A STUDY OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS IN A LARGE URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEM

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
ELMER H. VRUGGINK

1970

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A STUDY OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS IN A LARGE URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEM

presented by

Elmer H. Vruggink

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

Charles A. Blackman
Major professor

Date June 8, 1970

O-169

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS IN A LARGE URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEM

By

Elmer H. Vruggink

The purpose of this descriptive study was to examine factors in education that were affected by the availability of compensatory programs.

The approach was to look broadly at all aspects of compensatory programs in a large urban center. This process provided the basis for decisions about their influence and led to recommendations for improving future programs.

The review of literature touched on identifying the disadvantaged, examining the special acts related to educating him, and analyzing the effectiveness of representative programs nationwide.

Information on programs in a large school system, Grand Rapids, Michigan, was obtained from existing records, interviews, and questionnaires.

Some of the findings uncovered in the analysis of this information were:

1. The rate of transciency in inner-city schools since 1963 has not changed.
2. The average age of teachers in disadvantaged schools has fallen from 41 to 35 since 1963.
3. I.Q. scores show very little change when compared with 1963. Schools with majority black enrollments show the same I.Q. patterns as the schools with majority white enrollments.
4. Compared to 1963, first grade students in 1969 showed a slight improvement in readiness on the Metropolitan Readiness Test.
5. Pupil teacher ratios in inner-city schools have been reduced from 27.3 in 1963 to 21.1 in 1970.
6. Inner-city schools do not have a higher percent of first year teachers when compared with 12 other control schools.
7. Significant gains in I.Q. and achievement were shown when a highly structured language arts and mathematics program was tried with preschool and kindergarten children.
8. Teachers and principals feel that compensatory programs are helping children achieve better today than five years ago.

After the findings were examined, the following trends seem to have occurred as a result of the availability of compensatory programs:

1. The movement toward differentiated staffing has received general support from educators at all levels.
2. Through the attempt to better educate the disadvantaged child, all schools in Grand Rapids now are on a nongraded, continuous progress program.
3. Staff development programs are concerned with providing more meaningful education, indicating a willingness to recognize the deficits within the current education of the deprived, and proposing to make the changes that will help to eradicate these deficits.
4. Curriculum changes have evolved in many areas, such as those affecting preschool, reading, and dropout programs, as well as other specialized areas.
5. Decentralization of operations in large school systems has been started by compensatory programs. More building autonomy plus parent participation seems to be the trend.
6. Health services have greatly expanded as a school function since 1965.

7. Agency cooperation has progressed to the point where various community agencies have been cooperating in a united attack on the effects of poverty.
8. Compensatory programs have forced schools to reconsider the evaluative function and to look carefully at goals in education, whether cognitive, affective, or psychomotor, and forced educators to consider accountability for results.

In addition, the comprehensive look at programs led to these conclusions.

1. There is a serious problem in planning due to inadequate lead time in funding.
2. There appears to be a trend to over emphasize achievement tests as a single tool in evaluation.
3. There is a great interest by teachers and principals to have more building level control for planning and implementation of programs.
4. A prevention program is more likely to work than a remedial one.
5. A good program of teacher education seems to be a most important factor if education in disadvantaged areas is to be improved.

A STUDY OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS IN A LARGE URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEM

By

Elmer H. Vruggink

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education
Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer particularly wishes to thank Dr. Charles Blackman, Chairman of the Doctoral Guidance Committee, for his continuous encouragement, support, guidance, and inspiration throughout all phases of this doctoral program. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Richard Featherstone, Dr. Howard Hickey, and Dr. John Wagner for their many valuable suggestions and support.

Also, an expression of gratitude is given to the Grand Rapids Board of Education and colleagues on the staff for their help and encouragement. Special thanks is expressed to my secretary, Mrs. Karon Buning.

This study would not have been completed without the encouragement and support of my family. I owe gratitude to my wife, Vivian, and children, Gary, Kathy, Mark, and Karen, for their understanding and patience during the time required to write this dissertation; and it is to them that I dedicate this manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Education in public schools has been front page news in recent years. Strikes, riots, disruptions, and boycotts have revealed deep-rooted problems and have caused seemingly unbudgeable polarizations. Parents, students, administrators, and teachers have questioned the adequacy of present programs; and books and articles on the topic have become popular reading.

Legislation by local, state, and national governments has called particular attention, in the last five years, to problems of the inner city. More money is being poured into more and more programs to try to find simple answers to the complex problem of educating children in depressed urban areas.

A study of education in these urban areas is particularly appropriate at this time, since the various levels of government are asking serious questions about whether the funds are improving education at all. The President of the United States has recently vetoed a bill after the Congress added funds to his request calling for

less money than the previous year. In addition, the President said in his Message on Education Reform on March 3, 1970:

> We must stop letting wishes color our judgments about the educational effectiveness of many special compensatory programs, when--despite some dramatic and encouraging exceptions--there is growing evidence that most of them are not yet measurably improving the success of poor children in school.[1]

The Problem

Rapid changes in our society have contributed to creating a large group of economically and educationally deprived people living in environmental conditions and maintaining value systems significantly different from those of the traditional middle class. This disparity has created both a problem and a challenge for the education profession.

The children from the disadvantaged home show a generally poor performance in school. They have a high proportion of reading and life-adjustment problems. As a result, their failure and dropout rates are very high. The task now facing our public schools is that of providing adequate and equal educational opportunities for the

---

[1]Richard Nixon, President, "Message on Education Reform," to the Congress of the United States, March 3, 1970.

masses of students who do not and cannot respond to the traditional curriculum and instruction.[2]

In 1963, principals at 12 inner-city schools in Grand Rapids, Michigan conducted an extensive study detailing the problems in learning that children in their schools were having, and made several recommendations for improvement. The following is a summary of their findings.

> As our city has grown, the deprived areas have become more crowded and the educational needs of the children in these areas have become more conspicuous. Culturally impoverished through heritage and environment, these children have great difficulty in conforming to the learning process and pace set for middle-class youngsters. They need special programs that are somewhat different from those of the middle-class schools. The teachers in these schools need additional training in procedure and methods of instruction. Many are not prepared to cope with the unique educational and cultural retardation of many of these youngsters.
>
> The families of most of these children are dependent on welfare, and other such agencies or earn so little they barely manage to exist. Children are usually improperly fed, poorly clothed, and often unkempt. The house which they must live in is usually sub-standard and located in deteriorating neighborhoods that further encourage undesirable behavior and attitudes. The home is usually devoid of books, magazines, and newspapers. Many families lack one parent (usually the father). There is, therefore, no enthusiasm for school and no incentive for learning what is taught at school. Rarely do the children have any great drive or ambition to enter a particular field of work.

---

[2]Hilda Taba and Deborah Elkins, Teaching Strategies for the Culturally Disadvantaged (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966), p. 3.

Their recommendations were to:
(a) Secure a coordinator of the program.
(b) Maintain a pupil-teacher ratio of not more than 25 to 1.
(c) Secure a coaching teacher to do remedial work for each school.
(d) Provide a preschool program.
(e) Provide a summer school.
(f) Establish libraries and expand cultural activities.[3]

In 1964, a coordinating committee submitted "A Plan for School Action for Culturally Disadvantaged and Economically Deprived Children." This plan suggested ways of utilizing sections of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in educating children from the inner city.

Some of the suggested programs were implemented in 1964; and with the advent of special funding through Title I of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act and a variety of other sources, most others were added in subsequent years. Several million dollars were spent as various compensatory programs were tried in an attempt to improve the education of the disadvantaged.

In spite of these added programs, there is still concern in Grand Rapids as the Board and staff are trying to find answers to perplexing problems as they attempt to plan for the next decade. Their concerns center around whether meaningful education can take place in

---

[3]Principals' Report, "Report of the Study Group on Education of Culturally Disadvantaged Children," Grand Rapids Public Schools, Grand Rapids, Michigan, October, 1963, p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

"neighborhood" schools in the inner city, and whether compensatory programs should have a role in this education.

In a paper prepared by the Office of Instruction in New York City, compensatory education is defined as "an organized effort to create positive effects to counter balance negative environmental factors which have created a failure proneness in some individual children or groups of children." It should be noted that the term "environmental factors" should also include teacher attitude and influence, and other elements of the education process, as well as home and society implications.

The general problem to be faced is: Can we identify areas where any aspects of education have been influenced as a result of compensatory programs? Dr. Helen Rees enlarges upon this when she says:

> Perhaps the time has come, as has been mentioned before, when we must decide whether we are going to use as bases for judgment of further endeavors of compensatory education only those specific gains that can be statistically measured and compared, such as the increased points in the I.Q. and increased grade level accomplishment in the subject matter areas, or whether the actual changes that take place in the behavior, the speech, and the attitude of a deprived child or a deprived youth as observed by competent teachers, by parents who have discovered the value of an education, or by the child himself in his willingness to come to school and in his desire to communicate and cooperate with his peers, have some place in evaluation. Perhaps we have three figures to choose from at this point: the statistically significant correlation or score arrived at through perfectly

> controlled conditions; the figure of speech within the academic language of the educator, the psychologist, the sociologist, or the anthropologist, which sound well in speech and reads well in the latest article but seldom reaches a state of reality; and the man or woman to be, a human being, one who is unique and has gifts that if developed will contribute to the society in which he lives--a figure that cannot be duplicated but one that may have an inestimable value. This is indeed a choice for us to consider carefully.[4]

The Purpose

The purpose of this study is to identify those factors which might be affected by the availability of compensatory programs. The intent is to describe compensatory program process nationally, as well as examine such programs in one urban community and make recommendations for future programs.

No attempt will be made to do a statistical analysis of any programs. References, however, will be made to other pertinent statistical studies.

The author will not attempt to "prove" the value of a narrow aspect of compensatory education. Indeed, the intent is to look at the broad aspects of programs in order to better understand the total effects on a school system, and to enable schools to plan programs for maximum total impact.

---

[4]Helen E. Rees, Deprivation and Compensatory Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), pp. 229-230.

To do this comprehensively, it is recognized that the ease of identifying effects of various types will vary considerably. It appears that in many studies the selection of questions asked has been determined by the availability of "hard data" that can be readily obtained. This study admittedly will sacrifice hard responses in favor of an effort to look at a number of areas related to compensatory education, many that presently do not lend themselves to quantification.

Some writers question the strategies in evaluation of programs for the disadvantaged. Gordon in a recent speech said:

> The principal focus of evaluative research is placed on changes in cognitive development as reflected in scores on standardized tests of intelligence and academic achievement. A review of many of the reports emanating from these studies reveals negligible gains as reflected by these criteria, but almost always a subjectively determined greater gain in emotional-social development and stability.[5]

He went on to discuss the strategy of research design (the recognition of the interaction between school, community, and family influences, and the developmental processes in children) and the designing of studies to explore much more than can be measured by a Stanford-Binet or a SCAT-STEP battery.

---

[5]G. G. Gordon, Report to the Steering Committee, Longitudinal Study of Culturally Disadvantaged Children (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, May, 1968), p. 3.

Much in educational research in the past, and at present, is based on strategic errors. In effect, we measure the easy-to-measure, easy-to-change elements and avoid or ignore the difficult-to-measure, difficult-to-change elements and influences in the development of children--disadvantaged and otherwise.

John Gardner also touches on the need to be careful when we study the external aspects of education.

> We seem immensely satisfied with the outer husk of the enterprise--the number of dollars spent, the size of laboratories, the number of people involved, the fine projects outlined, the number of publications. Why do we grasp so desperately at externals? Partly because we are more superficial than we would like to admit. Perhaps partly because we are too lazy or too preoccupied to go to the heart of the problem. But also because it is easier to organize the external aspects of things. The mercurial spirit of great teaching and great scholarship cannot be organized, rationalized, delegated, or processed. The formalities and externals can.[6]

If an administrator is to make future decisions on compensatory programs however, he must have a variety of information. Daniel L. Stufflebeam states:

> Programs to improve education depend heavily upon a variety of decisions, and a variety of information is needed to make and support those decisions. Evaluators charged with providing this information must have adequate knowledge about the relevant decision processes and associated information

---

[6]John W. Gardner, Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963), p. 82.

> requirements before they can design adequate evaluations. They need to have knowledge about the locus, focus, timing, and criticality of decisions to be served. At present no adequate knowledge of decision processes and associated information requirements relative to educational programs exists. Nor is there any ongoing program to provide this knowledge. In short, there are no adequate conceptualizations of decisions and associated information requirements or programs to produce them.[7]

In an attempt to uncover this "variety of information," it seems that the following areas should be explored. These are not intended to be all inclusive. Other factors may be uncovered as all facets of the program are examined.

1. Cost
2. Achievement and/or I.Q. as measured by standardized tests
3. Changing practices, such as differentiated staffing or continuous progress
4. Transiency
5. Curriculum improvements or teaching techniques
6. Parent involvement
7. Staff involvement
8. Teacher characteristics (age, race, perceptions)
9. Adult-pupil ratio

---

[7]Daniel L. Stufflebeam, "Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision Making," in Improving Educational Assessment and An Inventory of Measures of Affective Behavior (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1969), p. 46.

10. Teacher and administrator turnover
11. Student racial characteristics
12. Decentralization

Obviously, there cannot be a depth study of all of these areas. In Chapter III an attempt will be made to look at some of them. During this process, the writer hopes to generate some ideas and feelings that will help uncover areas not previously considered, and will lead to recommendations for improving educational programs.

The plan is to examine the principals' report for base-line data, search the literature for similar studies, check the records for all programs and their cost since 1963, try to isolate some promising practices, compare achievement and other data, and question competent teachers and administrators regarding changes that have taken place.

An examination of the abstracts of similar studies shows many attempting to study a single area of compensatory programs that is limited. None examined by this writer have tried to observe the comprehensiveness and overall "gestalt" look this study is attempting. Hopefully, by standing back and taking this broad look, areas will evolve that will show some effectiveness of compensatory programs.

Procedure for the Study

This study can best be characterized as a descriptive one. It will provide a history of compensatory programs for the public school system in Grand Rapids, Michigan, as well as facts, information, and opinions of existing programs. John W. Best defines descriptive research as follows.

> Descriptive research describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist; practices that prevail, beliefs, points of view, or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt, or trends that are developing. The process of descriptive research goes beyond mere gathering of data. It involves an element of interpretation of the meaning or significance of what is described.[8]

The major sources of information employed in this study will be found in (1) existing literature, (2) existing data in the Grand Rapids school system, (3) observations in school settings, and (4) conversation and dialogues with educators.

The method employed will include researching and synthesizing materials from various compensatory programs, analyzing programs in Grand Rapids, and developing recommendations for future programs.

---

[8]John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), pp. 102-103.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study will be conducted within the school district of the City of Grand Rapids, Michigan, although background will be drawn from around the country. Therefore, the applicability of the conclusions and recommendations to other districts should be assessed in this light by those wishing to use the findings.

Secondly, although references will be made to programs in the middle and secondary school, most conclusions will be drawn from the elementary schools that were in the original principals' study.

Thirdly, since many variables such as the demographic composition of the various neighborhoods are in a process of change, it is not the intent to show "cause and effect" relationships.

Fourthly, although various aspects of compensatory education will be analyzed, the main emphasis will be on developing recommendations so compensatory programs can become more effective.

Fifthly, while the researcher is familiar with the school system under study, this can be a limitation as well as a strength. It is recognized that his orientation may make him subject to errors of omission and commission.

A final assumption that is made is that compensatory education programs will continue, and that the results of this study will be used in planning new programs in the future.

CHAPTER II

SELECTED REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Identifying the Disadvantaged

Numerous labels have been used to identify the children of the poor: economically deprived, culturally deprived, culturally different, low socio-economic group, and disadvantaged. Although the poor exist in every geographical area of this country, the focus here is on those that are located in the slums of cities and will be referred to as "disadvantaged." Frost says that "in an educational context, 'disadvantaged' refers to children with a particular set of educationally associated problems arising from and residing extensively within the culture of the poor."[1]

The immigration of the poor to the inner cities and the retreat of the middle class to the suburbs have reached alarming proportions. In 1950, approximately one child in ten residing in our largest cities was

---

[1]Joe L. Frost and Glenn R. Hawkes, The Disadvantaged Child (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966), p. 1.

disadvantaged. This ratio is now about one in three, and will continue to increase unless currently developing programs of compensatory education are successful.[2]

Disadvantaged children may be described in terms of various characteristics. Basil Bernstein[3] has studied language behavior and found restricted language patterns characterized by short, often unfinished sentences, limited use of adjectives and adverbs, and simple and repetitive use of conjunctions.

The family environment that produces children with the preceding characteristics also tends to produce children with certain personal defects. Martin Deutsch[4] has studied such children and finds them to have inferior auditory discrimination; inferior visual discrimination; inferior judgment concerning time, number, and other basic concepts. He contends that this inferiority is not due to physical defects but inferior habits of hearing, seeing, and thinking.

---

[2]Frank Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962).

[3]Basil Bernstein, "Language and Social Class," British Journal of Sociology, XI (1960), pp. 271-276.

[4]Martin P. Deutsch, "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in Education in Depressed Areas, ed. by A. Harry Passow (New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1963).

In addition, children from the disadvantaged home are less likely to maximize their educational opportunity than children from more advantaged backgrounds. Passow[5] states that the children in the depressed areas seem severely hampered in their schooling by a complex of conditions at home, in the neighborhood, and in the classroom.

Legislation Related to Educating the Disadvantaged

Schoolmen in the late 50's and early 60's were recognizing the problems, but due to lack of understanding and money felt helpless to deal with them.

Federal and state governments began to awaken in the 60's and passed some legislation that related directly to the disadvantaged.

Federal Acts

1962 Welfare Amendments (Public Law 87-543). The amendments in this act placed special emphasis on proper education of children in families receiving public assistance, so that the children do not in their turn fall into the pattern of public dependency.

---

[5]A. Harry Passow, ed., Education in Depressed Areas (New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1963).

1963 Vocational Education Act (Public Law 88-210). Congress made it plain in this act that any disadvantaged person could be given vocational education whether in school, out of school, or merely in need of training.

Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA), Public Law 87-415, amended by Public Law 89-15. This is the principal adult manpower development and youth training program of the federal government for out-of-school youth who are already in the labor force. 1963 amendments permit local utilization of this program to be largely directed at disadvantaged youth.

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. There were two titles in this act that had particular importance for schoolmen.

Title I	Part A--Job Corps
	Part B--Work Training Program
	Part C--Work Study Program
Title II	Part A--Community Action Programs
	Part B--Adult Basic Education

This act marked the entry of the Grand Rapids School District into a host of programs designed to alleviate the educational problems of the disadvantaged.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. President Johnson, in his education message to Congress in January 1965, stated that one of the major tasks

confronting our society was "to bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most."

On April 11, 1965, the President of the United States signed Public Law 89-10--better known as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. President Johnson called it "the greatest breakthrough in the advance of education since the Constitution was written." The act contains five titles described briefly as follows.

Title I Education of Children of Low Income Families

Title II School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials

Title III Supplementary Educational Centers and Services

Title IV Educational Research and Training

Title V State Departments of Education

Although each of these titles was designed to fulfill certain purposes and needs in communities throughout our nation, the title having the greatest potential for impacting the lives of children in Grand Rapids was Title I. The following statement from the law reaffirms this.

> Section 201. Declaration of policy for the new title
> In this section the Congress, in recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational program, declares that it is the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to such local educational agencies so

> that they can expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.[6]

Much testimony was taken from school superintendents, educational leaders, and research scholars. House Report No. 143 summarizes their testimony as follows.

> It has been apparent for some time that there is a close relationship between conditions of poverty and lack of education development and poor academic performance. Testimony to the committee illustrated sharply and starkly that the conditions of poverty or economic deprivation produce an environment which in too many cases precludes children from taking full advantage of the educational facilities provided. They have been conditioned by their home environment or lack thereof, so that they are not adaptable to ordinary educational programs. . . . There was virtually unanimous agreement among those testifying that aid to the economically disadvantaged child represented the basic approach to widespread educational improvement in this country. . . . Title I can be considered as another very potent instrument to be used in the eradication of poverty and its effects.[7]

State of Michigan Acts

The State of Michigan also recognized the problems in educating disadvantaged children and in 1965 passed Act 199, known as Section 4 of the State School Aid Act.

---

[6]U.S. Congress, House, Report No. 143, 89th Cong., 1965, p. 52.

[7]Ibid., p. 2.

This section allotted four million dollars divided among school districts where there exist " . . . conditions such as high percentages of culturally and economically deprived children, including the physically and mentally handicapped, intermittently employed parents, welfare dependents, minority groups, families experiencing great mobility, and others of a similar nature."[8] A school district was eligible for a grant if at least one-fifth of its pupil membership consisted of underprivileged children.

In 1966-67, the State granted another four million dollars for the same purpose and repeated the grant in 1967-68.

Early in 1968, a group of school districts in Michigan with unique problems in urban education formed the "Middle Cities Education Association." This group of large cities presented a proposal to the legislature which led to the approval of an Act on June 27, 1968, called Section 3 of the State Aid Act. The proposal of the Middle Cities group contained the following passage.

> Yet, without question, the single most effective agency yesterday, today, and tomorrow for alleviating the ravages of environmental

---

[8] "Education for the Underprivileged--A Report to the State on Section 4 of the Michigan State School Aid Act," State Board of Education, Lansing, Michigan, 1967. (Mimeographed.)

> deprivation is the public school. And if the massive problem facing us today is to be resolved expeditiously, the prime agency must be the public school. Educators and educational systems must be asked to contribute to all efforts of environmental change and must have some prerogatives for initiating change.[9]

The programs funded under Section 3 had to involve the following.

1. The reduction of the pupil-adult classroom ratio in a school.
2. The employment of paraprofessional personnel.
3. An in-service education program for the staff of a school which is directed toward achievement of higher qualifications for meeting the needs of massive educational deprivation.

It should be noted that individual schools had to qualify under this section, and funds could be used at that school only. Grand Rapids qualified 2 schools in 1968-69* and 12 schools in 1969-70.**

---

[9]"Proposals for Providing Equal Educational Opportunities for Children of Economically and Culturally Disadvantaged Families," Middle Cities Education Association, 1967, p. 12. (Mimeographed.)

*Sheldon, South Middle.

**Sheldon, South Middle, Campau Park, Coit, Franklin, Hall, Henry, Jefferson, Madison Park, Vandenberg, Alexander, Sigsbee.

Representative Programs

Programs designed to alleviate and rectify the problems proliferated during the 1960's and many volumes are written on theory and practice for educating disadvantaged children. Furthermore, the programs have evolved under differing approaches and differing philosophies; and it is, therefore, difficult to understand their many ramifications. Brief reviews of selected projects that seem representative of most compensatory programs follow.

New York Higher Horizons Program

Started originally in 1956 and expanded after results seemed heartening, the project was designed to identify and stimulate able students from a culturally deprived area, and from generally low-income families without an educational tradition to reach higher educational and vocational goals. The program concentrated on six areas.

1. Appraisal of ability and teacher outlook. Since group intelligence tests appeared to be unsuitable for the type of student, other nonverbal and subjective rating procedures were used. Teachers were constantly reminded to search for clues of ability and to lose their morbid outlook about children.

2. Early identification.
3. Self-concepts and aspiration levels. The use of educational and guidance approaches that would raise the student's opinion of himself and his level of appreciation.
4. Raising educational achievement. Remedial services, both individual and in small groups, were provided whenever necessary.
5. Adequate guidance. Not more than 250 students were assigned to a full-time counselor in junior high school and 150 in senior high school.
6. Raising the cultural level. Trips to museums, theatres, libraries, and college campuses were utilized.

One of the outstanding features of this program has been the carefully planned evaluation and questioning that has gone on. The final evaluation comes from an intensive experimental-control study using tests, reading scores, personal evaluations, record cards, questionnaires, and check lists. Statistical analysis was applied to the evaluation of the growth and development of those participating. Where no form of measurement could take place, samplings were taken of opinions. Perhaps one of the weaknesses (which also could be said of every program) is the inability to state or to weigh which of the many

variables being considered in a program as extensive as this has more or less influence on the results.[10]

The following statement by Jacob Landers explains some more of the philosophy of the program.

> Higher Horizons is an organized effort to effect a major breakthrough in the education of those who need special help to be able to make their maximum contribution to our American democracy. It has established the basic philosophy and indicated the major areas of operation. It inspires hope and supplies the personnel to translate that hope into reality. What might formerly have been done sporadically or in isolation is now part of a total program, with far greater impact upon the child. If Higher Horizons has done nothing else, it has provided a rallying point in the fight for our disadvantaged children, and a peg upon which all-supervisors, teachers, parents, and pupils--might hang their hopes.[11]

The Great Cities Program for School Improvement

Concern about urban school problems resulted in the formation in 1961 of a nonprofit educational organization called The Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement. The chief purpose was to conduct studies of unique problems that are faced by great cities in their efforts to plan for continuing development of improved educational opportunity for all children.

---

[10]Helen E. Rees, Deprivation and Compensatory Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), p. 214.

[11]Jacob Landers, Higher Horizons: Progress Report (New York: Board of Education of City of New York, 1963), p. 98.

The individual programs that have grown out of this larger improvement program differ in detail, but there are certain common factors. Four of these are:

> Awareness that the culturally deprived student is usually poor in communication skills and that this inability causes failure in other subjects;
>
> Willingness to experiment with a broad range of teaching materials such as filmstrips, records, and television, and with administrative approaches such as team teaching and flexible programming;
>
> Strenuous efforts to search out and use community help, such as various public health and welfare services or private philanthropic organizations and business and industry;
>
> Preparation both in teaching skills and in attitudes of teachers involved in the great cities programs and, happily, the concern, devotion, and enthusiasm which ordinarily result from that involvement.[12]

A brief description of some of these projects, as summarized by Helen E. Rees, follows:

> Baltimore. The Early School Admissions Project . . . , experimental in nature, was planned to attempt to establish a foundation for the continuity of experience, to promote parental understanding of the growth and development of children and the roles of parents, to augment and increase the effectiveness of the project's staff through the involvement of volunteer personnel, and to better coordinate their work with community agencies.
>
> Buffalo. In the development of a program adapted to the needs of the culturally different, the emphasis was placed upon the raising of the academic achievements of the pupils in five of the elementary

---

[12] Dorsey Baynham, "The Great Cities Projects," NEA Journal, LII (April, 1963), pp. 1-2 (from a Ford Foundation reprint).

schools, particularly in the area of reading, by introducing necessary services through additional personnel, among whom were reading specialists, special reading teachers, and speech therapists.

Chicago. A special project here was planned for the development of an improved program for boys and girls over 14 years of age who had not graduated from the eighth grade, through the planning of an in-school and an out-of-school program; the in-school phase has grown into Educational and Vocational Guidance Centers where these children may be groups in non-graded classes for intensive help.

Cleveland. The phases of the public school program which have received attention and been considered successful because of their more promising practices are: An intern program for prospective teachers, transition classes for pupils entering from elementary schools, the organization of dropout prevention program classes through the industrial arts and the home economics departments involving the "least likely" pupils. Other satisfactory innovations were the pre-orientation for new teachers, and programs for secondary reading, home visitation, after-school and Saturday recreation, and a summer camp.

Detroit. The promising practices here related to the reinforcement of the teaching of reading in the classroom, the encouragement of reading for pleasure and information, the development of an "integrated," urban environment reading series for grades one, two, and three, the organization of a summer school program, and the use of the project school as a community agency.

Houston. An effective practice emerged from the Talent Presentation Project as a back-to-school drive conducted during the month of August when twenty teachers were employed to screen the records of incoming seventh grade students, and to visit homes of the students enrolled in the project classes and of those who would be eligible for the incoming class.

Milwaukee. School Orientation Centers were established for the culturally deprived children of in-migrant and transient parents to help them to adjust to the community, to provide remedial help, and to prepare them for regular classwork.

New York. In addition to the Demonstration Guidance Project, the programs for dropouts, for junior high school career guidance classes, junior guidance classes, and teacher recruitment for "special service" schools have been most successful.

Philadelphia. This city added a bilingual coordinator for its project to work with Spanish-speaking parents and help them to establish a stronger bond with the schools, and has put special emphasis upon pointing out the importance of the language arts teacher's responsibility in providing for the improvement of communication skills and the structuring of the reading program.

Pittsburgh. Team teaching and flexible programming have been points of interest in the planning of education for the deprived children, with special emphasis upon the "more able pupils."

St. Louis. A combined academic and vocational program was set up which was aimed at the economic independence for students who would otherwise join the army of dropouts, and this group has received special counseling and assistance from both the school and the employer.

San Francisco. The need was felt to provide extra services to be of particular help to the teacher of culturally deprived pupils in order to extend their practice of individualized instruction. This has been promoted through their School-Community Improvement Program, Superintendent's Compensatory Program, the State Compensatory Education Program, Youth Opportunity Center, and the Drama Demonstration Projects.

District of Columbia. The emphasis here was also on the language arts, and the practice was established to assign one language arts special teacher to work with the primary children in a school which served the deprived; the direction here points to the development of a curriculum innovation with the teaching of our standard English to these children as a second language.[13]

---

[13]Helen Rees, op. cit., pp. 227-229 from Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement, Promising Practices for the Culturally Deprived (Chicago: Research Council, 1964).

This listing by no means includes all of the efforts in compensatory education in these cities. It does, however, indicate the directions many of the early efforts were taking, and served as a pattern for other cities to follow when additional monies were appropriated.

St. Louis Banneker District Project

This project, under Dr. Sam Shepard in the Banneker area of St. Louis, was the first program to attempt to raise self-concepts on a large scale in all-Negro schools. A school community venture which places much value on achieving and doing well in school, it had as a motto for parents, "Success in school is your child's most important business." For the child, "Success in school is my most important business." The school symbol was a "Mister Achiever" and his exploits were broadcast on the school radio. Teachers were instructed to ignore I.Q. scores and treat all children as if they had superior ability. Visits were made to places of work to give pupils a chance to see the relevance of school skills to real work and to build an image of the Negro at work. The first three years of the project demonstrated significant academic gains for many pupils and increased the proportion of junior high school graduates admitted to Track I in high school.

Head Start

This program began in the summer of 1965 and was funded under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Its purpose was to stimulate a child to learn simple things he does not learn from his parents--how to talk in sentences; how to make a mark with a pencil; how to tell one color from another; the idea of counting, of wondering why, of asking an adult a question; and most important, learning to feel the simple nourishing emotion that comes from experiencing success.

It was also intended to combine the educational activities with a good health program, social services, nutritional improvement, and intensive work with families.

Early classes in Grand Rapids, as well as in other areas of the country, produced highly significant increases in school readiness. As pointed out later, however, the benefits of special preschool stimulation were not enough, apparently, to sustain the children in later school experiences.

Most educators, however, feel that preschool programs hold the brightest hope for the disadvantaged child. Programs have expanded to full year; and in Grand Rapids, numbers in the program have increased by using both Title I and Economic Opportunity Act funds.

Follow Through

Started in 1968 with approximately 18,000 disadvantaged youngsters and continued in 1969 with twice as many, Follow Through is funded under the Economic Opportunity Act and coordinated by the United States Office of Education. It serves children in kindergarten through third grade, and is designed to reinforce the educational gains made by students from Head Start or similar preschool programs. Each new project normally begins by serving children entering kindergarten or first grade and expands one grade level each fall, allowing participants to continue in the program.

Follow Through youngsters get medical and social services as well as intensive classroom instruction. Health and dental care, nutrition, and social and psychological services are provided through cooperation with community agencies.

Participating communities are encouraged to select 1 of 19 instructional approaches that have been developed to educate disadvantaged children. These represent some of the most promising approaches to early childhood education developed in recent years by the educational research community. The Office of Education has contracted with the Stanford Research Institute to conduct an independent study over the next several years to assess the educational effect of these various new instructional approaches.

Active parent participation plays an essential part in the Follow Through program, which requires that parents make up half of each project's policy advisory committee. Some parents also serve in the classroom as paid volunteers or observers; some develop educational and community services. Many have returned to school through a project's encouragement, and often Follow Through runs special education programs and basic literacy classes for parents.[14]

Analysis of Programs

"Thou art weighed in the balances and found wanting." This quotation from the Bible (Daniel 5, verse 27) seems to summarize what has happened when one analyzes many of the reports and studies since compensatory programs started in the early 1960's. What went wrong? Why haven't the bright goals of the planners for the federal and state programs been achieved? What are the so-called critics and supporters saying? A brief review follows.

Title I

After the first full year of operation of Title I (school year 1966-67), a high level group of

---

[14]"Federal Funds--Follow Through, 1969-70," American Education, V, No. 9 (November, 1969), p. 26.

evaluators[15] could only conclude that "the public schools of America have a long way to go, first in discovering the ways in which education can effect major changes in the lives of the poor, and then in doing something about it." In presenting this dismal report in January, 1968, the Council indicated directions in which Title I programs ought to be headed, such as:

> Use of criteria other than reading at normal grade levels to measure the progress of disadvantaged children. The Council suggested "such relatively uncharted fields as creativity, motivation for achievement, awareness of the varied world of work. . . ."
>
> Use of prototype programs, concentrating on fewer children, to demonstrate successful compensatory techniques. Spreading the Title I funds to cover as many eligible children as possible "has caused many Title I programs to become overextended and ineffective."
>
> A change in teaching approaches. Only a small portion of Title I funds was spent on "genuinely new approaches to guiding and stimulating learning." Neglected were programs in the area of conceptual thinking, sensory and motor experiences for young learners, realistic reading experiences, and field trips.
>
> Thorough diagnosis of the individual child's situation and problems.
>
> Substantial attention to summer programs. According to the Council, "dollars thoughtfully expended on summer schools may be among the most productive dollars spent by Title I. . . ."

---

[15] Report of the National Advisory Council of Education of Disadvantaged Children (Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council of the Education of Disadvantaged Children, 1968).

> Parent involvement in the child's learning. Of the 116 programs observed by the Council, only two attempted to involve parents as reinforcing agents in their children's reading.[16]

Another report published in December, 1969, claims that it does not evaluate compensatory programs but reports on how Title I money has been spent and administered.

Reacting to the universal assumption that Title I is providing benefits to educationally disadvantaged children from low-income families, the report says:

> We find this optimistic assumption largely unwarranted. Instead we find that:
>
> 1. The intended beneficiaries of Title I--poor children--are being denied the benefits of the Act because of improper and illegal use of Title I funds.
>
> 2. Many Title I programs are poorly planned and executed so that the needs of educationally deprived children are not met. In some instances there are no Title I programs to meet the needs of these children.
>
> 3. State departments of education, which have major responsibility for operating the program and approving Title I project applications, have not lived up to their legal responsibility to administer the program in conformity with the law and the intent of Congress.
>
> 4. The United States Office of Education, which has overall responsibility for administering the Act, is reluctant and timid in its administration of Title I and abdicates to the United States its responsibility for enforcing the law.

---

[16]Education U.S.A., "What Directions for Title I," Education U.S.A., Special Report: The New ESEA (Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1968), p. 5.

5. Poor people and representatives of community organizations are excluded from the planning and design of Title I programs. In many poor communities, the parents of Title I-eligible children know nothing about Title I. In some communities, school officials refuse to provide information about the Title I program to local residents.[17]

Further criticism came from the National Advisory Council which said: "Some (projects) are imaginative, well thought-out, and demonstrably successful; other projects exemplify a tendency simply to do more of the same, to enlarge equipment inventories or reduce class size by insignificant numbers."[18]

Another concern of critics is the dilution of Title I money despite the Office of Education's requirement that the annual expenditure per child for Title I compensatory services "should be expected to equal about one-half the expenditure per child from state and local funds for the . . . regular school program."[19]

---

[17]Washington Research Project, Title I of ESEA, Is It Helping Poor Children? (Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project and NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., 1969), pp. ii-iii.

[18]National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Title I--ESEA: A Review and a Forward Look, Fourth Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, 1969), p. 13.

[19]U.S. Office of Education, Program Guide #44, Section 4.7 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Division of Compensatory Education).

California makes concentration of Title I services mandatory. In his testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor, Dr. Wilson Riles, Director of Compensatory Education in the California State Department of Education, explained that this state policy was adopted because:

> Our research and evaluation have shown that . . . piece-meal projects which have attempted through a single-shot activity to overcome learning handicaps caused by poverty (have) usually failed to result in demonstrable achievement gains. . . . We have found that projects which concentrate at least $300 per child over and above the regular school program were the most successful.[20]

The second annual report of Title I said that youngsters who previously lost ground each month were improving, "sometimes gaining a full month of learning for every month spent in the classroom." The report added:

> Reading-test data from a sampling of the States indicate that Title I youngsters are attaining higher levels of achievement according to national testing norms. The drop-out rate in Title I schools has decreased. . . .[21]

---

[20]California State Board of Education, "Supplemental Policies for ESEA Title I Projects Adopted by the California State Board of Education," California State Board of Education in House Hearings, February 14, 1969, p. 2525.

[21]U.S. Office of Education, Title I/Year II--The Second Annual Report of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, School Year 1966-67 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 137.

But then the report said:

> Despite these hopeful signs, however, the Title I child is still far behind the average student. As many as 60 per cent of the Title I youngsters in some districts fall in the lowest quarter on reading scores; they have higher absentee rates than other children; substantially fewer continue their education beyond high school, and of those who do a disproportionate number go into trade or business schools rather than into college.[22]

Other Programs

Doxey A. Wilkerson analyzed ten compensatory programs in 1965, including New York City's Higher Horizons Program, Philadelphia's Great Cities Program, reading programs in Detroit and San Diego, and preschool programs in Baltimore and Ypsilanti, Michigan, and states:

> For the most part, the findings were negative, ambiguous, or contradictory. The preschool studies consistently revealed pronounced early spurts in intellectual and language development, but there was no clear-cut evidence that the compensatory programs made any substantial difference in the educational growth of disadvantaged children.[23]

Other reports claim that compensatory education programs to improve achievement will not work if schools remain segregated.

---

[22] Ibid., p. 7.

[23] Doxey A. Wilkerson, "Programs and Practices in Compensatory Education for Disadvantaged Children," Review of Educational Research, XXXV (December, 1965), pp. 426-440.

The Coleman and Pettigrew reports document the best and most recent research done on this topic. The Coleman Report,[24] Equality of Educational Opportunity, was commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education following enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Information was obtained from 600,000 students in grades 1, 3, 6, 9, and 12 in a sample of 4,000 schools across the United States. This research was based on one of the largest samples ever utilized in educational research.

The Pettigrew Report,[25] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Volumes I and II, represent the findings of the Commission on Civil Rights based on detailed information obtained from more than 100 school systems, public hearings held throughout the country, and several research studies commissioned by the Commission, including a reanalysis of the Coleman data by Coleman.

The findings in the Pettigrew report indicate that Negro children attending desegregated schools without compensatory education tend to perform better than similar children attending segregated schools with special

---

[24]James S. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Government Printing Office, 1966), 737 pp.

[25]U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Two Volumes (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

compensatory programs. The commission concluded in its report that "compensatory education programs have been of limited effectiveness because they have attempted to solve problems that stem, in large part, from racial and social class isolation in schools which themselves are isolated by race and social class."[26] It went on to say that "none of the programs appear to have raised significantly the achievement of participating pupils, as a group, within the period evaluated by the commission."[27]

The Coleman Report found that "a pupil's achievement is strongly related to the educational backgrounds and aspirations of other students in the school" and that "if a minority pupil from a home without much educational strength is put with schoolmates with strong educational backgrounds, his educational achievement is likely to increase."[28]

Moreover, the characteristics of pupils' peers seem to be more decisive in shaping their academic behavior than anything else about the school. In the words of the Coleman Report: "Attributes of other students account for far more variation in the achievement of minority-group

---

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Coleman, op. cit.

children than do any attributes of school facilities and slightly more than do attributes of staff."[29]

Another recent study,[30] using data from Coleman's work in Michigan, disagrees with Coleman's conclusions. "Schools make a difference," Guthrie argues, "or at least good schools make a difference. Every social scientist we have shown this study to agrees that we have refuted Coleman."

Other opponents to the Coleman and Pettigrew studies do not deny the deleterious nature of deliberate racial segregation or doubt that integration is a desirable end to be achieved as rapidly as possible. Viewing the record over the past 14 years in major cities, they question whether racial balance can be achieved with sufficient speed to help disadvantaged children already in the system.

Some writers claim that attempts at integration have been tragic failures. Stewart Alsop, writing in Newsweek magazine, claims that "truth, like murder, will out, and there is no longer any escaping the plain truth that integration of the country's schools is a tragic

---

[29] Ibid.

[30] William Grant, Detroit Free Press, January 20, 1970.

failure."[31] He documents this by quoting the reactions to his statement from the following people.

> Ben Holman, director of the Justice Department's Community Relations Service: "Of course it's true. I started out at 14 picketing for integration, but it's just not going to work. We've got to admit publicly that we've failed, so we can stop pursuing this phantom, and concentrate instead in gilding the ghetto--a massive diversion of manpower and money to the central city schools."
>
> Dan Watts, editor of The Liberator, intellectual organ of the black militants: "You're so right. It's a traumatic experience, anyway, for a black kid to be bused clear across town for the privilege of sitting next to Miss Ann . . . we've got to move away from integration and toward coexistence."
>
> Julius Hobson, Washington's leading black militant: "Of course--integration is a complete failure . . . but I think it's time we tried to make the schools good where they are . . . the integration kick is a dead issue."
>
> "We should proceed to upgrade the schools where they are now," says John Gardner, chairman of the Urban Coalition, "and not sit around waiting for integration that may never happen."

Roger A. Freeman[32] from Stanford University, writing in the Wall Street Journal, in reviewing the Coleman report, drew the conclusion that "there is no evidence that racial mixing per se, whether by open enrollment, busing, or any other plan, advances the measurable achievements of lagging children." He also

---

[31]Stewart Alsop, "The Tragic Failure," Newsweek, February 23, 1970, p. 108.

[32]Roger A. Freeman, "Schools and the Elusive Average Children Concept," Wall Street Journal, July 8, 1968.

quotes Christopher Jencks, who wrote in The New Republic: "Over all, the Coleman report makes a convincing though not definite case for the view that student achievement depends largely on forces over which today's schools exercise little control."[33]

Freeman also says that it is futile to expect children of low intelligence to perform at average levels and backs this by quoting Henry Levin of the Brookings Institution, who discussed the Coleman report.

> Since children possess a wide range of inherited abilities and are products of different family and community influences, the finding that most variation in performance is not attributable to the schools is hardly surprising. The literature on testing suggests that from 60% to 90% of the variance in standardized ability tests is attributable to genetic differences among individuals.[34]

Freeman claims we will continue to experience failure as long as we fail to recognize differences in innate abilities of children. He concludes by saying:

> The goal of raising the achievement level of children from low-income families who lag one or several years behind national norms has proven elusive. . . . But unless we recognize certain facts of life that should by now have become clear, we shall continue the experience of the past few years: frustration, growing conflict, hostility and mutual faultfinding, and the waste of large resources. It may well be that present

---

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid.

> programs seemingly based on the assumption that all children are possessed of the same--or at least an average--ability must run their course until the frustration and conflicts they create become unbearable and the waste of scarce resources too costly. Our emotional need to believe that all children can be made equal is too deep, and our national idealization of the average man too entrenched, to be quickly replaced by an acceptance of the notion that the range of educational and occupational offerings must be kept as wide as the range of human abilities. But until this awareness dawns, we shall not do justice to children poorly endowed by nature or to those who are highly gifted.[35]

A. R. Jensen, in his recent controversial article, argues that environmental factors are not nearly as important in determining I.Q. as are genetic factors. He also examines other evidence, including results of attempts to use education to raise the I.Q. and concludes that "compensatory education has failed." And, in a still more controversial vain, he summarizes intelligence tests and school performance of Negro children and concludes, "The preponderance of evidence is, in my opinion, less consistent with a strictly environmental hypothesis than with a genetic hypothesis, which, of course does not exclude the influence of environment or its interaction with genetic factors."[36]

---

[35] Ibid.

[36] A. R. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review (Winter, 1969), pp. 1-123.

Even evaluations that had rigid controls and hard data, such as the previously described Higher Horizons Program, reached basic conclusions typical of findings for rigorous educational evaluations: "There were no significant differences." In sharp contrast, however, the report also noted that teachers and principals who had been involved in the program said that it was making differences so significant that the program simply could not be abandoned.[37]

Other charges have been hurled at the schools' lack of ability in carrying out the spirit and intent of the recent legislation. Some segments have raised a demand for local control of their schools. This movement is most advanced in New York City and will probably grow. The charge is that the vast educational bureaucracies now running the schools in big cities tend to stifle initiative and innovation and relieve the schools of accountability.[38]

It is almost axiomatic that in order to develop an effective educational program, the school must win the support and cooperation of the home. Yet this relationship

---

[37]J. Wayne Wrightstone, et al., Evaluation of the Higher Horizons Program for Underprivileged Children, Cooperative Research Project No. 1124 (New York: Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York).

[38]Wilkerson, op. cit., pp. 426-440.

rarely exists in the urban ghetto. As emphasized by the so-called "Bundy Report":

> Precisely because special problems do exist in teaching the children of the modern cities, the parents should be more closely engaged in the process. We see this sharing of responsibility as part of a fundamental redirection of the process of education, designed to make education more relevant to the student, to bring it closer to his feelings and concerns, and to connect all members of the school community with one another.[39]

Following the riots in 1966 and 1967, President Johnson issued Executive Order 11365, setting up a National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. The final report, commonly referred to as the "Kerner report," after seven months of painstaking investigation had this to say about education:

> But for many minorities, and particularly for the children of the racial ghetto, the schools have failed to provide the educational experience which could help overcome the effects of discrimination and deprivation. . . .
>
> The bleak record of public education for ghetto children is growing worse. In the critical skills--verbal and reading ability--Negro students fall further behind whites with each year of school completed.[40]

---

[39] McGeorge Bundy, ed., Reconnection for Learning, By the Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of New York City Schools (New York: Office of the Mayor, 1967), p. 124.

[40] Report of the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders, U.S. Riot Commission Report, Otto Kerner, chairman (New York: New York Times Co., 1968), p. 425.

Even preschool programs, which most educators agree have most potential for helping the disadvantaged, have come under attack. In the recent Westinghouse-Ohio University Study,[41] an answer was to be obtained to the question: "Had Head Start classes made an intellectual and psychological difference to poor children who are now in first, second, and third grades?" It tried to measure this by using three kinds of tests and comparing the scores of former Head Start students in first, second, and third grades with those of control groups of poor children who never attended Head Start. On the first test, "language development," the Head Start children scored better than the control groups by a small but statistically significant margin. On the Stanford Achievement tests, which measure academic achievement, the two groups performed about the same. And on a battery of psychological tests, there did not appear to be too much difference in scores.

The study concluded that summer programs--which showed no traceable effect--should be scrapped in favor of year-round programs which do have a discernible, if slight, effect.

Other studies have attempted to show that children have not achieved because teachers have had low

---

[41] "A Study of Head Start," The New Republic, April 26, 1969.

expectations for children. The charge is that the prevailing posture of compensatory education is essentially defeatist.

In an experiment on the West Coast reported by Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson in their book, Pygmalion in the Classroom,[42] teachers were misled to believe that new tests had been given which suggested that certain children in their classes should be expected to show spurts of academic achievement during the year. Teachers went about their work as usual, with no suggestion that anything special be done with these children. Yet tests at the end of the year did, indeed, show dramatic increases in achievement.

In the light of these findings, Rosenthal and Jacobson comment that one reason a disadvantaged child "does poorly in school is because that is what is expected of him. In other words, his shortcomings may not originate in his different ethnic cultural, and economic background but in his teacher's response to that background."[43] They suggest this as one basis for evaluating any proposed change in an educational program: Is it "more effective (and cheaper) than the simple expedient of trying to change

---

[42]Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson, Pygmalion in the Classroom (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. 240.

[43]Ibid.

the expectations of the teacher?" In an article in Scientific American, they note: "Most innovations cost more in both time and money than inducing teachers to expect more of disadvantaged children."[44]

Other writers such as Kenneth Clark question whether any amount of money can improve education because the system is inefficient and ineffective. He states that "one of the problems in public education today is that money is subsidizing the inefficiency." He goes on to say that "I do not believe the funds appropriated by the federal government for the public schools are having any positive effect in raising the quality of public education in America."[45]

In reply to a question whether additional money is needed, Mr. Clark offers the opinion that

> . . . we ought to examine the fact that within the past ten years the budget for public education in New York City has gone up precipitously, and yet the achievement level of the children in the same ten years has been going down. I don't say that there is an inverse relationship between the amount of money spent on education and the efficiency of the schools, but we ought to examine whether that might be the case. I wasn't being facetious when I said that maybe one of the best things we could do for public education is to declare a moratorium

---

[44]Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson, "Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantaged," Scientific American, CCXVIII (April, 1968), pp. 19-23.

[45]Kenneth Clark, "Symposium for the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions," in The Center Magazine, January, 1970, p. 57.

> on additional amounts of educational expenditures and to demand that something happen within the present budget.[46]

Even the President of the United States questions the value of current aid programs as indicated in the following newspaper article.

> In President Nixon's message to Congress on education, he placed heavy and repeated emphasis on what he described as the failure of current federal aid programs to improve the academic performance of poor children. "There is growing evidence that most of them are not yet measurably improving the success of poor children in school," he said. "We must recognize that our present knowledge about how to overcome poor backgrounds is so limited that major expansion of such programs could not be confidently based on their results."[47]

In spite of this, the President in his long awaited speech on school desegregation on March 24, 1970, exhibited some of the ambiguities and frustrations many others feel. After recognizing the difficulties in achieving integration, he asked for 1.5 billion dollars in the next two years to be spent on programs to offset the disadvantages of segregated, slum-style education.

Some writers criticize the types of evaluations that have been conducted. Ralph W. Tyler says:

> We are so tied to the kind of achievement test which is focused on the middle level of difficulty that we have not examined what kinds of assessment

---

[46] Ibid., p. 59.

[47] Michigan State University State News, March 4, 1970.

> the teacher needs to determine whether the curriculum is really sequential and whether the student has mastered a particular set of basic concepts and is ready to move on to the next stage in the process.[48]

He questions the use of mean scores: "The mean relative standing of individuals, or of individual schools . . . has very limited usefulness. . . ."[49]

Egon G. Guba considers the evaluations of programs to be of low quality and based on his analysis of 32 Title III proposals, concludes:

> It is very dubious whether the results of these evaluations will be of much use to anyone. They are likely to fit well, however, into the conventional school man's stereotype of what evaluation is: something required from on high that takes time and pain to produce but which has little significance for action.[50]

An examination of dissertation abstracts reveals that certain aspects of compensatory programs have been examined, but none have taken a broad look at the whole problem. For example, Brown[51] studied the knowledge of

---

[48]Ralph W. Tyler, Improving Educational Assessment (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1969).

[49]Ibid.

[50]Egon G. Guba, Evaluation and the Process of Change, Notes and Working Papers concerning the Administration of Programs Authorized under Title III of Public Act 89-10 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, April, 1967), p. 312.

[51]Bernard F. Brown, "A Study of the Operation and Effects of Selected Title I Programs" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969).

the goals of elementary Title I program as perceived by teachers. Others have looked at achievement data or materials accumulation.

These questions then become apparent: What programs did Grand Rapids institute in compensatory education? Is there reason to believe that they are any more effective than those previously mentioned? Are there any factors that can be observed that may have been influenced by the availability of compensatory programs? In the next chapter, pertinent data regarding Grand Rapids programs will be considered.

Summary

The review of the literature has revealed the scope and extent of compensatory programs for the disadvantaged.

The "disadvantaged" are children from low-income families who usually live in the slums of cities and who have unique educational problems as a result of poverty.

The federal and state governments have passed much legislation which allows school districts funds to alleviate the educational problems of the disadvantaged.

Since 1965 many programs have been instituted to provide an improved educational experience for the deprived child. Some of these are the New York Higher Horizons Program, the Great Cities Program, and Banneker Project

from St. Louis, Head Start and Follow Through. Grand Rapids participated in many programs that were similar to these.

But few portents are more gloomy than the alleged general failure of compensatory education. There is much controversy over reasons for this so-called failure. Some writers claim we cannot have better education until we have basic educational reform, rather than doing more of the same. Others feel services should be more concentrated on fewer youngsters if they are to do any good. The Coleman and Pettigrew reports state that compensatory programs have limited effectiveness because they are attempted in racial and social isolation. Others feel the only solution is to have community control of each school. The Rosenthal study suggests that children have not achieved because teachers have had low expectations of children. Some claim that student ability is the crucial factor and this is determined by certain innate or genetic differences, and until we recognize this we shall continue to face frustrations and failure.

Most studies show a "no significant difference" when traditional measures of performance are applied to compensatory programs.

The review of the literature reveals a genuine ambivalence on the part of most evaluators as to what

constitutes effective programs. It appears that much more study is needed concerning the objectives which should be set for compensatory programs.

This review also indicates a need to look at other factors, other than achievement or I.Q. scores, to see what effects compensatory programs have had on education.

CHAPTER III

COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS IN GRAND RAPIDS

Introduction

The Grand Rapids Public Schools were in the forefront in recognizing the problem and developing programs to meet the needs of inner-city youngsters.

The previously mentioned principals' report of 1963 had several recommendations as indicated in Chapter I. All of them were implemented during the past six years. The principals' report, in fact, was used as a guideline in planning many of the programs.

The following data aid in an attempt to look at the varied factors that influence disadvantaged children. The material was gleaned from existing records and is the most complete picture available for the schools involved in the study.

Grand Rapids has participated in a variety of programs since 1965 which could come under the category of "compensatory." Some of these were Title I and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; Section 4

and Section 3 of the Michigan State Aid Act; various other Federal programs, such as Head Start and Neighborhood Youth Corps of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and Follow Through from the U.S. Office of Education.

Although each of these programs has in some measure contributed funds to education for disadvantaged students, Title I will be more completely described since it has had the most consistent funding during the last 5 years in the 18 target elementary schools.*

Summary of Title I

First Year, 1965-66

Nine projects were submitted for a total of $686,186.

Project 1. Reading in-service with college credit; Wayne State University; 42 teachers at a cost of $10,003.34.

Project 2. In-service for South High teachers in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth with college credit from Wayne State University in conjunction with Title III project; involved 60 teachers; cost $35,995.

Project 3. Sub-professional aides employed to work 1, aide per 2 teachers in Title I schools and

---

*Alexander, Campau, Coit, Coldbrook, Franklin, Hall, Henry, Jefferson, Kensington, Lexington, Madison, Maplewood, Morris, Sheldon, Sigsbee, Stocking, Straight, Vandenberg.

3 weeks pre-employment in-service; 1 librarian employed to work with aides; 60 aides; total cost, $58,818.

Project 4. Prekindergarten classes: 3 schools had classes 8:30-11:30 and 1:30-3:30 (Alexander, Lexington, Straight); 10 schools had classes from 3:30-5:00 p.m. (Hall, Henry, Jefferson, Kensington, Madison, Morris, Sheldon, Sigsbee, Stocking, Vandenberg); 320 students, 4 full-time teachers and aides and 22 part-time teachers and aides; total cost, $43,624.85.

Project 5. Primary cycle implementation: employed Director and had funds for materials and in-service necessary to implement nongraded program in 16 Title I target area schools; cost $30,371.

Project 6. Instructional assistants and Enrichment program. Employed two instructional assistants for target area schools, four music, and two art consultants for after-school programs at public and nonpublic schools, transportation for students, large amount for instructional materials. Total cost for this project was $93,235.

Project 7. Preschool units. Two preschool primary units were built; one at Henry School and one at Madison. Total Title I cost was $151,580 for structure and equipment.

Project 8. Summer School. Classes were held in ten elementary buildings and four junior high buildings.

Employed 119 teachers, 74 aides, 12 secretaries, 18 custodians, a director, 4 coordinators, and a diagnostician. Stressed reading and enrichment activities. One week in-service for staff and six weeks school. Total cost, $263,843.

Project 9. Camp for Type "A" handicapped children at Camp Blodgett. This was a cooperative project with the East Grand Rapids School System using their Title I funds. Two 2 week camp programs served approximately 400 Type "A" children at a contracted cost of $23,300.00 with the Camp Blodgett Board of Directors.

Second Year, 1966-67

Five projects were submitted for a total of $641,367.00.

Project 1. Ninety sub-professional aides assigned to 17 inner-city schools. Total cost, $263,607.48.

Project 2. Prekindergarten classes serving 500 preschool children at 9 sites (Lexington, Campau, Coit, Straight, Alexander, Franklin, Coldbrook, Jefferson, Henry). Cost $68,665.83.

Project 3. Instructional specialists and coordinator of Primary Cycle innovation. Four junior high instructional specialists were employed to work with students and teachers. The Director of Primary Cycle

(nongraded elementary schools) and two secretaries were employed. A large portion of the project was for instructional materials. Total cost of project, $116,681.47.

Project 4. In-service education in conjunction with Michigan State University. One class of "Diagnosing Reading Difficulties" was offered to 50 elementary teachers for 10 weeks. A 10 week class entitled the "Education of the Culturally Deprived" was held for 75 teachers. A winter class of 10 weeks on methods and materials for teaching the culturally deprived had 75 teachers enrolled. A spring class entitled the "Administration of Schools in Depressed Areas" was held for 50 inner-city school administrators. MSU credit was given all participants. Cost of project was $14,124.52.

Project 5. Mentally Handicapped Camp and Elementary-Junior High Summer School. Classes for six weeks were held for perceptually handicapped, oral deaf, speech handicapped, visually handicapped, mentally handicapped, and regular school children. A camp program was included in the project for 30 crippled children at Indian Trails Camp, and a special camp for 150 mentally handicapped children for 2 weeks was included. Nine hundred and sixty elementary children were served at 11 centers, and 480 junior high students were served in 4 centers. Also included in this project were special instructional and

recreational activities for Villa Maria Home, St. John's Home, Bethany Christian Home, and Christian Youth Home. Cost of project, $204,709.26.

Third Year, 1967-68

One project was submitted providing the following: 110 teacher-library aides were employed in target area elementary and junior high schools; 1 librarian to work with library aides; 3 preschool classes to serve 180 students; 6 middle school consultants; 5 reading teachers basically for Catholic schools; 1 bilingual teacher basically for Christian schools; summer in-service for West Middle School and Union High School staffs, inner-city elementary staffs, South Middle staff, and administrators. This in-service was directed by Science Research Associates (S.R.A.). Fifty Olivetti calculators were purchased for a special math program at Central, and 12 Welch auto-tutors and tapes were purchased for a special paraprofessional student assistant program at Central High School. A mentally handicapped camp was held for 120 children for 2 weeks at Camp Blodgett. Programs were run during the summer for Villa Maria, St. John's Home, Bethany Christian Home, and the Christian Youth Home. A summer school for 900 children in the elementary schools was held. This project was the final

year of the primary cycle (nongraded) program under Title I. Total cost of project, $696,409. It served approximately 2,500 students.

Fourth Year, 1968-69

The Title I program for 1968-69 was funded at $710,618. It was designed to service approximately 3,000 students, prekindergarten through 12th grade.

One hundred and ten teacher aides, one librarian, four middle school consultants, nine pre-school teachers, three instructors for the Collegefields Program, four instructional tutors for the Catholic schools, and one bilingual teacher for the Christian schools were employed. In-service for 85 teachers and 110 aides was written into the project. The necessary materials and supplies for the year-long components cost $11,400. The summer program consisted of 6 summer school sites serving 720 elementary children, and $4,000 to send 100 junior high students to the YMCA summer school program. Summer programs were also implemented at the four homes: Villa Maria, St. John's, Bethany Christian, and Christian Youth Home.

Fifth Year, 1969-70

The program, which was substantially the same as in 1968-69 except for the elimination of a summer program, was funded for $647,488 in its initial grant. During

this writing, however, additional monies were appropriated to enable a summer program to be added. This made the total Title I grant, $946,049.

Programs and Cost

In Tables 1 through 7 all the compensatory programs and their cost since 1965 are shown. Attention should be given to the fact that all programs suggested by the principals in 1963 were implemented and a considerable amount of money has been added to these schools. It should also be noted that the "target area" for Title I consists of 18 schools, whereas most data in this study are based on the original 12 schools as identified in the original principals' report of 1963. Total funding in all of these programs since 1965, and including 1969–70, was approximately 8 million dollars.

TABLE 1

FEDERAL PROGRAM--TITLE I, E.S.E.A.

Program	Total Cost
1965-66	$686,186.00
1. Reading In-Service, Wayne State University	10,003.34
2. In-Service for South High Teachers, Wayne State University	35,995.00
3. Sub-Professional Aides and In-Service	58,818.00
4. Prekindergarten Classes	43,624.85
5. Primary Cycle Implementation	30,371.00
6. Instructional Assistants and Enrichment	93,235.00
7. Preschool Units	151,580.00
8. Summer School, Elementary and Junior High	263,843.00
9. Camp for Type "A" Handicapped	23,300.00
1966-67	$641,367.00
1. Sub-Professional Aides	263,607.48
2. Prekindergarten Classes	68,665.83
3. Instructional Specialists, Primary Cycle	116,681.47
4. In-Service (4 Classes with Michigan State University)	14,124.52
5. Summer School for Mentally Handicapped and Elementary-Junior High	204.709.26

TABLE 1--Continued

Program	Total Cost
1967-68	$696,409.00
Teacher-Library Aides, Librarian, Preschool Classes, Middle School Consultants, Reading Teachers, Bilingual Teacher, Summer In-Service for Teachers-Administrators (S.R.A.), Calculators and Auto-Tutors, Mentally Handicapped Camp, Summer Programs, and Primary Cycle Program	
1968-69	$710,618.00
Teacher-Library Aides, Librarian, Preschool Teachers, Middle School Consultants, Bilingual Teacher, In-Service for Teachers and Aides, Summer Programs, Instructors for Collegefields Program, and Instructional Tutors	
1969-70	$946,049.00
Teacher-Library Aides, Librarian, Preschool Teachers, Middle School Consultants, Bilingual Teacher, In-Service for Teachers and Aides, Summer Programs, Instructors for Collegefields Program, and Instructional Tutors	

TABLE 2

STATE OF MICHIGAN--SECTION 4

Program	Total Cost
1965-66	$ 73,020.91
Community Schools, Study Centers, Enrichment Trips	
1966-67	$199,594.00
Community School Centers (7), Study Centers (5), Enrichment Fund for Schools	
1967-68	$ 99,425.00
Community Schools	

TABLE 3

STATE OF MICHIGAN--SECTION 3

Program	Total Cost
1968-69	$ 357,856.60
Employment of Aides and Extra Teachers to Reduce Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Community School Program, and Additional Attendance Office Help (South Middle and Sheldon Schools)	
1969-70	$1,186,228.00
Same as 1968-69 plus Added Materials for Specific Instructional Programs--Project Read, Bank Street Readers, Bereiter-Engelmann (Alexander, Campau, Coit 1/2 Year, Franklin, Hall 1/2 Year, Henry, Jefferson, Madison, Sheldon, Sigsbee 1/2 Year, South Middle, Vandenberg Schools)	

TABLE 4

FEDERAL PROGRAM--OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Program	Total Cost
Summer School--1965	$ 7,371.00
Vandenberg School, 150 Students (Reading)	
Summer Head Start	
1965	$ 25,683.00
12 Rooms, 180 Students; Parent Councils, Food, Health Services, Cultural Enrichment	
1966	$ 67,306.00
32 Classes, 480 Students	
1967	$ 83,386.00
34 Classes, 510 Children	
1968	$ 94,499.00
34 Classes, 510 Children	
1969	$ 55,260.00
16 Classes, 240 Children	
Full-Year Head Start	
1967-1968	$123,573.00
6 Classes, 180 Students (Beginning of Experiment Using the Bereiter-Engelmann Approach)	
1968-1969 (Two Grants)	$221,598.00
7 Classes, 140 Students	

TABLE 5

FEDERAL PROGRAM--FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

Program	Total Cost
1968-69	$187,500.00
Kindergarten Only, 250 Students	
1969-70	$368,250.00
500 Students. Parent Participation, Bereiter-Engelmann Approach, 1 Teacher, 2 Aides Per Class, Video-Tape Classes for Evaluation, Health Services, Social Services, University of Illinois Consultants, Meals. Kindergarten and First Level	

TABLE 6

FEDERAL PROGRAM--TITLE III, E.S.E.A.

Program	Total Cost
1966-67	$ 57,176.00
An in-service program for teachers at South High School along with experimental programs for students in the summer.	
1968-69	$235,335.00
Educational Park	
1969-70	$138,870.00
Educational Park--now completing its second year on a three-year project	

TABLE 7

FEDERAL PROGRAM--NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Program	Total Cost
1965-1969	Approximately $1,125,000.00
A program for high school age youth whose families meet certain income limitations; students are given jobs around the school system to enable them to earn some money to stay in school.	

Demographic Data

Table 8 reports a comparative study of transiency of children taken from June, 1963 principals' summaries. It shows that the culturally disadvantaged areas had a total "in and out" movement of close to 36 percent. The 12 schools classified as culturally advantaged had a total "in and out" movement of around 9 percent. It appears that the principals' conclusion was sound when they said,

> A study of these numbers indicates a high transiency in culturally disadvantaged areas. With this high transiency, it is difficult to promote and maintain continuity in learning.[1]

In Table 9 is reported a comparative study of transiency of children taken from June, 1969 principals' summaries. It shows that the same schools had a total "in and out" movement of close to 37 percent and the 12 other schools had risen to 15 percent.

These data would indicate that compensatory programs have not slowed down the rate of transiency in inner-city schools. Further study of the statistics indicates an increased transiency in the other schools from 9 to 15 percent. However, it must be remembered that 1968-69 was the first year of the implementation of

---

[1]Principals' Report, "Report of the Study Group on Education of Culturally Disadvantaged Children," Grand Rapids Public Schools, Grand Rapids, Michigan, October, 1963, p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

TABLE 8

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PUPIL TRANSIENCY, 1963

School	Enrollment	Number Entered	Number Left
Disadvantaged			
Campau Park	464	79	86
Coit	387	67	103
Coldbrook	166	29	45
Franklin	553	71	114
Hall	483	93	84
Henry	594	96	100
Jefferson	548	87	106
Lexington	352	71	112
Madison Park	682	76	92
Sheldon	607	93	91
Straight	339	47	64
Vandenberg	548	101	124
Totals	5,723	910	1,121
Percent Entered and Left Based on Enrollment			36%
Advantaged			
Aberdeen	532	31	23
Alger	897	51	56
Beckwith	258	9	8
Brookside	466	11	41
Covell	205	3	13
Crestview	280	0	1
C. A. Frost	211	12	17
Michigan Oak	183	2	9
Mulick Park	452	15	32
Ottawa Hills	345	14	19
Riverside	472	19	24
Shawnee Park	249	16	5
Totals	4,550	183	248
Percent Entered and Left Based on Enrollment			9%

TABLE 9

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PUPIL TRANSIENCY, 1968-69

School	Enrollment	Number Entered	Number Left
Disadvantaged			
Campau Park	312	45	81
Coit	398	61	112
Coldbrook (regular)	56	17	18
Franklin	341	54	88
Hall	380	79	85
Henry	688	90	128
Jefferson	669	84	123
Lexington	364	48	103
Madison Park	666	58	109
Sheldon	561	68	146
Straight	372	41	73
Vandenberg	378	88	106
Totals	5,185	733	1,172
Percent Entered and Left Based on Enrollment			37%
Advantaged			
Aberdeen	421	34	51
Alger	816	50	72
Beckwith	315	11	12
Brookside	392	46	48
Covell	289	9	10
Crestview	229	12	15
C. A. Frost	213	14	23
Michigan Oak	177	11	9
Mulick Park	401	47	44
Ottawa Hills	325	34	26
Riverside	462	20	23
Shawnee Park	339	27	16
Totals	4,379	315	349
Percent Entered and Left Based on Enrollment			15%

the School Master Plan,[2] which called for some busing of inner-city youngsters to some outer-city schools, namely Aberdeen, Crestview, Michigan Oak, and Mulick Park.

Table 10 reports a six-year study of enrollment of nonwhite students. It is estimated that at least 95 percent of the nonwhite students are black. A study of this chart shows that although the city-wide percentages of nonwhite students have increased from 15.5 percent to 19.52 percent in the 6 year period, the original 12 selected disadvantaged schools remained fairly constant with the exception of Jefferson School, which rose steadily from 47 percent to 89 percent.

The other 12 schools show a change upward, partly reflecting the "busing" at some schools as well as shifting housing patterns. It should be noted that two schools, Alexander and Sigsbee, not in the original study but now in the Title I target area, have also rapidly "tilted" to a majority nonwhite enrollment.

Table 11 shows a study of the average age of teachers in each of the sets of 12 schools. It shows average age of elementary teachers city-wide dropping from

---

[2]Adopted in 1968, this plan was the result of a complete study of school building needs. The intent was to set guidelines for the future. In its initial stages the plan called for relieving overcrowding in certain inner-city schools and using available space in other schools.

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF NONWHITE STUDENTS

School	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
Disadvantaged						
Campau Park	91.0	93.0	93.0	89.0	96.0	92.0
Coit	0.0	0.0	0.002	0.0	0.0	0.0
Coldbrook	13.4	9.8	11.9	10.4	0.9	1.9
Hall	4.1	4.1	4.1	6.2	7.2	7.0
Henry	85.0	88.0	89.0	92.0	88.0	92.0
Franklin	78.0	79.0	78.0	69.0	79.0	75.0
Jefferson	47.0	58.0	75.0	74.0	85.0	89.0
Lexington	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madison Park	86.0	90.0	94.0	95.0	95.0	85.0
Sheldon	97.0	96.0	96.0	99.0	94.0	98.0
Straight	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6
Vandenberg	90.0	84.0	82.0	85.0	86.0	90.0

TABLE 10--Continued

School	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
Advantaged						
Aberdeen	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	8.5
Alger	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.3
Beckwith	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.2
Brookside	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.3	0.8	1.3
Covell	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Crestview	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.5	8.3
C. A. Frost	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Michigan Oak	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.9
Mulick Park	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	16.0
Ottawa Hills	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.6	2.5	11.4
Riverside	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shawnee Park	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.3
City-Wide for All Levels	15.5	16.7	17.1	18.1	19.3	19.5

TABLE 11

AVERAGE AGE OF TEACHERS

School	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
Disadvantaged						
Campau Park	35	33	32	35	35	36
Coit	43	41	39	38	40	40
Coldbrook	55	51	45	43	39	42
Hall	47	48	44	48	46	33
Henry	39	39	39	36	38	35
Franklin	36	37	34	34	39	33
Jefferson	45	40	38	35	32	32
Lexington	49	50	45	46	38	37
Madison Park	35	34	33	34	33	35
Sheldon	40	38	36	36	38	35
Straight	45	42	37	36	38	33
Vandenberg	36	36	35	36	37	38
Average	40.97	39.8	37.8	37.4	37.2	35.2

TABLE 11--Continued

School	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
Advantaged						
Aberdeen	42	41	44	41	47	46
Alger	43	45	40	41	41	39
Beckwith	47	50	46	45	45	41
Brookside	44	45	44	40	43	42
Covell	41	41	55	45	46	44
Crestview	39	35	34	35	34	36
C. A. Frost	44	45	38	38	40	37
Michigan Oak	53	56	52	40	34	31
Mulick Park	46	49	45	42	47	39
Ottawa Hills	51	50	50	48	44	44
Riverside	47	46	40	43	41	38
Shawnee Park	38	43	39	39	40	40
Average	44.28	45.26	43.13	41.58	42.22	40.27
City-Wide Average	42.0	42.0	38.0	39.0	39.0	38.0

42 to 38. At the same time, the average age in the 12 "inner-city" schools dropped from 41 to 35, and the 12 "outer-city" schools from 44 to 40. It appears that all schools in Grand Rapids are averaging younger teachers, reflecting a nationwide trend. Also, since many "inner-city" schools increased their staffs as a result of decreased pupil-teacher ratios, the trend toward younger teachers there is more pronounced. The Personnel Office reports that recently hired teachers tend to be younger than the average of the city.

In Table 12 the distribution of I.Q. scores is reported, comparing 1963 with 1969 for both sets of schools. The scores are based on the fifth grade Kuhlmann-Anderson Test and show six of the inner-city schools to have a higher median I.Q. in 1969 than 1963, four lower, and one remaining the same. (Coldbrook is not represented in 1969 since it did not have a fifth grade.) Of the other 12 schools 4 have higher median scores in 1969 and 8 report lower median scores.

Conclusions regarding any improvement in I.Q. from these figures, however would be difficult to draw. At best, it showed that I.Q. scores did not decrease in the inner-city schools, probably increased slightly, but it would be difficult to ascribe it to "effects" of compensatory programs.

TABLE 12

KUHLMAN-ANDERSON TEST RESULTS, FIFTH GRADE

School	Number Tested		Median I.Q.		Number Below 80		130 and Over	
	1963	1969	1963	1969	1963	1969	1963	1969
Disadvantaged								
Campau Park	38	42	83	90	13	7	0	0
Coit	40	44	93	92	7	4	0	0
Coldbrook	7		94		1		0	
Hall	60	38	86	87	14	8	0	0
Henry	47	49	98	89	3	9	0	2
Franklin	70	77	92	90	12	16	1	1
Jefferson	74	69	85	88	21	14	0	0
Lexington	39	46	92	94	7	7	0	0
Madison Park	79	74	90	94	19	11	0	0
Sheldon	67	65	87	111	16	0	0	13
Straight	34	32	96	89	3	6	1	0
Vandenberg	57	43	91	91	7	9	0	0
Total	612	579	92	91	123	91	2	16

TABLE 12--Continued

School	Number Tested		Median I.Q.		Number Below 80		130 and Over	
	1963	1969	1963	1969	1963	1969	1963	1969
Advantaged								
Aberdeen	73	65	106	99	2	4	4	3
Alger	128	96	107	115	4	0	10	9
Beckwith	30	40	114	109	0	0	5	4
Brookside	59	38	103	104	4	2	0	3
Covell	32	34	115	107	0	0	3	4
Crestview	41	32	111	104	1	0	5	2
C. A. Frost	30	44	111	108	0	0	9	4
Michigan Oak	25	31	105	103	0	0	0	1
Mulick Park	60	56	108	112	0	4	0	3
Ottawa Hills	45	47	113	111	0	1	3	4
Riverside	59	59	105	103	1	3	2	3
Shawnee Park	21	39	114	116	0	1	1	5
Total	603	581	110	108	12	15	42	45

In assessing these data, the following points should be kept in mind.

1. The children measured in 1963 are different from those in 1969.
2. Since there is a high rate of transiency in these schools, many children have not had the opportunity for many consecutive years of compensatory programs. (See Table 13.)
3. The schools (four) with a large majority of white students score about the same as the schools (seven) with a large majority of black students. It appears that the effects of poverty and social class are felt equally across racial lines when it comes to I.Q. scores on standardized tests.
4. The percentage of children in the inner city who scored in the low I.Q. range (below 80) fell from 20 percent in 1963 to 16 percent in 1969.

Table 13 was added after the results of Table 12 were tabulated. The writer sought the percentage of the children tested and reported in Table 12 who had received compensatory education for at least three years. Previous lists were obtained when the students were in the second grade and compared with the fifth grade list. Table 13 reports the percent of children in the fifth grade who were on a list at the same school as little as three years

TABLE 13

PERCENT OF FIFTH LEVEL PUPILS TESTED WHO RECEIVED COMPENSATORY EDUCATION AT LEAST THREE YEARS IN THE SAME SCHOOL

School	%	I.Q.
Campau Park	49	89
Coit	45	93
Franklin	32	86
Hall	38	92
Henry	39	92
Jefferson	43	88
Lexington	46	99
Madison Park	38	93
Sheldon	51	113
Straight	29	88
Vandenberg	33	91
Average	40	93

before. Even though some, no doubt, transferred within the Title I target area, the statistics point up a serious problem already alluded to in Table 8.

The data show that teachers in the inner city could have great difficulty in maintaining continuity of program. It also points up the need for school officials to be very careful when measuring results and drawing conclusions about effectiveness of programs.

Table 13 also reports the I.Q. scores of the children who remained for at least three years. It reports the mean school I.Q. to be 93, as opposed to 91 when all children were measured.

Tables 14 and 15 compare the Metropolitan Readiness Tests for the two years 1963 and 1969. An examination of these charts show 57 percent of the inner-city school children in the superior, high normal, or average category in 1969, as compared to 55 percent in 1963. The outer-city schools show a 90 percent readiness as compared to 94 percent in 1963. Again, the children studied are different and there does not appear to be any meaningful change.

Table 16 reports the pupil-teacher ratio for the two sets of schools. It indicates a significant drop in ratio for the inner-city schools, with little difference in the other schools. Pupil-teacher ratio was obtained by dividing the enrollment of the school by the number of classroom teachers.

Some idea of the number of paraprofessionals (aides) in the 11 inner-city schools is presented in Table 17. Although some are half-time, it shows the tremendous amount of additional adult paid help available to these schools. When one considers the already low pupil-teacher ratio, it is apparent that there can be a considerable amount of small group work in these schools. The use of aides appears to be related to teacher retention. In Chapter IV a reference is made to a study regarding attitudes of teachers with and without aides.

TABLE 14

METROPOLITAN READINESS TESTS, 1963

	Total No. Tested	% Superior	High Normal	Average	Low Normal	Poor Risk
Disadvantaged	935	3%	16%	36%	37%	8%
Advantaged	730	18%	46%	30%	6%	Under 1%

TABLE 15

METROPOLITAN READINESS TESTS, 1969

	Total No. Tested	% Superior	High Normal	Average	Low Normal	Poor Risk
Disadvantaged	512	4%	13%	40%	37%	6%
Advantaged	575	27%	35%	28%	10%	Under 1%

TABLE 16

PUPIL-TEACHER RATIOS, LEVELS 1-6

School	1963-64	1968-69	1969-70	Jan. 1970*
Disadvantaged				
Campau Park	27.2	22.7	19.4	19.0
Coit	25.8	22.5	23.9	21.9
Coldbrook	23.8	27.0	--	--
Franklin	29.7	26.4	22.4	21.2
Hall	27.7	21.8	25.3	25.6
Henry	26.3	25.5	23.8	23.8
Jefferson	27.8	24.5	22.5	21.8
Lexington	29.1	24.2	22.3	21.4
Madison Park	27.1	25.3	22.5	20.6
Sheldon	27.6	22.2	18.7	16.1
Straight	28.6	25.2	24.4	22.5
Vandenberg	26.6	22.7	19.8	18.2
Average	27.3	24.2	22.3	21.1
Advantaged				
Aberdeen	27.4	26.8	26.6	25.1
Alger	25.8	26.4	27.6	27.9
Beckwith	29.3	29.6	26.1	26.5
Brookside	28.8	29.3	27.5	27.3
Covell	27.6	28.5	28.5	28.8
Crestview	27.8	25.6	29.4	29.5
C. A. Frost	27.3	28.7	28.3	28.7
Michigan Oak	22.8	24.8	27.2	29.2
Mulick Park	27.5	24.7	26.5	26.2
Ottawa Hills	28.4	27.0	29.4	30.2
Riverside	28.0	28.0	28.6	27.6
Shawnee Park	30.1	28.1	23.6	25.3
Average	27.6	27.3	27.4	27.7

*After Section III.

TABLE 17

PARAPROFESSIONALS IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS, 1969-70

School	Teachers	School Aide	Instructional Aide	Reading Aide	Library Aide	Home-School Coordinator	Corner Mother	Total Para-professional
Campau	18	1/2	10 1/2		1	1		23*
Coit	15	1/2	3		1	1	1	7
Hall	18	1/2	3			1		5
Henry	26	1/2	17		1	1		20
Franklin	17	1	8		1	1		11
Lexington	14	1/2	3		1	1		6
Jefferson	27	1	18	2	1	1		24
Madison	25	1/2	18 1/2		1	2		22
Sheldon	21	1/2	11		1	1		14
Straight	14	1/2	3		1	1		6
Vandenberg	15	1/2	10	_	2	__	1	14
Totals	210	6 1/2	105	2	11	11	2	152

*Includes nine aides in Follow Through Program.

The charge is often made that schools in the inner city are subject to greater teacher turnover with a consequent greater proportion of new, inexperienced teachers. The data regarding years of teaching experience are presented in Table 18. It is surprising to note that in the 11 disadvantaged schools, 30 percent of the teachers have been there 1 year and 61 percent less than 4 years. In the so-called advantaged schools, 33 percent have been there 1 year and 63 percent less than 4 years. Apparently assignment practices as well as teacher retention are quite similar city wide.

The number of black teachers assigned to buildings with large black enrollments is illustrated in Table 19. While the number of black teachers has increased from 35 to 53, the more significant difference is the change in black principals from 1963-64 to 1969-70. Only one school, Campau, with a majority black student body has a white principal.

TABLE 18

YEARS TEACHERS TAUGHT IN PARTICULAR SCHOOL, 1969-70

School	1	2-4	5-7	8-10	11-15	16-20	21-up
Disadvantaged							
Campau Park	10	6			2		
Coit		6	5	1	2	1	
Hall	5	8	2	2			1
Henry	6	15	1	4			
Franklin	6	7	4				
Lexington	3	7	3		1		
Jefferson	14	10	2				1
Madison Park	5	12	3	4		1	
Sheldon	5	12	1	1	2		
Straight	4	6		1	2	1	
Vandenberg	4	6	3	2			
Totals (210)	62	95	24	15	9	3	2
Advantaged							
Aberdeen	7	4	2		3	1	3
Alger	12	4	2	5	3		
Beckwith	4	2	1	5			
Brookside	5	7	3	2	1	1	
Covell	4	2	1	2			
Crestview	3	3	1	2			
C. A. Frost	3			4			
Michigan Oak	3	2	1				
Mulick Park	3	6	3	1	1		
Ottawa Hills	2	8	1				
Riverside	4	9	2		1		
Shawnee Park	3	2	5	2			
Totals (161)	53	49	22	23	9	2	3

TABLE 19

NUMBER OF BLACK TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

	1963-64				1968-69				1969-70			
	Teachers			Prin.	Teachers			Prin.	Teachers			Prin.
	Black	Total	%	Black	Black	Total	%	Black	Black	Total	%	Black
Campau	3	16	18.8	0	5	16	31.3	0	4	18	22.2	0
Coit	0	10	--	0	0	16	--	0	0	15	--	0
Coldbrook	0	4	--	0	0	2	--	0	--	--	--	--
Hall	0	14	--	0	0	16	--	0	0	18	--	0
Henry	5	20	25.0	0	8	25	32.0	1	9	25	36.0	1
Franklin	8	15	53.4	0	5	15	33.3	1	6	14	42.9	1
Jefferson	0	16	--	0	10	25	40.0	1	7	26	26.9	1
Lexington	0	8	--	0	0	15	--	0	0	14	--	0
Madison	6	22	27.3	0	7	25	28.0	1	13	25	52.0	1
Sheldon	7	22	31.8	0	7	23	30.4	1	8	20	40.0	1
Vandenberg	6	19	31.6	0	8	17	47.1	1	6	16	37.5	1
Totals	35	166		0	50	195		6	53	191		6

Specific Programs

Bereiter-Engelmann Program

One of the more carefully controlled experiments, now in its third year, was conducted in Grand Rapids during 1967-68 and 1968-69. In a study conducted by Erickson,[3] the problem to be assessed was whether levels of academic achievement of disadvantaged preschool and kindergarten children could be improved through compensatory educational programs to a level of achievement equal to or higher than national norms for all children.

The primary objective was the assessment of the immediate and long-term academic and personal adjustment effects of a highly structured academic preschool program (the Bereiter-Engelmann Preschool Program), and a more traditional developmentally structured Head Start Program (The Enrichment Preschool Program).

From an initial population of 1,000 who met O.E.O. poverty standards, 180 children were randomly selected to be placed in Program "A" (the structured language program). The same number were similarly assigned to Program "B" (the unstructured language program). The remainder of the

---

[3]Edsel Erickson, Joseph McMillan, Jane Bonnell, Louis Hofmann, and Orel D. Callahan, Final Report: Experiments in Head Start and Early Education--Curriculum Structures and Teacher Attitudes, Contract No. OEO-4150 (Kalamazoo: Kaars X-Press Printing, 1969).

initial population were defined as the Control Group, i.e., they were not included in any program.

Background characteristics of students and teachers were carefully studied. Teachers were assigned to get a cross section of attitudes toward the program.

At the end of the preschool year (1967-68) the mean I.Q. of the B-E preschoolers was 108.1; that of the enrichment preschoolers 105.7; and that of the control group sample 94.8.

At the end of the kindergarten, after various combinations of students were placed in regular kindergarten or B-E kindergarten, the study showed that students from B-E preschool maintained their I.Q. of about one year above the population norms in both programs; children from the enrichment preschool who went into regular kindergarten were significantly lower than those who went into B-E kindergarten; children from the preschool control group who went into B-E kindergarten did much better (I.Q. of 105) than those who went into regular program kindergarten (I.Q. of 91.5).

The study showed that intelligence, as measured by the most reliable and valid measures, is not a fixed trait. Perhaps the most significant thing for educators, regardless of disagreement over process, is to recognize this one factor for disadvantaged children.

Erickson further comments on the conclusions when he says:

> For children who were in the Bereiter-Engelmann Preschool there was no drop in intelligence regardless of the kindergarten program they were in. Nor were there any significant increases. However, when one considers the fact that there is a tendency for groups which differ from the mean to regress toward the mean, this finding--that the Bereiter-Engelmann group of inner-city children remained at approximately one year above the norm for all children including children from more affluent families--takes on tremendous importance for educational theory and practice.
>
> At this point we conclude that no longer is economic or racial status alone sufficient groups for explaining poor performance of students. Certain educational programs can, it is hypothesized, overcome intellectual deficiencies commonly associated with poverty.[4]

This study also considered the effect of the structured program on behavior of the children. The investigators concluded that "the data . . . does not support the view that the Bereiter Englemann program produces emotional or adjustment problems among children."[5]

Educational Park

Started in the summer of 1968, this compensatory program, funded under Title III of E.S.E.A., was created to offer specialized courses for junior and senior students

---

[4] Ibid., pp. 71-72.

[5] Ibid.

enrolled in metropolitan area high schools. Although not created exclusively for use of disadvantaged students, courses were designed to meet some of their needs at levels not touched by most Title I programs.

The objectives for the program were:

1. To provide for the involvement of religious and civic groups in both educational planning and instruction.
2. To provide an exemplary, innovative curriculum.
3. To make the facilities of the educational center available for adult basic education.
4. To encourage the return to school by students who have left for various reasons during the past years.
5. To plan the best utilization of existing staff and facilities.
6. To be in full operation within the regular budget of the Grand Rapids Board of Education by September, 1970.
7. To provide more individualized instruction.
8. To operate a program of pre-employment education.
9. To analyze the effect of the educational center in correcting existing racial, religious, ethnic, and socio-economic imbalance in the Grand Rapids public and nonpublic high schools.

During the first year of operation, 550 students attended, representing 20 different public and nonpublic schools in Kent County.

During its second year of operation (1969-70), the program has expanded and plans are now being formulated for its third and final year under federal funding. Courses have been offered in advanced placement English, advanced languages, African languages, social problems, anthropology, physics, and various types of vocational programs.

Although students must leave their base high schools to attend the downtown center at Junior College and Central High School, the holding power during the first year was over 94 percent.

Project Read

Project Read is designed to bring approximately 2,600 of Grand Rapids' underachieving children up to grade level in reading and language arts. Begun in the summer of 1969 with an intensive pre-service and in-service program, it is now in its first full year of operation in five schools.

This code-emphasis program embodies a one-to-one sound-symbol relationship and is designed for the student to:

1. Work at his own pace.
2. Participate actively and get a chance to respond personally and individually.
3. Experience success and receive strong reinforcement as his reading improves.

A unique feature of the program is the linguistic placement exam that indicates the precise starting point for each individual student. After examining the transiency problem in the schools, this appears to be an important point for any program in the inner city.

Baseline reading tests were administered prior to program beginning and will be again administered in the spring of 1970.

An added problem in this type of program is the need for additional "human" reinforcers. Although these schools have extra teacher aides assigned, the Grand Rapids schools made arrangements with Calvin College to send approximately 150 educational psychology students on a regular basis to assist in the project.

Collegefields

This social and educational rehabilitation program is designed to provide a setting for delinquent boys to help each other make a better life for themselves in the community. It first started in November, 1967 as a Title I program.

To be accepted into Collegefields, a boy must be between 13 and 15 years of age and be referred by the Juvenile Court and/or school authorities.

All boys in the program participate in an intensified, individualized, positive educational experience which motivates the boys by using a reward system.

Many kinds of materials are used as well as a "contract system" to enable the boy to progress as far as his ability allows.

Each afternoon following the educational program and a period of recreation, the boys participate in guided group interaction meetings. By using the pressure of a peer group which demands pro-social behavior, the program attempts to shape the member's behavior in a positive direction.

Results to date show many boys responding to this type of program with several returning to regular school, helped both behaviorally and academically.

Park School

"I think this is really a wonderful thing that they've done to help us in our education. I want to finish school and now I know I will." This is from a pregnant teenager reacting to her impression of the Park School for pregnant girls which held its first class on November 1, 1968.

A joint program involving 16 agencies, major funding came from the Grand Rapids Board of Education grant for the Educational Park under Title III, E.S.E.A.

The objectives for the program are:

1. To provide to junior and senior high school pregnant girls (unmarried and married) instruction comparable to that received in regular school and throughout a maximum of the prenatal period and continuing to the end of the semester following delivery of the baby.
2. To provide instruction on diet and a balanced noon lunch to improve the mother's capacity to maintain her and the baby's health.
3. To provide counseling service to assist the mother in her personal adjustment, plans for her child, her plans for continued schooling, and her economic plans and family future.
4. To provide a focus for various community and governmental agencies to effectively bring medical, psychological and social welfare services to the individual girl and her family.

During the first 14 months of operation, 384 girls received education at Park School, representing schools from all over Kent County.

The educational program includes continuing previous academic school work as well as classes in child care, health, and nutrition.

The remarkable aspect of this program has been the wide cooperation among the community's educational and social agencies--a move which should point the way to other cooperative ventures in the future.

The Questionnaire

Teachers

To gain further insight into feelings and perceptions about compensatory programs, a questionnaire was sent to teachers in the 11 inner-city schools who had at least 4 years of experience teaching under compensatory programs. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

Approximately 75 percent of the questionnaires were returned. Teachers, in general, responded very frankly to the questions and many made additional comments on the back of the questionnaire. Some questions were designed to allow the greatest latitude for opinion. This does not allow for complete quantification, but the following summary is an attempt by the writer to treat the responses with the greatest objectivity possible.

Q-1. Before President Johnson signed the Elementary-Secondary Education Act of 1965, he stated that a major task was to "bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most." Several million additional dollars have been allotted to inner-city schools in the last five years. What's better educationally as you see it now?

Materials, supplies, and books
Teacher aides
Smaller pupil-teacher ratio
Educational trips
Programs, such as Head Start and Follow Through
Attitudes of teachers
More professional help
Consultant help
Services of social worker, nurse, psychologist
Summer school, community school

Most answers to this question indicated that things were better because the teacher had more materials and supplies than before, followed by teacher aide services and smaller classes.

Q-2. Which of the following words would describe how well you think compensatory programs are working in Grand Rapids?

Excellent	3	Fair	16
Very good	16	Poor	3
Good	20		

Q-3. How well do you think the children are achieving today as a result of compensatory programs as compared to five years ago?

Better	39
Same	17
Worse	2

Q-3. Why do you think so?

Most teachers tended to hedge on this question, although it is significant to note that a high percentage felt that children were achieving better today than five years ago. This feeling is inconsistent with the results of any achievement, I.Q. or readiness data from previous tables. Significantly, these items were seldom mentioned as a basis for this positive decision. Yet, this writer detects an increasing intangible "something" among teachers that indicates that children are doing better. Their answers reflect this, as well as uncertainty about their reasons.

> Given more time, teacher aides, consultants, etc., teachers certainly are able to give the individual child more help.
>
> With wider choice of good materials, we have increased interest and thus greater achievement.
>
> They would have to achieve better with 14 to a room and an aide--upper elementary are not achieving better!
>
> Have more money to spend for various programs which are proving to be quite effective in motivating students to learn. One example would be the Sullivan Reading Program.
>
> We are more able to individualize instruction--more adequate materials and help.
>
> Students in my room have more skills and concepts as a whole than former students.

The way programs progress, they develop good basic skills in the children--if teacher teaches in proper way.

With Head Start and prekindergarten plus a substantial diet, I feel they are being developed in most important years--which helps to improve achievement in later years.

Observe change of attitude toward learning. More interesting things are happening, children are excited, more eager to learn, more curious. However, test results still do not indicate much more growth. (Also, kids in school more regularly.)

I strongly feel pilot programs in individualized learning--plays major factor in achieving of low-income children.

Use of standardized tests have shown children are improving in areas of reading, math, etc.--but at much too slow rate.

At level I teach, I see more children achieving goals set for them. Progress is better.

Hard to compare anything with five years ago--without compensatory programs it would be far worse it would seem. Values, social problems, etc. have changed; therefore, teaching has been "forced" to do so.

Because of prekindergarten programs--really thorough curriculum rethinking, as in Project Follow Through with the University of Illinois materials.

Educational research has shown beyond question that special early elementary programs have been very successful in achieving good results as measured by I.Q. scores. The recent study by Dr. Erickson shows our programs have helped children achieve at higher levels.

Difficult to measure on comparison basis. Children definitely learning skills and acquiring ability to use them, which was not true in our kindergarten program in 1965.

Because of improvements in compensatory program, and a growing tendency among schools to emphasize a human relations approach to instruction in the classroom.

They are making better progress in many areas, such as reading and math. I think their attitudes are better.

I have found the last three 4th level groups coming to me were in much better shape than the first 3 or 4 years I taught in G.R. Some improvement is being made.

Comparing children to ten years ago, they are happier for the most part. Less bickering, more learning. The struggle for learning isn't so constant. Better feeling of self-concept. Now teacher gets help with extremely difficult problem children.

Q-4. Would more be accomplished if each building were allotted funds so the staff could establish objectives and have accountability for results?

Yes	41
No	14
Don't know	4

Q-5. Do you think parent committees should be involved at the building level to assist in setting objectives and assessing results?

Yes	37
No	21
Don't know	1

Q-6. If you had the choice, where would you put the money that we now receive for compensatory programs?

This question brought a variety of suggestions, some of which are indicated below.

Smaller pupil-teacher ratio
Teacher aides
In-service for teachers
Reading curriculum
Materials

Head Start and Prekindergarten
Nutritional program
Health services, psychologists, social workers, speech therapists
Trips
Screen teachers for attitudes
Long-range planning
Same as now

Q-7. Some people claim that too much emphasis is placed on achievement and I.Q. as measured by tests. Do you feel other values have accrued that are not related to achievement and I.Q.? If yes, what are they?

Yes	50
No	8

At least 85 percent of the responding teachers felt that other values had accrued that were not related to achievement and I.Q. In almost all cases, they felt the children were better in the "affective" areas even though they had no objective evidence except day-by-day observation. Some representative comments were:

Emotional stability is improved.

I have watched the children become happier because of efforts made in academic areas.

Better self-image and self-control.

There is less bickering and more learning.

Teacher gets help with difficult problem children.

Children are more content with the role of the school in their lives.

Interest in reading.

An attitude of wanting to learn.

Determination to get an education.

I believe that the children are gaining a better feeling about themselves and school.

The attitudes of teachers toward children has improved.

Parents are beginning to realize that an all-out effort is being made to teach their children.

The children now have definite plans to go on to school and to get jobs, whereas they use to laugh when a teacher would mention college to them.

They are happier and better dressed.

A qualified, understanding, responsible, and conscientious teacher is still the best criteria for a good education, regardless of the amount of money put into schools from any funds, whether it be in materials for teaching, equipment, or program.

Consideration and respect for each other.

Administrators

The Special Programs Office assessed the feelings of principals in the inner-city schools through the use of a questionnaire. A summary of some of their responses is included in order to gain further insights into feelings about compensatory programs.

Q-1. Do you believe in the philosophy of compensatory programs? If so, do you feel the need for more programs or a greater concentrated effort in those existing? Please explain.

In general, all principals who responded believe in compensatory programs. Most felt we should concentrate our efforts in existing programs.

Q-2. Do you feel that the programs are accomplishing their purposes?

Principals had the most differences of opinion on this question and tended to give conflicting answers. The following comment "sums up" some of their ambivalence.

> The program objectives are depressed by the curricula activity and the immediate environmental factors. As the students leave the compensatory programs, they often enter rooms that are not adapted for the continuation of the same magnitude of programming. Further complications are involved in the fact that the parent's program often does not contain "follow ups" for the compensatory programs.

Q-3. Do you feel that your teachers are aware of the objectives of and are properly prepared to instruct in the program in which they might be participating? If not, what would you recommend to alleviate this problem?

Most principals felt the staff was aware of the objectives, but stressed the need for in-service programs.

Q-4. What is your feeling about the use of paraprofessionals (teacher aides, etc.) in your building?

All principals felt paraprofessionals were extremely important in programs at their schools. Some representative comments were:

> The paraprofessionals in my building are a tremendous asset. They reduce numbers in the classroom (pupil-teacher ratio), are performing some instructional duties, and are used in many extra-curricular activities.
>
> I welcome the use of paraprofessionals. They, of course, mean more work for the school principal, but their help is well worth the effort.
>
> Paraprofessionals are an asset to the school system. With proper instruction and motivation, they can be one of the most effective persons in education. We are in favor of continual use of these employees.
>
> They are indispensable. They, too, must be very carefully screened. Last year we had one who did a lot of good and a lot of harm. The harm outweighs the good. All of the aides this year are excellent.

Q-5. Do you feel that your community is aware of their school program? If not, what thinking do you have on "how to" involve the community in active participation?

Principals tended to respond in the same way as teachers did on a similar question. Those who were for an advisory committee qualified their answers by calling for a cautious approach.

Q-6. What is your feeling about the P.T.A.? Should it be retained or replaced, etc.?

Most principals felt the P.T.A. had limited value in their schools.

Q-7. What are your thoughts about preschool education? Do you feel that it is as important as educators have recently claimed?

All principals responded positively regarding preschool. They answered:

> Preschool education is essential if disadvantaged students are to succeed in school. I can say this because of existing research.
>
> Is tremendously important, especially for inner-city youngsters. Most important of the special programs.
>
> Best addition to the American educational system in ages. It is as important as educators claim.
>
> Everyone should have it for 4-year-old children. Low income groups should have it for 3- and 4-year-old children.

Summary

The purpose of Chapter III was to examine compensatory programs in Grand Rapids to see what has happened in the past five years in one urban center. Programs were described and costs were obtained from records. Approximately eight million dollars were put into programs during the past five years.

Data on transiency of children, racial makeup of student bodies, age of teachers, I.Q. scores, Metropolitan readiness, pupil-teacher ratios, paraprofessionals, teacher turnover, and racial makeup of instructional staffs were obtained to get a total picture of the schools involved with compensatory programs. Twelve control schools, identified in the principals' study of 1963, were also included.

Some specific programs that have received some attention nationwide were included. These are Bereiter Engelmann, a structured program; Educational Park; Project Read, a programmed, code-emphasis program; Collegefields for delinquent boys, and Park School for pregnant girls.

A teacher questionnaire was prepared and sent to teachers who had at least four years of experience teaching under compensatory programs. They seemed to feel that things were getting better for the disadvantaged child, even though "hard data" in the form of I.Q. or achievement tests do not justify their feelings.

Principals identified paraprofessionals and preschool programs as the most significant factors in educating disadvantaged children.

As a result of looking at all aspects of data in this chapter, Chapter IV will contain a review of factors affected by compensatory programs.

CHAPTER IV

FACTORS AFFECTED BY COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS

Introduction

As educators look at programs locally and nationally with the target on changing the learner and see the many "no significant difference" patterns, they should question whether compensatory programs may have had other influences on the educational process.

Early efforts called for more concentrated doses of the prevailing technology--more reading teachers, more trips, more guidance services, lower pupil-teacher ratio, etc. These efforts consisted of studying a child's deficiencies and adding layers to a prevailing process.

Fantini and Weinstein in commenting on the lack of results, say:

> This is not to say that compensatory education is an irreparable and irrevocable mistake. American institutions change less by radical overthrow than by step-by-step evolution, and it was too much to expect that education, which is not one of our more fluid institutions, would be an exception.
>
> Compensatory education is at least evidence that we are not willing to stop the world and write off hundreds of thousands of children while a quest for fundamental solutions goes forward. And at

> best compensatory education can provide the bridge to a real overhaul of the entire process by which people are educated. This is more than a pious wish. Concern with the disadvantaged is already forcing educators engaged in research and compensatory projects to re-examine assumptions about learning and teaching, and many of their findings are applicable to all children in all schools. The pressure to educate the disadvantaged has already stimulated departures from the fixed habits of education, and the hope is that an across-the-board strategy will free education from all its barnacled moorings.[1]

After assessing the data in Chapter III, it appears that we are in a transition from compensatory education to total institutional reform, even though the steps seem relatively modest.

In this "total" look at compensatory program, some effects have been observed that, in the long run, may have a significant impact for meeting the needs of all children--through what we have learned from programs for the disadvantaged.

One of the biggest values has been in the ability to have some necessary "change money" available. American education is a changing enterprise--no doubt, a much more slowly changing one than it should be or could be. The overall impact of mass media, in terms of social change, may well be that we become saturated with the overwhelming

---

[1]Mario D. Fantini and Gerald Weinstein, "Taking Advantage of the Disadvantaged," Teacher's College Record, LXIX, No. 2 (November, 1967), Columbia University, p. 4 (from a Ford Foundation reprint).

presence of change but feel less and less able to influence it.

Yet, it is the contention here that compensatory programs have helped us answer a qualified "yes" to the question, "Can education leave the static ways and static guidelines which have dominated the history of schooling and adopt the process ways which must become the educator's ways if the school is to survive?

The following areas seem to be where changes have taken place and where we could not have moved to the present state without special funding--changes so profound that, if compensatory education programs were eliminated tomorrow, the effects would remain.

Differentiated Staffing

A comparatively new process was initiated with the advent of compensatory programs. Grand Rapids started in 1965 with 60 teacher aides, as explained earlier, and has expanded this small "inner city" project to 400 para-professional staff members, encompassing a wide range of duties. Where teacher aides have been used, efficiency has increased and the morale of the professional staff has improved.

The Grand Rapids Public Schools-Western Michigan University Center for Educational Studies in 1968 made a

study of teacher aides involved in classroom work. They reported the following findings:

> Inner-city teachers with aides are more satisfied with teaching as a career than outer-city teachers.
>
> The morale of inner-city teachers with aides equals that of outer-city teachers.
>
> Teachers would like teacher aide training to be expanded so that the aides would not only be competent to do clerical tasks but also to assist with classroom instruction.
>
> Inner-city teachers with aides as compared to inner-city teachers without aides
> --are more satisfied with teaching as a career
> --spend more time preparing for school
> --spend more time with parents
> --have more professional discussions with other staff members
> --spend more time in individual instruction
> --spend less time in disciplinary action.[2]

In January, 1969, several members of the Curriculum Division, Michigan Department of Education, made a team visit to review and evaluate the Grand Rapids compensatory education programs. In a section of their report, they said:

> The consultants were impressed by the way which the teacher aides were utilized in the programs at the elementary schools. The teacher aides' services were designed to provide assistance to the professional teacher in the function of individualized instruction to the students. There was good rapport between the teachers, aides, and students.

---

[2]Jane Bonnell, Edsel Erickson, and John Natzke, "Teacher-Aides in Grand Rapids," Grand Rapids Public Schools-Western Michigan University Center for Educational Studies, 1969, pp. 2-4. (Mimeographed.)

> The consultants observed and talked with target students, and it was gratifying to see and hear the children express positive reactions toward professionals and aides.[3]

The questionnaires to teachers and principals revealed an overwhelming acceptance of paraprofessionals in education. Comments indicated that this additional help was a factor in keeping experienced teachers in the inner city.

It appears to this writer that the impetus provided by compensatory education funds has started a trend that will breathe new life into the American educational system.

In addition, it seems that this movement may well lead to various levels of teachers such as associate, staff, senior, and master. It also presents a challenge to the present system of teacher education. Perhaps it suggests that college education might not be the only route to a teaching career; that a variety of systems, timetables, and entry points might be provided for teacher preparation. This will demand a need for new alliances, among community, school, and university, in order to develop and train educational personnel for the future.

---

[3]Harry Groulx, "General Overview of the Grand Rapids Projects Relating to Change-Process at the Building Level," 1969, p. 2 (Mimeographed.)

Continuous Progress

Started as an experiment in 1961, this program received its biggest thrust when Title I funds were allotted to hire a coordinator to assist target area schools in developing a program to assist teachers to meet individual needs of children so they could show continuous progress. Title I funds are no longer used but the influence of the action led all elementary schools to adopt this method of organization. An added outgrowth of this program has caused the schools in 1968-69 to adopt a policy of nonretention in grades seven and eight.

Also, textbook rental as opposed to student purchase was necessary to the program and has been adopted by the Board of Education for all elementary and middle school levels. Curriculum materials and handbooks of instruction for teachers have been produced.

New report forms and reporting to parents with parent teacher conferences have been instituted.

Recent buildings have been designed to support the concept of better individualization of instruction.

In spite of these "effects," it appears that more emphasis must be given to continuous progress as a philosophy of education rather than an organizational structure. It seems that a nongraded philosophy or a continuous progress curriculum should use many different organizational structures, teaching technologies, and grouping practices.

Compensatory programs have given the impetus to a concept that should make individual growth possible. But there is a long way to go. Individuality is not going to come about by changing textbooks, or class size, or school architecture--although these may help.

The problem with individualization of instruction must be more fundamental than we have acknowledged it to be, or it would long since have been solved. How can it be that it continues to be a problem? Does it presume too much that people are alike enough to permit grouping? Must we change our goals before changes in practice will have a fundamental effect on individualization of instruction? Can the educational system have goals independent of the differences that really exist? Should educators receive a different type of pre-service and in-service training?

These and other questions must be answered. In any case, compensatory programs have pushed us a little further down the road to answering them.

Staff Development

From the initial Title III program at South High School to the training for Project Read under Section 3 of the State Aid Act, in-service education has been an important factor. This important aspect in change is a

critical one since it involves the human factor. In a recent report on Michigan Title III projects, Miller says:

> The commonly held notion that materials, equipment, and organizational patterns are the key factors in program development is dispelled. While time for planning the operation of new programs is of some importance, from the data available it is apparent that teachers and administrators who are involved in ESEA Title III projects look upon human factors as more crucial to curriculum change than non-human or material factors. Humans are both the most commonly cited obstacles to and facilitators of educational change. Working effectively with people appears to be the key to successful innovation and change, particularly when the "unknown" is involved.[4]

Yet, most observers would agree that change efforts, in general, have been less successful and less effective than the pace of the times demands. We have looked at failures to use evaluative data properly, new curriculum ventures, and different staffing patterns. Some work needs to be done in examining whether teachers can change--whether there is a psychological inability to change. In-service programs have tended to emphasize new concepts, techniques, and media, but unless teachers receive the new idea into their experiential field and give it new meaning in terms of their own attitudes, feelings, and skills, they cannot effectively implement

---

[4]Peggy L. Miller, "Innovation and Change in Education," in Educational Leadership (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1970), p. 339.

programs for the disadvantaged. This problem has caused an increase in programs that are "teacher proof." Although this may have merit for some narrow behavioral objective, all that is known about student motivation and ability demands an openness on the part of the teacher.

Stated simply, unless those who are called upon to implement "better" programs for the disadvantaged are psychologically able to entertain innovation, significant change cannot occur. Here is another area for schools and colleges to take some hard looks at their pre-service and in-service programs. Compensatory programs have given the opening necessary to "go to the heart of the problem."

Curriculum Implications

Several programs in compensatory education have effected practices in curriculum as related to process and properties.

One program which was described earlier (the Bereiter Englemann Program) was highly structured and produced some great gains in I.Q. and achievement. As the study pointed out, the investigators were uncertain if the use of operant principles in the teaching methodology, the structure of the concepts taught, or simply the presentation of important principles are what made the program so successful. Neither could they discern

the contribution of parent involvement, teacher attitudes, or the actions of the other children. Probably they all had some effect.

This observer spent many hours watching the process in the classroom. One gets the feeling that this method has been an excellent vehicle that allows children and adults to interact in a positive way. It appears that much of what is known about Rosenthal's study on expectations and other affective areas, such as attitude and empathy, may be a big factor here. Before polarizing thoughts for or against a program of this type, aspects of it ought to be examined to see whether they can be generalized to the regular school program.

Perhaps this program capitalizes on the young child's intense interest in low level skills of identifying letters, words, and numbers. Much more study of the principle of optimal developmental match between the challenge of a task and the child's skills and interests needs to be done.

Another program has been Project Read, described earlier. This individualized program in reading has been a factor in curriculum effected by compensatory programs. In fact, many new reading programs have been tried such as I.T.A., and a host of multi-ethnic basal series. All of these could not have been tried and assessed without the availability of "change funds."

Other influences have occurred in technology with the changes in audio-visual, programmed instruction teaching machines, and computer assisted instruction. Educators have voiced concern whether the great advances in educationally applicable technology will dehumanize education. This will depend upon how it is used. Many dehumanizing experiences occur without technology. If technology can create an environment in which each student can engage in learning those things geared to his interests, needs, and learning characteristics, it can make a big contribution to learning. Compensatory programs have given us the opportunity to harness this great power and direct it to ways that will foster humaneness.

In addition, these funds have enabled schools to initiate programs such as Collegefields for delinquent boys. This program, described in Chapter III, has given us better insights for dealing with potential dropouts.

The Park School for pregnant girls is another example of compensatory programs being the catalyst for changing attitudes and practices. Whereas 6 years ago a girl was "sentenced" to home and ostracized by school and society, this program has had 384 girls in 14 months with close to 75 percent finishing their education during the pre- or postnatal periods. Who can measure the attitude of these girls toward the future when someone

has "gone the second mile" to help them. In fact, the Kent County superintendents have recently voted to pick up the cost of the program when compensatory funds run out.

The Educational Park concept, where juniors and seniors from all public and nonpublic schools go for specialized courses, has also been a program where "change money" has altered existing patterns for educating high school age youth. This program, now in its third and last year of funding, has proven valuable enough to cause the Grand Rapids Board of Education to add local funds for expansion and eventual take over.

Preschool education, barely a thought six years ago, has grown to a reality today as one of the most significant factors in improving the lot of the disadvantaged. Most reports in this study point out the values of a good preschool program. However, too many school systems are entering the field with little understanding of how such programs should differ from the "good nursery school." One stumbling block to the development of a clearly defined, testable program is the reluctance of teachers to structure programs, since introduction of formal activities supposedly will "rob little children of their childhood." Perhaps Montessori's concept of "liberty within limits" should be examined further to

see whether a structured environment can help children to become autonomous and self-directing.

Decentralization

An important factor affected by the availability of compensatory programs has been the emphasis on decentralization of decision making. O.E.O. guidelines in 1964 called for more involvement of the poor in determining programs for them. Title I procedures call for an advisory committee to work with school authorities in planning programs in the target area. This advisory committee was to be made up of a wide range of individuals--parents, teachers, administrators, and representatives of community agencies. Although Grand Rapids has had such an advisory committee, an analysis of reports, interviews, and questionnaires show a lack of understanding in this area. The recent State Department curriculum report on the visit to Grand Rapids said:

> Generally speaking, the staff (teachers, principals, and aides) at the building level are not aware of the program objectives under which they are working. Because of this uncertainty they are not clear as to the nature of evaluation techniques to be employed. It appears that an analysis of data as related to program development would not be possible under these circumstances at the building level.[5]

In addition to staff involvement, there is a rising trend toward parent involvement. The Follow

---

[5]Groulx, op. cit., p. 1.

Through program has a strong parent committee and could well set the pattern for other areas.

Community and lay participation in school operations through advisory boards or councils is not without problems. Experience has shown that in order to operate effectively, lines of control and authority must be clearly spelled out to the people by the central board of education. For, if effected, decentralization carries with it a finality; for power, once given, is difficult if not impossible to retract.

It is obvious in this study that real decision-making power has not been delegated to local educational units in city school districts.

The recently completed study of the New York City Schools, commonly called the Bundy Report, says:

> The Panel holds strongly with the proposition that the most significant interaction between the community and the educational system occurs at the level of the individual school. Under effective decentralization, as before, the school would be the primary point of contact with the system for the vast majority of parents. It is at the school level that the decisive test of the proposed Community School system will occur.
>
> The reorganized system should open up possibilities for new and strengthened avenues of participation and dynamic partnership among parents, teachers, and administrators of each school--all for the educational growth and personal development of all pupils.[6]

---

[6]McGeorge Bundy, ed., Reconnection for Learning, By the Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of New York City Schools (New York: Office of the Mayor, 1967), p. 124.

Perhaps here is a place where the community school movement can help in true involvement. It is difficult to imagine that a single pattern or formula for action will develop in the next few years. In all probability, we should experiment with a great many versions of community control, involvement, and participation.

In any case, compensatory programs have opened new possibilities for joint involvement of parents and educators and children.

Health Service

Prior to the availability of funds for special purposes to assist the disadvantaged, health services were extended from the county health department to the schools. This service, woefully inadequate, provided a nurse approximately a day a week to the individual schools.

Full-time nurses began in the Title I high schools in 1967-68, and have continued and expanded under various programs until there are now 13 nurses functioning in inner-city schools.

It is difficult to measure the "effect" of this type of program. In the first year of the program, however, one high school had 2,913 pupils use the health service. It seems to this writer that this program has had important effects on the total learning ability of the disadvantaged student. How can one measure the improved

self-concept of a student which may result when he now can get professional help for problems, real or imagined? What effect does it have on his future, now that a personal hygiene or emotional problem has had attention? And is there really any hope of educating children, particularly young adolescents, when not enough adequate attention has been paid to some of these underlying problems? Although not the intent of this study, it seems that this is one problem that needs far more intensive study.

Agency Cooperation

Many programs in compensatory education call for joint efforts of various community agencies to attack the problems of the disadvantaged. One of the most significant factors uncovered in this study has been the opening of lines of communication between schools and other agencies.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 saw the first joint effort between groups from United Community Services and the Board of Education to plan and implement programs for the inner city. In addition, establishment of a target area under Title I called for data on welfare, socio-economic standing, transiency, health, and achievement that heretofore had been exclusive to each agency. For the first time these groups started to look at the "total" picture and how various factors affected the learning process. Again when schools had to qualify

under Section 3 of the State Aid Act described in Chapter II, criteria for selection meant opening up lines of communication between the Board of Education, City Planning, Welfare, and Health Departments.

When the program for unmarried pregnant girls was instituted, it was a joint effort of 16 different agencies, all with a voice on the planning committee.

Another area where joint planning was necessary was with the nonpublic schools. Title I programs called for involving children from nonpublic schools in programs if they met the conditions specified. This dialogue has opened up and set a pattern for other cooperative programs, such as dual enrollment, joint use of audio-visual supplies, exchange programs, and an awareness by both systems of the other's problems.

When one looks back on six years of compensatory programs and sees many joint efforts where little existed previously, compensatory programs can be singled out as the main driving force for cooperation. At the very least, educators may have started to recognize that the school cannot take on the full job of "compensation" alone, and are starting to recognize this fact by utilizing services of other agencies.

Evaluative Function

> If the success of our efforts at facilitating the educational development of disadvantaged youngsters could be evaluated simply on the basis of the amount of enthusiasm and activity generated by those efforts, we would at once declare the majority of the programs . . . successful.[7]

No area has come under greater criticism than the evaluative function, since compensatory programs have come into focus.

With the recent thrust by the state and federal government for "quantifiable results," it would be easy for evaluators to settle for "hard" data. It appears to this writer that from observations of both national and state compensatory programs, the trend is too narrow our outlook regarding purposes of education.

> Preoccupation with subject matter has also blinded most schools to the "affective" element in learning--the emotions and personal concerns of the students. Machines can be enormously helpful in teaching children, but children are not learning machines. Their feelings can impede learning of the most carefully organized subject matter. And it is as important to diagnose the values and concerns of the middle-class students as it is to comprehend the feelings of powerlessness and weak self-image of disadvantaged pupils.
>
> More effective learning does not consist, of course, of scrapping or diluting traditional subject matter. But it does demand that academic subjects be orchestrated with the learner's feelings and

---

[7] Edmund W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson, Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged--Programs and Practices: Preschool Through College (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966), p. 156.

> concerns. "Hard" knowledge--the fundamentals--is not compromised by real integration of affective with cognitive aspects of education. To assume that it is, is to deny that knowledge is relevant to life and that emotion is a spur to productivity and creativity.[8]

This should not imply that it is unwise to establish any behavioral objectives or to develop skills. Indeed, this study has shown that some amazing achievement and I.Q. improvements can be exhibited if an objective is set and all energy is devoted to achieving that objective.

One cannot help but feel however, that most programs are woefully lacking in opportunities for affective learning. Too often we see ourselves as dispensers of content-information, facts, knowledge--that emphasizes the cognitive development of students. The lack of emphasis on affective learning is due in part to a failure to understand its role in supporting and promoting cognitive learning. The little affective learning that does take place usually occurs informally.

The typical classroom reflects the adult environment in which ideas are shared, but not feelings. Schools reinforce the assumption that the proper response to an idea is another idea, never an expression of feelings. But the unconscious irony of the situation is that failure to deal with feelings creates an unhealthy atmosphere that

---

[8]Fantini and Weinstein, op. cit., p. 8.

hinders students from learning the content of the curriculum. Students who never learn healthy ways of coping with their feelings easily learn self-defeating and disruptive ways of obstructing the teaching of facts and concepts.

Weinhold reinforces this idea when he says:

> In a world of unprecedented change, today's students need to examine attitudes, values, and skills even more than they need to learn specific content. They need to learn how to use these attitudes, values, and skills for organizing themselves and their institutions to solve the problems and make the decisions of the future. The day is gone when we can hope to prepare all students for life by presenting a basic body of knowledge. Today's curriculum has to emphasize that the most important lessons concern people rather than things.[9]

Yet, with education getting more and more expensive, parents--and legislators--are demanding a quick payoff. They want their money's worth of educational "improvements" in terms they can readily comprehend. And to an extent undreamed of in the long history of education, students are being tested, measured, analyzed, classified, and segregated by their ability or inability to sit, pencil in hand, and check off "right" answers. George B. Leonard says that the child's teacher stands in danger of becoming

---

[9]Barry K. Weinhold, "Small Group Approaches to Affective Learning," Curriculum Trends (New London, Connecticut: Croft Educational Services, Inc., January, 1970).

not a connoisseur of learning, but a custodian of examinations.[10]

Hopefully the increased emphasis on testing will not inhibit change and experimentation. So long as the teacher can hide behind tests, he will not feel the urgent need for reform in teaching methods. So long as the student senses that tests and scores are what really count in school, he will not know the joy of real learning. So long as the school administrator knows his school is being rated by how well students perform on a nationwide or statewide standardized test, he will be limited in his emphasis on new programs to help the disadvantaged.

Evaluation money has forced us to take a hard look at objectives of programs. Varied means of achieving such objectives can be devised with both formal and informal means used to collect the desired evidence.

Although our major long-term goal should be real and lasting gains in intellectual and academic compentence, intermediate steps involving language development, social orientation, and perceptual organization should not be lost.

> It is therefore appropriate, and probably necessary, that the goals at any one time may be, not academic achievement as such, but a whole series of underlying

---

[10]George B. Leonard, "Testing vs. Your Child," Look Magazine, March 22, 1966.

> competencies which may eventually contribute to the ability to succeed in school. As evidence to support this point of view is being collected, it is important that programs for the disadvantaged be judged on the basis of the goals which are actually operating at any one time rather than on a long-range goal which may be several steps--and several years--in the future. It is only when evaluation is thus conceived that meaningful data can be collected and the functional contribution of any program be assessed.[11]

It is the feeling here that the aforementioned areas are the underlying factors that eventually will pay off in school success. In fact, careful study of the total picture in Chapter III has led this writer to conclude that we have arrested the downward trend for disadvantaged children and are now ready to show positive results with a variety of evaluation instruments.

Summary

The purpose of Chapter IV was to consider some factors in education that have been influenced by the availability of compensatory programs. The contention is that promising practices, formerly isolated from the formal education process, have been woven into the very fabric of education.

Compensatory education programs have influenced changes in education, changes so profound that, if the

---

[11]Alexander Frazier, ed., Educating the Children of the Poor (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1968), p. 29.

money were eliminated tomorrow, the effects would remain.

The following changes have been observed through this "total" look at compensatory programs:

Use of teacher aides and other paraprofessional personnel has expanded into all areas of the school system.

Nongraded or continuous progress programs have expanded to encompass all areas of the elementary school and some in the senior high school.

Staff development and other in-service programs are being recognized as an important factor in the operation of school systems.

Curriculum changes in reading and mathematics have been instituted.

New programs to deal with delinquent boys and unwed mothers have been tried.

There is a trend toward decentralization, i.e. more building autonomy with parent and teacher involvement.

Health programs in the inner city are the result of compensatory programs and a recognition that children have difficulty learning when they are hungry or ill.

Planning for compensatory programs has forced school and community agencies to pool resources and exchange information.

The urgency for evaluation has created much turmoil for educators. This has caused concern, and has helped us look carefully at the whole learning process.

Chapter V will contain a summary of the findings in this study, as well as conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to contribute to an understanding of the factors which might be influenced by the availability of compensatory programs.

To assist in this understanding, many aspects of compensatory programs in Grand Rapids were examined.

Summary of Findings

1. Various compensatory programs have supplied billions of dollars to local school districts across the nation in an effort to improve education for disadvantaged youth. This money was spent on a variety of types of programs. Grand Rapids could be considered a microcosm, since many representative type programs have been offered in the past five years at a cost of approximately eight million dollars.
2. The rate of transiency in the schools first identified as disadvantaged in the principals' report of 1963, has not changed. The total "in

and out" movement was 36 percent in 1963 and 37 percent in 1969.

3. In 1963, 6 of the 12 inner-city schools were predominately nonwhite, 5 were predominately white, and 1 (Jefferson) was approximately half of each.

   In 1969 the pattern remained the same, except Jefferson had now become 89 percent nonwhite. Whereas in 1963 only 1 "advantaged" school had any nonwhites, in 1969 all schools in the study except 2 had nonwhite percentages ranging from .3 percent to 16.0 percent.

4. The average age of teachers since 1963 in disadvantaged schools fell from 41 to 35; in advantaged, from 44 to 40; and city-wide from 42 to 38.

5. I.Q. scores of fifth grade students show very little change when 1963 is compared with 1969. The seven schools with majority black enrollments show the same I.Q. patterns as the four schools with majority white enrollments.

6. Students do not tend to stay at a disadvantaged school a long period of time. Only 29 to 51 percent of the fifth grade students measured on a Kuhlman Anderson I.Q. test had been at the particular disadvantaged school at least 3 years.

7. On the Metropolitan Readiness Test, given to first grade students, 55 percent of the students in disadvantaged schools scored superior, high normal, or average in 1963, whereas 57 percent scored in these categories in 1969.
8. Compensatory programs had a pronounced effect on pupil-teacher ratios. The disadvantaged schools had ratios lowered from 27.3 in 1963 to 21.1 in January, 1970; while the other schools' ratio remained approximately the same--27.6 in 1963 and 27.7 in 1970.
9. Significant numbers of paraprofessionals were employed in the inner-city schools. About 50 percent of Title I funds goes to this program.
10. A larger percent of teachers (63 percent) have had less than 4 years experience in the advantaged schools than in the disadvantaged schools (61 percent). Also, 30 percent of the teachers are in the first year of teaching in the inner-city group of schools, while 33 percent are in the first year of teaching in the outer-city group of schools.
11. In 1963, the 12 disadvantaged schools had 35 black teachers and no black principals, while in 1969 there were 53 black teachers and 6 black principals.

12. Although this study was not intended to be one in which statistical analysis was to be applied, overall comparisons of children's I.Q. and achievement scores between 1963 and 1969 reveals little change. It appears that the programs in Grand Rapids follow the pattern of studies reviewed in Chapter II when traditional methods of performance are supplied to program.
13. An exception to this occurred where an experimental program, the Bereiter-Engelmann Program, which stresses a highly structured language arts and mathematics program, was tried. In a two year study, disadvantaged preschool and kindergarten children showed significant gains in I.Q. and achievement when traditional test measures were applied. It is too early to tell whether these early gains can be maintained.
14. The following observations were elicited from teachers through the use of a questionnaire. The questionnaire contained items to determine the attitudes of teachers toward compensatory programs in Grand Rapids.
    a. Most teachers felt things are better educationally because they have more materials and supplies, teacher aide services, and smaller classes.

b. Sixty-seven percent of the responding teachers felt that compensatory programs in Grand Rapids were excellent, very good, or good; while 33 percent felt they were fair or poor.

c. Sixty-seven percent felt that children were achieving better today than 5 years ago, 30 percent the same, and 3 percent worse.

d. Seventy-one percent felt more would be accomplished if each building were allotted funds.

e. The question involving parent committees assisting at the building level caused more differences of opinion than any other question. Although 65 percent of the teachers said they felt parent committees could assist the schools, additional comments indicated a cautious approach.

f. Most teachers would put the compensatory education money into the same programs we now have, i.e. more materials and supplies, teacher aide services, and smaller classes.

g. Teachers overwhelmingly (86 percent to 14 percent) felt that other values have accrued that are not related to achievement and I.Q. Among them were affective areas of learning, such as interest, attitude, and self-concept.

15. Principals' questionnaire responses:
    a. Principals tended to be highly supportive of the philosophy of compensatory programs.
    b. Principals had little agreement on whether programs were accomplishing their purposes.
    c. They felt a need for more meaningful in-service programs.
    d. Principals considered paraprofessionals extremely important in educating disadvantaged youth.
    e. They were cautious in their appraisal of advisory parent committees.
    f. They felt that the PTA had limited value in their schools.
    g. All principals considered preschool to be very important, perhaps the most important of all compensatory programs.

Conclusions

1. Compensatory programs have been a strong factor in enabling education to move from its fixed habits to a flexible format, of benefit to more children in all schools. They have contributed to education in general by influencing changes in the following areas:

a. The movement toward differentiated staffing has received general support from educators at all levels.

b. Through the attempt to better educate the disadvantaged child, all schools in Grand Rapids now are on a nongraded, continuous progress program.

c. Staff development programs are concerned with providing more meaningful education, indicating a willingness to recognize the deficits within the current education of the deprived, and proposing to make the changes that will help to eradicate these deficits. This feeling comes from examining in-service programs as well as teacher education programs at Michigan State University.

d. Curriculum changes have evolved in many areas, such as:

Preschool--programs have been instituted using the "cultural enrichment" approach as well as a highly structured (Bereiter-Englemann) skills approach.

Reading--programs using multi-ethnic basal series, Initial Teaching Alphabet, and Sullivan programmed materials have been tried.

Dropout programs--A Park School for pregnant girls is functioning whereby a girl can continue her education and return to her base high school. A special program for delinquent boys has been started where boys under 16 years can receive individual help with academic and social problems.

High school juniors and seniors from all public and nonpublic schools may attend an Educational Park to get specialized courses not offered at the base schools.

e. Decentralization of operations in large school systems has been started by compensatory programs. More building autonomy plus parent participation seems to be the trend.

f. Health services have greatly expanded as a school function since 1965.

g. Agency cooperation--various community agencies have been cooperating in a joint united attack on the effects of poverty.

h. Evaluative function--compensatory programs have forced us to look carefully at our goals in education, whether cognitive, affective, or psychomotor, and forced us to consider accountability for results.

2. Questionnaires and interviews with administrators and teachers revealed a serious problem regarding adequate lead time in allocation of funds to local districts. Therefore, planning is not only limited in breadth but also in time. Short-term authorizations of funding prevent anything but short-term planning. Long-term and intelligent planning gives way to "eleventh hour" efforts that result in waste of resources and poorer educational experiences for students. Unless school systems can know of a program's funding at least six months prior to operation, we shall continue to have frustrations, waste, and deficient programs. A good example was this year's Section 3 funds from the state. Allotments were not made until school was underway and some schools were not funded until January.
3. There appears to be an alarming trend at all levels to use tests to do more than the test makers intended. The cry is for accountability, and this is usually related to what some researchers have termed "pay off evaluation." At least for the short run, more and more on measures of finite things, such as measurable achievement and intelligence as distinct from the more

subjective values (attitudes, social responsibility, creativity) that make up a human being, quite apart from academic learning seem to be relied upon. There also appear to be greater pressures to do "statistical gymnastics" with the results of tests rather than to use the results as a diagnostic tool.

In this study of many programs, it appears that many evaluators are ignoring some basic weaknesses of tests. Most of these tests ignore the motivation, thinking patterns, environment, and vocabulary of children in the inner cities. They are ill suited to measure present achievement and are of dubious value in measuring potential achievement. They measure only a small segment of the curriculum but do little to measure objectives, such as problem solving, creative thinking, artistic expression, skills of group living, independent judgment, and physical dexterity.

4. In many instances in this study, the writer found that the children did as well as five years earlier when measured as a group. With the increasing social problems of these last few years, maybe "doing as well" is an improvement that could be attributed to compensatory programs. As the

Red Queen said in Alice In Wonderland, "It takes all the running you can do just to keep in the same place."

5. Pressures for immediate, as opposed to long-term, carefully planned evaluation will continue until major funding sources believe that compensatory programs have demonstrated their value.

   This does not create an atmosphere conducive to careful feedback. Yet, if one takes the position that the true impact may be realized only when this generation become parents, long-term evaluation is dictated.

6. Educational change is upon us and how it is responded to in the inner cities will determine the road for public education in the future. It is the contention here that the new concern for the disadvantaged will be the impetus for new concern for education in general.

   Care must be taken to avoid the "more and better of the same" syndrome. This study has shown the fallacy of looking for the one right and true way to educate children. Many ways are available, and it is our duty to individualize instruction to match the proper methods and children.

7. There is a great interest by teachers and principals to have more building level control for planning and implementation of programs. However, it is interesting to note that they were less willing to share some of this local control with parent advisory groups.
8. It appears that compensatory education programs in the form of teacher aides, lower pupil-teacher ratios, and updated in-service programs are correlated with teachers staying longer in inner-city schools.
9. Compensatory education programs in general are beneficial to disadvantaged children in ways that may not show up in intelligence or achievement tests. This feeling comes through strongly from teachers who have worked with these children for several years.
10. A prevention program is more likely to work than a remedial one. Meaningful preschool and primary programs with a series of sequentially ordered activities appear to have the chance for greater success in remedying cognitive learning deficiencies.
11. Although improved school facilities, better pupil-teacher ratios, and a rich supply of

instructional materials cannot be minimized, a good program of teacher education seems to be a most important factor if we are to improve education in disadvantaged areas.

Recommendations

1. Greater attention must be given to the human element in educational change. An analysis of the teacher and administrator questionnaire indicates that human obstacles in the form of suspicion, reluctance, and lack of involvement in decision making are factors that influence the adequacy of compensatory programs.
2. A more systematic attack needs to be made to establish procedures by which problems as viewed by parents, students, and teachers can systematically be identified. And when projects are initiated, they must be tied to a systematic program of implementation. In addition, we must define our instructional objectives and closely link our instruction and materials to them. Although this immediately raises arguments between so-called child-centered and subject-centered groups, there is no logical reason why these convictions should militate against the defining

of instructional objectives, since specifying what children should learn does not in itself rule out or entail any particular ways of treating children.

3. A careful study should be made to examine why a majority of teachers and principals feel that children are doing better today than before. Perhaps their everyday contact with children has enabled them to discover (subjectively perhaps) some values in areas of interests, attitudes, and appreciations--values that tests of cognitive skills have difficulty measuring. If the Rosenthal studies of expectations have any merit, this feeling of teachers should pay off in future gains for children.
4. Factors outside of classrooms have profound effects on learning, effects that few schools are compensating for today. The school cannot take on the full job of "compensation" alone, and we ought to do more than just recognize this fact. There is need to have closer involvement of parents and other community agencies in decision making. Interviews, questionnaires, and evaluation data show a feeling of lack of participation in program development and

implementation at the building level. It is recommended that an added emphasis be put on parent, teacher, and principal involvement in program planning. In addition, added accountability for results should be developed at the building level. Although initially this writer considered total building autonomy, data on transiency within the inner city indicates a need for some cooperative effort that would make transferring students feel at ease and able to adjust.

5. Immediate steps need to be taken to alert legislators at both state and national levels of the urgency for adequate lead time for funding.
6. Efforts must be intensified to develop programs in conjunction with colleges and community to train teachers in methods as well as in positive attitudes toward disadvantaged children.
7. All methods of evaluation must continue to be examined. If we get in the great test race, we may miss out on other, perhaps more important, means to get feedback on programs--means such as teacher judgment, self-appraisal, and parent comment.

8. A final recommendation centers around the implications for further research and study both in Grand Rapids and other cities throughout the country.

   It would appear that there is a need to determine:

   a. whether teachers in other cities feel that disadvantaged children are doing better today than before;
   b. whether there is a difference between the way black and white teachers perceive the value of compensatory education;
   c. whether there is a relationship between the amount of input and quality of educational output;
   d. what influence, if any, do colleges of education have on goals for compensatory education; and
   e. what happens to children in later years after they leave compensatory programs.

Finally, the question must be asked: Has compensatory education contributed to instructional improvement in Grand Rapids? Although there is little statistical proof and present evidence is sometimes conflicting, this writer feels a positive trend favoring instructional improvement is evident. This feeling arises out of

studies of data, discussions with parents, but above all, an increasing feeling of adequacy among school personnel that they can make a difference with disadvantaged children.

Robert Kennedy summed up the attitude needed by people when he said: "Some men see things as they are and say why. I dream of things that never were and say why not." As long as educators feel this way, education for the disadvantaged is not hopeless.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Beatty, Walcott H., ed. Improving Educational Assessment. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.

Bereiter, C., and Engelmann, S. Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Bouma, Donald H., and Hoffman, James. The Dynamics of School Integration. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1968.

Bruner, J. S. The Process of Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Bundy, McGeorge, ed. Reconnection for Learning. By the Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of New York City Schools. New York: Office of the Mayor, 1967.

Coleman, James S., et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Government Printing Office, 1966.

Deutsch, Martin P. "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process." Education in Depressed Areas. Edited by A. Harry Passow. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1963.

Frazier, Alexander, ed. Educating the Children of the Poor. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1968.

Frost, Joe L., and Hawkes, Glenn R. The Disadvantaged Child. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.

Gardner, John W. Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963.

Gordon, Edmund W., and Wilkerson, Doxey A. Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged--Programs and Practices: Preschool Through College. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

LaBenne, Wallace D., and Greene, Bert I. Educational Implications of Self-Concept Theory. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1969.

Miller, Peggy L. "Innovation and Change in Education." Educational Leadership. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1970.

National Education Association. Schools of the Urban Crisis. Task Force on Urban Education Report. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Passow, A. Harry, ed. Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1963.

Piaget, J. The Origins of Intelligence in Children. New York: International Universities Press, 1952.

Rees, Helen E. Deprivation and Compensatory Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Report of the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders, U.S. Riot Commission Report. Otto Kerner, chairman. New York: New York Times Co., 1968.

Riessman, Frank. Blueprint for the Disadvantaged. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

_____. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Rosenthal, Robert, and Jacobson, Lenore. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Rubin, Louis J., ed. Life Skills in School and Society. Prepared by the ASCD 1969 Yearbook Committee. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1969.

Scobey, Mary-Margaret, and Graham, Grace, eds. To Nuture Humaneness. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1970.

Scriven, M. "The Methodology of Evaluation." Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation. Edited by R. W. Tyler, R. M. Gagne, and M. Scriven. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1967.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. "Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision Making." Improving Educational Assessment and An Inventory of Measures of Affective Behavior. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1969.

Taba, Hilda, and Elkins, Deborah. Teaching Strategies for the Culturally Disadvantaged. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.

Tyler, Ralph W. Improving Educational Assessment. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1969.

_____, et al. Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1967.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Two Volumes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Wilhelms, Fred T., ed. Evaluation as Feedback and Guide. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967.

Journals and Periodicals

"A Study of Head Start." The New Republic, April 26, 1969.

Alsop, Stewart. "The Tragic Failure." Newsweek, February 23, 1970.

Baynham, Dorsey. "The Great Cities Projects." NEA Journal, LII (April, 1963). From a Ford Foundation reprint.

Bernstein, Basil. "Language and Social Class." British Journal of Sociology, XI (1960).

Clark, Kenneth. "Symposium for the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions." The Center Magazine, January, 1970.

Fantini, Mario D., and Weinstein, Gerald. "Taking Advantage of the Disadvantaged." Teacher's College Record, LXIX, No. 2 (November, 1967), Columbia University. From a Ford Foundation reprint.

"Federal Funds--Follow Through, 1969-70." American Education, V, No. 9 (November, 1969).

Jensen, A. R. "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review (Winter, 1969).

Leonard, George B. "Testing vs. Your Child." Look Magazine, March 22, 1966.

McIntosh, R. Gordon, ed. "Equal Educational Opportunity." Harvard Educational Review, XXXVIII, No. 1 (Winter, 1968).

Rosenthal, Robert, and Jacobson, Lenore. "Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantaged." Scientific American, CCXVIII (April, 1968).

Wilkerson, Doxey A. "Programs and Practices in Compensatory Education for Disadvantaged Children." Review of Educational Research, XXXV (December, 1965).

Unpublished Materials

Boozer, Raymond L. "A Study of the Voting Publics in Grand Rapids, Michigan to Provide the Basis for Planning and Conducting Future Public School Operating Millage Elections in that District." Unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, 1969.

Brown, Bernard F. "A Study of the Operation and Effects of Selected Title I Programs." Unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, 1969.

Hickey, Howard W. "Development of Criteria for Evaluating Alternative Patterns to Reduce School Segregation in the Inner City." Unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, 1968.

Muth, C. Robert. "A Study to Develop a Decentralized Organization Model for Urban School Systems and to Demonstrate a Process of Decentralization of Decision-Making at the Elementary School Level." Unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, 1970.

Other Sources

Bonnell, Jane; Erickson, Edsel; and Natzke, John. "Teacher-Aides in Grand Rapids." Grand Rapids Public Schools-Western Michigan University Center for Educational Studies, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

California State Board of Education. "Supplemental Policies for ESEA Title I Projects Adopted by the California State Board of Education." California State Board of Education in House Hearings, February 14, 1969.

"Education for the Underprivileged--A Report to the State on Section 4 of the Michigan State School Aid Act." State Board of Education, Lansing, Michigan, 1967. (Mimeographed.)

Education U.S.A. "What Directions for Title I." Education U.S.A., Special Report: The New ESEA. Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1968.

Erickson, Edsel; McMillan, Joseph; Bonnell, Jane; Hofmann, Louis; and Callahan, Orel D. Final Report: Experiments in Head Start and Early Education--Curriculum Structures and Teacher Attitudes. Contract No. OEO-4150. Kalamazoo: Kaars X-Press Printing, 1969.

Freeman, Roger A. "Schools and the Elusive Average Children Concept." Wall Street Journal, July 8, 1968.

Gordon, G. G. Report to the Steering Committee, Longitudinal Study of Culturally Disadvantaged Children. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, May, 1968.

Grant, William. Detroit Free Press, January 20, 1970.

Groulx, Harry. "General Overview of the Grand Rapids Projects Relating to Change-Process at the Building Level," 1969. (Mimeographed.)

Guba, Egon G. Evaluation and the Process of Change. Notes and Working Papers concerning the Administration of Programs Authorized under Title III of Public Act 89-10. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, April, 1967.

Landers, Jacob. Higher Horizons: Progress Report. New York: Board of Education of City of New York, 1963.

Michigan State University State News, March 4, 1970.

National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Title I--ESEA: A Review and a Forward Look. Fourth Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, 1969.

Nixon, Richard, President. "Message on Education Reform," to the Congress of the United States, March 3, 1970.

Principals' Report. "Report of the Study Group on Education of Culturally Disadvantaged Children." Grand Rapids Public Schools, Grand Rapids, Michigan, October, 1963. (Mimeographed.)

"Proposals for Providing Equal Educational Opportunities for Children of Economically and Culturally Disadvantaged Families." Middle Cities Education Association, 1967. (Mimeographed.)

Report of the National Advisory Council of Education of Disadvantaged Children. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council of the Education of Disadvantaged Children, 1968.

Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement. Promising Practices for the Culturally Deprived. Chicago: Research Council, April, 1964.

U.S. Congress. House. Report No. 143. 89th Cong., 1965.

U.S. Office of Education. Program Guide #44. Section 4.7. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Division of Compensatory Education.

U.S. Office of Education. Title I/Year II--The Second Annual Report of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, School Year 1966-67. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

Washington Research Project. Title I of ESEA, Is It Helping Poor Children? Washington, D.C.: Washington Research Project and NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., 1969.

Weinhold, Barry K. "Small Group Approaches to Affective Learning." Curriculum Trends. New London, Connecticut: Croft Educational Services, Inc., January, 1970.

Wrightstone, J. Wayne, et al. Evaluation of the Higher Horizons Program for Underprivileged Children. Cooperative Research Project No. 1124. New York: Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York.

APPENDIX

February 23, 1970

Dear Colleague:

I am presently doing a study of compensatory programs and their effects on education in Grand Rapids during the last five years. Hopefully, this study will lead to improvement of education in the future.

Since the teacher is a key factor in the total education program, I would appreciate it if you would give me some frank and honest opinions of your feelings regarding our programs. I am asking you to respond since you have had several years of successful experience in teaching children from the inner city. Please be assured that your replies will be kept in strictest confidence, and you will not be identified in the study.

If possible, I would like the questionnaire returned to my office in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope by March 6, 1970.

Thank you very kindly for your attention to this request.

Sincerely,

Elmer H. Vruggink
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

EHV:klb
Enclosures

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please use back of sheet if necessary to complete your answer.

1. Before President Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, he stated that a major task was to "bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most." Several million additional dollars have been allotted to inner-city schools in the last five years. What's better educationally as you see it now?

2. Which of the following words would describe how well you think compensatory programs are working in Grand Rapids?

   Excellent ☐ Good ☐

   Very good ☐ Fair ☐

   Poor ☐

3. How well do you think the children are achieving today as a result of compensatory programs as compared to five years ago?

   Better ☐ The Same ☐ Worse ☐

   Why do you think so?

4. Would more be accomplished if each building were allotted funds so the staff could establish objectives and have accountability for results?

   Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Do you think parent committees should be involved at the building level to assist in setting objectives and assessing results?

   Yes ☐ No ☐

6. If you had the choice, where would you put the money that we now receive for compensatory programs?

7. Some people claim that too much emphasis is placed on achievement and I.Q. as measured by tests. Do you feel other values have accrued that are not related to achievement and I.Q.?

   Yes ☐ No ☐

   If yes, what are they?

Please return in the enclosed envelope to the Office of Elmer Vruggink, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, by March 6, 1970. Thank you.