which any attendance area where at least 25 percent of the children are from low-income families can be designated as eligible; and a "grandfather" option, by which districts can continue programs an additional year after schools become ineligible (U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

Within districts, funds are also allocated to eligible schools based on the number of low-achievers. Although rankings of schools by subsidized lunch participation generally corresponds to rankings by achievement, there are exceptions. For example, districts with large populations of illegal immigrants who are unlikely to apply for subsidized

lunch may nevertheless have high numbers of low achievers. Similarly, secondary school students are less likely than elementary school students to apply for subsidized lunches (U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

As Darling-Hammond (1993) pointed out, the elaborate funding mechanisms of Title I/Chapter 1 were intended to "level the playing field between the poor and the privileged..." Yet, despite some successes, the program has created "new problems and educational inequalities for the very schools and students Chapter 1 was designed to help" (p.v). At the funding level, these inequalities stem from two weaknesses: First, the current system of funding "serves as a disincentive to raising the performance of participants," since once test scores show improvements, funds are reallocated to students and schools with lower scores (Statement of the Independent Review Panel, 1993, p.7). For example, 13 percent of elementary school principals in an analysis by Millsap, Moss, and Gamse (1993) reported that their Chapter 1 program had lost some funding as a result of improved performance.

The second weakness is that money is both spread too widely and allocated to too few high poverty, and too many affluent counties, districts, and schools. Currently, Chapter 1 funds go to almost all counties, to 93 percent of all school districts, and to 71 percent of all public elementary schools (Moskowitz et al., 1993). Moreover, a U.S. Department of Education study found that the riches counties were receiving a disproportionately high share of funding. Counting differently, Anderson (1992) argued that "the least poor districts—those in which no more than 1 in 10 students is eligible for special lunch—account for 19 percent of all the public school districts which receive Chapter 1 funds" (p.i). In fact, while school districts receive larger amounts of Chapter 1 funding as their numbers of low-income students increase, districts with high concentrations of low-income students do not receive larger allocations per poor pupil despite Concentration Grants (Rotberg & Harvey, 1993; U.S. Department

of Education, 1993). Moreover, in schools where more than 75 percent of students are eligible for subsidized school lunches, one-third of the eligible children do not receive Chapter 1 services (Moskowitz et al., 1993). As Moskowitz and his colleagues argued, "Spreading Chapter 1 resources across the vast majority of school systems and schools diffuses the program's potential impact and limits its capacity to concentrate resources on the neediest schools" (1993, p.ix).

Chapter 1 and the Financial Conditions of Children and Schools

The financial assistance provided to schools by Chapter 1 cannot be separated from either the growing rate of poverty and poverty concentration among children in the U.S., or from the worsening financial straits of public schools in urban districts with great tax burdens or in districts with low property taxes. During the last decade, as poverty has increased among America's children, the schools serving high concentrations of low-income students have also experienced the greatest financial troubles.

In the last decade the growth of poverty among students has been enormous. The proportion of high poverty Chapter 1 schools doubled between 1985/86 and 1991/92 (Millsap et al., 1993). Such mushrooming poverty has had a noticeable effect on school environments: principals and teachers report increased vandalism and theft, more physical fighting, and increased displays of disrespect for teachers in Chapter 1 schools over this period. Moreover, there are significant differences between high and low poverty schools. For example, student absenteeism and mobility are a serious problem in high poverty schools, but only rarely a problem in low poverty schools (Chambers, Parrish, Goertz, Marder, & Padilla, 1993). Not surprisingly, teacher mobility is also much more a problem in high poverty than in low poverty schools (Millsap, Moss et al., 1993).

Unfortunately, the program has not kept pace with the growing needs of either poor students or under-resourced schools—despite current law, which requires that Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 schools within the same district receive comparable district resources before Chapter 1 funds are added. True, recent analyses suggest that within districts equity is achieved on such aspects of educational programming as cost per student, number of staff, average class size, teaching experience of teachers, and availability of instructional materials; however, comparability has not been achieved between districts as a whole, or between high poverty schools in high and low revenue districts. To take just one example, despite added personnel in the highest poverty schools, there are s ll 37 students per full-time-equivalent instructor in the highest poverty schools compared with 24 in the lowest poverty schools, and high poverty schools rely on instructional aides more than do low poverty schools (Millsap et al., 1993). This may be partly due to the fact that cost-adjusted Chapter 1 personnel expenditures are lowest in the high poverty schools in low revenue districts—that is, exactly those schools with the greatest need (Chambers et al., 1993). Thus "low-income children often face a double handicap: They have greater needs than more affluent children, yet they attend schools with substantially fewer resources" (Rotberg & Harvey, 1993, p.ix).

However, in high poverty, low revenue districts, even when Chapter 1 money is used to fund personnel at the same level as high-revenue districts, funds may not be available to provide other services vital to student improvement. This is not only because the districts' own resources are more stretched, but because low-revenue districts appear to receive lower funding from other programs, such as state compensatory educational, special education, and programs for limited-English proficient students (Chambers et al., 1993). In fact, state compensatory education expenditures per pupil in the low poverty schools studied by Chambers et al. (1993) were "nearly seven times greater" than in the high poverty schools (p.xxiii).

Moskowitz and his colleagues have argued that, "if Chapter 1 simply buys services in poor districts that wealthy school districts routinely provide to all students, its ability to break the link between poverty and achievement and to narrow the gap between the haves and the have-nots is limited" (1993, p.x-xi). In addition, because schools with many poor students receive less support from their districts and states, Chapter 1 itself has evolved into different types of programming and curriculum in poor schools that serve many poor children and in affluent schools that serve a few low-income students (Millsap et al., 1993).

The Role of Accountability and Assessment in Chapter 1

Just as funding for Chapter 1 passes through successive levels of government, so too accountability and evaluation responsibilities have been divided among the local, state, and Federal governments. School-level evaluation results are collected by school districts, which report their findings to the SEAs. State education agencies then use the local data to develop state-wide reports that, in turn, are transmitted to the U.S. Department of Education. The form of these data is determined largely by Congress, through the authorizing statute, and by the Department of Education, through its regulations and other written guidelines. The Department of Education is also responsible for compiling the state reports into a national summary of Chapter 1 effectiveness for Congress.

Title I/Chapter 1 legislation has always had a great deal of local flexibility into its regulations, and the program has gone through periods in which Federal requirements have been relaxed. Unfortunately, the absence of detailed guidelines has tended to leave state and local authorities confused and uncertain, and the fear of audits has led to the decision to play it safe. Moreover, partly because schools have done what is required and ignored areas of flexibility, Chapter 1 evaluations have followed the

national trend toward increasing reliance on norm-referenced tests. At the same time, the testing of students has come to permeate all aspects of Chapter 1, from the determination of program eligibility, to year-end assessments of outcomes. Among the decisions for which the current Chapter 1 framework requires, encourages, or permits LEAs to use tests are these:

- to identify eligibility and establish "cut-off scores" for children receiving services;
- to assess the educational needs of Chapter 1 children;
- to determine both the achievement of children before (pre-test) and after (post-test) receiving the services;
- to decide whether schools with high proportions of low-achieving children should be given preference over schools with high poverty for receiving Chapter 1 programs;
- to allocate funds to individual schools;
- to establish student's needs and goals for schoolwide projects;
- to determine whether schoolwide projects are continued beyond their initial three-year period;
- review the effectiveness of building-level programs at the end of the year;
- decide which schools to target for program improvement, or whether a school no longer needs program improvement; and
- to identify students who have or have not progressed sufficiently after two years (Kober, 1991).

In addition, Congress and the Department of Education use accumulated standardized test data to justify continued appropriations and authorizations, to weigh major policy changes in the program, to target states and districts for Federal monitoring and audits; and to carry out Congressionally-mandated studies of the program (Kober, 1991).

Ironically, despite the heavy use of testing in Chapter 1, the issue for states and LEAs receiving funding has been less the achievement gains of students in the program than their targeting and fiscal compliance (Odden, 1987). Moreover, since funding to those schools that make achievement gains is cut, the reliance on test scores has worked against schools with strong programs (Rotberg & Harvey, 1993).

In 1988, the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments sought to place a new emphasis on program quality and student performance by making a number of important changes to Chapter 1, including changed accountability for student outcomes. Unfortunately, the consensus on these Amendments is that, with some exceptions, they have led to more of the same problems. Most important, because state coordinators find that the new mechanisms are "burdensome" and that they offer only minor programmatic contributions, they give the new provisions a relatively low priority. At the same time, local districts and school practitioners have been as reluctant to change as the state education agencies. Thus, "the new mechanisms of accountability and program improvement have not stimulated particularly high standards for student achievement or an early surge of new ideas for school improvement" (Turnbull, Zeldin, & Cain, 1990).

One of the more innovative provisions of the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments was a set of requirements that directed school districts and states to find out where their programs are not working well and then improve their operations. However, a survey conducted soon after the change in regulations suggests that states and districts have been cautious in implementing the new regulations. SEAs have tended to leave their standards for student achievement at the same level specified by the regulations, and to avoid measuring achievement in more advanced skills; this has had the effect of minimizing the number of schools identified as

needing improvement, and has "sent an implicit message of low expectations for the effects of Chapter 1 on student achievement" (Turnbull, Zeldin, & Cain, 1990, p.ii). Moreover, although the new regulations suggested widening evaluations of program effectiveness beyond achievement tests, many school districts still measure outcomes only through norm-referenced achievement test scores (U.S. General Accountng Office, GAO, 1993).

In fact, the heavy reliance on norm-referenced tests in Chapter 1 has been subject to a number of criticisms over the years. Kober (1991) pointed out the overarching issue: "While standardized achievement tests may serve as indicators of participants' educational progress in the basic subjects, they reveal little about progress toward other overt or implied program goals, such as redistributing resources to poor areas, mitigating the social effects of childhood poverty, building children's self esteem, and keeping children in school" (p.7). More specifically, it has been noted that the standardized achievement tests don't measure the impact of Chapter 1 supportive services, that they underestimate children's program-related growth, and that even within academic areas they measure achievement in skills that were never intended to be taught and ignore other skills that students learn as a result of participation. Needless to say, these tests don't reflect the long-term effects of Chapter 1 participation (Kober, 1991). Rotberg and Harvey (1993) have also pointed out that, because of changes in student populations, incentives encouraging certain students to take (or not take) tests, and the consistency between tests and instructional programs, the quality of a Chapter 1 program cannot be measured "simply by comparing test score fluctuations from one year to another, or by comparing schools or classrooms on test scores" (p.xiv). Similarly, criticizing the new regulations for identifying program improvement, the U.S. General Accounting Office has argued that "when schools are evaluated only on achievement test scores, many schools are likely to be judged as effective or ineffective on the basis of changes in test scores that

reflect random fluctuations, rather than actual changes in student performance" (1993, p.4). Finally, both the U.S. GAO (1993) and an Independent Review Panel conducted by the U.S. Department of Education (*Statement*, 1993) have argued that norm-referenced multiple choice tests are an impediment to good teaching and high student achievement, because teachers drill students on a narrow range of information covered by the tests instead of engaging them in interpretation and problem solving. As demonstrated below, the reliance on standardized testing in Chapter 1 has had a significant and negative impact on all aspects of program implementation.

MODELS OF CHAPTER 1 IMPLEMENTATION

Organization

From the legislation's beginnings in 1965, Title 1/Chapter 1's goals have been fairly clear and straightforward: it is a program to supply funds to schools serving low-income and educationally deprived students.

Translated into practice, however, Chapter 1 has become an increasingly intricate and often confusing program. Not only has the legislative history of Chapter 1 programs been complex and often contradictory, but beyond the authorizing legislation there exists a whole realm of policies and directives which, while not of the same legal status as legislative mandates, have nevertheless had an immense impact on the development of Chapter 1 programs. Often these policies and directives have led to procedures and practices far more involved and complicated than the relatively simple wording of the original legislation would suggest.

Most important, perhaps, to the shape of Chapter 1 in schools around the country is that the original legislation stipulates that Chapter 1 funds *supplement* rather than *supplant* general programs. In other words, Chapter 1 funds have been intended from the beginning to provide services to low-achieving students over and above what they receive in the regular classroom; they cannot be used to create programs that "ghettoize" Chapter 1 students by removing them altogether from their primary classrooms. Further, Chapter 1 funds must be used specifically to benefit low-achieving students; they cannot be diverted from this target population and used for non-Chapter 1 projects. Traditionally, in terms of the implementation of Chapter 1 programs in the schools, this mandate has caused the population of Chapter 1 students to be very precisely defined, and the programs serving these students to be demonstrably aimed at them rather than at other students. The challenge of Chapter 1, then, has

been to develop replicable paradigms for the delivery of supplementary services to a precisely defined subset of students.

Development and implementation of models for the delivery of Chapter 1 compensatory or remedial benefits to the children identified as needing them has, therefore, constituted much of the history of the program. Traditionally, schools have used four basic organizational models to supply these services, each of which aims to meet both the supplement-not-supplant requirement and the necessity to demonstrate that funds are used only to benefit Chapter 1 students (Ascher, 1987; Passow, 1988; Millsap, Turnbull, Moss, Brigham, Gamse, & Marks, 1992):

- ***Pullout*** programs: Chapter 1 students are removed from the regular classroom for special instruction for no more than 25 percent of instructional time.
- ***Replacement*** programs: Chapter 1 instruction replaces large portions of regular instruction; many of these take the form of extended pullouts, where students spend more that 25 percent of their time outside of the regular classroom.
- ***Add-on*** (or extended time) programs: Chapter 1 students receive instruction beyond regular class time, whether during the summer, or before or after the school day; and
- ***In-class*** programs: Chapter 1 instruction is provided within the regular classroom.

Since the passage of the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendments, a fifth implementation model has become increasingly common: ***schoolwide*** projects, in which Chapter 1 funds may be used to serve all students in a school. Each of these five major implementation models is discussed below.

Pullout Programs

Long the primary model for Chapter 1 implementation and delivery, pullouts remove Chapter 1 students from the regular classroom for short periods during the day for intensive supplemental instruction. They were originally designed to provide a specialized environment for Chapter 1 students, one that would provide them with more closely focused and individualized instruction, because it separated the students from the mainstream classroom and placed them in smaller groups (Carter, 1984; King, 1990a). In addition, pullouts were founded on the philosophy that children—whether disadvantaged or not—had to learn the "basics" before moving on to higher-level skills and a more challenging curriculum based on problem-solving (Commission on Chapter 1, 1992). It was argued that pullouts were an ideal way for Chapter 1 students to master the basics without the distractions of heterogeneous classes. In addition, pullouts could let schools more easily provide Chapter 1 students with the benefits of instruction from specialists; without them, regular classroom teachers—who were often untrained in the special needs of these students—would have to take on the additional burden of teaching the Chapter 1 curriculum on top of the regular curriculum. Thus, not only do pullouts fulfill the administrative requirements of a Chapter 1 program but, when managed well, they assure more on-task time for both students and teachers.

Although intended to provide Chapter 1 students with the educational benefits of supplementary and focused on-task time, for the most part, pullouts have not had such a salutary effect (King, 1990a). Indeed, as many critics have pointed out, their impact has all too often been the opposite, causing Chapter 1 students to lose instructional time simply because they must travel from their normal classroom to another site; so, while students may gain time for remedial work in mathematics and reading, it comes at the expense of work in social studies, science,

physical education, as well as non-remedial mathematics and language arts (King, 1990a).

Furthermore, by separating Chapter 1 instruction from regular instruction–compartmentalizing it–pullouts can fragment the education of Chapter 1 students. At least as significant, they can isolate Chapter 1 students from their peers, by treating them as a separable, homogeneous group, and effectively functioning as a model of educational segregation. And, because Chapter 1 teachers must do their jobs in a separate room, pullouts can work to undermine communication between them and mainstream faculty (Carter, 1984; King, 1990a).

Finally, and most seriously, pullouts–like other remedial and compensatory programs–can place serious limits on what Chapter 1 students can learn: instead of providing the benefits of specialized and individualized supplementary instruction, they can lead to lowered expectations for the achievement levels of the students they are intended to benefit. Too often limited to repetitious drilling of the "basics," they do little to teach the students how to think or to solve problems. As the Commission on Chapter 1 (1992) put it,

> Rather than experiencing the joy of wrestling with ideas, these children are more likely to spend their time circling *m*'s and *p*'s on dittos. (p.6)

Because of the problems and limitations that seem to be inherent in pullouts, in recent years Chapter 1 programs have moved steadily if slowly away from this model, which was once nearly ubiquitous. Still, as recently as the 1990-91 school year, pullouts were still offered by a full 82 percent of districts (Millsap et al., 1992). Despite increasing dissatisfaction with both the results they have generated and the fact that they isolate Chapter 1 students from their peers, pullouts persist, largely because of tradition and entropy (Birman et al., 1987).

This continued reliance on pullouts is being challenged, however. Major nationwide assessments of Chapter 1 in 1987 and 1993 have called for a significant reduction in the number of pullout programs. In addition, the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendments to Chapter 1, which took into account the 1987 assessments and which reauthorized the program, encouraged schools to reject pullouts in favor of other models. This encouragement has shown some success. In fact, of all the implementation models, the pullout model is the only one to show diminishing popularity. Even though 82 percent of schools used the model in the 1990-91 school year, that number is down from 84 percent in 1985-86; by the 1991-92 school year, the percentage had dropped even further to 74 percent (Millsap et al., 1993).

Given both the shortcomings of the pullout model and its diminishing popularity, it is possible to consider all the other models as potential alternatives. In fact, while the percentage of schools using pullouts has dropped, the percentage of schools using each of the other models has grown. In addition, compensatory education programs have, for the most part, ceased to be simply discrete packages implemented in isolation. Rather, a full 82 per cent of schools at the elementary level—where most Chapter 1 programs are operating—provide more than one type of program, with 18 percent offering four or more programs simultaneously (Millsap et al., 1993). Thus, even schools still using pullouts no longer use them in isolation, but tend to merge them with other models, a trend that has been especially pronounced in high poverty schools.

Replacement Programs

Replacement programs, often called extended pullouts, are still relatively uncommon. As described in a guide issued by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

(1992), replacement programs are similar to standard pullouts in that they remove Chapter 1 students from the regular classroom. However, standard pullouts are limited to approximately 30 minutes and offer supplementary instruction in a subject also taught in the regular classroom. Replacement programs, which remove students from their regular classrooms for more than 25 percent of their instruction,

> replace all or part of the course of instruction regularly provided to Chapter 1 participants with a program that is particularly designed to meet participants' special educational needs. (U.S. Department of Education, 1992, p.12)

In other words, replacement programs *take the place of* regular instruction in a particular subject. Designed to address some of the shortcomings of regular pullouts by increasing the amount of time Chapter 1 students spend outside the regular classroom, replacement programs cut the time lost in moving from place to place and mitigate some of the fragmentation that results when students must travel to a separate site for a limited time. In addition, since only one teacher is responsible for a given subject area, some of the problems caused by a lack of communication between teachers can be eliminated (King, 1990b).

The replacement model is still relatively rarely implemented, however; only 10 percent of schools utilized it in the 1991-92 school year (Millsap et al., 1993). Consequently, there is little in the Chapter 1 literature explicitly examining its success as a delivery mechanism for participating students. Still, while replacement programs may help compensate for lost time and limit the fragmentation of educational programs, they do little to overcome other drawbacks of the pullout model. Most significantly, like standard pullouts, replacement programs isolate Chapter 1 students, in effect segregating them from other students in their schools. And, while they are not explicitly designed as a tracking mechanism, they do put Chapter 1 students in a track of their own. Thus,

like pullouts—and like other remedial and compensatory programs—replacement programs may have the unintended effect of lowering expectations for achievement by Chapter 1 students (King, 1990b).

Add-on Programs

One of the major problems associated with pullouts is the availability of instructional time. Rowan and Guthrie (1990) have suggested that, in reality, little time is lost in travel from one classroom to another, since the Chapter 1 room is frequently just down the hall from the regular classroom. However, since the time spent in Chapter 1 instruction in pullouts is limited to approximately 30 minutes a day, even a very short trip can have a serious impact on instructional time. And, indeed, the actual amount of extra instructional time provided to Chapter 1 students continues to be, on average, no more than 10 minutes per day (U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

Add-ons (also known as extended time programs) are intended to remedy this situation. Unlike pullouts, however, they do no take time away from regular non-Chapter 1 instruction; they supply Chapter 1 instruction outside of regular class time. Because they increase Chapter 1 students' overall instructional time, add-ons were recommended in the 1987 National Assessment of Chapter 1 as a promising strategy for the delivery of Chapter 1 services (Birman et al., 1987).

In a major study of Chapter 1 add-on programs, Moore & Funkhouser (1990) identified five major ways to provide this extra time:

- extended day kindergarten classes;
- before- or after-school programs;
- home-based programs, above and beyond regular homework;

- Saturday programs; and
- extended-year or summer school programs.

In addition, most programs studied by Moor and Funkhouser used add-ons in addition to other types of Chapter 1 delivery, thus increasing instructional time even further. Of the add-ons, summer school programs have been the most popular, even though only 15 percent of Chapter 1 schools offered a summer program in the 1991-92 school year. In that year, other forms of add-on projects were used in fewer than 10 percent of Chapter 1 schools (Millsap et al., 1993). Thus, although add-ons can result in up to 450 hours of extra instructional time per year (Moore & Funkhouser, 1990), they have, like replacement programs, had a limited impact.

Research has shown that extra time spent on-task can have a positive impact on the achievement of disadvantaged students (Moore & Funkhouser, 1990). However, this is not a straightforward, simple equation; additional instructional time, in and of itself, does not necessarily lead to improvements in achievement. Moore and Funkhouser have suggested that these benefits depend on two other factors as well:

(1) increased instructional time must be used effectively; and

(2) it must take advantage of practices that enhance student learning, including challenging curricula, high expectations, and individualized instruction.

To put it bluntly, then, add-on programs can only be as effective as the quality of instruction they offer.

Unfortunately, like any other implementation model, add-ons are not immune from the damaging effects of watered-down curriculum and lowered expectations. In addition, because they require an extra time commitment, add-ons may have to overcome serious attendance-related

problems. A further complication is that, because they are offered outside of regular school hours, parents may have to supply their children's transportation to and from school (King, 1990a). Finally, add-ons can result in an extra expense for schools, since they are offered outside of regular school hours (King, 1990b). Thus, while add-on programs may be a more educationally effective means of offering Chapter 1 services than pullouts, they can also generate administrative obstacles that may ultimately work against their effectiveness.

In-Class Programs

In-class Chapter 1 programs provide the mirror image of pullouts. That is, where pullouts provide Chapter 1 instruction in a setting away from the regular classroom, in-class programs, as their name suggests, provide it without moving students from one room to another. Thus, in theory, they are ideally designed to overcome the loss of time problems caused by pullouts. In addition, because they can become part of the regular classroom routine, they can also—again, in theory—help to reduce the fragmentation of Chapter 1 education so common in pullouts. Furthermore, they can avoid some of the logistical complications caused by replacement and add-on models, again because they take place in the regular classroom.

Perhaps for these reasons, the in-class model has shown a significant gain in popularity over the last few years. While only 28 percent of schools used the model in the 1985-86 school year, and only 32 percent used it in 1988-89, Millsap et al. (1993) reported that as many as 58 percent had adapted some form of the model by the 1991-92 year. Thus, the in-class model has become second only to the pullout model as a method of implementing Chapter 1 services in the schools.

It is uncertain, however, whether the in-class model, as typically

implemented, offers significant advantages over the pullout model. For one thing, while in-class programs do not move Chapter 1 students into a separate classroom, many do move them into isolated groups within the classroom (Harpring, 1985). In addition, even in the primary classroom, these children are taught by special teachers—and often by aides—rather than by the room's main teacher (Low achievers, 1991). In-class programs, thus, often effectively function as pullouts even though they require no change in setting. As Slavin and Madden (1987) put it, they "are often structurally identical to pull-out programs except that the remedial services are provided in a different location" (p.1).

In addition, even when an in-class implementation is significantly differentiated from a pullout implementation, there is little evidence to suggest that this in itself is sufficient to make the difference in the educational success or failure of a Chapter 1 program. Indeed, in some ways the in-class model can create problems that use of pullouts can avoid. Archambault (1986) summarized these potential problems:

- a reduction in the variety of materials available to the Chapter 1 instructor;
- the need for, and lack of, available joint planning time for the classroom and Chapter 1 teachers;
- additional scheduling conflicts; and
- the disturbances caused by two distinct groups receiving instruction simultaneously in a single classroom.

As a result, there seems to be no across-the-board reason for schools to prefer in-class models over pullouts. Indeed, as Kennedy, Birman, et al. (1986) suggested in their major evaluation of Chapter 1, neither pullouts nor in-class models are inherently superior to the other; rather, each can be effective, or ineffective, in different settings. In addition, Rowan and Guthrie (1987) concluded that the implementation of a particular organizational model—whether pullout, replacement, add-on,

or in-class–is not the most important question in Chapter 1 service delivery, even though it has received so much attention. Rather, other concerns should take precedence: the needs of students in a particular context, the amount of direct contact between student and teacher, and the nature of the curriculum. In other words, educational issues are much more important than delivery issues to the success of Chapter 1.

Schoolwide Projects

Schoolwide projects have been designed with the hope that they can address some of these educational issues more adequately than other models. The Hawkins-Stafford Amendments legislated that schools with an enrollment of at least 75 percent low-income students may use their Chapter 1 funds to create schoolwide projects for the improvement of educational programs throughout the entire school rather than for implementing separate remedial programs. Such projects have been permitted since 1978; they were, however, rarely implemented prior to 1988, when Hawkins-Stafford eliminated a requirement that districts match Federal grants with funds of their own (U.S. Department of Education, 1993; Millsap et al., 1992). In the last six years, schoolwide projects have generated widespread enthusiasm–some 2,000 schools nationwide now have them–and they have been touted as an ideal method for providing underachieving students with extra help, and even as a means of removing the "disadvantaged" label from the poorest Chapter 1 schools (Gittleman, 1992).

The intent of schoolwide projects, then, as the Commission on Chapter 1 (1992, p.7) put it, is to build good schools, not just good programs. Designed to benefit entire schools while also improving the education of Chapter 1 students, schoolwide projects can increase the flexibility of Chapter 1 implementation beyond what is possible through other methods, in part because they can incorporate aspects of all of the

other forms of Chapter 1 implementations. In addition, nearly 85 percent of principals in schools with schoolwide projects have reported generally positive results, and have emphasized the increased flexibility of this implementation method, as well as its ability to benefit the entire student body in their schools. Still, although schoolwide projects vary widely across the country, most schools have used them only to reduce class size and to strengthen a variety of already existing programs (U.S. Department of Education, 1993). Other common implementations include the following (Millsap et al., 1992; Gittleman, 1992):

- an informal process of ***expanded student selection*** for supplementary and pullout services, through which any student can be provided with extra support on an "as-needed" basis;
- formal ***staff development programs***;
- an ***increase in services*** provided by supplementary professional personnel, such as counselors, social workers, project coordinators, in-class teaching assistants, etc.;
- ***family-oriented programs***, including in-school parent centers, home visits, collaborations with family service agencies, school-based child-care, etc.;
- ***innovative practices***, including the development of teacher resource centers, cross-age groupings, cooperative learning arrangements, augmented school libraries, etc.; and
- other ***enrichment programs***, including increased field trips and various extended time programs.

Although some cities with long-term projects–like Philadelphia–have reported consistent gains in student test scores, grades, and attendance (Davidoff & Pierson, 1991), such success has not been universal. For example, schoolwide projects in Austin, Texas, have exhibited only minimal improvements in student achievement–and at a cost several times higher than required for other Chapter 1 programs (Fairchild, Christner, & Wilkinson, 1988).

In addition, critics of schoolwide projects suggest that many of the perceived benefits reflect administrative convenience rather than a true concern with educational reform or improved outcomes (U.S. Department of Education, 1993). They have also expressed concern that, because schoolwide projects make resources available to all students without distinction, they will be diverted from those who need them the most, thus subverting the intent of Chapter 1 legislation.

Despite general enthusiasm, the impact of schoolwide projects has been mixed. While they do have the potential of providing schools with significant flexibility in fulfilling the goals of Chapter 1, they—like other alternative models—have too often led to nothing more than cosmetic and administrative changes. To be more effective than other models, they will have to do much more; that is, as Slavin and Madden (1987) have suggested, the quality of a Chapter 1 model, whether pullout or schoolwide project, can never be any higher than the quality of instruction provided within that model. Unfortunately, it is much harder to transform the quality of instruction on a broad scale than it is to change delivery models; until that happens, the outlook for schoolwide projects as the salvation of Chapter 1 is uncertain.

Curriculum and Instruction

Restricted to barest outlines, the story of curriculum in Chapter 1 programs is a simple one, because Chapter 1 programs have been limited to only two primary curricular areas, reading and mathematics, throughout most of its history. Indeed, statistics can tell this bare bones story perfectly adequately, whether taken from the 1985-86 school year or the 1991-92 school year. Although some changes did take place between these two years, the overall picture remained the same: reading was offered in nearly all Chapter 1 schools, while mathematics was offered in nearly 70 percent of all schools in 1991-92. Fewer than half of all schools offered other

subjects, most commonly in language arts, although approximately 15 percent of schools offered English as a second language within their Chapter 1 programs (Millsap et al., 1993).

This curriculum story gives a good indication of Chapter 1's intent as a compensatory education program: if, as the original legislation put it, the program is meant to "contribute particularly to meeting special educational needs of educationally deprived students" (cited in Commission on Chapter 1, 1992, p.vii), then what better way to meet these needs than by providing supplementary instruction in the basics of reading and mathematics with the ultimate goal of moving disadvantaged students into the mainstream? This rationale has informed and structured Chapter 1 in the schools since the beginning of the program.

Frequently, discussion of Chapter 1 curriculum ends with the decision to teach the basics in reading and mathematics. Indeed, in comparison to the wide interest in implementation models--whether, for instance, pullouts are superior to in-class models--curriculum *per se* receives little attention. A complete discussion, however, would also include conceptions of appropriate delivery of curriculum--of instructional modes. Below is a brief overview of instructional practices within the Chapter 1 framework.

The Deficit Model and Curriculum Design

As is typical in compensatory education, much of the instructional and curricular focus of Chapter 1 derives from an assumption of an educational deficit inherent in disadvantaged children--an assumption that has often been called the "deficit model." According to this model, children from poor families suffer from severe deficiencies in their learning even before they begin school; as opposed to middle- and upper-class children, they begin their school careers at a disadvantage, lacking the strong

educational preparation available to their more advantaged peers. Schools, thus, must make up—or compensate for—this gap through remedial programs designed to give them the basics already possessed by others (Levin, 1987).

While this assumption of deficit has led to such educational delivery models as the pullout, it has also had a strong impact on the design of curricula for disadvantaged children, though too often without sufficient consideration of the effects of such curricula. Thus, while there has been steady movement away from the use of pullouts in recent years, the movement away from remedial curricular models has been much slower and more problematic. Indeed, an observation made by Gordon in 1970 (p.8), and quoted by Passow in 1988 (p.14-15), is still appropriate: "in contrast to the rather well-designed and detailed research into the characteristics of disadvantaged groups, the description and evaluation of educational programs and practices for these children"—particularly curriculum—"have generally been superficial." Further, as Doyle (1986) suggested, compensatory education programs have, almost across the board, emphasized process—delivery mechanisms—over content. As a result, perhaps, Chapter 1 curricula today look much like they always have.

How, then, is Chapter 1 curricula taught in the schools? Not surprisingly, given the prevalence of pullouts and other isolating models, as well as the assumptions governing remediation and the need for instruction in the basics, traditional Chapter 1 classes tend to focus on a very narrow set of fundamentals, presenting them to students primarily as drill and practice exercises. This material is introduced to students through a series of very small, independent steps, and often students' classroom experience is limited to the completion of a series of worksheets (Doyle, 1986).

Such instruction methods apply whether the classroom is devoted to mathematics or to reading. Thus, despite important differences between

the subjects, the overall shape of the two Chapter 1 curricula is similar, as are their effects.

In mathematics, the emphasis is not on fostering an understanding of the ways that mathematics can apply to the world outside the classroom, but on "a static collection of concepts and skills to be mastered one by one," presented through a repetitious series of worksheets and multiple-choice exams (Romberg, 1986, p.IV 11). Where Chapter 1 reading classes stress decoding to the exclusion of comprehension, mathematics classes stress the retention of "right answers" over an understanding of the ways that those answers are derived, the ways that they are related to one another, or the ways that they might be applied in other situations.

Romberg (1986) argued that, taught in this way, mathematics becomes merely an abstract process to Chapter 1 students, rather than a tool for thinking about and gaining understanding of the world. Calfee (1986) made much the same point regarding Chapter 1 reading programs: the emphasis is not on comprehension and the application of reading skills to the world outside the classroom—on what Calfee calls literacy, broadly defined--but rather on the most elementary forms of decoding. Instead of focusing on written language as a medium of communication, the Chapter 1 reading classroom treats reading as a series of discrete skills such as phonics, sounding out words, and letter recognition.

Thus, the content of Chapter 1 curricula in both reading and mathematics is severely circumscribed (Doyle, 1986). In both cases, what is taught is a set of discrete and watered-down low-level skills rather than the "semantic network of information structures and processes" that could make these skills meaningful to students' lives outside of the classroom (p.IV-263). Just as pullouts most likely create more educational problems than they alleviate, typical Chapter 1 curricular designs may ultimately be counterproductive, not only keeping Chapter 1 students from learning the

subjects they are intended to teach, but actively keeping them from gaining the skills they need to move into the mainstream (Passow, 1988).

Impediments to Curricular Change

The critiques of Chapter 1 curriculum drawn upon here—Doyle (1986), Calfee (1986), Romberg (1986), and Passow (1988)—all preceded the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendments, which attempted to put development of higher-order skills into Chapter 1 curricula. That the critiques are still applicable—and, indeed, that they are still the best treatments of the state of Chapter 1 curricula—speaks not only to the persistence of the assumptions underlying compensatory programs, but also to the depth of institutional impediments to curricular change.

Most significant among these impediments is the continued reliance on standardized, norm-referenced tests to assess student progress in Chapter 1 programs, as the Advisory Committee on Testing in Chapter 1 (1993) has pointed out. In this regard, too, little has changed since 1986 when the curricular goals of Chapter 1 were most often stated in terms of the outcomes of standardized tests rather than in terms of either enhancing student abilities or increasing student learning (Zumwalt, 1986). Standardized testing persists despite a strong recommendation in the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments that Chapter 1 programs adopt multiple measures of student achievement. The shortcomings of these tests have been thoroughly explored in the testing literature, and while this is not the appropriate place to undertake a review of that literature, it is useful to point out that an overemphasis on standardized testing has several consequences for Chapter 1 curricula (Advisory Committee on Testing in Chapter 1, 1993):

- Because standardized tests almost always use a multiple-choice format, they are best designed to measure low-level skills rather than higher-order abilities.

- Because they cannot be modified according to the needs of local curricular practices, they are of limited usefulness in measuring local educational goals.
- Because they cannot adequately measure higher-order abilities, they may undermine the efforts of innovative programs that may be effective even though they do not teach students to test well.
- Conversely, because they easily measure low-level skills, they encourage teaching only those skills that can translate into test gains.

Recent Chapter 1 assessments, undertaken in preparation for the 1994 reauthorization of the legislation, have almost uniformly recommended an increased effort to develop curricular and instructional practices that truly help students develop higher-order skills. It remains to be seen whether these new recommendations bring about change any more effectively than those in the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments.

Alternative Practices

Not all Chapter 1 programs, of course, fall into the outline sketched above. For example, a small-scale study of 18 Chapter 1 elementary schools in central Pennsylvania found that many student gains—and many innovative instructional practices—might remain undocumented simply because there is no way to quantify them using the results of standardized tests (Seda, 1989).

It is more than likely, however, that Seda's findings are not widely generalizable, particularly since fewer than 30 percent of Chapter 1 teachers see the teaching of higher-order skills as a high priority in their programs (Millsap et al., 1993). Still, if the 30 percent of programs that emphasize something beyond drill and practice is any indication, there are

programs that do attempt to move beyond the limitations of ordinary Chapter 1 mathematics and reading curricula.

Legters and Slavin (1992), who recorded a noticeable trend away from the teaching of isolated and limited skills in recent years, have provided a useful summary of some of the characteristics of these alternative curricula. In both mathematics and reading, these programs emphasize exploration and discovery rather than rote learning. Further, while they do aim for an understanding of the basics, they do so in a contextualized way, not isolating those basics from their applications outside the classroom. In addition, the programs emphasize an integrated approach in which mathematics and reading are taught across the disciplines. In mathematics, this new curriculum allows students to discover mathematical principles, rather than making them simply memorize the principles; it emphasizes problem-solving and group work instead of the completion of work sheets by students isolated at their desks. In reading, the curriculum employs a "whole-language" approach, minimizing the typical reliance on phonics and workbooks and emphasizing the use of novels and the integration of reading and creative writing.

The purpose of these new approaches is twofold. First, the approaches attempt to make reading and mathematics challenging and interesting to students. Second, they attempt to teach Chapter 1 students higher-order thinking skills in addition to giving them an understanding of the content of reading and mathematics classes. Several other curricular efforts, described by Adams (1989), have attempted to separate the teaching of higher-order skills from instruction in traditional subjects. They have created new Chapter 1 curricula, which emphasize thinking skills as a coherent and specialized subject, and which can, when mastered, be applied across the curriculum.

The Outlook

Unfortunately, the programs described by Legters and Slavin (1992) and Adams (1989) have not yet affected a majority of Chapter 1 schools, as they themselves acknowledge. Further, current testing and accountability requirements are actively impeding their spread. The recent nationwide study of Chapter 1 implementations conducted by Millsap and her colleagues (1993) pointed out that the major focus of Chapter 1 mathematics and reading classes is neither to engage students with the content of the curricula nor to introduce them to higher-order thinking skills. Rather, the focus remains on the reinforcement of basic concepts through repeated drill and practice—as asserted by 84 percent of teachers in reading and language arts programs and 97 percent of teachers in mathematics programs. Indeed, fewer than 30 percent of teachers responding to Millsap's questionnaire see the development of higher-order thinking skills as an important goal of Chapter 1. So, as currently implemented in the schools, Chapter 1 remains a basic remedial program, circumscribed in its objectives and limited in the opportunities it offers its students.

This approach to Chapter 1 programs persists despite the fact that the remediation model has come under increasing attack in recent years precisely for the kinds of *a priori* limits it seems to place upon the achievements of students. Most surprising, perhaps, is that the remediation concept remains the *status quo* even in the face of recommendations of change contained in the 1987 National Assessment of the Chapter 1 program (Birman et al., 1987; Kennedy, Birman et al., 1986).

Unfortunately, the likely results of low-level remedial instruction, built on an unchallenging curriculum, can be seen most clearly in a description by Savage (1987) of an all-too-typical Chapter 1 classroom:

> [T]he reading instruction in the Chapter 1 tutoring session focused solely on basic skills, mechanically defined. The children labored over worksheets that checked whether they knew their synonyms, their homonyms, and their diphthongs. A visitor is informed that the children are learning their "basic skills." Some of the exercises seemed stultifying to absolutely no purpose: "Circle the initial consonant R in the following words: The red fire engine rested beside the road."
>
> The response from the children was reasonable. Some worked away with eyes glued to the paper. Some gazed out the window. A few, heads propped on their hands, dozed.... [They] were learning that reading is a dreadfully boring exercise. (p.583)

Of all the Chapter 1 areas reviewed here, curriculum is perhaps the most in need of reinvention. As the Commission on Chapter 1 (1992) has advocated, such a reinvention will require a fundamental conversion of Chapter 1 legislation from its original mission to teach basic skills to poor children to a new mission dedicated to giving all children the higher-order skills necessary for college or for "skilled and productive work" (p.vi). In the area of curriculum, this is a formidable challenge.

Parent Participation

There has been nearly universal agreement among educators and researchers that the support and active involvement of parents in their children's education is indispensable for educational achievement. Indeed, James Coleman's classic mid-1960s study found that the home and family life of a student has an even stronger impact on achievement than the quality of the school (Coleman et al., 1966). Because of this recognition, requirements for parent participation have been written into legislation authorizing compensatory education programs in the United States beginning with Lyndon Johnson's Head Start initiative in 1964 (Jay & Shields, 1987).

However, the reality of parent participation in compensatory

education and Chapter 1 has not been a simple matter. For one thing, all parents—not only those from poor or minority communities—can sometimes be "hard to reach" (D'Angelo & Adler, 1991). In addition, the most common methods used by schools to support the interaction of parents and teachers—Parent Teacher Associations and teacher conferences—are often ineffective in reaching the parents of students in compensatory programs (McLaughlin & Shields, 1986; Jay & Shields, 1987).

A national survey conducted by the National PTA in 1989 (cited in Duran, 1991) found a number of factors contributing to these difficulties. While several of them can affect all parents regardless of ethnicity or income, they all may have a greater impact upon poor and minority parents. These problems, thus, can have a particularly damaging impact on parent participation programs in Chapter 1:

- parents often lack time for meetings or conferences;
- they often face a conflict between work obligations and school meetings;
- they are often unable to arrange for child care;
- they are often unable to find transportation to and from their children's schools;
- they may face language barriers;
- because they may lack strong educational backgrounds themselves, they may fear active participation in their children's school; and
- they may feel uninformed or inadequate.

In addition, poor and minority parents may feel particularly unwanted or unwelcome in the schools, either because of their own lack of education, or because of an institutional resistance to their presence—a belief among some administrators and educators that parents do little more than interfere in the educational process (Riddle, 1989).

As a way of overcoming institutional reticence, and guaranteeing that all Chapter 1 parents have the opportunity to become involved in their children's education, parent participation has thus been built into Title I/Chapter 1 legislation from the beginning.

The Mandate of Parent Participation

To say that parent participation has always been a part of Chapter 1 is not to say that the program has had either consistent or coherent policy support, for the character of parent participation in Chapter 1 has repeatedly been subject to redefinition and reinvention. In large part, such a continually shifting definition has been a function of the recurrent need for legislative approval of Chapter 1; like other elements of the program, parent participation has faced careful and repeated scrutiny each time Chapter 1 legislation has come up for reauthorization.

Chapter 1's parent participation requirements may have been subject to even more extensive changes than other facets of the program: the language mandating the involvement of parents in Chapter 1 has been fully—and often radically—revised and rewritten in each reauthorization. For instance, statutes requiring districts to use specific models of parent participation throughout the 1970s were eliminated in 1981 in favor of a single clause requiring that "consultations" with parents and teachers continue to be part of Chapter 1 program development (Jay & Shields, 1987). While this language meant that schools no longer had to achieve the often overly specific legislative requirements, its vagueness resulted in the withering and disappearance of many formal parent participation programs. Many programs were replaced with voluntary—and often almost nonexistent—informal strategies.

Stronger, more specific language reappeared in 1983, and was further fortified in the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendments. While still

leaving the details of implementation up to local districts, the Amendments once again required formal parent programs. In addition, they mandated three goals for a district's Chapter 1 parent participation efforts (Riddle, 1989). Each district must:

(1) inform parents about Chapter 1;

(2) train them to help with instruction in the program; and

(3) consult with them.

Schools are also obligated to communicate with parents in a language and a form understandable to them (Riddle, 1989). The 1990 *Chapter 1 Policy Manual* (Department of Education, 1990) increased the stringency of these requirements; it directs each district to develop a written plan for the support of parent participation, and dictates that such efforts be "organized, ongoing, systematic, informed and timely" (p.77). Further, each district must conduct ongoing formal assessments of the effectiveness of their parent participation programs (D'Angelo & Adler, 1991).

Despite these efforts to increase the level and quality of parent participation in Chapter 1, genuine changes in programs have been somewhat limited. Palanki, Burch, and Davies (1992), in a study of policy developments in the early 1990s, have found that only a handful of states (such as Kentucky and California) have taken the steps needed to transform strong parent participation policy into meaningful programs. Most other states, and most local districts, have done little to implement the 1988 policies.

Because of this laxity, it is almost certain at press time that the 1994 reauthorization will further strengthen the legislative support, and requirements, for parent participation within Chapter 1.

Types of Parent Participation Programs

McLaughlin and Shields (1986) outline two primary models for effective parent participation, each of which has been part of Chapter 1 from its earliest years:

(1) the ***advisory model***: parents serve on counsels to help develop and administer Chapter 1 programs; and

(2) the ***partnership model***: parents do not take part in the decision-making process, but rather take an active role in the educational process itself, whether in the classroom or at home.

Of these, the first, utilizing parents as advisors in the decision-making process, has, for much of the history of Chapter 1, loomed large in the schools. This emphasis primarily due to requirements prior to 1981 mandating parent advisory counsels (McLaughlin & Shields, 1986). However, the very fact that such counsels were mandated as part of Title I led to resistance from school administrators, who often felt that they impeded rather than aided the educational process (Riddle, 1989). Thus, these counsels, which are intended to give parents a strong voice in the development of Chapter 1 policy, have not provided a consistently successful method for generating and sustaining parent participation (McLaughlin & Shields, 1987). For instance, in the 1985-86 school year, while 54 percent of districts used parent counsels in their decision-making process, only 7 percent of district administrators thought that the counsels had a substantial impact on the development of their Chapter 1 programs (Jay & Shields, 1987). The final report of the 1993 *Chapter 1 Implementation Study* noted that this pattern has continued. In the 1991-92 school year, 68 percent of elementary schools and 78 percent of middle and secondary schools held meetings of parent advisory counsels, but no more than 12 percent of principals felt that they were the most useful parent activity (Millsap et al., 1993). However, the recent increase in the number of schools developing school-based management strategies may

well bring about a new enthusiasm for parent participation in decision-making (Chimerine, Panton, & Russo, 1993).

As a result of the perceived shortcomings in the advisory model, much of the emphasis has shifted in the years following the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments to the partnership model. This model is now not only the predominant type of parent program in Chapter 1, but is generally thought to be more effective, both in encouraging the participation of parents and in its educational benefits for students.

Because of the flexibility built into the Chapter 1 legislation, the implementation of the partnership model takes many forms across the country. Indeed, even the traditional, and still nearly ubiquitous, parent-teacher conference can be considered a form of partnership, since it brings parents into the classroom and puts them in direct contact with teachers. Not surprisingly, since conferences are easy to implement and have the support of almost all teachers, many principals consider them to be the most effective parent activity in their Chapter 1 programs (Millsap et al., 1993).

In addition, 75 percent of elementary schools make it possible for parents to volunteer as Chapter 1 classroom tutors and aides (Millsap et al., 1993). Volunteering brings Chapter 1 parents directly into the classroom as active partners in the education of their children. Some critics have argued, however, that because this practice increases the number of non-professional and untrained instructors in Chapter 1 programs, it can actually lead to the increased segregation of Chapter 1 students from their mainstream peers, who remain with professional teachers (de Kantor, Ginsburg, & Milne, 1986; Jay & Shields, 1987).

As a result, there has been an increased emphasis on finding ways to enhance parents' at-home participation in their children's education. By

the 1991-92 school year, 55 percent of schools had developed home-based activities aimed at supporting and augmenting Chapter 1 classroom instruction (Millsap et al., 1993). Such home-based models can run the gamut from strategies to involve parents in their children's homework to full-fledged programs for training parents as in-home instructors and programs in which trained paraprofessionals visit the homes of Chapter 1 students (Chimerine et al., 1993).

Family Programs and Even Start

The most recent—and, in many ways, the most fundamental—change in the shape of parent participation in Chapter 1 has been a new emphasis on the educational needs of entire families. As Chimerine and her colleagues (1993) put it,

> Parents themselves can benefit [from parent participation programs], particularly when participating in programs that include parent education components focusing on academics, parenting skills, job training, literacy, and the like. As the number of parents [who] are economically disadvantaged, have low literacy skills, or speak languages other than English increases, parent involvement programs may need to target parents as learners, not just as supporters of children's learning. (p.35)

A number of new programs have emerged in recent years, attempting to create full, family-oriented compensatory programs by means for educating students and their families, rather than students alone.

Within Chapter 1, the most highly visible of these new programs is Even Start, which was established by the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendments (U.S. Department of Education, 1993). The Amendments set out three goals for Even Start (Fore, 1991):

(1) train parents to participate in their children's education;

(2) teach literacy skills to parents; and

(3) prepare preschool children to succeed in regular school programs.

Even Start, thus, takes a new approach to parent involvement in Chapter 1. Uniquely, it is a literacy program for the full family, and is predicated on the rationale that children's literacy skills can best be improved by simultaneously improving their parents' skills (U.S. Department of Education, 1993). In addition, the Even Start legislation encourages local staff to develop full relationships with existing community services; the program attempts to build extensive collaborations between schools, students, families, and communities.

There is some evidence that Even Start has positive short-term benefits for both children and adults (U.S. Department of Education, 1993). However, it is too early to tell whether or not Even Start and similar family-oriented programs will be able to provide a new and more comprehensive model for parent participation in Chapter 1 in the long run.

Teacher Training and Preparation

At the classroom level, the setting is a room for pullout instruction or a corner of the regular classroom, Chapter 1 students come into direct contact not with programs, delivery mechanisms, or assessment measures, but with individual teachers. As noted earlier, Chapter 1 legislation requires both that the program serve a carefully defined group of students and that it supplement, not supplant existing services. Not surprisingly, this latter stipulation has not only had an impact on the students who occupy Chapter 1 classrooms, but has also helped determine their teachers. Because Chapter 1 has traditionally been defined as a distinct, supplementary program, appended to normal classroom instruction—and particularly because of its traditional reliance on pullouts—it has required a

separate, specially trained group of instructors. And Chapter 1 cannot exist without these teachers.

Curiously, teacher training for Chapter 1 programs has received relatively little attention in the educational literature. Issues of teaching and teacher preparation tend to be limited to their relationship to curriculum and program design. Still, teaching and training issues are vital to Chapter 1 effectiveness. The most important are briefly examined below.

Instructor Background

During the 1991-92 school year, there were approximately 72,000 full-time-equivalent teachers and 65,000 full-time-equivalent aides making up the cadre of Chapter 1 instructors in the United States, according to Sinclair and Gutman's summary of state Chapter 1 participation and achievement (cited in U.S. Department of Education, 1993). In terms of general characteristics, this group of instructors appears to be quite similar to their non-Chapter 1 colleagues: a recent study of Chapter 1 resources undertaken by the American Institutes for Research (Chambers et al., 1993) found that similar percentages of these two groups are self-contained classroom teachers (almost 20 percent in each category), administrators (approximately 1.5 percent), library personnel (0.7 percent), and various paraprofessionals and aides (between 10 and 12 percent).

In terms of education and experience, the study also found few differences between the two groups of teachers; although Chapter 1 teachers are slightly more likely to have a Master's degree and to hold a standard teaching certificate, teachers in regular classrooms have slightly more teaching experience.

The fact that these figures mirror the findings of a Department of Education survey of teachers undertaken prior to the 1988 reauthorization of Chapter 1 suggests that there has been little change in the makeup of the Chapter 1 teaching force over the last few years (cited in U.S. Department of Education, 1993). However, a larger study conducted as part of the 1993 national evaluation of Chapter 1 painted a rather different picture, suggesting that Chapter 1 teachers may in fact be quite different from their non-Chapter 1 colleagues, at least with respect to educational background; according to this study, 62 percent of Chapter 1 teachers have at least a Master's degree, compared to only 39 percent of regular classroom teachers (Millsap et al., 1993). In addition, principals tend to rate their Chapter 1 instructors more favorably than their other teachers, a fact that may reflect their extra training.

In the Chapter 1 classroom, aides do nearly as much of the actual teaching of students as teachers, and constitute nearly half of Chapter 1 staff nationwide (U.S. Department of Education, 1993). Not surprisingly, in the highest poverty schools, where the need is often greater, these aides (most of whom do not have a college education) take on an even greater share of the burden of teaching. In these schools, 56 percent of in-class mathematics instruction is provided by aides; in low poverty schools, this drops to 7 percent (Millsap et al., 1993).

Clearly, such a heavy reliance on aides as the primary instructors in high poverty schools can mitigate the effects of a more highly educated cadre of certified Chapter 1 teachers, particularly since many aides have been inadequately trained (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1990). In addition, while the increased presence of aides in high poverty Chapter 1 schools could have the effect of lowering class sizes, thus allowing more instructional time for each student, this has not happened. Despite the presence of more aides, the significantly higher numbers of Chapter 1 students attending these schools result in an average class size

in high poverty schools of 37, compared to only 24 in low poverty schools.

Inservice Training and Staff Development

One way to continue to rely on aides as instructors without sacrificing instructional quality, and to assure the continued quality of instruction from certified teachers, is through strong inservice training. Unfortunately, even though the legislation provides districts and schools with funds for it, Chapter 1 has long been weak in providing such training. As Millsap and her colleagues (1993) put it, "Staff development is a continuing though infrequent part of most classroom and Chapter 1 teachers' lives" (p.7-1).

In terms of overall numbers, there does appear to be an extensive effort to promote staff development in Chapter 1: nearly all teachers in the program (92 percent) did participate in inservice training of some form or another in 1991. However, the actual time spent in training has been and continues to be very small. Of certified teachers, fewer than one third spend more than four days per year in training. Chapter 1 aides spend considerably less time in inservice training; in 1991, fewer than 10 percent received more than 35 hours of training time. In addition, this time—for both teachers and aides—is divided among a number of different subjects, with the result that very little time is spent on any single subject (Millsap et al., 1993).

The effectiveness of current inservice training programs is uncertain. While Millsap and her colleagues (1993) report that most teachers find that training improves instruction at least somewhat, the survey of Chambers et al. (1993) elicited that "teachers' assessment of the quality of [their] training were uniformly low" (p.62). Whichever is a more accurate reflection of the state of inservice training, both Millsap and

Chambers agree that it is one of the weak links in the current operation of Chapter 1.

Training Prospects

While there are clear trends in other areas of Chapter 1—for instance, away from pullouts and toward more teaching of higher-order thinking skills—there is little firm progress in enhancing and strengthening training programs for teachers and aides. In addition, the literature contains little to suggest that there has been any substantive effort to "reinvent" such programs.

However, several of the major reports written for the 1993 national assessment of Chapter 1 include strong recommendations for substantial increases in commitment to and funding for inservice training, linked to school-based decisions about training needs. As the Commission on Chapter 1 (1992 put it:

> [P]rofessionals must be helped, too, to learn how to invent as they go, because circumstances, school histories, and capacities vary significantly. They must have time and support to experiment, to evaluate, and to analyze. They must themselves become a learning community—focused on improving student learning. (p.11)

Whether the 1994 reauthorization of Chapter 1 makes any real difference in teacher training and staff preparation, however, remains to be seen.

Additional Issues: Special Student Populations

As suggested above, the original intent of Chapter 1—to provide supplementary instructional time to "educationally deprived" students assumes a certain definitional clarity concerning the nature of the

population served by the program. In practice, however, the border separating the Chapter 1 population from other student groups has become increasingly complex and blurred, because of conflicts between Chapter 1 legislation and other compensatory programs and because of changing demographic patterns across the country. As a result, certain particular groups of students either do not fit easily within Chapter 1 or receive special attention from the program.

This section briefly examines the status of two of these groups: language minority students and migrant students. Although the literature concerning the place of these groups within Chapter 1 is not extensive, they warrant special attention. (A third important group, Chapter 1 students attending private or religious schools, falls beyond the scope of this review.)

Language Minority Students

Students who come from homes where the primary language is not English present a particular problem in Chapter 1. Many of these students could clearly benefit from the kinds of services offered by the program; as a group they are more likely than their English-speaking peers to fit most of the criteria for Chapter 1 eligibility, as Strang and Carlson (1991) have suggested. However, as part of its supplement, not supplant provisions, Chapter 1 legislation does not allow the use of Chapter 1 funds for student services already required by other Federal, state, or local laws (Strang & Carlson, 1991).

In addition, the program's funds may not be used to offer Chapter 1 services to students whose "educational deprivation" is related to the fact that their English proficiency is limited. As Strang and Carlson (1991) put it, "if limited English proficiency is the only cause of low academic

achievement, then the child would not be eligible for Chapter 1 services" (p.1).

As a consequence of these two legislative limitations, students who are defined as limited English proficient (LEP) may be deemed ineligible for Chapter 1 services.

Even though 94 percent of elementary school principals have reported that their district policies do not exclude LEP students from their Chapter 1 programs (Millsap et al., 1993), the extent to which such exclusion is actually taking place is not clear. For one thing, districts across the country vary widely in terms of their standards for defining students as LEP, so students who might be eligible for Chapter 1 in one district may be ineligible in another (Strang & Carlson, 1991). In addition, districts also vary widely in how they link services for LEP and Chapter 1 services: some districts allow them to be offered to students simultaneously, while others require that students achieve English proficiency before they are considered eligible for Chapter 1 (Strang & Carlson, 1991). And, finally, many districts exempt LEP students from taking the kinds of standardized tests used to determine eligibility for Chapter 1. While this practice stems from a desire to spare students the burden of taking tests that do not accurately or fairly measure their abilities, it can lead to the unfortunate side effect of districts' failing to identify these students for Chapter 1 at all (U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

The 1994 reauthorization offers the possibility of a change in the status of language minority students in Chapter 1. As part of its recommendations for reauthorization, the Clinton Administration has proposed not only that poverty become the sole criterion for Chapter 1 eligibility, but also that existing restrictions on LEP student participation in Chapter 1 be repealed (Lyons, 1993). It is possible, thus, that the future

shape of Chapter 1, at least with respect to language minority students, may be radically different from its past.

Migrant Students

Students whose families are migratory farmworkers and fishers also offer special challenges to Chapter 1. Unlike language minority students, however, whose Chapter 1 eligibility is ambiguous, migrant students have had their needs carefully considered; in 1966, one year following the passage of Title I, the Federal Migrant Education Program (MEP) was created for these students (U.S. Department of Education, 1993). Later, the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments of 1988 created a National Commission on Migrant Education to study the implementation of the MEP, and to bolster the program's impact.

This group of students, numbering approximately 597,000 in the 1990-91 school year, face particularly difficult educational challenges. Not only are they highly transient, often averaging over one move per 12-month period, but they must also deal with the language barriers and poverty faced by other Chapter 1 students (U.S. Department of Education, 1993; Cox et al., 1992). Of the nearly 30 percent of these students who were born in Mexico, many must not only move from school to school within the United States, but between countries (National Commission on Migrant Education, 1992). Further, nearly one-fourth of all migrant students do not enroll in school until more than 30 days after the beginning of the school year (Cox et al., 1992).

In many ways, the MEP is similar to regular Chapter 1 programs. It is most often provided as a pullout program, and typically offers the standard Chapter 1 curricular choices of reading, language arts, and mathematics, although it also often provides support for instruction in

other subjects, including science, vocational education, and health (U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

The impact of the MEP has been somewhat uncertain, particularly with regard to its relationship to other Federal compensatory programs. There is evidence that the MEP often supplants these other programs, including regular Chapter 1 (U.S. Department of Education, 1993); for example, in Florida—a state with a large population of migrant students—only 14 percent of migratory students receive aid from other programs, including Chapter 1 (National Commission on Migrant Education, 1992). Major recommendations for change in the MEP include, most significantly, a recommendation for increased flexibility in its implementation, to allow improved coordination between it and other Federal programs (National Commission on Migrant Education, 1992).

THE FUTURE OF FEDERAL COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

As Darling-Hammond (1993) has written, despite its critics, Title I/Chapter 1 has benefitted the Nation by bringing attention to the educational needs of low-income, low-achieving students neglected by the educational system before the War on Poverty; helped to equalize educational spending; institutionalized parent involvement in the schools; and "probably helped to narrow the gap in basic skills achievement between majority and minority students" (p.26). Yet Federal compensatory education programs have not done enough, and no one is satisfied with their distribution mechanisms and accountabilities, organization and instructional practices, or outcomes.

Title I/Chapter 1 was never intended to "ghettoize" low-income students by removing them from the regular classroom and exempting them from the regular curriculum: its purpose is to provide funds to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of these children to supplement the educational services delivered in the regular classroom. In practice, however, the programs are a major part of a "second system" of categorical special programs for students who need special instructional support. This system is a patchwork of programs, funding streams, eligibility requirements, and identification and monitoring efforts over which educators feel little instructional ownership (Allington, 1993). Arguably, Chapter 1 is not an instructional program at all now because it is not designed to deliver the most effective instruction but rather to adhere to the current funding streams. The policy instruments, the procedures and rules, for bringing these programs into being do not help teachers, administrators, and parents to design the programs they believe can be most successful in the culture of their schools. Unlike in the past, the goal of Federal compensatory education policy in the future should be to improve the competence of the schools that serve predominantly low-income children, as many observers now maintain (Timar, 1993).

Allocation formulas should provide and insure more funds to schools, districts, and counties with greater concentrations of poor students; but do so with incentives, supports, and rewards for projects to improve the whole school, not just to remediate the student, and in ways that have already demonstrated at least limited success (*Statement*, 1993). The promise of whole school reform, as advanced most prominently by Henry Levin, Robert Slavin, James Comer, and Theodore Sizer, is that it does not distinguish the educational needs of poor children from those of all children; good instruction and other good educational practices are good for all.

Federal funds are also needed to provide more learning time for low-income, low-achieving students, who, like all students, spend too little time on academic tasks. For too long the local implementation of the "supplementing" requirements of the legislation has led schools to pull students out of their regular classrooms for remedial instruction in one form or another. This has meant less time for instruction and a diluted curriculum; students in pullouts learn by rote, using worksheets to perform low-level cognitive tasks unrelated to the skills they need for getting out of a remedial track, into the regular class, and on to upper tracks, where they can learn the higher level cognitive tasks necessary to advance in school, enter postsecondary education, and become employable beyond the entry-level jobs. As Darling-Hammond quite rightly asserts after studying the effect of instruction on achievement, it is the quality of instruction, not a student's race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic class—all status rather than functional characteristics of students—that accounts for success as a learner.

Because even at the end of the twentieth century, in a coming cybernetic age, education remains a social engagement between persons, a teacher and learner, the flow of Federal money must also make staff development funds available for both teachers and administrators.

Knowledge of effective teaching strategies is necessary to the teaching of early reading and higher-order skills in subjects like mathematics, science; and in responding to students' particular learning needs and styles. Furthermore, with advanced professional development, teachers will not need to resort to remedial measures to educate their poor, low-achieving students; they will have a broader and different repertoire of skills and strategies (Darling-Hammond, 1993).

Finally, evaluation of the success of Federal compensatory education programs must be changed. As discussed earlier, most local school districts use standardized test scores to determine how to meet changing Title I/Chapter 1 accountability requirements. In turn, the government uses accumulated standardized test data to justify continued appropriations and authorizations, to weigh major policy changes in the program, to target states and districts for Federal monitoring and audits, and to carry out Congressionally-mandated studies of the program (Kober, 1991). States and local school districts receiving the funding the tests have been used to target funds and assure fiscal compliance (Odden, 1991). The use of standardized tests has been even more disastrous for evaluating the outcomes of the programs because it trivializes other indicators of a program's success, like the number of students at grade level, retention rates of students in high schools who were in the programs in elementary school, and changes over time in the number of students in any school or district considered special (Brophy, 1993).

In all policy formulations, and in the organization and design of instruction in Federal compensatory education programs, it is necessary to keep in mind the historical purpose of Title I/Chapter 1: to improve schooling so that subsequent generations of students will not need anti-poverty programs like compensatory education programs at all.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. (1989). *Teaching thinking to Chapter 1 students*. Cambridge: Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, Inc. (ED 309 399)

Advisory Committee on Testing in Chapter 1. (1993). *Reinforcing the promise, reforming the paradigm: Report of the Advisory Committee on Testing in Chapter 1*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. (ED 361 465)

Allington, R.L. (1993). Commentary. In I.C. Rotberg & J.J. Harvey, *Federal policy options for improving the education of low-income students. Volume I: Findings and recommendations*. Santa Monica: RAND Institute on Education and Training.

Anderson, J. (1993). *Working paper: The distribution of Chapter 1 services: Data from the schools and staffing survey*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ED 362 610)

Anderson, J. (1992, April). *The distribution of Chapter 1 services: Which school districts and schools serve students in Chapter 1?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ED 346 209)

Archambault, F.X. (1986). Instructional setting: Key issue or bogus concern. In B.I. Williams, P.A. Richmond, & B.J. Mason (Eds.), *Designs for compensatory education: Conference proceedings and papers*. Washington, D.C.: Research and Evaluation Associates. (ED 293 901)

Ascher, C. (1987). *Chapter 1 programs: New guides from the research*. New York: Teachers College, Institute on Urban and Minority Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ED 289 947)

Birman, B.F., Orland, M.E., Jung, R.K., Anson, R.J., Garcia, G.N., Moore, M.T., Funkhouser, J.E., Morrison, D.R., Turnbull, B.J., & Reisner, E.R. (1987). *The current operation of the Chapter 1 program. Final report from the National Assessment of Chapter 1*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ED 289 935)

Brophy, J. (1993). Commentary. In I.C. Rotberg & J.J. Harvey, *Federal policy options for improving the education of low-income students. Volume I: Findings and recommendations*. Santa Monica: RAND Institute on Education and Training.

Calfee, R. (1986). Curriculum and Instruction: Reading. In B.I. Williams, P.A. Richmond, & B.J. Mason (Eds.), *Designs for compensatory education: Conference proceedings and papers.* Washington, D.C.: Research and Evaluation Associates. (ED 293 901)

Carter, L.F. (1984). The sustaining effects study of compensatory and elementary education. *Educational Researcher, (13)*, 4-13.

Chambers, J., Parrish, T., Goertz, M., Marder, C., & Padilla, C. (1993). *Translating dollars into services: Chapter 1 resources in the context of state and local resources for education. Final Report.* Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.

Chimerine, C.B., Panton, K.L.M., Russo, A.W.W. (1993). *The other 91 percent: Strategies to improve the quality of out-of-school experiences of Chapter 1 students. Supplement to the National Assessment of Chapter 1.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning. (ED 361 445)

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. (ED 012 275)

Commission on Chapter 1. (1992). *Making schools work for children in poverty: A new framework prepared by the Commission on Chapter 1.* Washington, D.C.: Author. (ED 362 618)

Cox., J.L., Burkheimer, G., Curtin, T.R., Rudes, B., Iachan, R., Strang, W., Carlson, E., Zarkin, G., & Dean, N. (1992). *Descriptive study of the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning. (ED 355 085)

D'Angelo, D.A., & Adler, C.R. (1991). Chapter 1: A catalyst for improving parent involvement. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(5), 350-54.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). *Federal policy options for Chapter 1: An equity agenda for school restructuring.* New York: Teachers College, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching.

Davidoff, S.H., & Pierson, E.M. (1991). *A continued look at the promise of schoolwide projects.* Philadelphia: Philadelphia School District Office of Assessment. (ED 330 709).

de Kantor, A., Ginsburg, A.L., & Milne, A.M. (1986). Parent involvement strategies: A new emphasis on traditional parent roles. In B.I. Williams, P.A. Richmond, & B.J. Mason (Eds.), *Designs for compensatory education: Conference proceedings and papers.* Washington, D.C.: Research and Evaluation Associates. (ED 293 901)

Doyle, W. (1986). Vision and reality: A reaction to issues in curriculum and instruction for compensatory education. In B.I. Williams, P.A. Richmond, & B.J. Mason (Eds.), *Designs for compensatory education: Conference proceedings and papers.* Washington, D.C.: Research and Evaluation Associates. (ED 293 901)

Duran, M., Jr. (1991, February). *Increasing parental involvement in a Chapter 1 reading program.* Practicum. Nova University, Fort Lauderdale, FL. (ED 329 956)

Fairchild, M.E., Christner, C., & Wilkinson, D. (1988). *What price achievement: A cost-effectiveness study of Chapter 1 and schoolwide projects.* Austin: Austin Independent School District. (ED 300 507)

Flaxman, E. (1983). International compensatory education programs. In T. Husen & T.N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education: Research and studies.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Fore, D.A. (1991). *Off to a good start with Even Start.* Unpublished manuscript, Dahlonega, GA. (ED 344 687)

Gittleman, M. (1992). *Chapter 1 program improvement and innovation across the states. An overview and state profiles.* Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers. (ED 350 379)

Gordon, E.W. (1970). Education for socially disadvantaged children: Introduction. *Review of Educational Research,* (40), 1-12.

Harpring, S.A. (1985, April). *Inclass alternatives to traditional Chapter 1 pullout programs.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ED 261 127)

Jay, E.D., & Shields, P.M. (1987). *Parent involvement in local Chapter 1 programs.* Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. (ED 293 962)

Jendryka, B. (1993, Fall). Failing grade for Federal aid: Is it time to close the book on Chapter 1? *Policy Review, 66,* 77-81.

Kennedy, M.M., Birman, B.F., Demaline, R.E., Moore, M.T., Myers, D.E., Chaikind, S., Strang, W., von Glatz, A., Reisner, E.R., Apling, R.N., & Bogart, J. (1986). *The effectiveness of Chapter 1 services: Second interim report from the National Assessment of Chapter 1.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ED 281 919)

Kennedy, M.M., Jung, R.K., & Orland, M.E. (1986). *Poverty, achievement, and the distribution of compensatory education: An interim report of the National Assessment of Chapter 1.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Education and Improvement. (ED 271 546)

King, F. (1990a). *Chapter 1: Does the model matter?* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (ED 330 448)

King, F. (1990b). *Alternatives to the pullout model.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (ED 330 447)

Kober, N. (1991, June). *The role and impact of Chapter 1, ESEA, evaluation and assessment practices.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. (ED 340 774)

Legters, N., & Slavin, R.E. (1992). *Elementary students at risk: A status report.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. (ED 352 425)

Levin, H.M. (1987). *New schools for the disadvantaged.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory. (ED 310 176)

Low achievers can catch up: Chapter 1 expects more of schools. (1991). *Harvard Education Letter, VII*(1), 1-4.

Lyons, J.J. (1993, September). Clinton Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal sent to Hill: Positive policy directions, troubling details. *NABE News, 17*(1), 1, 7, 9, 20-21.

McLaughlin, M.W., & Shields, P.M. (19986). Involving parents in the schools: Lessons for policy. In B.I. Williams, P.A. Richmond, & B.J. Mason (Eds.), *Designs for compensatory education: Conference proceedings and papers.* Washington, D.C.: Research and Evaluation Associates. (ED 293 901)

Millsap, M. A., Moss, M, & Gamse, B. (1993). *The Chapter 1 implementation study: Final report: Chapter 1 in public schools.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning. (ED 362 613)

Millsap, M. A., Turnbull, B., Moss, M., Brigham, N., Gamse, B., & Marks, E. (1992). *The Chapter 1 implementation study: Interim report.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning. (ED 351 420)

Moore, M. T., & Funkhouser, J. (1990). *More time to learn: Extended time strategies for Chapter 1 students.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget & Evaluation. (ED 317 279)

Moskowitz, J., Stullich, S., & Deng, B. (1993). *Targeting, formula, and resource allocation Issues: Focusing Federal funds where the needs are greatest. A supplemental volume to the National Assessment of the Chapter 1 program.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. (ED 362 614)

National Commission on Migrant Education. (1992). *Invisible children: A portrait of migrant education in the United States.* Washington, D.C.: Author. (ED 348 206)

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (1990). *Paraprofessional training manual.* Portland, OR: Author. (ED 334 151)

Odden, A. (1987). How fiscal accountability and program quality can be insured for Chapter 1. In D.P. Doyle, J.S. Michie, & B.I. Williams (Eds.), *Policy options for the future of compensatory education: Conference papers.* Washington, D.C.: Research and Evaluation Associates. (ED 298 209)

Palanki, A., Burch, P., & Davies, D. (1992). *Mapping the policy landscape: What Federal and state governments are doing to promote family-school-community partnerships.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning. (ED 343 700)

Passow, A.H. (1970). *Deprivation and disadvantage: Nature and manifestations.* International Studies in Education, 21. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute of Education.

Passow, A.H. (1988). *Curriculum and instruction in Chapter 1: A look back and a look ahead.* New York: Teachers College, Institute for Urban and Minority Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ED 306 346)

Puma, M.J., Jones, C.C., Rock, D., & Fernandez, R. (1993). *Prospects: The Congressionally mandated study of educational growth and opportunity.* Interim Report. Bethesda: Abt Associates. (ED 361 466)

Riddle, W.C. (1989). *Education for disadvantaged children: Major themes in the 1988 reauthorization of Chapter 1.* CRS Report for Congress. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service. (ED 308 253)

Romberg, T.A. (1986). Mathematics for compensatory school programs. In B.I. Williams, P.A. Richmond, & B.J. Mason (Eds.), *Designs for compensatory education: Conference proceedings and papers.* Washington, D.C.: Research and Evaluation Associates. (ED 293 901)

Rotberg, I.C., & Harvey, J.J. (1993). *Federal policy options for improving the education of low-income students. Volume I: Findings and recommendations.* Santa Monica: RAND Institute on Education and Training.

Rowan, B., & Guthrie, L.F. (1990). *The quality of Chapter 1 instruction: Results from a study of 24 schools.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ED 317 655)

Savage, D.G. (1987). Why Chapter 1 hasn't made much difference. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68*(8), 581-84.

Seda, I. (1989, November). *Rich literacy curricula: Undocumented and unstandardized.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX. (ED 322 486)

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1987). *Effective classroom programs for students at risk.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools. (ED 288 922)

Statement of the Independent Review Panel of the National Assessment of Chapter 1. (1993, February). Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Education. (ED 355 330)

Strang, E.W., & Carlson, E. (1991). *Providing Chapter 1 services to limited English-proficient students. Final report.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning. (ED 348 439)

Turnbull, B.J., Zeldin, S., & Cain, T. (1990, August). *State administration of the amended Chapter 1 program.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation. (ED 362 612)

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). *Reinventing Chapter 1: The current Chapter 1 program and new directions: Final report of the National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program.* Washington, D.C.: Author. (ED 355 329)

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1990). *Chapter 1 Policy Manual. Basic Programs operated by local educational agencies. Part A of Chapter 1 of Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 amended by the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 (Public Law 100-297).* Washington, D.C.: Author. (ED 323 274)

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (1992). *Chapter 1 flexibility: A guide to opportunities in local projects.* Washington, D.C.: Author. (ED 346 197)

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1993, March). *Chapter 1 accountability: Greater focus on program goals needed.* Washington, D.C.: Author. (ED 359 304)

Zumwalt, K.K. (1986). Curriculum and instruction: Reactions. In B.I. Williams, P.A. Richmond, & B.J. Mason (Eds.), *Designs for compensatory education: Conference proceedings and papers.* Washington, D.C.: Research and Evaluation Associates. (ED 293 901)

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027