

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 508

UD 009 729

TITLE Field Survey of Selected Urban Education Projects.  
INSTITUTION General Learning Corp., Washington, D.C.; New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office of Urban Education.

PUB DATE 69  
NOTE 141p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$7.15  
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education, Community Involvement, \*Compensatory Education, Cultural Enrichment, \*Disadvantaged Groups, Guidance Services, \*Inner City, Program Coordination, Program Evaluation, Reading Improvement, Skill Development, Spanish Speaking, Staff Improvement, \*Urban Education

IDENTIFIERS \*New York

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this field survey report is to present the actual operations of programs geared for disadvantaged residents of New York State and funded through Urban Education appropriations for 1968-1969. The descriptions attempt to provide a picture of how the programs are actually operating, the processes by which they were established, the promise they hold, and their impact on inner-city residents. Programs described are in the following areas: reading, basic skills, guidance services, staff training, bilingual instruction, human relations and sensitivity training, and cultural enrichment. Observations reported inadequacies in effecting desired community participation, coordination of programs with outside agencies and local resources, and inservice training of staff. Other criticisms and recommendations are included. (KG)

ED037508

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE  
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
POSITION OR POLICY.

FIELD SURVEY OF SELECTED URBAN EDUCATION PROJECTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
OFFICE OF URBAN EDUCATION

Spring 1969

UD009729 E

Conducted by

General Learning Corporation  
Educational Services Division

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I Introduction . . . . .	1
II A Program Operations: Community Education Centers . . . . .	6
i. New York - I.S. 201 . . . . .	10
ii. New York - Ocean Hill-Brownsville . . . . .	16
iii. Poughkeepsie . . . . .	17
iv. Rochester . . . . .	22
II B Program Operations: Quality Incentive Projects . . . . .	28
i. Reading . . . . .	29
Reports on: Buffalo (3054) . . . . .	31
New Rochelle (3060) . . . . .	32
New York (40607, 43201, 3089, 40106, 41807) . . . . .	33
Rome (3074) . . . . .	41
Schenectady (3106) . . . . .	42
Syracuse (3046) . . . . .	43
Troy (3080) . . . . .	44
Yonkers (3064) . . . . .	45
ii. Basic Skills . . . . .	46
Reports on: Binghamton (2004) . . . . .	50
Elmira (2041, 2042) . . . . .	51
New York (3119, 3092, 42404, 40404, 40801, 40202, 41203, 41604, 2048) . . . . .	53
Niagara Falls (3095, 3097) . . . . .	65
Rochester (2026, 2027) . . . . .	67
Troy (3078) . . . . .	69
Utica (3131) . . . . .	70
iii. Guidance Services . . . . .	72
Reports on: Middletown (3061) . . . . .	74
New York (41010, 42105, 43001, 40501, 40905, 42701) . . . . .	75
Poughkeepsie (2029) . . . . .	84
Syracuse (3047) . . . . .	85
White Plains (3042) . . . . .	87
iv. Staff Training . . . . .	88
Reports on: Albany (3088) . . . . .	90
Hempstead (3110) . . . . .	92
Lackawanna (3075) . . . . .	93
Mount Vernon (3128) . . . . .	94
New York City - Central (3090) . . . . .	95
v. Bilingual Programs . . . . .	97
Reports on: New York (41401, 40303, 3135, 3146, 2083) . . . . .	99
vi. Human Relations and Sensitivity Training . . . . .	109
Reports on: New York (41305, 40701) . . . . .	111
Port Chester (3068) . . . . .	113
White Plains (2002) . . . . .	114

vii.	Cultural Enrichment Programs . . . . .	115
	Reports on: Albany (3087) . . . . .	117
	Newburgh (3043) . . . . .	118
	New York (41503, 2058, 2072, 42003) . . . . .	119
III	Findings and Recommendations . . . . .	122
IV	Survey Methodology . . . . .	132
	Index . . . . .	136

## I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this field survey report is to provide a picture of the actual operations supported by a portion of the Urban Education funds for 1968-69. The bulk of the report is made up of a series of "capsule" descriptions of local programs in New York State based on site visits conducted in the spring of 1969. These descriptions try to provide some sense of how the programs are actually operating, the processes by which they were established, the promise they hold, and their impact on the State's inner-city residents. Following the program descriptions is a set of observations and recommendations regarding the overall administration of the new Urban Education program.

A clear distinction among some critical terms can be provided by explaining their origin and use throughout this report. In order to avail itself of Urban Education funds, each school district is required to submit a district plan. The district plan proposes uses for all Urban Education funds for that school district, and contains at least one project. For example, a Community Education Center (CEC) in a particular school district is considered one project. Within a given project may be several activities. An activity description contains the greatest level of detail concerning program objectives, procedures, and budget. These distinctions are maintained in this report; however, to avoid confusion or stylistic awkwardness the word "program" is occasionally employed.

One other word deserves clarification. The term site is used to mean a place visited. A site may be a classroom within a school where part of an activity takes place, or it may mean a store front where all the activities within a CEC are conducted.

The contract between General Learning and the New York State Education Department called for visits to 60 activity sites. This was interpreted to mean that a visit might entail examination of the operation of a project (as with CEC's), an activity (as with activity 3087, a music program in Albany), more than one activity (as in a single report of two activities, 2026 and 2027 in Rochester), or an activity within a CEC (2048 in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville CEC). The requirement to conduct visits to 60 activity sites was interpreted to mean that the General Learning Corporation was to report on 60 activities or projects, regardless of how many visits would satisfy the objective.

Each team of two consultants spent approximately 2 days per visit interviewing program personnel and participants. (For a further discussion of the survey methodology see Section IV.) These visits were made to 21 local school districts outside New York City, 23 decentralized districts and six central Board of Education activities in New York City, and two of the three experimental demonstration districts: IS-201 in Harlem and Ocean Hill-Brownsville in Brooklyn. A massive coordination effort was needed to execute so many visits over the relatively short period of two months. Special thanks must be extended to the superintendents of schools of the local school districts and their professional staffs. In virtually no case did General Learning receive any resistance to their visit. Even more noteworthy, however, was the fact that once appointments were made and schedules established, very few changes were encountered, and none was effected without prior notice. Local program administrators and staff gave their time generously on site.

The projects visited are grouped under two major headings: Community Education Centers and Quality Incentive projects. Under "Community Education Centers" there appears a short introductory description followed by four studies of the process

by which they were planned and established in Poughkeepsie, Rochester, and New York City's Ocean Hill-Brownsville and IS-201 demonstration districts. Under "Quality Incentive projects" the activities visited are usefully (if somewhat arbitrarily) categorized into seven subject-matter areas: reading; basic skills; guidance services; staff training; bilingual programs; human relations and sensitivity training; and cultural enrichment programs. For each of these subject-matter areas, there is a short analytical overview followed by individual "capsule" reports of the appropriate activities.

The activities visited represent only a small part of the total number of Urban Education funds--\$54,815 in Federal funds and \$69,500 in contributions from local boards of education. They serve the needs of almost 75,000 children at the elementary level, about 115,000 at the secondary level, and smaller numbers of preschool children, parents or residents, and teachers. Although it is often difficult to convert the various activity size indicators--ranging from the number of participating schools to the number of parents and teachers involved--many of the visiting consultants were able to report general percentages of eligible populations served. Figures like 20-25 percent in Elmira, 20 percent in Lackawanna, 20 percent in Albany, and 25 percent in Buffalo were not uncommon. On the basis of these statistics, the General Learning Corporation judges that there are at least as many children and adults not yet served by Urban Education programs as have already been served. The need is great.

It is interesting to note that many programs did not begin until at least half way through the school year, which suggests that various stresses were encountered in program design, staffing, and local community support and involvement. In some cases, these and other related troubles were compounded by late funding; reading teachers, for instance, are difficult to find in the middle of the year, or parents may

not want their children shifted about in "mid-stream." The lack of program maturity in some cases threatens the meaningfulness of even an operations description; some projects had to be visited only two or three weeks after they had commenced. On the other hand, it must be mentioned that many programs were effectively implemented with remarkable speed, and are providing parents, teachers, and students with opportunities which would not have been otherwise available.

Some hard data regarding operations were collected on all visits and were used to provide indicators of program progress. More important, however, were the impressions formed by the visiting teams who were concerned primarily with the development and administration of programs. This must be differentiated from the role of program evaluators who provide assessments based on formal evaluation techniques. A survey report such as this one is concerned with the status of the programs and not yet--especially since so many of them are still in their infancy--with their individual results.

Generalizations about the entire statewide Urban Education program cannot necessarily be made from the information presented here. The projects visited were selected by field supervisors from the Office of Urban Education to provide a broad cross section of activities, intentionally including some that are operating on a reduced level, or not at all. But in no way are these 64 programs representative--in the scientific sense--of the whole new statewide Urban Education effort.

It is obvious that Urban Education is having a considerable impact around the State. Many new programs are underway; thousands of children are receiving help and enrichment not otherwise available; other worthwhile Federal and State programs that might have been dropped because of dwindling funds have been retained;

parents and community members, many for the first time, have been actively involved in the education of their children; teachers have received extra training and extra help in the classroom; new methods and materials are on the job. This discussion provides a closer look at some of the programs that are helping these things happen.

## II. A PROGRAM OPERATIONS: Community Education Centers

### Critical Points:

- Community Education Centers provide formal structures for community involvement at the local level.
  - Of the CEC's visited, many were only partially operating.
  - Since they involve the greatest efforts at local planning, they have spawned many more complex and politically sensitive issues than have Quality Incentive projects.
  - The lateness of legislative approval has caused some problems, principally staffing difficulties.
  - In most of the CEC's visited, a vitally concerned advisory board had been established which was actively involved in the developmental process.
- 

During the Spring of 1969, the General Learning Corporation conducted studies of three selected Community Education Centers around the State and investigated the status of a fourth -- the Ocean Hill-Brownsville demonstration district in New York City -- on a somewhat smaller scale. These studies -- of Rochester, Poughkeepsie, and New York's IS-201 demonstration district -- were part of a survey of 64 projects designed to identify and characterize the status of New York State's new Urban Education program.

In their 1967 position paper, the Board of Regents specified two forms of assistance for urban education: Community Education Centers (CEC's) and Quality Incentive projects. Community Education Centers as conceived by the Regents are the vehicles by which formal structures for community involvement would be established in local systems. Quality Incentive projects, on the other hand, are more simply special individual programs which are generally established within the existing school structure. The latter have been grouped by subject-matter area and are discussed in II B.

The concept of a Community Education Center is extremely broad in scope. As the Regents asserted, the program of each center, to be determined "in large part by community representatives, will provide a means by which needs of employment, health, recreation, counseling, family services, and education for all age groups of the community might be met either through direct aid at the center or by coordinated referral."\* In addition, the following features were planned as central to the notion of Community Education Centers:

- They would be established in school structures and other community locales;
- They would operate throughout the year, at hours convenient to the local community;
- They would cater specifically to the priorities established by the local community;
- The membership of the advisory committee would include parents and community leaders.

Therefore, the complexity of a CEC requires appropriate operational staffing. Recruiting and training such staff has taken considerable time and effort as will be seen.

Rochester and Poughkeepsie, representing a total population of 340,000 had CEC's approved for almost a half million dollars. Of the total of \$15,407,800 appropriated for Urban Education programs visited in New York City, \$3,227,778 were designated for CEC's in Ocean Hill-Brownsville and IS-201 in Harlem. These are in two of the three demonstration districts which were established as experimental models for local control of school functions. The choice of these districts as demonstration centers reflects their deep involvement in the problems of the inner city, hence they serve as ideal testing grounds for the viability of the Urban Education position of the Board of Regents and the State Education Department. However, at the time of the

visits, neither these nor the Poughkeepsie CEC was operating. Some observations can be made as to why this was the case:

- Because the CEC's are viewed as the principal vehicle for the involvement of local residents in the governance of education programs, the greatest efforts at local planning and control are made in these projects. This involvement has led to procedures more complex and politically sensitive than the procedures associated with Quality Incentive projects.
- Though the Office of Urban Education may have dealt with designated community officials, the community itself may not present a united front. Considerable time and many meetings and discussions may be necessary before a suitable coalition develops. In Poughkeepsie, for example, it was some time after approval had come from the State before already existing local service organizations could decide among themselves how they would come together without abdicating individual power and responsibility.
- There appears to be a lack of confidence, on the part of some officials, in the ability of the community to participate.
- Late funding has caused staffing difficulties.
- Providing staff positions for community residents is an involved and lengthy process. In the IS-201 demonstration district in Harlem, for instance, it has taken a long time to canvass the community for available personnel. The administrators of the IS-201 center wish to assure that local residents have every reasonable opportunity to apply and be hired for programs before persons outside the district are considered.
- Boards of education, normally the recipient of Urban Education funds, may require extensive documentation and formal procedures for all programs

administered at local levels that have the expressed purpose of community involvement. These boards are concerned with satisfying the needs of all residents rather than those only of specific groups. They are also responsible for management of funds and policy direction, so they attempt to maximize their control over operations. Thus, boards of education may be perceived by CEC personnel to be obstructing the establishment of programs. Consequently, confrontations may and have resulted which slow down the implementation process.

The following studies of CEC development in New York City, Rochester, and Poughkeepsie illustrate the fact that this important concept is being supported by extensive planning efforts coordinated with the surrounding community; that because the CEC concept is so important its implementation has been the object of disputes by those who see their educational responsibilities differently, and that the groundwork has been laid for a fuller realization of CEC potential in the near future.

City New York City

Activity No. N. A.

Activity Title IS-201 Community

Education Center project

Population Served

All age groups in the demonstration district will be served.

Date Began Non-Operating

Date Visited April 1969

Budget: State \$1,190,594 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

A large portion of Community Education Center funds for New York City were allocated to the IS-201 demonstration district in Harlem. The purpose of the allocation was to establish a coordinated set of programs for all age groups in the neighborhood of the IS-201 Complex.

The planning of the IS-201 Complex CEC was directed by two persons over a 10-month period under a \$100,000 Title III grant. Approximately one half of the planning grant was spent; the remainder (\$50,000) was returned to the central Board of Education.

During the fall of 1968, a consultant who helped establish the Complex in 1966 talked with different individuals and groups and asked for their ideas regarding a CEC. He met with the Governing Board, its Educational Research Committee, two parent associations, and several student and community groups such as the United Black Association, the East Harlem Triangle, and the Addie Mae Collins Association. Other consultants, many of whom were connected with the Governing Board or the IS-201 administrative staff, were hired to write specific proposals.

Programs

At the end of January 1969, 12 programs offering a wide range of services for all ages and all segments of the population were approved by the Governing Board. Some projects were planned for the five schools in the Complex; others were to be operated in storefronts, lofts, churches, and community centers. The proposals call for an inservice teacher training program, an Afro-American History program, a community referral center, a curriculum development unit, a multimedia center, an adult bound program, a preschool program at three day-care centers, a bilingual program, a newspaper, an advisory board training program, a central programming unit, and a supporting administrative service unit. A Puerto Rican development program is included in the administrative service unit.

The activities range from strictly academic programs, as the bilingual and Afro-American History, to the family service-oriented community referral center and

day-care units. The most expensive is a \$285,000 multimedia center which will bring closed-circuit and on-the-air television to all classrooms in the Complex and enable the students to produce and televise their own shows. The most unusual in terms of objectives and techniques is the advisory board training program, through which community leaders would take part in weekend seminars outside of the city.

The majority of the programs are staffed by a project director, an administrative assistant, and a community liaison worker. Whenever possible, there is also a subsidiary advisory council attached to the program. The aim of the three-pronged administration is to free the director from paperwork, and ensure the continued involvement of the community and staff programs with local residents.

One of the local administrators explains his position regarding staff in the proposals. In order to develop a sense of autonomy and involve the community in the decision-making process, "the local community must be integrally involved at all levels of the structure and in all phases of the process," one proposal for the central programming unit reads. "Local community residents, like all other segments of the population do not get involved for altruistic reasons or solely because of a sense of civic responsibility." It continues, "Jobs must be provided with the roles and resources to make this involvement meaningful and relevant."

The 12 programs are coordinated through the \$243,812 Central Programming Unit (CPU), which is second in cost only to the multimedia center. Described in the proposal as the "prototype of the central office," it is designed to coordinate programs in a variety of locations and to use the resources of the community as fully as possible. It is responsible for developing programs, feeding available resources into ongoing programs, directing evaluation, and analyzing and compiling data. Ten community liaison workers will work out of the CPU to maintain contact with the parents and the community. One worker will be assigned to each of the five schools to work under the supervision of the CEC and the school principal. He will establish contact with the PTA and provide a link between the CEC and the school. Five others, working under a senior community worker at the CEC, will act as consultants to individual projects, represent the CEC at community meetings, and link the surrounding community to the schools and the CEC.

Individual projects will be decentralized to the greatest degree possible. Project directors will hire all staff members except for the assistant project directors who will be selected by the executive director and the Governing Board. The project directors will have complete responsibility for program operation. A total of 205 jobs will be created by the CEC. Some of the jobs must be filled by the local residents; other candidates will be chosen on professional competency alone.

All the jobs, but especially the community liaison positions, are themselves training programs designed to teach specific skills and to enable the workers to move on to similar, higher-paying jobs elsewhere. The positions will then be filled by other community residents who will receive the same training. For instance, the multimedia project initially calls for a staff of 11. An arrangement has already been worked out with Bell and Howell, the company selling much of the equipment, to give the chief engineer a 3-week training program.

## Program Operation

In February, the CEC staff negotiated with the City to set the budget for the 12 programs. The separate program to establish contact with the Puerto Rican community was incorporated into the central administration unit. The programs received final approval in April and were funded for 4 months from March 1 through June 30. However, the budgets agreed upon by CEC staff and the City were different in several cases from the amounts finally approved by the State. The CEC staff continued to negotiate the budget with the City during April and May. These negotiations slowed down program implementation.

The CEC executive director was hired by the Governing Board in March. At the end of April, she began a recruitment campaign. About 250,000 flyers advertising the CEC jobs were distributed at subway stops, supermarkets, and other centers in the IS-201 Complex; and spot announcements were made on local radio stations. About 200 persons applied, of whom 75 percent lived outside of the IS-201 Complex.

In May, four project directors and a small administrative staff were hired. Almost a hundred thousand dollars worth of equipment was installed at IS-201 for the first multimedia satellite center. A council room was set up for the advisory board and the first of the weekend retreats for the board members was held in Tarrytown. Additional office space was leased for the administration staff in the building serving as the IS-201 Complex headquarters and possible sites for several projects were found in East and Central Harlem. However, none of the school or community programs had begun and none was expected to be operational until September. About \$600,000 was expected to be spent by the end of the fiscal year, of which 75 percent was marked for equipment.

Although the proposals called for a CEC Advisory Board which was separate from the Governing Board, the Governing Board acted in both capacities from the beginning. During the spring, the Board met once a week to discuss the IS-201 Complex and the CEC problems. However, CEC problems received less attention because of the crisis over seven teachers at PS 39 who had violated orders given by the Complex administrators.

The executive director of the CEC said that, although she was under pressure from the City and the State to put programs into operation, she would not start any activity before September. It was impractical to hire staff for a 6-week program which would end with the closing of school, she said. Even if it were practical, she wanted the additional time in the summer to find qualified directors, to train them, and to let them hire their own staff. She felt that a 90-day timetable between program approval and program operation was "not realistic." She said that, to the contrary, the State should "mandate a training period for all the CEC's for staff recruitment and training." "It would be equally unrealistic to get a million dollar business going in 90 days," she said.

Requirements of the New York City central Board slowed down the implementation of the CEC program. Depending upon the problem, the director used different channels to either bypass or eliminate many of the difficulties. For instance,

when she applied for certificates of competency for several persons who were not licensed by the school system, the certificates were held up for more than a month. She worked with the CEC coordinator at the central Board to track down and send through the applications. In one case the job description had been changed after the application was made; and in another case, the application was lost for several weeks on a clerk's desk. Both applicants finally received certification. On one occasion, when applications for the certificate were delayed, the applicants were hired anyway, and were paid as consultants. Other regular staff members went without pay for 9 and 10 weeks while their applications were being processed.

The CEC director worked with representatives from the two other operating CEC's in the City, in Ocean Hill-Brownsville and in District 12, to assure that similar regulations were set for all three areas. Staff of the three CEC's agreed not to meet with personnel of the central Board unless all three centers were represented. As a result of the four-way meetings, some inequities were eliminated. For instance, the central Board of Education set a \$16,000 salary for the IS-201 Complex television coordinator and an \$18,000 salary for the same position in Ocean Hill-Brownsville. Again, the IS-201 Complex salary for the engineer was set at \$16,000 while the salary for the same job in Ocean Hill-Brownsville was set at only \$13,000. The Ocean Hill-Brownsville pay scale was set for all three districts in both cases.

At times, the CEC director negotiated directly with the central Board staff. Because the budget department had never allocated more than \$1,000 for an imprest fund for any specific project, the department initially turned down her request for a \$30,000 revolving fund. However, she met with a budget director and explained to him how the larger sum could be allocated within existing regulations, and she received the money.

Many other problems, however, remained unsolved. Because the CEC salaries were annuated on a 12-month basis, even for those who worked 9 months or less, many CEC staff were paid less than their counterparts in the regular school system who were paid on a 10-month basis. In addition, the funds for the fringe benefits written into the project description were not released by the City.

### Analysis

The IS-201 Governing Board received notification that the Urban Education funds would be available for the Community Education Center in the spring of 1968. More than a year later, 12 proposals for CEC programs had been approved under a \$1,500,000 grant; but none of the activities except for a small staff of the administrative unit was in operation. Many factors account for the delay.

There was little continuity in leadership during the first year. The Governing Board was occupied with crises in the regular school system and did not push development of the CEC. Antagonisms which had built up between the IS-201 Complex and the central Board of Education became intensified. Hostility on both sides resulted in a breakdown in communication over program aims and implementation procedures.

The Governing Board represented a ready-made vehicle for the development of a community-based CEC, but the actual participation of community residents was limited.

Three individuals directed the development of the CEC. Each one was a forceful and dynamic personality who gave the program a new direction when he took over and built up a following in the community. The executive secretary of the Governing Board took the first exploratory steps in the summer of 1968. He talked with community leaders, teachers, and administrators in the school system and established contact with officials at the City's central Board of Education. The consultant involved in the early development of the Complex took over as the chief planner in September. He met with many of the same groups and rehashed the ground work laid by the executive secretary. He established his own group of friends in the community and, working on a part-time basis, slowly developed the proposals.

In March, the permanent executive director of the CEC was hired. Because she was unable to leave her then current job, she worked for two months for both groups. She did not have the time to get the programs moving. She then was sick for 2 weeks in May after she had officially started on a full-time basis. When she finally began work full time, 6 weeks before the end of school, it was far too late to start programs for the 1968-69 school year. Moreover, she wanted time to select her project directors with care, train them, and let them select their own staff to build up a cohesive group which supported one another. This could not be done before September. Some of the staff hired in May came from the same former employment as the director; others gave up higher paying jobs elsewhere.

There is ample evidence to indicate that the participation of the community as a whole in the development of the CEC was limited. Most of the residents probably did not know that the CEC existed during the planning stage. Information on the programs was spread only by word of mouth through the Complex. One parent, who said she attended all the meetings of the Governing Board's Educational Research Committee, had never heard of the CEC; and several others said they knew nothing about the programs. The CEC may have been discussed, as the chairman maintains, at several meetings; but it is clear that the line of communication between the CEC planning staff and the parents outside of the central influential group was not as extensive as hoped.

There were some community leaders and teaching personnel who would be directly affected by the CEC and yet were not consulted during the planning stage. For instance, he did not meet with all the Complex principals to ask them what their schools needed. The principal of IS-201 said he was never consulted about the CEC except by formal memoranda. He criticized the emphasis on eye-catching programs such as the multimedia center, and said that he saw a much greater need simply to improve the quality of education through activities such as teacher training programs. The teacher training was funded for \$65,925, while the multimedia center was budgeted for \$285,000.

However, representatives of many groups in the community were included in the planning process and the interests of each group took form in one program or another. The parents, represented by the parents on the Governing Board, asked for the community referral and the day-care centers. The staff, represented by a

group of administrators and influential teachers, asked for the curriculum development and the multimedia units. The IS-201 students made suggestions for the adult bound program. The black and Puerto Rican Board members agreed that both Afro-American and Puerto Rican development programs were needed.

Some changes have already been made in the original proposals. The proposal for the Advisory Board Training Program calls for an advisory board which is separate from the Governing Board even if some members sit on both boards. But, from the beginning, the entire Governing Board has served as the CEC advisory board, and the Director suggested that an additional board would create one more group to vie with the others that already exist and that the Governing Board ought to continue in the dual role.

Whether the staff at the central Board of Education consciously blocked the CEC program is a subject of controversy. The CEC coordinator for the central Board said every effort was made to bypass barriers in the City bureaucracy and to put the programs into operation. However, he admitted the antagonism was strong on both sides, and suggested that it had slowed down the implementation of the programs. Negotiations over the budget dragged on for months, salary payments were delayed, and applications for certificates of competency were lost for several weeks at a time. The City set different conditions for the three CEC's in the City; salary scales, for instance, initially were different for the same positions at Ocean-Hill Brownsville and IS-201 until a standard scale was demanded by the three Centers.

It became clear at one meeting that the City and the three CEC representatives interpreted the relationship of the regular school system to the CEC's in very different ways. Some central Board staff seemed to assume that all the CEC programs should be controlled by the school system. The CEC director, however, saw her role as a representative of the community, not of the Board of Education. According to her view, the CEC was an integral part of that community.

City New York City

Activity No. N. A.

Activity Title Ocean Hill-Brownsville

Community Education Center project

Population Served

All age groups in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville demonstration district will be served.

Date Began Non-Operating

Date Visited April 7, 8, June 12

Budget: State \$2,037,184 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Planning for the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Community Education Center began in August 1968, when it was announced that New York City would have approximately \$12 million available for four such centers. A month thereafter the Ocean Hill staff submitted 15 highly innovative programs for a cost of \$3.4 million; however, subsequent legislative cuts brought the grant down to \$2.1 million at the time of funding approval, March 1, 1969.

At the time of the first evaluation visit in early April, the Community Education Center was still largely a "paper project." The major obstacle to implementation was a series of interrelated disputes that had arisen between the officials of the central Board of Education and the staff of the Ocean Hill project concerning selection and testing of personnel and their qualifications, salaries, and benefits and site acquisition. These disputes became heated as a long series of negotiations ensued. Finally the local Governing Board decided to reject the entire Urban Education grant and filed suit against the central Board of Education.

When a second visit was made in early June, the situation had improved slightly. Some agreement had been reached, catalyzed partly by the suit, and eight of the 15 projects had begun to operate. In the view of the visiting consultants, it seemed that the real issue at stake in this situation was that of community control of local education (and its purse strings) and that the concept of a Community Education Center would probably not be fully realized until the larger problem was resolved.

City Poughkeepsie

Activity No. N. A.

Activity Title Community Education

Center project

Population Served

The entire student and adult population will be served.

Date Began May 1, 1969

Date Visited April 24, 25, 28

Budget: State \$60,170 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Poughkeepsie is a city of about 40,000 residents located in Dutchess County approximately 80 miles from New York. Vassar College is one of six colleges in the County, and several major industries such as IBM have large plants in the area. The city has received urban renewal and Model Cities funds and has several Federal school programs. After riots in 1967, industry took the first steps to increase its involvement in the city's problems and black leaders set up their own job training program. The Chamber of Commerce, the 4-H Club, and more than 100 other agencies run separate, community-service programs.

In the 1968-69 school year, the Poughkeepsie school system attempted to coordinate the existing services offered by the many agencies in the area under a \$60,170 grant from the State Office of Urban Education for the establishment of a Community Education Center. The Urban Education program actually began with a short summer tutorial session in August, 1968. A proposal for an Interaction Center to coordinate the services was submitted in October, and then for months nothing happened. In May, 1969, a small community center sponsored by three family-service agencies finally opened in a housing project in the inner city.

From the beginning, the Urban Education program moved slowly. The summer tutorial session began 10 days before it was scheduled to be finished. The supplementary education department staff in charge of the funds was also responsible for many other activities, and, as a result, the program for the Interaction Center had not taken focus. The proposals were too general to satisfy State requirements and funds were delayed for several months until additional information was supplied. The Urban Education director had difficulty persuading the various city agencies and organizations to work together to find the Urban Education staff to provide the necessary support. However, with the opening of a three-room community center, the groundwork for further cooperative action was set.

Programs

An \$18,000 summer program with afternoon tutorial sessions for 150 high school students was approved at the same time the city was notified of its total allocation.

Because the city received final approval for the summer program almost a month after it was scheduled to begin, only a limited tutorial session was put into operation. Fourteen teachers tutored 50 students on a one-to-one or a small group basis for 11 days instead of the entire five-week period of the summer school. All the regular academic courses were offered.

In August, the Superintendent of Schools in Poughkeepsie met with members of the Office of Adjunct and Supplementary Education Programs (OASEP) to discuss the city's \$60,170 Urban Education grant. He suggested the funds be used to coordinate the existing services in the city, an idea which grew out of an earlier Title III study of those services. In his words, he wanted to "marshall the city's resources" and make the existing services readily available to the community.

The proposal developed in the fall calls for an Urban-Core-City-Interaction-Center to coordinate all the existing services in the city and to serve all the needs of its residents. Education programs financed through an estimated \$8,000,000 from local, State, and Federal governments, as well as several million dollars worth of community services, would be available at the Center.

Five specialists at the multiservice center would coordinate services for different age groups and build up a record system of all participants. The proposed personnel are: a prekindergarten specialist, an inschool specialist responsible for ages 5-11, a bilingual specialist for ages 12-17, a job specialist for the out-of-school population, and an evaluation-dissemination specialist. Poughkeepsie has almost no Spanish-speaking or other non-English-speaking groups, so the high school coordinator would not be a bilingual expert in the usual sense. The "bi-lingual specialist," as he is described in the proposal, is intended to have a thorough knowledge of the life and speech styles of the inner city high school students. An out-of-school Community Education Center would be set up at a State housing project. Eventually this CEC would be one of the many centers under the out-of-school coordinator. A CEC Advisory Board would be set up from an already established Blue Ribbon Task Force of civic, political, and church leaders. A data bank would store information on all participants. An evaluation to be developed by New York University was expected to spell out the guidelines for the information center and the data to be collected on the participants.

The district plan and the proposal for the Interaction Center were presented to and approved by the Board of Education early in October. There was little discussion at the time and little interest in the CEC in the following months. It appears that the Board was occupied with more urgent issues such as the controversial question of the neighborhood school versus interschool bussing which dominated local politics during the school year. (Subsequently, a conservative defeated the school board president in the Board election in May on the single issue of the neighborhood school. The election drew the largest voter turnout since 1955.)

The Superintendent and the OASEP staff met with the State Office of Urban Education in November. The State asked for more information on job descriptions, criteria for participants, and evaluation procedures. An additional \$500 was granted for

an outside consultant to develop an evaluation profile. In February, the city received tentative approval from the State with the understanding that an evaluation profile would be developed by consultants at New York University.

### Program Operation

Meanwhile, the Urban Education director met with the major agencies in the city to put the community center for the out-of-school population into operation. He had been active in many civic groups in Poughkeepsie, so he worked with city leaders whom he already knew.

In August, the director invited 10 major social service, housing, and job training agencies to discuss the possibility of coordinating their problems in a center at the Smith Housing Project. They explored the possibility of using \$250,000 worth of heavy machinery, turret lathes, and drill presses, which had been donated to the Neighborhood Service Organization (NSO) while the Urban Education director was director there. They decided a complete vocational program would be set up in the basement where the machinery was stored. Basic education courses as well as tool instruction would be offered for adults who were ineligible for the other vocational training programs in the city because they had never completed eighth grade. Participants at the Smith Housing project program would then go on to other programs such as the Manpower Development Training Act for training for a specific industry. Since there was not enough money for a comprehensive vocational school, the agencies decided instead to set up a multiservice CEC, where the services provided by several agencies would be offered at one location.

In October, the Superintendent of Schools called a meeting of the Blue Ribbon Task Force. Although there was a general discussion of the CEC, the Task Force members were not asked to make recommendations and no action was taken by them. Only about half of the 26 members attended. The Task Force was invited to attend seminars on "Urban Societal Problems" financed through Title III funds and held during the fall and winter. Fewer and fewer people attended each meeting; and after four sessions, the seminars were reorganized for teachers in the school system. The Task Force was to form the nucleus of a permanent CEC Advisory Board. But, at the end of the first four seminars, the Urban Education planning director and the program director agreed that the group showed no interest in such a function.

In January, after the State had received the first addendum and had approved the program, the director began to recruit staff. He contacted all of the colleges in the area and posted notices of the available jobs at the schools, but he was unable to find qualified personnel.

In March, three staff members were hired. A prekindergarten specialist agreed to begin work on a part-time basis in July and full time in September. A social worker was hired as the elementary school liaison worker. However, she was assigned to the out-of-school CEC and she left after two weeks work. She said that although she had left chiefly for personal reasons, her job had been too unstructured

for her liking. A photographer was hired as a dissemination assistant to develop a slide presentation of available programs and services in the city to be shown to various community agencies.

At about the same time, the OASEP director reorganized the structure of that office to adjust the position titles to the functions of the two staff administrators. As the year progressed, the director gradually relinquished his paper work and concentrated on community liaison work. He was named Associate District Community Liaison Coordinator and the planning director was named Associate Coordinator for Education Planning, Research and Program Development. The Associate Coordinator had experience in writing reports and was interested in program development. The program director was the only black staff member and was in the best position to establish contact with the inner-city schools. Because he was interested and active in a number of city groups, he also was in a position to coordinate their programs.

At a meeting in April attended by site visitors, final plans for a CEC at the Smith Housing Authority were approved by three agencies. Representatives from the Neighborhood Service Organization, the Family Service Association, and the Hudson Valley Opportunity Industrialization Center, a manpower training group, met at the headquarters of the Community Chest. The NSO, since it had already established contact with the project residents through a community center there, agreed to take responsibility for case intake and followup. The other two agencies present agreed to staff the center for at least part of every week. The OASEP offered equipment and support staff.

### Analysis

A year after Poughkeepsie was notified of the \$60,170 Urban Education grant, the Office of Adjunct and Supplementary Education Programs had accomplished virtually nothing. Community groups met, leaders tried to coordinate their programs, and finally one small community center was set up. From an extremely ambitious design to coordinate all services on a citywide basis came a three-room center for about 750 persons. The focus of that center was on family-service rather than on school programs as initially proposed.

Several reasons are suggested for the Urban Education program delay:

- From the beginning, the administration of the program was badly organized and administrative responsibility was poorly divided. One man was put in charge of two programs simultaneously. He gave most of his time to the Title III camp and the Urban Education program suffered. Also, he was assigned responsibility for administrative and financial reports in which he had little interest. Reports were delayed and little administrative initiative was taken. The reorganization of the supplementary education department in March was intended to correct these weaknesses.

- Neither the community residents nor the school board pressured the Urban Education staff to put a program into operation. The Blue Ribbon Task Force was not interested or involved in the CEC planning at all. The board members were more concerned with the issue of the neighborhood school versus interschool bussing, an issue which dominated the school board election in May. Only one meeting took place between the board and the OASEP staff, and no pressure was put upon the department to get the program going.
- The proposals called for the coordination of several million dollars worth of services through the Interaction Center without spelling out the steps to establish the Center. Several persons interviewed questioned whether it was possible to establish such a center on a \$65,600 grant. Practicality aside, the proposals gave very little operational direction when attempts were made to implement the programs.
- The 9-month delay between August and May was caused to a large extent by the competition among agency leaders who were unwilling to relinquish their independence.
- At present, there appears to be little interest in the Urban Education program among the school staff. The Interaction Center was treated as the stepchild of the school programs and its development was sacrificed to the more exciting projects such as the Title III camp.
- Despite the proposal to coordinate existing resources, the Urban Education staff failed to make use of the city's resources such as Vassar College, the businesses, the city government, and civic and cultural groups. For instance, college students, who are now used as volunteers for some OASEP programs, could be used for Urban Education projects. Thus, these organizations might have assumed a stronger role in fostering programs of this nature.

City Rochester

Activity No. N. A.

Activity Title Community Education

Center project

Population Served

Elementary school children in ten target area schools were served as well as a limited number of all age groups.

Date Began January 1969

Date Visited April 17 - 23

Budget: State \$421,839 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Rochester, an industrial city with a population of 300,000 in the northwest corner of New York, has made a name for itself in recent years for setting up landmark programs involving the community in the city's urban problems. In 1963, FIGHT, an organization representing civic, church, and militant black groups, was created to pressure Eastman Kodak and Xerox to alter their employment practices. Since then, several industries have started programs to train or hire minority groups. After the riots in 1964, several million dollars from Federal, State, and city governments were used to set up Project UNIQUE, a group of programs designed to provide quality, integrated education, and increased community involvement in the city. Several of the programs such as the House of Inquiry, a school for inner-city and suburban children, have received nationwide attention. More recently, Rochester became one of the eight cities in the State with Model Cities programs. The Urban Development Corporation is now making studies in the city for low-income housing and potential industrial development.

The Rochester Community Education Center is the newest program under the administration of Project UNIQUE. The CEC has its headquarters in a small, wood frame house in a low-income residential area, several blocks away from the recently renovated central office of UNIQUE. A small staff, working on a \$360,000 grant from the State Office of Urban Education, runs supplementary education programs for elementary school students in 10 inner-city schools. An advisory council, elected by the community, meets every other week.

The planning for the CEC began with a survey of community needs in July 1968. The acting director organized the election of the community advisory board the following November. The first afternoon basic education classes were started in January 1969, and the program was enlarged until it served more than 400 elementary school students. A small evening adult education program was started in March. At about the same time, approximately 100 high school students were registered for an evening tutorial program, which the parents on the advisory board fought for. When the classes began, there was a waiting list of more than 600 students. However, many of the details have not yet been worked out. The teachers work in the same schools where they teach during the day. They often use the same materials. Although the target

population is almost 100 percent black and Puerto Rican, less than half the staff is black and only two members are Puerto Rican. The advisory board members are still inexperienced and are not in contact with the parents. However, despite the problems, the machinery has been set up to give the parents and community residents a chance to say what they think their children need, and to see some of their ideas implemented.

### Programs

The Superintendent of Schools called a meeting of staff and school principals in April 1968 to discuss the possibility of a Rochester CEC. A target area covering 10 predominately black inner-city school districts with a student population of almost 10,000 was selected.

During July, two community workers talked with about 600 area residents and helped them fill out questionnaires to determine the programs and the leaders they wanted. Letters were sent to 60 churches and other groups who were asked similar questions. According to the report compiled from the questionnaires, there were more than double the number of requests for remedial and basic education programs for school children than for any other single activity. The questionnaire also included space for general comments from the parents. Some of the comments received were: "Be sure to have good teachers in the centers. If not, they will be like some of the schools. Nobody will accomplish anything." "Put black people on the Board," and "Have programs the people can handle. Everyone does not want to be a nurse, cook, or secretary. Have someone to advise what you are suited for."

The community workers said that many parents were outraged that their children had not learned to read at school and felt that mathematics and reading were essential skills. They said the parents initially were suspicious of the CEC program. The target area residents assumed that the CEC was "just another Board of Education project, one which made the usual promises and did nothing," the workers said.

A temporary CEC advisory board was appointed by the Board of Education from names suggested in the survey and by school staff. The predominately black, 10 member board was made up of one representative from each district. A PTA president from one school was elected chairman.

The temporary advisory board, the planning director, and the acting CEC director decided that the afternoon basic education classes should be the first program developed by the CEC. Several other programs suggested were dropped and the scope of the CEC was narrowed to the supplementary education program. The proposed programs which were eliminated included adult education courses on civil service and financial management, cultural programs, and classes in arts, crafts, and photography.

The proposals call for supplementary education classes to be held in the regular school facilities and for two community centers, one on the east and one on the west. The proposals were approved by the temporary board with little discussion. They

were passed by the Board of Education with equal speed; and at the first meeting with staff from the State Office of Urban Education, the approval was given for program operation.

In October, the temporary board approved guidelines drawn up by the planning director for a permanent Central Advisory Board made up of 10 members elected from the districts and five members appointed by the Board of Education. The Board would approve all staff members, budgets, and program proposals for the CEC. It would be advisory in the sense that it could be overruled by the Board of Education.

The residents in each district elect five representatives. The representatives in turn choose one person for the 10-district council. All elected representatives are expected to remain active as community liaison workers. All nominees for the Board in each district must be parents of school-age children and residents of the district. The Board of Education appoints five additional members to the Central Advisory Board. Those members are business and professional leaders who bring administrative experience to the otherwise "grass-roots" Board and create an economically balanced group.

When the two community centers become fully functioning units, two subsidiary councils, the East and West Side CEC Advisory Boards, will be set up to advise the respective Centers. Twenty-five members, the five elected from each district, will sit on each Board. The elections will be organized by the PTA and the other parent groups at each school.

At the end of 1968, the CEC program was transferred from the Office of the Assistant Superintendent in charge of Administration, who was in charge of Title I and other supplementary education programs, to UNIQUE.

During the fall, the acting director and his secretary began to organize the supplementary education program. They worked in a basement room of one of the target schools and borrowed paper, typewriters, and other supplies from the school until they received their own materials purchased through Urban Education funds. A project director was hired in November.

The CEC staff asked the school guidance counselors and teachers to provide names of students who did not achieve their grade level in the standard reading and mathematics achievement tests. They distributed application forms which were filled out by the teachers and given to the students to take home to their parents. Students returned the forms to the principals' office where they were picked up by the CEC staff. The acting director advertised for teachers in the Board of Education administration bulletin and passed out applications at the schools. Community workers spoke with local residents to find teacher aides and with the school guidance counselors to find student assistants.

In December, notices about the program were mailed to parents whose children were being considered for enrollment. The community workers visited all the parents to explain the details and continued to work with those families whose children had special problems.

## Program Operation

Basic education classes in reading and arithmetic began in three inner-city schools on January 6, 1969. Students were enrolled from all 10 target schools; and whenever necessary, they were bussed to the three schools. The Advisory Board limited the number of students to 10 per class, but as many as 15 were initially put together in order to accommodate a greater number of students. A bilingual class staffed by three teachers, three aides, and three student teachers also started in January at the school with the highest Puerto Rican enrollment. Students studied reading, mathematics, and regular academic subjects in English and Spanish.

Although the original proposal calls for 5 days of classes, the students meet from 3:30 p. m. until 5:30 p. m. 4 days a week. Both the project director and the Advisory Board felt that teacher training was essential to the success of the programs, and therefore reserved Wednesday for staff-training meetings.

Each teacher is assisted by a teacher aide from the community and a student assistant from a local high school. The teachers choose and develop their own materials and are encouraged to order whatever they need to vary the afternoon program as much as possible from the regular day school. As a result, the techniques and materials vary from classroom to classroom, but, in general, conventional methods such as word and number games, newspapers, and coloring books are used.

In March, the CEC administrative offices were moved to their permanent headquarters in a wood frame house in a low-income residential area on the west side of the city. A second Center was rented on the east side of the city and renovations were started. The east side community center was expected to open in May 1969.

As teachers were hired, basic education classes were opened in the target area. By the end of April 1969, 55 teachers were working in six of the 10 schools. All of the students on the waiting list had been placed. Besides the teachers, the staff consisted of five full-time professionals, five full-time paraprofessionals, three secretaries, 53 teacher aides, and 56 student assistants. The full-time staff included the acting director, a project director, two guidance counselors, and six community workers. About half of the administrative staff, a third of the teachers, and all of the teacher aides and student assistants were black. There was one Puerto Rican teacher and one Puerto Rican lay community worker. Two other Spanish-speaking teachers worked in the bilingual program.

The teaching staff received 6-hour orientation training. New teachers and teacher aides sat in and observed classes for 2 days. On the third day, they attended a general meeting to discuss the aims and special problems of the program. Outside consultants were invited to speak on these occasions.

A director was to be chosen by the Advisory Board before June 1969. UNIQUE's director said he would submit four applications to the Central Advisory Board for a decision. Two of the applicants were from out of town and a third was the acting director. According to UNIQUE's director, Board members could propose other candidates, but the final choice would have to be approved by the Board of Education.

Throughout the winter, the Advisory Board met twice a month. They approved all the staff members who had already been hired, and discussed the budget and specific program proposals. The temporary board had accepted and approved all the proposals and guidelines that had been submitted to it with very few questions; the permanent Board, however, did not. During the winter, they became increasingly vocal. Sometimes they raised and discussed policy questions vital to the program. Other times, they argued over procedures or information which had already been discussed and delayed program implementation.

The Central Advisory Board meeting, which was attended by General Learning staff, was the first to be held as a closed meeting without the acting director and the CEC staff. The members talked for about an hour in the faculty room of one of the target schools and then went to the gym where 16 persons waited. Only one parent, who was not connected with the CEC, was present. Others in the audience were CEC staff or teachers directly affected by the program. During the meeting, several important weaknesses of the CEC program became apparent.

An alternate member of the Advisory Board who was vice president of a newly organized parents' group in the 10 CEC schools, said the CEC was "still in the hands of the school board." Both white and black Board members agreed that the Board of Education had an unfavorable image in the community and that the CEC was linked to the unpopular school Board. The Central Advisory Board chairman admitted that the Advisory Board had done little to gain the confidence of or involve the residents. The elected members of the Board had never met with their alternates, persons who were responsible for maintaining contact with the residents in the 10 districts. Two alternates, who were in the audience, said they had done nothing at all since the election.

### Analysis

Six months after planning began, the CEC in Rochester had put conventional basic education and bilingual programs into operation in three target area schools. An Advisory Board had been established representing the civic, business, and professional leaders of the community as well as the parents. However, it is questionable whether community residents actually participated in the formation of the programs or that the Advisory Board accurately represented the makeup of the community.

Although the Advisory Board was set up to give the parents a chance to ask for the programs they want, it is uncertain whether the Board now really represents the community residents. The Board members are those who are already active in school or civic groups and they have not established contact with parents who were outside those groups. Though there is a heavy representation of the black population in the community, the more militant groups are not represented. The Puerto Rican segment of the community is, with the exception of one appointed Board member, totally excluded.

The Board of Education appointed a temporary board made up of school leaders who were accustomed to working with school staff. Those leaders in turn organized the election of the permanent Board. Parents nominated candidates. The temporary

board and the PTA officers then selected the names of candidates to be put on the ballot. In most cases, no more than six candidates for the five positions were presented. In one district, only five candidates for the five positions were presented. When asked about the small number of candidates presented in the parents, the CEC acting director said that all candidates who received more than "a few" nominations were presented. Whatever the factor in candidate selection, the fact remains that parents or school staff who were already active in the school program were elected to the permanent Board. As a result, the Advisory Board is closely associated with the PTA's and the CEC program is closely linked to the Board of Education and the regular school programs. As Board members admit, they have not reached the majority of the parents in the school system. The community as a whole is suspicious of them and of the CEC.

It is difficult to measure the effectiveness of community residents in the development of the CEC programs. The temporary advisory board passed the project proposals with little discussion. The program was approved by the State Office of Urban Education with equal speed in October and the first classes began in January. Thus, the entire development seems to have been controlled by the Board of Education. Programs were set up with remarkable speed, but perhaps at the expense of community participation.

According to several teachers interviewed, the program is not an exciting one. The acting director said that he had difficulty finding teachers and that, of 200 black teachers in the school system, he was not able to hire more than 15 for his program. He hired only one Puerto Rican teacher and one Puerto Rican community worker. The basic education and bilingual classes extended the regular school day in conventional fashion. The program uses the same classrooms, the same teachers, and the same materials during official school hours. In many classes, the students do not receive the individual attention called for in the proposals; in many cases there is neither a formal nor an informal program of instruction.

It must be recognized that the Rochester Board of Education set up a CEC with remarkable speed. This speed, however, was possible because certain guidelines for CEC development were interpreted loosely. Community residents were not given and did not ask for an active role in planning the program; they simply approved what was presented to them. The basic education programs became conventional after-school classes without creative methods or techniques.

Despite the problems, Rochester has made a large step toward setting up an effective CEC. There is important potential in the mechanism of the Advisory Board to involve the target area residents and increase the participation of the parents. With increased education and experience, the Board should be able to introduce meaningful programs initiated by the community. The success of the program may depend upon the director who must both involve as many community residents as possible and educate the Advisory Board to use its power to obtain the needed programs.

## II. B PROGRAM OPERATIONS: Quality Incentive Projects

The second vehicle of assistance for urban education (after the Community Education Center) is the concept of the individual Quality Incentive project. In the words of the Board of Regents, these projects "shall include... (those) determined to be of great promise for promoting quality of education for disadvantaged children, at the prekindergarten, elementary, and secondary school levels."\*

Although Quality Incentive projects can be operated through Community Education Centers, as do several reported on here, it is not necessary that this be the case. However, the Regents did specify that such programs should be "primarily... directly related to the regular... school program."

The projects reported on in this section of the survey have been collected into seven subject-matter areas: reading; basic skills; guidance services; staff training; bilingual programs; human relations and sensitivity training; and cultural enrichment programs. This categorization is somewhat arbitrary, but it does provide a convenient basis for some generalization. Thus, each subject-matter area begins with a short overview, followed by "capsule" summaries of the individual projects in that area.

---

\*Urban Education: A Statement of Policy and Proposed Action by the New York State Board of Regents. Albany; The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, November 1967.

## i. Reading

### Critical Points:

- The 12 programs detailed in this section have as their major goal a considerable emphasis on remedial reading.
- The standard methodology is the small group tutorial session with as much individualization of attention as possible.
- Staff and administrators are enthusiastic, empathetic, giving more of their time and energy than the project proposals anticipated.
- Preservice and inservice staff training is not generally as extensive as it might be.

---

Reading is a critical area. Educators have long told us that reading disabilities are a major cause of educational failure. State legislators recognized the importance of reading skills when they specified reading test scores as one of the criteria for identifying students with "special educational needs associated with poverty."

The 12 programs detailed in this section have as their major goal the improvement of reading skills. As might be expected (since the target group for this aid is the inner-city poverty population), there is a considerable emphasis on remedial reading, though other reading objectives -- developing better than average skills, for instance -- are also being addressed.

The standard methodology for these programs is the small group tutorial session with as much individualization of attention as possible. Most of the projects -- seven of the 11 reported here -- are aimed at elementary school children and "hardware" is therefore relatively simple: tape recorders, Language-Masters, etc. In contrast, New Rochelle's program for junior high school students uses 8mm. cameras and editing machines which allow stories to be constructed from the children's film.

Additionally, in Manhattan's District 18, a unique "intersensory approach" is being used with materials developed by a doctor from the local mental health center, and in Districts 12 and 13 in Brooklyn, Project READ is using special programmed instructional materials in a large program currently reaching 38,000 children.

Perhaps the most interesting program is in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville demonstration district in Brooklyn where it is hoped that the children will take a "Giant Step" toward reading proficiency with an innovative precision teaching methodology (see the summary report). Because its elements are so easily quantified, accurate evidence of progress may issue most readily from this project.

Some generalizations can be made about these reading programs (though not to reading programs statewide). On the positive side, we can report that everywhere staff and administrators are enthusiastic, empathetic, giving more of their time and energy than the project proposals anticipated. Likewise, student motivation is high and evaluation, for a variety of reasons, is somewhat better than that for other subject-matter areas. However, it must be reported that preservice and inservice training is not generally as extensive as it might be, that program objectives could be stated in a more contemporary, more easily measured fashion, and that parent involvement is lagging behind what was hopefully expected.

City Buffalo

Activity No. 3054

Activity Title Emphasis on Reading

Population Served

1,300 students in five schools participate. This represents about 25 percent of the total eligible population.

Date Began September 1968

Date Visited April 22, 23

Budget: State \$266,940 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 1,300 secondary school students participate in a reading and language arts program in five schools, two senior high, two junior high, and one "adjustment" school in the city. Twenty teachers, most of whom previously worked in a similar Title I program, hold classes in reading, speaking, and composition. Each class contains no more than 15 students.

Students are selected for the program on the basis of low scores on standard reading achievement tests. They are drilled orally in reading and speaking. They write compositions in class which are corrected and revised under the supervision of the teachers. Work folders are kept for each student. In three schools, language laboratory instructors teach the standard dialect to black students whose "home-talk" is nonstandard. The instructors develop their own lesson materials for the dialect program and alter their curriculum as they learn more about the nonstandard speech patterns. Tapes and other language arts equipment are used.

The staff attended five pretraining sessions where reading specialists discussed new reading techniques and materials. Inservice training sessions on all aspects of reading education were held on a monthly basis. In addition, the language laboratory instructor at one of the schools visited all the schools twice, explaining the structure of the nonstandard dialect to the teachers and reviewing the students' needs.

According to the project director, staff enthusiasm is high and many regular teachers in the school system requested transfer into the program. However, the director said the program is not as successful in involving the parents. The parents were invited to attend classes and to observe the project for themselves, but the director said the response was not good.

An evaluation is planned using the data from pre- and post-tests administered to the eighth grade students and reports based on subjective judgements of the teachers. No information was available at the time of the site visit.

City New Rochelle

Activity No. 3060

Activity Title Reading and Language

Skills

Population Served

About 100 secondary students -- less than 10 percent of the total eligible population -- benefit from this activity.

Date Began December 1968

Date Visited April 21, 22

Budget: State \$65,051 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

The Basic Language Skills program in New Rochelle was designed to provide remedial help to 100 secondary students who are retarded in basic reading skills. The selection of students was based on records of students from the sixth grade and scores on the Metropolitan reading tests (all under 5.2 qualified). The goals of the program are intensive and comprehensive diagnosis of students' disabilities in reading and the basic language skills on the secondary level, institution of individual and group remediation programs, development by the reading staff of more effective materials and ways of working with the underachieving disadvantaged student, and the initiation of resource aids to subject area teachers. The last two goals are attained through workshops for reading teachers to develop their skills in working with disadvantaged underachieving students and workshops conducted by the reading teachers for subject-area teachers. The individual and group remediation program for 72 attending students became operational in December 1968 with three full-time reading teachers. An attempt was made to bring experiences to these students which would improve their attitude toward themselves and toward learning through the use of 8mm. movie cameras to make films, and the use of editing machines to allow students to create their own stories using films.

The Coordinator of Language Arts in charge of Urban Education states that attempts were made to use the reading specialists to help other teachers in the school through a kind of ongoing, inservice training plan. This allows other teachers to attack the problems of the students who have not mastered basic skills. The reaction of the "older" teachers to the plan has not been good and only two high school teachers have participated in the inservice training aspect of the project. The coordinator also stated that students sometimes resent being singled out for participation in a program which was viewed by others as a "special" program for poor students. At the same time many junior and senior high school students have demonstrated a changed attitude toward reading.

The evaluation of this program will be based upon significant measures of pupil attendance, questionnaires on attitudes, and reports by participants on the effects of the program. A measurement of improvement in the basic skills in reading and the related language will also be conducted.

City New York City

Activity No. 40607

Activity Title Library Use Incentive

Date Began February 5, 1969

**Population Served**

6,000 elementary pupils, representing about half the eligible population, are served by this activity.

Date Visited May 5, 6

Budget: State \$103,999 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

This program offers increased library services to 6,000 students in 12 schools in District 6 in Manhattan. Library services are normally offered to grades 4, 5, and 6 in these schools. The Urban Education program extended services to the primary grades. Twelve teachers and paraprofessionals are extending library services into the classroom in order to encourage students to read. Classes are held in the libraries and students are encouraged to take out books and to read outside of regular school hours, an activity towards which they are not normally inclined. Films, tapes, and a limited amount of other audiovisual material are used in the libraries and classrooms. For students without scheduled library periods, carts of books are taken into the regular classrooms. The original proposal called for providing services to 7,200 students, but late funding caused staffing difficulties.

The teachers are certified instructors who assist the children with their reading skills and encourage them to read. Paraprofessionals with high school diplomas are appointed as Educational Assistants and work directly with the students. Those without diplomas serve as teacher aides, taking over the clerical duties of the classroom teachers.

Forty hours of inservice training were offered to the professional staff, and informal meetings were held to discuss methods of motivating the students to read and ways to solve problems encountered in the program. Although each teacher-librarian was responsible for training the paraprofessional assigned to her, there was no group training for the assistants and the aides. Most teachers interviewed said they think the paraprofessionals would benefit from some more formal training.

While one of the objectives of the program is to encourage students to take books home, some staff members feel that an overemphasis on keeping books in good condition discourages this practice.

City New York City

Activity No. 43201

Activity Title Project GIANT STEP

Date Began March 1969

**Population Served**

200 elementary pupils, or  
about 40 percent of those  
eligible, participate.

Date Visited June 2

Budget: State \$63,298 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 200 primary grade children at PS 155 in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville demonstration district in Brooklyn participate in a remedial and developmental reading program.

Called by the staff a system of "precision teaching," the project uses an innovative, highly structured methodology originally introduced into the district by the Behavioral Systems Corporation of Seattle, Washington. Elementary children are provided with programmed readers which require the child to proceed on his own until he reaches a juncture where new material is presented. At this point, the pupils are instructed to raise their hands and the teacher assists them personally. The teacher takes this opportunity to both review the pages the child has completed on his own as well as to help present the new material. In this way, the teacher has an opportunity to interact personally with every pupil in the class at least once a session.

The principal feature of the system is that it works on a "contingency" basis. Children receive points for the amount of work they accomplish; these points are then redeemable for independent time at a game area in the back of the room. Teachers do encourage the children to save their daily points, however, and those that accumulate 125 points over the course of a week get a special treat--ice cream, perhaps, or a field trip in good weather. As an additional motivational device, the children keep their own graph of daily points earned so they themselves can see how they are doing.

The programmed materials are quite sophisticated--going more or less quickly depending on the level of difficulty. In turn, the rules by which the children earn their points also change depending on the speed with which the child progresses. Slow children are not required to earn as many points to get a given reward as the children who learn more rapidly, and the number of points that must be earned also varies with the level of difficulty of the program.

Since the project is dealing with easily quantifiable entities--points earned, number of pages of program material covered, etc.--the project staff is able to keep a great amount of hard data on the performance of the system and the children. Measures

such as degree of participation, attendance, and correct and error responses per minute are charted daily and used to diagnose troubles before they can cause significant damage. Similar data, where appropriate, are kept on several classes not using the system, and this control measure should provide a significant measure of the program's success at the end of the school year.

The program is an impressive motivator for young children. They are divided into "tables" and each table competes with the others for most quiet, best performance, etc. As a result, there are almost no discipline problems. Two paraprofessionals help children who are having trouble and oversee the room as the teacher moves around giving children individual assistance. Some of the children who typically finish their material more rapidly act as peer instructors and seem to be accepted.

This project started originally in two other schools in the district and failed because of lack of community support. A new project coordinator was hired and the members of the Behavioral Systems Corporation withdrew. The new coordinator commenced a fairly extensive public relations campaign for the system and convinced the Governing Board that it was worth trying again. Only those teachers who volunteered for the program are using it this year. The coordinator and staff hope that the system will have gained the confidence of other teachers by the end of this school year and that it can be greatly expanded hereafter.

City New York City - Central

Activity No. 3089

Activity Title Project READ

Date Began July 1968

Population Served  
  
38,000 students are being served by this program.

Date Visited May 22, 23

Budget: State \$725,081 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

This extensive remedial and developmental reading program serves approximately 38,000 disadvantaged students in all grades in the predominately Negro and Puerto Rican Districts 12 and 13 in the Bronx and Brooklyn. About 24 schools in the Brooklyn district and 22 schools in the Bronx participate. The program was developed by the Behavioral Research Laboratories and is based on the use of the Sullivan programmed reading materials in regular classrooms with a high percentage of poor readers. The Sullivan series includes four reading readiness books and 29 programmed readers. The programmed textbooks are designed to teach the student to "decode" the English language by teaching him sound-letter relationships. The paperback readers contain stories and anecdotes with built-in drills on sounds and concepts. Children reading as much as 2 years below grade level were chosen for the program, and include a large majority who are elementary school students.

Each student works relatively independently, using the textbooks and related readers at his own achievement level. Using the textbooks, he studies a graded series of vocabulary words and syntactical combinations of words. The readers provide drills in story form. He progresses at his own rate, often finishing several books during a term. He is assisted daily by the teacher who explains the concepts and the drills as necessary.

The program was developed by staff from the central Board of Education and members of Behavioral Research Laboratories, under a \$600,000 contract to develop a pilot summer program and to provide reading materials, teacher trainers, and consultants to establish the program. The total program cost was \$725,081.

The program was funded relatively early in June 1968 and operated for the entire school year. An orientation meeting of teachers, supervisors, and BRL staff was held in District 12 at the beginning of the summer. A closed-circuit television program was used in District 13 for staff orientation. Dr. M. W. Sullivan, author of the materials, explained the linguistic principles behind their development and teachers from other cities reported on actual implementation. A pilot summer program was operated for 1,000 elementary students in three schools in the Districts. During the summer, community meetings were held to explain the program, and smaller workshops for the parents were scheduled for the fall.

The preservice teacher training programs were scheduled to begin in September. However, because of the United Federations of Teachers strike, most of the sessions planned by BRL for October and November were not held. With the reopening of the schools in December, each school district and schools within each District planned their own inservice training programs. The sessions varied from school to school and month to month. Paraprofessionals, paid through other funds, also received a limited amount of training in the system.

Educational Records Bureau Inc., a second consulting firm, was hired to develop a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the reading program. Two additional school districts with similar ethnic and socioeconomic makeup were chosen as control groups. Progress reports were written in cooperation with the City's Bureau of Educational Research.

City New York City

Activity No. 40106

Activity Title Early Reading

Incentive Center

Population Served  
  
100 preschool children in 4 district schools are served.

Date Began February 1, 1969

Date Visited May 7, 8

Budget: State \$101,931 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Sixteen teachers and paraprofessionals and one social worker provide a learning environment for approximately 100 four-year-olds, prekindergarten children in four schools in Manhattan. About 75 percent of the children and paraprofessionals are Spanish speaking, 15 percent of the children are Negro, and the remainder are from other ethnic groups.

The principal objectives of the program are to provide a series of structured experiences which will help children to integrate knowledge and skills, and to provide parents and teachers with experience and training in working with children who need compensatory training to cope successfully with the school environment.

Because the administrators of the program share the general feelings of most of those in early childhood education that extensive testing of very young children is not desirable, measures of achievement of the objectives are limited to the professional appraisal of the teaching staff. Some anecdotal records are maintained for each child and his progress, or lack of it. No summary data or information were available at the time of the visit.

The program director stated that one of the elements of the program which makes it more effective and different from most other prekindergartens is the larger role of the family assistant. Family assistants work in the classroom with the teacher and children for at least part of almost every day. They spend most of their time out in the community in the homes of the children working with parents. The program director felt that the dual role of classroom family helper provides a strong link between the school and the community and, in effect, extends the program into the home.

Inservice training for professional staff and for the paraprofessionals is conducted regularly and frequently (once per week for each group) with content of the training program focused on sharing experiences. Training sessions are under the supervision of the program director.

The program director and the Urban Education Coordinator for the district are experienced, qualified early childhood education specialists, and both make



frequent visits to all classes in the program to provide adequate supervision of staff as well as some on-the-job training where indicated.

Administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals all mentioned some difficulty in obtaining some of the materials and equipment planned for use in the program, but felt that the problem was relatively minor. The project director thought the most serious problem was the difficulty of obtaining experienced staff in the middle of the school year. Two of the four teachers have little previous experience.

City New York City

Activity No. 41807

Activity Title Intersensory Reading

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>Population Served</b>
585 kindergarten through second grade students - about 20 percent of those eligible - being served.

Date Began April 1, 1969

Date Visited June 16, 17

Budget: State \$102,137 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Since the beginning of March, District 18 in Brooklyn has been implementing a multifaceted program in both remedial and developmental reading for a total of almost 600 kindergarten, first, and second grade students. The program funds provide seven coordinators and five paraprofessionals who work closely with 30 existing staff members who are paid from local funds. The project operates in 17 of the 25 schools in the District and uses a unique "intersensory" approach. Pre-reading children are first taught sounds using objects; then the objects are replaced with letter cards, and finally wordbuilding and spelling are introduced. The materials were developed by Dr. Pollack of Maimonides Mental Health Center and she and her staff have presented a number of workshop sessions as part of staff training. A versatile feature of these materials is that they are structured enough to be used effectively by paraprofessionals and even older children with a minimum of instruction. They can be used for both developmental and remedial work.

The Community Council approved the proposal and submitted a list of paraprofessionals. In addition, a representative of the Council has seen the program in action.



City Rome

Activity No. 3074

Activity Title Project REACH

Date Began March, 1969

Population Served  
480 third through fifth grade students are served, representing almost all the children in these grades.

Date Visited June 2, 3

Budget: State \$103,860 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

In Project Reach, 480 students in the third through the fifth grades receive remedial reading instruction in a program designed to improve their reading skills and motivate them to read and use school and public libraries. Eighteen tutors work with children in groups of four for 1 hour twice a week. Thirteen assistants work as library aides, assisting the librarians and the tutors and encouraging the students to take out and read books.

Games, films, and magazines are used extensively in the small group instruction and in the library periods. Language Masters, teacher-developed drills, and other games also are used. Children receive intensive exposure to the library and are encouraged to take out books for leisure reading. According to the project director, the students have been very enthusiastic and sometimes ask for additional classes.

Students are selected on the basis of low scores in standard achievement tests like the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and on their teachers' recommendations. All third grade students and 85 percent to 90 percent of fourth and fifth grade students in schools in the target low-income area of the city are served.

Certified teachers on the school system's substitute list were hired as tutors. Several teachers refused to work because the salary for a tutor is less than for a substitute teacher and two positions were not filled. Some of the staff began in October. However, because of a delay in funding, the full program did not begin until March. Staff training included an inservice program for the tutors and a course in library utilization for the aides.

Neither the tutorial nor the library programs have adequate space. Tutors meet with the students in storerooms, library cubicles, and other available space. In some cases, the libraries expand into the corridors where books and displays are set up.

An evaluation is planned using scores from pre- and post-tests, a survey of teacher and student attitudes, and anecdotal records. In addition, work folders are kept on each child. No results were available at the time of the site visit.

City Schenectady

Activity No. 3106

Activity Title Reading and Language

Development project

Population Served

850 elementary and 150 secondary students are served, forcing an enlargement of proposed class size.

Date Began September 1968.

Date Visited May 22, 25

Budget: State \$103,673 Local \$52,500 Federal \$54,815

About 850 elementary and 150 secondary students participate in a reading and language development program financed through Urban Education, Title I, and local funds. The State funds pay for four full-time and six part-time reading development teachers and 13 paraprofessionals.

Classes are held in 10 schools for students with special reading problems. Participants are selected on the basis of their scores on standard reading tests and their teachers' recommendations. They meet in small groups for half hour periods, using tapes, controlled readers, and other standard reading equipment. Although a maximum of 10 students per class was set initially, some classes are slightly larger to accommodate more students. As a result, almost double the number of students originally proposed are being served.

The paraprofessionals and about 50 volunteers, recruited by the individual school principals, assist the teachers. The teacher aides are required to have high school diplomas and be residents of the community. Limited training was offered only for the teacher aides.

Several of the staff interviewed said that more money is needed for materials and equipment and more space is needed to run the program. In some cases, teachers are unable to use language art machines that are available because they lack the necessary space.

An evaluation is planned using data from pre- and post-tests. In addition, a State College doctoral candidate was hired to do an analysis of Schenectady's overall Urban Education program, of which this project is a part.

City Syracuse

Activity No. 3046

Activity Title Corrective Reading

Population Served

375 elementary and 75 secondary students -- about 35 percent of those eligible -- participate

Date Began September 1968

Date Visited May 7, 8

Budget: State \$137,860 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 350 elementary and 75 secondary students in 11 inner-city schools receive instruction in reading in a program designed to improve reading comprehension, phonic skills, and word recognition. Nine teachers were hired at the time of the site visit.

The program, which is a continuation of a Title I project, varies from school to school. In some, the Urban Education teacher holds classes for small groups of students or tutors children individually. In other schools, where the reading instruction is given in the regular classroom, the reading teacher functions as a resource teacher assisting and supporting the regular staff. A wide variety of reading materials is used, though mostly of the software family.

Students are recommended for the programs by the classroom teachers. Final placement is decided by the principal and the reading teacher at each school. Students who have an I. Q. of at least 85 and who read at least a year and a half below grade level are eligible.

The program coordinator conducts weekly inservice meetings for his staff. He also oversees the collection of data with the aim of making longitudinal studies of student progress.

Plans have been made to shift the emphasis of the program from "corrective" to "preventive" instruction by changing the techniques and focusing on younger students including kindergarten and preschool youngsters.

The principal evaluation techniques will be the use of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills for pre- and post-testing and a measurement of teacher attitude and change.

City Troy

Activity No. 3080

Activity Title Operation BOOTSTRAPS-

Remedial Reading

Population Served

45 elementary students benefit from this activity.

Date Began March 1969

Date Visited April 1969

Budget: State \$18,900 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Forty-five students in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades receive remedial reading instruction on a one-to-one or small group basis. The program is one part of Operation BOOTSTRAPS, a project to upgrade students' basic skills in the city's target area.

Two additional remedial reading teachers are scheduled to be hired by the school system to increase the individualization of instruction and to give diagnostic tests. At the time of the site visit only one teacher was hired. The number of students served is expected to double when the second teacher is hired.

The Urban Education reading teacher meets with seven groups of five or six students for three one-half hour sessions every week. Three students with special reading problems are tutored individually.

The goal of the program is to show an annual growth of .7 in reading achievement; however, the program started so late in the year that this will be impossible. Pre-tests had been administered and a control group established; but, at the time of the visit, no results were available. In addition to this formal evaluation, the local Urban Education committee convenes monthly to discuss where the program stands and what changes should be made.

City Yonkers

Activity No. 3064

Activity Title Quality Incentive

Remedial Reading

Population Served

800 seventh through ninth grade students - between a third and a half of those eligible - participate in the activity.

Date Began September 1968

Date Visited April 30, May 1

Budget: State \$155,220 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Fourteen teachers give remedial reading instruction to about 800 junior high school students in six schools in a program designed to improve the students' reading skills and increase their motivation to read. Because of scheduling difficulties, the program was not able to reach the 1,400 students originally proposed.

Seventh, eighth, and ninth grade students attend the special reading classes two or three times a week depending upon their degree of reading retardation. Each teacher holds five classes a day with an average of about eight students in each class. Standard reading materials and equipment are used. Students whose test scores indicate they are reading two or more years below grade level are eligible for the program.

An evaluation is planned using data from pre- and post-reading tests and subjective judgments made by the teachers on students progress. No information on the evaluation was available at the time of the site visit.

Teachers stated that program materials are easily available to them and to students. Some teachers expressed two reservations about the materials: they feel that most of the materials chosen are slanted primarily at boys and that there is little of specific interest to Negro students.

The original proposal stated that reading teachers would hold regular conferences with teachers of other subject areas. As a rule, that has not been done. Some individual reading teachers consult with teachers in other subject matter areas on an individual basis. There was neither preservice training nor inservice training for teachers.

The project director stated that the remedial reading program had particular relevance for the students in this school district because the program originated with demands from students for help in reading. It was her opinion that the program is perceived by students as being designed to meet their expressed needs.

## ii. Basic Skills

### Critical Points:

- Eighteen activities offer remedial instruction, developmental instruction, or enrichment experiences.
- The projects serve approximately 220 preschool, almost 17,000 elementary school, and over 2,000 secondary school students.
- In general, the programs serve only a small percent of the students who need the additional help.

A variety of programs designed to teach or reinforce the standard academic subjects make up this category. The subjects taught include mathematics, reading, language arts, social studies, and music. The programs offer remedial instruction to students achieving below grade level, developmental instruction to students achieving at or above grade level, or enrichment experiences to improve the students' self-image or their attitude toward school.

In some projects, students attend afternoon or evening study or tutorial centers; in others, classes using innovative techniques or materials are held for small groups of students during the school day. Special services including counseling for dropouts, tutorial assistance for "gifted" students, and vocational guidance are offered.

Recreation programs and field trips often are included.

Eighteen activities costing approximately nine million dollars were visited in this category. The projects serve approximately 220 preschool, almost 17,000 elementary school, and over 2,000 secondary school students. In many cases, Urban Education funds alone finance the projects. However, in one case State funds contribute only a small part of the total cost of a nongraded elementary school. In another case, State funds supplement a Title I program by financing additional after-school centers.

In the after-school programs, the teaching techniques are generally the standard approaches used throughout the school systems. The average class is usually smaller than in the regular school day and techniques such as team teaching, small group, or individualized instruction are employed. The teachers generally are hired from the regular day school staff and the materials are often those used during the regular school day. However, several projects make use of highly innovative techniques or materials. In "Dial-a-Drill," a mathematics tutorial program in New York City, a central computer drills students in their homes through their telephones. In after-school study centers in Elmira, the staff developed unusual materials themselves by using Ektographic slides and a Caritell viewer.

In the inschool programs, additional teachers support the regular school staff by working with students who have special problems or by offering special materials and equipment. The programs vary widely. In Niagara Falls, mathematics and science teachers work, for 2 weeks at a time, with small groups of junior high school students who are weak in those areas. In Troy, day-long classes with a maximum of 10 students are set up for students achieving below capacity. The students have the benefit of new teaching materials and techniques as well as greater individualization of instruction. In a New York City program, mathematical laboratories with computers, calculators, and other machines are installed in eight schools in the Bronx. All the students in the eight schools receive instruction in the laboratories. The program, financed through a \$226,385 grant, is the most costly visited in this category.

Evaluation procedures set up for each program vary from project to project. Two preschool programs have little or no evaluation. Many of the basic skills elementary and junior high school programs call for standard pre- and post-achievement

tests in reading and mathematics; however, many of the staff interviewed said it is difficult to measure student progress in programs which operate no longer than 3 to 6 months.

Some programs have set up comprehensive evaluation procedures. In a remedial program in Troy, pre- and post-tests are given to students in special classes funded through Urban Education and to a carefully selected control group. Standard achievement tests are used and attitude scales are being developed for both groups. In an after-school study program in New York City, community groups, which initially asked for the program, take part in the evaluation. The community residents observe the classes and make recommendations. Standard achievement tests and a self-evaluation form developed by an outside consultant also are used.

In general, the programs serve only a small percent of the students who need the additional help. In an extended day kindergarten in Brooklyn, only 10 percent of the total eligible kindergarten population in the district is served. Similarly, in a Niagara Falls' preschool program, about 40 percent of the eligible 4-year-olds participate. In other programs such as an after-school study program in Harlem, as many as several hundred students were on waiting lists when classes started. Though all the waiting list students were eventually served by the end of the year, the program staff estimated that only a third of the students who need the tutorial assistance had applied for the classes to begin with.

Late funding caused staffing difficulties in many of the programs. Project directors frequently were unable to find qualified staff in the middle of the winter. Several directors asked for additional guidance, bilingual, and support staff, while others said more comprehensive staff training is needed. Several project staff in the

after-school study centers criticized the programs for merely being extensions of the regular school day without attempting to meet the special needs of the target students.

City Binghamton

Activity No. 2004

Activity Title Home and School Study

Centers

Date Began February 1969

Date Visited April 29

Budget: State \$22,720 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Population Served  
240 elementary school students,  
or 10 percent of the total eligible  
population, are served.

Evening study centers in three schools offer tutorial assistance to students whose home environment is not conducive to study as well as provide necessary materials and resources. About 240 students receive individual instruction from 14 staff members in the basic skills and regular academic subjects. One of the centers is a resource center set up under a Title I program and equipped with film loop projectors, controlled readers, tape recorders, and a library corner. The other two centers are located in regular classrooms in the schools.

Students who volunteer for the program are selected on the basis of recommendations of the school psychologist and information in the regular files. According to the project director, many applicants for the program were not eligible and he received many more qualified applications than the activity could accommodate. As a result, only about 10 percent of those eligible are actually being served.

The director said the children are extremely enthusiastic and progress rapidly. For instance, one student, who was unable to make progress in the regular classroom, learned the alphabet after only 5 weeks in the program.

An evaluation is planned based on assessment forms for the students, instructors, and parents and additional data supplied by the regular day school teachers. No information was available at the time of the site visit. The director, himself a principal in one of the city's schools, stated that the major weakness of the program is the lack of any meaningful parent involvement.

City Elmira

Activity No. 2041

Activity Title Developmental Educa-  
tion and Activity Centers for Disadvan-  
tagged Students

Date Began February 1969

Date Visited April 30 - May 2

Budget: State \$34,598 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Population Served

300 elementary school pupils --  
approximately one quarter of  
those eligible -- benefit from  
this activity.

Three afternoon activity centers, two located in the schools and the third in a housing project, offer tutoring in the academic subjects and guidance counseling to disadvantaged students. The goals of this activity are to provide an environment in which students may receive individual assistance, one conducive to experimenting with innovative teaching techniques, and one which can encourage students to continue their education. The students were selected by teachers and guidance counselors as those most likely to benefit from the program. At present, about 25 percent of the eligible population is being served.

Considerable time and imagination have gone into the program. Tapes and records, "cycloteachers," and Carousels and Caritell viewers with teacher-prepared material on Ektographic slides are used. One center has built a "space capsule" to simulate a "tree house" learning environment. Students at another center built their own carrels for only \$225. The centers also use standardized individual tutorial techniques, "controlled readers," and they are experimenting with peer-drilling using sixth grade students.

To evaluate the program's progress, the staff is planning to compare data from the pupils' school performance before and after exposure to the afternoon work. In addition, behavior and attitudinal questionnaires will be completed by the regular teacher, afternoon teacher, and parent of each child.

City Elmira

Activity No. 2042

Activity Title Drop-in Center for  
Dropouts

Population Served  
30 dropouts have been assisted  
by this activity.

Date Began September 1968

Date Visited April 30, May 1, 2

Budget: State \$14,444 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Elmira's "Drop-in" center (for dropouts) was begun under the auspices of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in September of 1968 and transferred to Urban Education funding in late January of 1969. The Neighborhood Youth Corps remains the principal agent of referral to the center under an arrangement whereby the Corps will employ dropouts on condition that they spend at least 6 hours a week at the drop-in center. (In practice this rule is not enforced, however.)

The objectives of the center are to train applicants in the basic skills and help them to get high school equivalency diplomas. A group counseling session, held between hours of instruction, enables the participants to achieve some sensitivity to one another's problems and possible solutions to them. Participants observed by the consultants are from broken or "breaking" homes, troubled by indigence, alcoholism, etc. Staff members are very optimistic, however, and feel that real progress is being made. At the time of the visit, four participants had received their equivalency diplomas and several others were ready and waiting for the examination to be held again.

Since the center seems to have some positive effects on its participants (and, as in other Elmira projects, a particularly dedicated staff), the director regrets that it is only serving a tiny percentage of the eligible population. (Elmira school officials estimate that the city suffers 250 dropouts per year.) The director is convinced that lack of adequate publicity accounts partly for this situation, but that conservatives in the community might be needlessly rankled by such advertising.

Currently the program is housed in a church (itself a converted house) for which nominal "donations" are made monthly. The facility is inadequate, especially if the number of participants were to increase at all.

Evaluation is designed to utilize outside questionnaires for staff and participants, the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (pre and post), and logs of individual student progress.

City New York City-Central

Activity No. 3119

Activity Title "Dial-A-Drill"

Population Served

1700 students in four areas of the City are able to take advantage of this activity.

Date Began March 1, 1969

Date Visited April 30, May 1

Budget: State \$177,243 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

In this project, a central computer feeds arithmetic drills by telephone to approximately 1,700 students in four areas of the City (the Bronx, Harlem, Queens, and mid-Manhattan). The computer asks the questions verbally, continually adjusting the level of difficulty to the students' level of performance. The students give the answers by touch telephone. The program is the first of its kind in New York City.

Two operators handle 16 telephone lines which operate simultaneously from the central computer facility in Manhattan. Approximately 10 students are scheduled every hour for each line and the computer operates from 2 p. m. until 10 p. m. Each student works with about 20 problems in his scheduled 5-minute period. The students are selected at random and those from families in all income brackets participate. Twenty family aides, who are employed half-time, visit the homes of students whose parents have questions about, or objections to, the program.

The "Dial-a-Drill" program was developed by staff from the City's central Board of Education, the New York City Urban Education Office, and the State Education Department. In addition to the regular participants, about 87 hospitalized or otherwise restricted youngsters are taking part in the project which began at the end of February. About 123 adults are scheduled for an adult education program in May.

The computer makes possible individualized programming in which the difficulty level of the drills is continually readjusted to the capabilities of each child. Thus an advanced third grade student can work on a fifth grade level while a slower student of the same age receives drills on a first or second grade level. One student progressed from the third to the fifth grade level in a 2-month period. Because the students are working at their ability level and because they are working alone, they are free of many psychological restrictions inherited in oral classroom drills. According to the staff, the students try harder and often are able to answer questions they would have been afraid to try in front of a teacher or their fellow students. Although no outside evaluation is planned, the drill schedules provide an ongoing study of each student's work.

Several staff members said that the program generates a high level of interest in the parents and noticeably improved the home-school relationships in the areas in

which it operates. At the outset, many parents asked to have their children's drill schedule adjusted to the family's schedule and barraged the central computer operators with questions about the program. However, once the drill schedules were underway and they saw the benefit to their children they became much more cooperative. Sixty-five parents attended one meeting which demonstrated the program; and, according to the staff, the majority praised "the remarkable mathematics progress" made by their children. One parent said the children "run from school to get home in time for their first lesson." Often the parents themselves become involved in the drills; and one father said he records his son's errors and works with him later in the evening on the corrections.

However, the program is not perfect. The computer-telephone system automatically eliminates all students who do not have a telephone, many of whom have the greatest need for the additional mathematics tutoring. Several staff members suggested that additional funds be allocated to install lines in homes of eligible children. It was also suggested that the potential for computerized programs was such that the possibility of cooperation with other agencies in the city should be explored. For instance, the computer facility could be used by health agencies and hospitals to extend the program to handicapped or hospitalized children.

City New York City-Central

Activity No. 3092

Activity Title Elementary Education

Programs

**Population Served**

Approximately 10,000 pupils and 1,000 staff personnel at all levels are reached by these projects.

Date Began January 6, 1969

Date Visited May 26, 27 - June 20

Budget: State \$7,471,306 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

The Experimental Elementary Programs (EEP) label covers a triad of new educational models proposed and elaborated upon in a study report to the New York City Superintendent by the "Gordon Committee." Focusing on the Special Services Schools of the City, the EEP project will be implemented on a fairly broad scale over 4 years. The project aims to improve on current and recent efforts in the City system (such as More Effective Schools and the All Day Neighborhood Schools) as well as to provide feasible and differentiated models for educating disadvantaged children.

Model A, currently active in six schools in the boroughs of Manhattan and Brooklyn, involves mainly: formal education beginning at age 3, extensions of the school day, clustering of classes, and teaming of staff - with the correspondingly better staff/pupil ratios, heterogeneity in class composition, and inschool capabilities for handling children with chronic or emergency problems. Model A presents the greatest range of innovative ensembles of the three recommended.

Model B, currently active in one school in the Bronx, is characterized by concentration on Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI), implemented with emphasis on behavioral factors and with a classroom organization adapted to IPI.

Model D, currently active in two schools in the Bronx and Brooklyn, aims at combining proven elements of recent programs in its target schools, emphasis being on a more traditional approach using elements of demonstrated feasibility. Important among these are the establishment of educational interaction between home and school; diagnosis, monitoring, and inschool service for children with learning (and other) problems; and the utilization of parents as well as specialists to assist in the learning process.

A fourth model recommended by the Gordon Committee has not yet been implemented; this model (Model C) is aimed at school children having potential or diagnosed communication difficulties, i. e., those for whom normal American English has the status of a second language. Personnel selection and organization for this fairly specialized model (which also includes several of the standard features of the others) have proven especially difficult to implement in the face of the implementation problems affecting the overall EEP project.

All models provided for: the involvement of parents in both the planning and operation of EEP project models; joint use of professionals and paraprofessionals; establishment of a research, development, and training center; and concentration of school-level efforts to locate and assist children with chronic and emergency problems.

The EEP project, though currently carried on with enthusiasm and direction, suffered at the outset from two problems recognized by most participants: principals, assistant principals, and operating staff were not uniformly integrated into the project at the point where they could be effectively involved in planning and operations; and the delays and disruptions associated with the teacher strike of the fall of 1968 have retarded implementation and, in some ways, influenced the various communities' receptions of the project models in their schools. At the time of the project visits, the overall degree of implementation of the EEP project was estimated to be not more than 60 percent.

In its first year, the EEP project has had difficulty in recruiting both professional and paraprofessional staff, as well as in achieving implementation in all target schools. In all, three schools out of a target 12 have not been able to start up in the EEP project as planned for the school year 1968-69 — one Model B school and two Model D schools (in two boroughs). The EEP project coordinators have indicated that the Model B school originally targeted has been replaced in the project by a primary school in another borough; this school has made progress toward implementation in the last months of the current year. In Model D, one replacement school has been identified and expects to run as an EEP school in September; the remaining Model D school has been definitely cancelled.

Within their constraints, the various project models have succeeded in such key common aims as: introducing paraprofessional personnel (in clusters) where they can support the learning process; drawing the communities and parents involved into participation in the early education of their children; and orienting target schools toward providing inschool services and monitoring for chronic and emergency problems of the children.

The number of pupils currently served, exception being made for the schools not implemented (as noted above), is estimated to be 10,119. The numbers of adults serving these pupils, within the cadre of the EEP project, is more difficult to calculate. Full-time staff of all levels is 473 toward the end of the current school year. This figure is probably equaled or exceeded by the "head-count" of part-time and paraprofessional workers serving with the EEP project. However, accounting and planning for these workers has been done in terms of man-hours, thus rendering a "head-count" tally difficult at best. The total number of adults connected with the EEP project on any basis is therefore estimated to be 1,000.

Four problem areas, all essentially related, still face the EEP project. In order of their immediacy, they are:

- The requirement to carry through implementation in those target schools which could not be handled in the first year;

- The need to deal with the requests of schools to join in one of the EEP models;
- The need for continuity in the face of the inevitable turnover among professionals, paraprofessionals, and community liaison personnel;
- The need to avoid loss of coordination across the broad range of the various models and their member schools.

It would seem feasible, within the EEP structure as proposed, to develop an approach to dealing with all four problem areas above on a concerted basis. All of the models are set up to include a research and development and training activity. As these activities become more clearly established and functionally identified, they can readily assume a focal role in sustaining EEP's feedback flow and in contributing both to the success of school-level elements of the EEP models and of the overall achievement of the project over 4 years. The critical problems of continuity, of coping with change and turnover, and of decentralizing to the limits of practicability, can all be attacked by configuring the research and development and training centers of the models as clearing-houses for the flow of operating information and the stream of training information. This approach would seem to permit attacking the four problem areas indicated, while remaining within the spirit and letter of the EEP character as it is being implemented.

City New York City

Activity No. 42404

Activity Title After-School Study

Center \_\_\_\_\_

Population Served

350 elementary students and 30 parochial students participate. However, almost as many students still remain to be served.

Date Began February 1969

Date Visited April 24

Budget: State \$18,704 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 350 public elementary school students and 30 parochial elementary students participate in an after-school study and recreation center at an elementary school in District 24 in Queens. The program is designed to improve the mathematics and reading skills of students who are working below level and to expose the culturally disadvantaged youngsters to music and art.

Thirteen teachers give classes in remedial reading and mathematics, music, art, gym, and library skills from 3:15 p.m. until 5:15 p.m. three days a week. Students who are underachieving are recommended for the basic skills program by their regular classroom teachers. Students who are interested in the cultural enrichment and the recreation classes volunteer for the activity. All the teachers are required to be regular staff members of the public school, even though parochial school students do participate.

The teaching procedures and materials in both the remedial and the cultural activities are the same as those used in the classrooms during the regular school day. However, the teachers work with the students on a one-to-one or small group basis whenever possible.

The program was financed under Title I funds during the 1967-1968 school year, but was discontinued because of lack of funds in the fall of 1968. When the Urban Education money became available in January, the District administrators put the program back into operation.

City New York City

Activity No. 40404

Activity Title After-School Study

Centers

Population Served  
1,050 elementary pupils are reached, but that is only approximately one third of those eligible.

Date Began February 1, 1969

Date Visited May 7, 8

Budget: State \$103,255 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Seven afternoon study centers in New York City provide basic skills instruction for students who are achieving above grade level as well as remedial assistance for poor students. About 1,050 elementary school students participate in the program in District 4 in Harlem. They are served by a part-time staff including seven center supervisors, 50 teachers, 35 paraprofessionals, and about 20 volunteers. Bright students, weak in mathematics, are tutored to raise their achievement level and make them eligible for special classes for gifted students. Poor students performing below grade level are given remedial instruction. Teaching methods vary from class to class, but most are extensions of normal day time activities.

School staff and parents, organized in parent associations and in three community advisory groups, participated in the selection of this activity by making formal recommendations to the Urban Education office. These parent groups as well as a newly created Urban Education advisory council are in continual contact with the school staff.

According to program administrators, union regulations sometimes preclude the most qualified teachers from participating since the regulations require that preference for afternoon activities be given to teachers with seniority.

In the opinion of center supervisors, the success of the program depends upon individual teacher ability coupled with participant enthusiasm.

City New York City

Activity No. 40801

Activity Title After-School Tutoring

Population Served

180 junior high school students are assisted by this activity.

Date Began February 1, 1969

Date Visited May 20, 21

Budget: State \$48,838 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 180 junior high school students in two schools in District 8 in New York City attend an after-school tutoring and compensatory education program. Seventeen teachers and paraprofessionals are employed in teams to assist the students in their work. Typically, one classroom with a small number of children (6-10) will have one teacher working with the students, while a larger class (18-20) will employ one or two teachers and a paraprofessional, with students changing classes during the 2-hour session.

The objectives of the program differ in the two schools. One school concentrates on intensive academic coaching to prepare academically talented children for the entrance examinations for special high schools and restricts its efforts to those students. The other school does this to a much smaller extent and concentrates on upgrading of skills of all students who are willing to remain for the after-school program. This school has an emphasis on reading skills as a general means of assisting students.

The general means used to achieve these differing objectives is basically the same in both schools - small classes with consequently greater individual attention. In addition, in the school preparing children for the highly competitive atmosphere of the special high schools, there is a greater than usual use of testing and emphasis on the skills and techniques of taking tests successfully. The participants interviewed felt the pressure of the long day caused by an after-hours program, but expressed pleasure at the idea of competing successfully with children from "good" schools.

Evaluation of the program will be made by comparing test scores on standard achievement tests administered before and after the program. Comparisons were not available at the time of the visit.

City New York City

Activity No. 40202

Activity Title Operation WARD'S

ISLAND

Population Served
500 fourth through sixth grade pupils and 30 elementary teachers are reached by this activity.

Date Began March 15, 1969

Date Visited May 1, 5

Budget: State \$48,298 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Urban Education funds are used in this project principally for preservice and inservice teacher training which permits dormant elements of the curriculum to come alive for fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students in nine schools, in the northeast section of Manhattan. The general objective of the program is to provide field trips and firsthand experiences for children in science. Curriculum guides have long been written for the subject matter presented, but the content was normally "lectured." Now the funds permit children to imbed specimens in plastic, study and participate in all elements of photography, and take field trips to places like Ward's Island for a study of biology, botany, and geology.

The principal use of the funds is to pay the 120 classroom teachers. Seven of these are science specialists. The goal is to provide them, through training courses, with the capability of presenting concepts and demonstrations to the approximately 2,900 students they serve. Special equipment and supplies will also be provided.

Late funding, however, coupled with the lack of willing teachers, limits the extension of services to 30 teachers and 500 students. In addition, many materials had not been received at the time of the visit, even though the program began operation on March 15.

According to the comments of the project director and others outside the project, staff morale is high regarding the inservice training, the critical element of the program. A considerable portion of the funds went towards hiring university personnel to conduct elements of the inservice training program. In fact, a strong aspect of the program lies in the fact that the program can be continued in 1969-70 with a considerable reduction in funds because of the projected availability of trained teachers.

This program does suffer from one rather unique weakness. District 2 covers both Manhattan's affluent east side mid-town and parts of Spanish Harlem. Only in this latter section of District 2 (above 96th Street) is the program operating. At the same time, however, a considerable number of children are voluntarily being bussed to the schools in the "better" southern section of the District. Thus, though these children live in the poverty area and are eligible for the program, they do not benefit from it.

City New York City

Activity No. 41203

Activity Title Experimental Mathematics Laboratories

Population Served

2,500 elementary students and 2,000 secondary students are served in 8 of the District's 15 schools.

Date Began February 1969

Date Visited May 28, 29

Budget: State \$226,385 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Mathematics laboratories with computers, calculators, and other electronic equipment are installed in eight schools in District 12 in the Bronx in a program designed to motivate students to study mathematics. The equipment alone costs approximately \$100,000. All classes in each school spend one 40-minute period a week in the laboratory. The work for each class varies according to the student's mathematics level. Each laboratory is staffed by a teacher and four educational assistants who work with the student on a one-to-one or small group basis.

The students use hand and electric calculators, a computer, and a series of games and materials developed by the University of Wisconsin and designed to illustrate the concepts and processes of the equipment. The specially developed materials include geoboards, polyominoes, cubes, cylinders, scales, meter sticks, weights, and springs. A new curriculum involving "flow chart" procedures is used to solve complicated problems with hand and electric calculators.

Although the project proposal states that the laboratories are designed to motivate and improve the academic performance of low and underachievers, the equipment is used by all the students in the schools, regardless of achievement level.

According to several project staff members interviewed, the mathematics laboratories are not altogether successful. Because of the danger of theft (15 calculators were stolen from one school the first weekend after they were installed despite the use of security storage cabinets), more than half of the equipment was locked up and never used. Although the project proposal calls for a comprehensive training program for the teachers and the assistants in the use of the equipment, only a limited orientation was held. As a result, two-thirds of the staff do not know how to use the computers and some teachers do not know where the machines are located in their schools.

An evaluation of the program is planned using subjective reports by the principals of the participating schools and the laboratory staff.

City New York City

Activity No. 41604

Activity Title Extended Day

Kindergarten

Population Served  
100 children -- 10 percent of those eligible -- are reached by this activity.

Date Began February 15

Date Visited June 4, 9

Budget: State \$104,101 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

In District 16 in Brooklyn, four schools have set up on extended day kindergarten class with supportive services for families with children who have had pre-kindergarten experience. The primary target group is children who have been enrolled in Follow Through. At present this is true of 70 of the 100 children in the project. The academic goal of the classes is to develop reading and mathematics readiness concepts. Supportive goals include offering breakfast, lunch, family assistance, and social and psychological services. Both the project coordinator and members of her staff stated that they feel these services should be expanded to include pediatric care for the children as well as speech therapy and other medical care.

The advantages of the program are the longer period of time the teachers can spend with the children and the small pupil-to-adult (including paraprofessionals) ratio: only 1 to 8. Field trips have greatly enhanced parent participation and interest as have visits to the home by the teachers and family assistants.

There is almost no evaluation planned other than staff judgment and evidently there is no plan for future evaluation. The staff felt that, considering Head Start and Follow Through, most of these children had been "over-evaluated." Secondly, there may be a facilities problem in the future if kindergarten enrollments continue to be large.

City New York City

Activity No. 2048 Ocean Hill-Brownsville

Activity Title Community Based

Homework Study Centers

Population Served  
100 students who have previously resisted help will be served by this activity.

Date Began Non-Operating

Date Visited June 12

Budget: State \$102,172 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

The goal of this activity is to provide suitable locations where children from grades 3 through 9 who come from crowded homes may do their homework and receive assistance particularly in reading and mathematics skills. These centers will be located in apartment buildings and lofts around the neighborhood and each will be staffed with a director and family worker on a full-time basis plus assorted assistants and workers on a part-time basis. Tutors will be recruited from local junior and senior high schools.

Particular emphasis in the planning of this activity is laid on reaching those children and parents who either have not participated or have overtly resisted participating in other programs offered by the schools. Thus the family workers will visit the homes of the children and try to involve the parents in "individualiz(ing) the needs of their children," promoting good study habits and a positive attitude towards education. Volunteers will organize special educational activities one evening each week and it is planned that the center will also be the focal point for field trips and cultural and social activities.

Estimated cost for this program will be \$370 per student. In order to evaluate its effectiveness, pre- and post-tests will be administered in reading and mathematics, school personnel will prepare reports, and arrangements may be made for a formal evaluation through the Planning and Evaluation Unit.

At the time of the evaluation visit, this program was not operating due to the disputes still in progress between the officials of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville demonstration district and the central Board of Education.

City Niagara Falls

Activity No. 3095

Activity Title Operation Prekinder-  
garten

Population Served

120 prekindergarten children,  
representing approximately 40  
percent of those who qualify for  
this activity, participate.

Date Began March 15, 1969

Date Visited April 21, 22

Budget: State \$100,039 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 120 four-year olds participate in prekindergarten classes in three schools. Morning and afternoon sessions are held for different groups at each school. The children take part in finger painting, story hours, puppet shows, and other forms of play. Two snacks with milk, juice, and cookies are offered for each session. The program is designed to help the children improve their self-image and provide enrichment experiences to prepare them for regular school.

Because the program was not approved until February, only three of the four proposed teachers and two of the four paraprofessionals were hired. As a result, classes opened in three of the four proposed schools and not all 160 proposed students were served. The fourth class is scheduled to open later in the spring. In addition, materials were delayed and some equipment designed for the students' physical development had still not arrived at the time of the site visit.

Students whose parents are on welfare or earned incomes of \$3,000 or less are eligible for the program. According to the project director, only 40 percent of the eligible students are served.

One of the instructors stated that most of the children respond favorably to the classroom setting. She suggested that the activity should provide each instructor with a syllabus and that a psychologist and a nurse should be employed to deal with those children who have health and emotional problems. Another instructor stated that the program could prove to be an exercise in futility and experience a loss of momentum unless the curriculum methodology used is paralleled at the kindergarten through third grade levels.

The assistant to the Superintendent stated that a degree of the impact of this program in the community could be measured by the large number of parents who asked to have their children enrolled.

City Niagara Falls

Activity No. 3097

Activity Title Individualized Instruction in Mathematics and Science

Date Began March 15, 1969

Date Visited April 23

Budget: State \$27,563 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Population Served

265 junior high school students are helped by this activity. This is estimated to be 25 percent of the total eligible population.

Individualized instruction in mathematics and science is offered to 265 junior high school students at one school. One mathematics and two science teachers each work for a 2-week period with a small group of students who have a similar difficulty. The students then return to the regular classrooms and a new group receives the special instruction

The program has been added to the regular school science and mathematics program in which two teachers work in each class under a team teaching system. Special materials, operating on a "contract" basis with each student working at his own level and progressing at his own rate, are used in the regular and the small group classes. Units relevant to the students' experiences such as check writing and recreational mathematics and science are studied.

The project staff said that many special materials not readily available on the market are needed for the target group. As a result, several staff members prepare curriculum materials themselves.

Several students interviewed stated that the "contract" means the teacher no longer "talks at" them during boring lectures; they can proceed at their own pace without too much pressure; they enjoy the opportunity to participate in 2 weeks of concentrated instruction in units that had not previously been clear to them; they liked the idea of available after-school tutoring; and they feel that the instructor cares whether or not they learn mathematics and science.

One of the quantitative evaluative measures of this program will be the Iowa Test of Basic Skills which will be administered to the entire student body.

City Rochester

Activity No. 2026 and 2027

Activity Title East Side Community

Center, West Side Community Center

<p>Population Served</p> <p>482 elementary school students, 18 high school students, and 16 adults are served, while many more are on waiting lists.</p>
--

Date Began January 1969

Date Visited April 17-23

Budget: State \$361,869 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Approximately 482 elementary school students receive instruction in reading and mathematics in after-school programs at six schools in a predominately black, low-income area of the city. Guidance counselors, social workers, and community liaison workers, who are assigned to two community centers (one on the east and one on the west side of the city), assist the families of the participants with home and family-related problems. A small high school tutorial program, an adult education class, and a bilingual program are also in operation.

The elementary school students attend a 2-hour after-school program in the regular school classrooms. Each teacher is assisted by a teacher aide and a student assistant. The materials and techniques vary from class to class. However, in general, conventional techniques and standard textbooks are used. Many of the same textbooks are used during the regular school day. In the bilingual program, three teachers, assisted by three aides and three student assistants, tutor Spanish-speaking elementary school children in all of the regular academic subjects in English and in Spanish. The students are taught individually or in small groups according to their language ability and their particular problem. In the high school tutorial program, 18 high school students are tutored on a one-to-one basis in mathematics and science by volunteers from local industry. Sixteen adults receive instruction once a week in topics related to their homes and their children's studies.

The guidance staff — two counselors and six community workers — assists the students and their parents with special problems. A staff assigned to the East Side Community Center serves the students at the four schools where programs are operating in its area. The East Side staff includes a Spanish-speaking community liaison worker to assist the families of the participants in the bilingual program which operates in an east side school with a high Puerto Rican student population. The West Side Community Center staff serves the remaining two schools.

In the elementary school programs, students with low achievement scores on the standard city tests in reading and mathematics are recommended by the regular classroom teachers in 10 target area schools in the city. All participants must have the approval of their parents. Although most of the project staff said it was impossible to

measure student progress over a 4 or 5-month period, a limited evaluation procedure was established. Sections of the Durrell Reading Test, a standard reading test, were given to all participants at the beginning of the project. The same test is scheduled to be given again in June.

Community residents were involved in all stages of the program. A survey was held of about 600 target area residents to find out what programs they wanted. In August, the central Board of Education appointed a temporary community advisory board, which approved the after-school basic skills and bilingual program. A permanent advisory board made up of representatives elected by the parents of the 10 target school districts and appointees of the Board of Education first met in December. For the remainder of the school year, the board approved all staff members before they were hired and decided on major issues relating to budget and program operation.

The first basic education classes and the bilingual program started in January. Additional classes started as staff was hired. By May, 55 teachers worked in the six schools, serving approximately 482 students. The adult and the high school tutorial sessions began in April. The West Side Community Center opened in March and the East Side Community Center is expected to open later in the Spring. Guidance staff worked out of both Centers before the Centers were operating. Neither Center is expected to offer all the guidance, tutorial, and counseling programs which were originally proposed during the 1968-69 school year.

City Troy

Activity No. 3078

Activity Title Operation BOOTSTRAPS-

Upgrading of Basic Skills

Population Served

20 third and fourth grade pupils participate in this activity.

Date Began January 1, 1969

Date Visited April 2

Budget: State \$20,910 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Two self-contained classes are set up for students who are achieving below grade level in a program designed to improve the basic skills through small group instruction. Each class, one at the third and one at the fourth grade level, contains 10 students.

With the exception of music, art, and recreation, students spend the entire day with the same instructor. They receive instruction individually and in small groups in mathematics, reading, social studies, and science. The curriculum varies from day-to-day and lesson units are scheduled according to the needs of each class. Materials and equipment such as Language Masters, tape recorders, record players, charts, maps, and texts are used. Special emphasis is given to increasing the students' reading comprehension, building up their vocabulary, and improving their speed and accuracy in mathematics.

The participants are students of average intelligence who are working below grade level. They were selected by the project coordinator after consultation with the city's curriculum coordinator and Title I staff. Children with serious behavioral problems were not included.

Although the program was in operation for only 3 months at the time of the visit, several teachers had already reported attitudinal changes in the students. The staff said the children are learning how to help one another in studying concepts presented in the lesson units.

An evaluation is planned using information from standard reading and mathematics tests and attitude scales developed on the students.

City Utica

Activity No. 3131

Activity Title Nongraded Primary  
and Early Intermediate Program

Population Served  
  
250 elementary pupils are reached  
by this activity.

Date Began September 1968

Date Visited May 14, 15

Budget: State \$7,287 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 250 elementary school students attend a nongraded elementary school in a predominately black, low-income area of the city. Each student is assigned to a multi-age class according to his achievement level in reading and mathematics. Five teams of teachers work with the different achievement level groups. One of these teams assists the physically and mentally handicapped students who are assigned to special education classes from schools throughout the city. Resource teachers, including music and art instructors, a physical education teacher, a corrective reading teacher, and a librarian serve the entire school. In addition, students from Hamilton College conduct a recreational program for the handicapped children 2 days each week. Students with emotional or family problems are given assistance by the school's guidance staff.

The school is financed through city, State, and Federal funds. The Urban Education allocation of \$7,287 is used to pay the salary of one of the three paraprofessionals in the school, to buy reading and other audiovisual equipment, and to finance field trips for the students. According to the project director, additional funds will be needed in the future to purchase more equipment and to finance trips for the teachers to observe other nongraded schools.

The program is designed to raise the achievement level of students, to increase their level of motivation, and to improve their behavior through individualized instruction in a learning situation geared to the individual student's needs. According to the staff interviewed, the students were placed successfully at their own achievement level and receive instruction at rates of speed appropriate to each individual. An evaluation is being conducted by a team from Colgate University at the end of the year. However, no data were available at the time of the visit. Further evaluation using achievement tests and teacher ratings is planned by the school staff. Continual changes in grouping are made based upon achievement tests administered periodically.

The program evaluator said the program is strong in two areas: teacher involvement and parent-teacher contact. All the teachers are members of the regular school system and many of them had been involved in the planning of the school the previous year. Many had actively participated in making the decisions about the changes in

organization and curriculum. Once the school began, a schedule was set up to increase the parent-teacher contact. Six afternoons and two evenings are reserved for parent-teacher conferences. The parents are invited to come to the school and discuss their children's progress and special problems. Parents who are unable to attend the scheduled conferences are visited by the teachers at home.

### iii. Guidance Services

#### Critical Points:

- Programs offer counseling in the areas of health, education, career, and family life.
  - Ten projects costing approximately \$860,000 and serving about 800 elementary and 6,500 secondary students were visited.
  - In the majority of the programs, a relatively small number of students are served.
  - Volunteers play an important role in several guidance activities.
  - The majority of the programs stress the need to involve the parents in their children's problems.
- 

Programs offering counseling to students and parents in the areas of health, education, career, and family life are included in this category. The emphasis is on improving the students' self-image, behavior patterns, and helping students and their families find solutions to their problems at home. In some programs, counselors work with students and their families on a one-to-one basis, and outside agencies such as housing, welfare, and medical groups are called in when needed. In other programs, vocational training or career guidance is offered to students on both an individual and group level. In a third type of program, students with poor behavior problems are taken out of the regular classrooms and put in special classes where academic instruction as well as counseling is offered.

Ten projects costing approximately \$860,000 and serving about 800 elementary and 6,500 secondary students were visited. In the majority of the programs a relatively small number of students are served, either because the programs operate on a one-to-one basis or because the services are offered over an extended period of time. In one New York City program community men work with 38 boys as surrogate

"fathers." In a horticultural work-study program, also in New York City, only 20 students are served. The exception is New York's Operation SEARCH, in which several thousand secondary students receive college and career counseling.

Volunteers play an important role in several guidance activities. The White Plains guidance program depends largely upon the volunteer work of the 18 psychology graduate students from Columbia University Teachers College. In Staten Island's Project REAL volunteer consultants from the New York area colleges run weekly training workshops for project counselors. Another example is the staff at the New York Botanical Gardens in the Bronx who work without pay with 20 students in a work-study program.

Lastly, the majority of the programs stress the need to involve the parents in their children's problems. In the Staten Island project, the counselors meet with the parents of all the participants to discuss the educational and career opportunities open to their children, and the paraprofessional family assistants in "Brandeis Reach Out" make a special effort to contact families of students with special problems.

City Middletown

Activity No. 3061

Activity Title Contemporary Home and  
Neighborhood Environment Program

Population Served

293 elementary and 209 secondary students participate in this activity.

Date Began November 15, 1968

Date Visited May 7, 8

Budget: State \$23,439 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Under this program, about 500 students and many of their parents receive information on health and related topics and specialized treatment when needed. The general objective is to remove the barriers to learning associated with poor health caused by poverty. Four half-time health clerks replace the regular nurses at four schools, freeing the nurses to work on individual cases. Two home counselors assist the nurses with the nonmedical problems of the participants families. A teacher gives lectures on sex education, narcotics, and good health habits at one of the senior high schools. The project draws upon similar experience gained through a previous Title I program.

The four health clerks take over many administrative and routine duties of four nurses in the school system. The nurses use the additional time to help students with social problems. The nurses work in close cooperation with the school system's psychologist and guidance counselors who are paid through city funds. The two home-school counselors visit the families of the participating students when necessary. They give health information to the parents, notify them of their own and their children's health needs, and refer the families to outside agencies when further assistance is needed. Approximately 157 families were visited and received followup treatment during the year.

Students are referred to the nurses for individual case work by the school principals, the school psychologist, and regular classroom teachers. The nurses call in specialized school staff or the Urban Education school-home counselors.

An evaluation is planned using records on the medical and family history of all the participants; evaluation sheets on the attitude, appearance, and classroom behavior; and attendance, home visit, and agency-referral records.

City New York City

Activity No. 41010

Activity Title Gardener Trainee

\_\_\_\_\_

Population Served

20 secondary students representing about one quarter of those who could be helped by this activity.

Date Began February 1969

Date Visited April 23

Budget: State \$21,933 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

A work-study activity teaches horticultural and maintenance skills as well as the regular academic subjects to 20 ninth grade potential dropouts from two schools in District 10 in the Bronx. The program is designed to improve their self-image and to teach them vocational skills.

The students attend their regular schools for part of each day and work for the remaining periods at the New York Botanical Gardens, where they receive on-the-job training in all aspects of horticulture including pruning, planting, and operating machinery such as tractors and saws.

According to the project staff, the success of the activity depends largely on the enthusiasm and skill of the Botanical Garden staff, who are not paid for their work with the students. The staff does assist the activity greatly, since the students have the opportunity to work with adults who respect their ability to be productive. This attitude of others assists in improving the self-image of students who do not normally satisfy conventional school demands.

Students interviewed were not as enthusiastic about their academic studies. In their regular classrooms, material is not adjusted to the vocational program. Development of closer relationships between the field and classroom programs should result in greater support by the students for the academic phase. In spite of this shortcoming, however, this program appears to be operating very smoothly and providing relevant experiences for boys beyond the normal school environment.

City New York City

Activity No. 42105

Activity Title "Fathers-In-Charge"

Population Served

38 fatherless fourth grade boys are helped by 19 community residents.

Date Began February 1969

Date Visited June 4

Budget: State \$43,905 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Each of 19 men who live in the community and have sons of their own works with two fatherless fourth grade boys in a program in three elementary schools in District 21 in Brooklyn. The project is designed to raise the boys' academic performance and to improve their behavioral patterns and their attitudes toward school and society. The substitute "fathers" are intended to provide a masculine image for and offer a stabilizing force to the participating children.

The fathers spend 2 hours a night with their assigned "sons" during the week and one day over the weekend. During the week, they assist the boys with their homework and advise them on school problems. On the weekend, they take trips together, play ball, and go camping, swimming, and hiking. The boys are included in the normal household routine of the fathers and are treated as regular members of the household as much as possible.

The boys are selected by the local Urban Education staff from lists submitted by the schools. The real fathers of all participants have been absent from home for at least a year. "Fathers" who have a steady employment record and stable families are selected for the program. Urban Education funds provide for part-time assistance by a social worker, a psychologist, a family assistant, and a clerk in each of the participating schools. The men meet once a week to discuss the program's progress.

The project administrators praised the commitment of the entire families of the fathers to the program. They said the major problems arise as a result of Board of Education procedures and regulations. In particular, the fathers have difficulty in obtaining funds for projects with their sons. The fathers criticized the need to account for all money spent, including small amounts for activities which do not provide receipts.

City New York City

Activity No. 43001

Activity Title Project REAL

Date Began January 1969

Population Served  
300 secondary school students actually benefit from this activity while another 300 were used as a control group.

Date Visited June 5, 6

Budget: State \$40,333 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Project REAL (Raise Educational Aspiration Level) in New York City's Richmond County (Staten Island) is a guidance activity designed to help disadvantaged junior high school students become aware of career and educational opportunities and thus raise their level of educational aspiration. This goal was suggested by the local Poverty Corporation whose Project CIVIC (a now defunct Title I project) was developed with community representatives to meet this same need.

Seventy-five children in each of four schools were selected for the program using three main criteria: good achievement records, economic deprivation, and low aspiration level. The level of aspiration was measured by a special test instrument developed by the project staff. Three hundred other seventh grade children, comprising a control group, also were given this test.

The program uses a variety of techniques including intensive individual counseling for both students and parents (at least one parent of every student in the program has been contacted), "career days," "college nights," and tours of Staten Island Community College (where students acted as guides) and other local colleges and local industries.

Training workshops for project counselors are held approximately once a week using volunteer consultants from local colleges. Local newspaper coverage (at the time of the visit) is going to be expanded into a weekly column.

In order to evaluate the program's success, the aspiration indicator is to be administered (both to the experimental and to the control group) again at the end of the program. At the time of the visit, however, it was apparent that the parent participation and interest will emerge as one of the project's major strengths and successes. At the parents' request, student reading scores and their corresponding grade level are to appear on report cards, and the local PTA had begun a campaign supporting the continuation of the program.

City New York City

Activity No. 40501

Activity Title "Brandeis Reach Out"

Population Served

150 secondary students are assisted. It is estimated that this represents 15 percent of those eligible for this activity.

Date Began February 3, 1969

Date Visited May 16

Budget: State \$40,394 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 150 secondary students with family problems at Brandeis High School in District 5 in Harlem receive assistance from 14 community residents employed as family assistants. The project gives these family assistants from the community a major role, under supervision, in the school guidance program, because they are called upon to establish contact with the students, parents, and school staff. The students are also tutored in the basic skills and academic subjects.

Students may be referred to the two program coordinators by teachers, guidance counselors, and deans. The majority are selected primarily because of poor attendance records; however, none is a "hard-core" truant or extreme discipline problem. Family assistants meet with each student individually, visit his family when necessary, and offer such assistance or guidance as may be indicated. Frequently they will refer the student or his family to other agencies when additional help is needed. In general, the assistants function as "substitute" parents, giving the student support and acting as liaison between the student and school or family. It is initially assumed that the students' difficulties would be related to school; but the troubles of most of the participants have been found to have their origins in the home. As a result, many referrals are made to medical, housing, welfare, or family counseling agencies in the area.

Members of the community are involved in many ways. Three Harlem community corporations originally established under the Community Action Program, suggested the project. They then reviewed applications for family assistant positions and made recommendations to the district office. Further, it should be noted that many other local agencies participate in the program either through referral or in the treatment of participants. These agencies include the Rockefeller Institute, the Urban League Street Academies, Harlem Hospital, the Hamilton Welfare Center, and other authorities concerned with drug addiction, juvenile problems, and housing.

Although the project lacks a comprehensive preservice or inservice training program, the family assistants are given a short orientation session on school operations and the manner in which they are to function as family assistants. They are shown how to locate attendance and academic records and are told whom to contact for additional information on the students. Whenever possible, one of the coordinators accompanies

each assistant on her first home visit. The director also indicated that additional support staff, including doctors, guidance counselors, and psychologists, would make the program more effective and meet the needs of other students awaiting service from the project.

A special program of group tutoring is offered to the "Brandeis Reach Out" students referred for this purpose. Teachers in the high school assisted by a group of 15 exceptionally bright students who have volunteered to act as tutors, have organized and are operating the tutoring activity at the school.

City New York City

Activity No. 40905

Activity Title Assisting Students With  
Serious Behavior Problems

Population Served

90 elementary and 40 secondary students — or slightly over 20 percent of those eligible — are served.

Date Began February 1, 1969

Date Visited May 14, 1969

Budget: State \$197,475 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Approximately 120 children whose behavior was severely disruptive in regular classes are receiving close individual attention in classes of no more than 15 students each. These smaller classes are each staffed by two teachers and one paraprofessional. Children are selected for placement in the special classes on the recommendations of the regular classroom teachers, school counselors, and school administrators.

Two principal objectives of the program are: to provide individual remediation for troublesome students within the school setting; and to provide an improved learning environment for other students by removing disruptive children from the classroom.

The second objective listed above was achieved by the physical removal of children with the most serious behavioral problems from regular classrooms. The project coordinator, principals at the schools visited, school counselors, and regular classroom teachers all commented on the improved atmosphere and more rapid progress of classes which no longer have severely disruptive children. Another general comment by all concerned was to the effect that the positive impact of the program on an entire school building is much greater than the number of children in the program would lead one to suspect.

The first objective, assisting the student with behavior problems, is seen by the staff as a function of the ability to deal helpfully with the student at the time of the behavior. Typically, when a student in one of the special classes "acts out," one of the two teachers in the classroom or the paraprofessional is able to concentrate his attention on that child, either in the classroom or outside, and to help the student realize why the behavior is inappropriate. While that problem is being handled, instruction for the other children in the class continues. One measure of success cited by the staff was that several children had improved their behavior to the extent that they had been returned to regular classes and are functioning well there.

Formal evaluation of the program is to be made through a questionnaire to be completed by all staff persons involved. That instrument had not been designed at the time of the visit. Additional evaluative input is to come from the Urban Education coordinator for the district.

There was no preservice training for the program staff, and inservice training is conducted by the program coordinator who makes regular and frequent visits to each of the special classes. His visits are frequent enough that he knows most of the children in the program by name and they know him. Supervision of the staff, other than inservice training, is the responsibility of the principal of each school, and special classes were in operation at seven separate schools at the time of the visit.

There are some problems cited by program administrators. One is a shortage of teachers experienced in handling disruptive youngsters, and the difficulty of mid-year recruiting. Another is that of obtaining funds for certain desired activities and the program director expressed the desire for a limited amount of money in a "discretionary fund" which, while accounted for, would allow more flexibility in providing specific needed experiences for the children.

Another problem arose in attempting to obtain the services of a psychiatrist. Program administrators suggested that an unacceptable rate of compensation and additional certification requirements (other than their professional preparation and licensing requirements) established by the New York City Bureau of Child Guidance are the reasons for this difficulty. No psychiatrist had been retained at the time of the visit.

The superintendent of the district voiced the opinion that this program had more positive effects within the district than almost any other.

City New York City

Activity No. 42701

Activity Title Operation SEARCH

Population Served

5,500 secondary students in this district participate in this activity.

Date Began January 1, 1969

Date Visited June 2, 3

Budget: State \$285,746 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

This program involves 23 guidance counselors, six teachers, and clerical support in an effort to improve and extend services to 5,500 high school seniors and juniors. The primary aim is toward those students who will be graduated without the prospect of admission to college. The secondary aim is toward those who will have some prospect of admission to further education.

The program is an extension of school guidance services with the following objectives:

- Identify eligible students;
- Provide available information concerning education and training beyond the secondary level from colleges, junior colleges, vocational schools, and industry;
- Involve parents in the program;
- Change curriculum content for students as the need for changes becomes known;
- Build in evaluation of the entire program.

To meet these objectives, one full-time guidance counselor is assigned to a group of 250 eligible students. Counselors meet with the students to assist them in realistic decision making, and to refer those who need and want assistance in preparing for civil service, college entrance, and other examinations to special full-time teachers. The original plan proposed to involve parents, and, as a result, almost all parents of eligible students have been contacted at least once. The workload of the counselors is such that more than a superficial involvement can be accomplished in only a minimum number of cases. Despite this fact, program administrators pointed out that the cost of the program was principally because of the large number of professional counselors involved.

The Program director, the staff, and teachers in the high schools all commented on two main points:

- The program appears to be having a positive effect on the students involved and on the general atmosphere of the schools
- There is no provision in the program to reach out to the youngster who has already dropped out of school and to bring him back to use the services of the program.

The eligible students who were interviewed feel that the program provides them with some concrete tools and helps them to set realistic aspirations and to meet them.

Evaluation of the program is to be conducted through use of student profiles, comparisons with previous student placement, questionnaires, and subjective appraisals by parents, students, and counselors. None of these data was available at the time of the visit.

City Poughkeepsie

Activity No. 2029 (Activity A)

Activity Title Prekindergarten Social

Psychologist Interaction Specialist

Population Served

All target Poughkeepsie pre-kindergarten children are eligible for this activity.

Date Began Non-Operating

Date Visited May 20, 1969

Budget: State \$12,500 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Poughkeepsie's Urban Education program calls for the establishment of a large Urban-Core-City Interaction Center designed to "evolutionize (the) Poughkeepsie City School District...for marshalling Poughkeepsie's resources to better identify and service the individualized needs of learners..." as well as to provide supporting services for teachers and to develop community participation.

Activity A is one aspect of this Center, and provides for a Prekindergarten Social Psychologist Interaction Specialist. The \$12,500 salary for this position represents the extent of Urban Education money allotted to it. The main duties of this specialist will be to establish a central data bank to "...direct the child through the parents, to the 150 agencies offering education or education-related programs, Poughkeepsie School District specialized personnel, private and non-public educational institutions, etc.," and follow through with the preparation of individualized records for all Poughkeepsie prekindergarten children.

As of the date of the visit, this activity was not underway because Poughkeepsie officials had experienced difficulty finding someone qualified in the middle of the year. A candidate had been identified, however, and they thought the job would be filled and operating by midsummer.

City Syracuse

Activity No. 3047

Activity Title Special Classes For

Problem Students

Population Served

271 elementary students, representing about 35 percent of those who qualify, are served by this activity.

Date Began September 1, 1968

Date Visited May 13

Budget: State \$189,600 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Two hundred and seventy one first through sixth grade students with learning or behavior problems receive remedial instruction in the basic skills and counseling from special education and resource teachers. Students with less serious problems attend scheduled classes at their own school while they continue in the regular school routine. Students whose problems are more severe attend day-long special education classes held at three schools in the city. The program attempts to adjust the child's behavior so that he can adapt to the regimen of the school and to identify his needs better so that services can be geared accordingly.

Seven resource teachers hold classes for 20 students at a time in the regular schools. The resource instructors teach the student the basic skills, help the youngsters with family and school problems, and attempt to build their self-confidence and improve their attitude toward school. The students are sent back to the regular classrooms as soon as their behavior or academic record improves. The resource teachers visit the students' parents to discuss their children's problems and to obtain their cooperation. They also meet with the students' regular classroom teachers to develop a continuing program for the problem students after they return to the regular classroom.

Nine special education teachers hold classes for a maximum of 12 students with more serious academic or emotional disorders. Students are sent from all the schools in the city to the day-long program. They are recommended by the school principals and are interviewed by the psychologists before they enter the special education classes. The teacher assesses the educational and behavioral strengths and weaknesses of each child and plans an individualized program to meet his needs. The teacher gives instruction in the basic skills, counsels the students and their parents, and provides psycho-educational experiences to increase the student's motivation and self-confidence. Much of the teaching is on a one-to-one basis and some students are tutored individually for a half or two-thirds of the school day. Programed materials, reading machines, and other audiovisual equipment are used.

In general, the students in the rehabilitation classes are those with chronic truancy records, bad behavior records, or consistently poor academic records. Many are potential dropouts who have little interest in school. The teachers keep folders on each student including information on his study habits, his classroom behavior, and his family.

An evaluation is planned using data from pre- and post-tests, information submitted by the teacher on each student's attendance, work habits, and background, and a poll of teacher opinion. Additional information will be gathered on each student a year after he leaves the special classes for a follow-up evaluation.

Although inservice training meetings are held once a month for the entire teaching staff, there are no preservice or inservice sessions for the Urban Education staff. According to the project director, a specialized training program is needed.

City White Plains

Activity No. 3042

Activity Title Psychological Services

Population Served

106 elementary and 50 secondary students are participating in this activity.

Date Began September 1968

Date Visited May 8

Budget: State \$4,210 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Teachers College of Columbia University and the White Plains school system jointly sponsor a student services program which serves 106 elementary and 50 junior high school students in the city of White Plains. The project introduces a new approach to school guidance services inasmuch as it is designed to treat rather than simply diagnose student problems. The project director, a psychologist from Teachers College, and 18 graduate psychology students meet with teachers and guidance counselors in three schools and treat students with learning disabilities or behavioral problems. The director's salary is paid with funds from Urban Education and from Teachers College, while the program utilizes the volunteer services of nine students each semester.

Students with special problems are referred to the program by the regular teachers and staff guidance counselors. The project director and the teacher develop a program geared to the needs of a particular child. The graduate students hold small classes to build up pupil strengths and to treat weaknesses. Role playing, games, and programmed educational materials are used to correct learning disabilities, sharpen the students' academic skills, and improve their behavior. Whenever possible, the teachers continue the treatment using similar techniques in regular classes.

The graduate students attempt to correct student difficulties. Thus the role of the school psychologist is shifted from the traditional testing and diagnosing function to the actual treatment of problems. According to the program director, teachers generally diagnose problems accurately, and, as a result, the need for extensive psychological testing of individual students is diminishing.

As in many cases where specialists are used in the regular classrooms, many teachers initially resisted the advice of the graduate students. However, the local Urban Education staff said that the teachers have become more cooperative as the year progresses. Although teacher training was written into the activity proposal, the project director did not have enough time to provide formal sessions. Several persons suggested that scheduled inservice training for the regular teaching staff would increase the program's effectiveness in the future.

#### iv. Staff Training

##### Critical Points:

- A total of approximately \$1,300,000 was appropriated for these five programs.
  - A major aim of the programs in this category is to provide formal training to local residents and involve them in actual classroom operations.
  - In all, approximately 690 paraprofessionals and 50 teachers received special training.
  - The extent of formal attempts to assess the effectiveness of programs was limited.
  - Because of late funding, programs did not begin operating until mid-spring 1969.
- 

The major aim of three of the five programs in this category was to provide formal training to local residents to involve them in actual classroom operations. This would reduce the load on teachers by providing them with assistance in administrative duties, reduce the pupil/staff ratio (thus providing more individualized attention), and decrease the polarization between home and school so often prevalent in inner-city schools.

Programs of this nature reflect an expressed purpose of the Urban Education program: to develop indigenous talent and provide them with the opportunity to participate in local school operations. Of the total of approximately \$1,300,000 appropriated for activities in this category the bulk (\$1,109,372) was placed in an ambitious project to train local residents to work as teacher assistants in low-income areas in New York City. Smaller activities in this category include training programs for existing staff in Albany and Hempstead. In all, approximately 690 paraprofessionals and 50 teachers received special training.

Because of late funding, programs did not begin operating until mid-spring 1969. In addition to causing limited operations, this late funding made it difficult to identify and recruit staff, and caused curtailed preservice training programs. Many community residents were unwilling to work for the short period remaining in the school year; others refused jobs in fear of having their welfare payments reduced.

Project staff were quick to comment that paraprofessional preservice training was weak in two of the activities visited. As a result, participants were not well prepared to contribute to the program effectively, and were assigned clerical duties and other tasks such as passing out snacks and supervising in the lunchroom. More intensive staff training was provided in the other three activities.

With the exception of Albany and Mount Vernon, the extent of formal attempts to assess the effectiveness of programs was limited. In two activities, the attempts were to measure attitude change on the part of teacher aides toward their schools, to have supervisory personnel evaluate daily performance, and to ask participants to rate the quality of their own performance. However, results were not available at the time of the site visits.

City Albany

Activity No. 3088

Activity Title Project for Improved

Pupil Achievement and Success

<b>Population Served</b>
640 elementary and 70 secondary students benefit from a team teaching program for 34 teachers.

Date Began March 1969

Date Visited May 28, 29

Budget: State \$66,297 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Resource teachers lead teacher teams in five inner-city schools in a program designed to develop a curriculum relevant to the inner-city students, to coordinate programs within each school, and to introduce new teaching methods and materials into the classroom. Five lead teachers, each working in a different school, work with 34 regular classroom teachers. Approximately 640 first through sixth grade students and 70 seventh through ninth grade students are served.

The teaching teams meet for at least two 30-minute periods per week at each school to discuss methods of teaching, to develop new curriculum materials, and to plan their programs. In particular, the teaching teams explore various teaching tactics such as the most effective use of individualized instruction, the need for an interdisciplinary approach to subject matter, and the introduction of field trips into the regular academic curriculum. The teaching teams work closely with the guidance counselors, the reading specialists, the speech therapists, and the psychologist to identify students with special problems and to plan a program to answer the individual needs.

Each resource teacher also holds demonstration classes to illustrate the ideas proposed and discussed at the team planning meetings. The resource teacher, the team teachers, and the school's specialists all participate in the demonstration classes according to the needs of each session. The resource teacher also observes the regular teachers in their classrooms.

The five resource teachers meet at least twice a month to discuss common problems and goals. They also meet with the district supervisors to coordinate the team planning activities with the overall district program.

The resource teachers are regular staff members with at least 3 years of teaching experience. They are selected on the basis of recommendations by the district supervisors, the school principals, and the other teachers in the schools. The teachers in the five teams volunteer for the program. According to the project staff, both the team teachers and the other teachers in the participating schools responded with enthusiasm to the program; many regular teachers asked for information on team



planning. As a result, the chief resource teacher started working after school hours and weekends with those teachers who were not included in the Urban Education program.

The five resource teachers took part in an intensive preservice training session on team teaching methods. Because of a delay in funding, this session was cut back from 2 weeks to 3 days. The teachers were not able to observe team teachers in nearby school districts as proposed. Instead, they limited their studies to published materials on team planning.

Information to be used for the program evaluation includes anecdotal and other data recorded by the teachers, evaluation forms filled out by the teachers and administrators, and ratings of student behavior.

City Hempstead

Activity No. 3110

Activity Title Reading Seminars for

Teachers

Population Served  
A small group of supervisors and department heads benefited from this activity.

Date Began February 1969

Date Visited April 29

Budget: State \$30,623 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

This project proposal called for a reading specialist to work with individual teachers and students. However, because the school administrator was unable to find the necessary personnel, a series of informal seminars on reading was held for the chairmen of the department and a few teachers at Hempstead High School. There was little advance notice about the program so a large number of teachers who might have been interested in the discussions could not attend. Several of the teachers who did attend said that the program content did not relate to the problems faced by the teachers in the classroom, and there was no set of follow-up activities in the classroom. One teacher specifically said that the program told her nothing about how to help students read better.

City Lackawanna

Activity No. 3075

Activity Title Paraprofessional

Assistance to High Failure Classrooms

Started September 1968;  
Date Began expanded January 1969

Population Served  
306 elementary and 28 secondary students - 20 percent of those in the school system - are helped by 6 paraprofessionals.

Date Visited May 19, 20

Budget: State \$31,553 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Six community residents assist regular classroom teachers in two elementary schools and one junior high school in a heavily industrialized, low-income area of the city. The paraprofessionals take over many administrative duties from the "lead" teachers and also work directly with the students. They attempt to develop students' listening skills with the aid of audiovisual equipment, reinforce reading skills by listening to the children read, and develop the students' language skills through vocabulary drills. They do not serve as community liaison workers as originally proposed.

The paraprofessionals are community residents who have had previous experience in community work. They are recommended by a 20-member community advisory council, made up of representatives of the central Board of Education, public and parochial schools in the area, and community organizations such as Friendship House. Each group selects its own representatives. The advisory council remained active in the program after it began.

The paraprofessionals receive 2 weeks of preservice training. Inservice training includes monthly meetings in Buffalo and occasional meetings with the school administrators. Several project staff members said they thought increased training for both the paraprofessionals and the lead teachers would improve the program.

Three paraprofessionals started in September. They were each assigned to one classroom full time and worked under the direction of one lead teacher throughout the year. The project staff said that they communicated well with the students and made valuable contributions to the classes. Three more paraprofessionals were hired in January after the funds for a second project were transferred to the teacher assistant activity. The second group rotates among four classes. According to several persons interviewed, this arrangement restricts their effectiveness because they are unable to establish their position in any of the classes in which they participate.

City Mount Vernon

Activity No. 3128

Activity Title Parent-Teacher Aides  
in the Classroom

Population Served

27 paraprofessionals serve almost 75 percent of the students eligible for this service.

Date Began March 1969

Date Visited May 27

Budget: State \$48,549 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Twenty-seven aides, who are local parents, assist regular classroom teachers in kindergarten through third grades in five elementary schools in the city. The aides take over many of the clerical and supervisory tasks of the teacher, but they also take part in the education process, drilling and helping students with special problems. The program is designed both to improve the performance of the pupils by bringing another adult into the classroom and to decrease the polarization between school and community by involving the parents in school activities.

Formal staff training for aides was limited. The aides, who were selected by the principals who knew them, attended a preservice orientation session. The regular classroom teachers are responsible for continuing the training in the classroom. It was emphasized that the aides are not to become "classroom domestics" and that they are to be involved in the instruction of the students.

Aides interviewed during the site visit were very enthusiastic. Several said they were considering continuing their studies and becoming teachers.

The evaluation plan included attitude questionnaires filled out by the aides at the beginning and the end of the program and performance ratings on the aides made by the principals, the participating teachers, and the aides themselves.

Many of the project staff said that the program ought to be expanded in the future, particularly to include the fourth through fifth grades. The project coordinator said that there were many more qualified applicants than positions and that over 200 volunteer aides are working in the Mount Vernon school system.

City New York City - Central

Activity No. 3090

Activity Title Educational Assistance

Program

Population Served  
Third grade students in 300  
Special Service Schools are  
served by this activity.

Date Began February 1969

Date Visited May 22

Budget: State \$1,109,372 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Six hundred and twenty community residents work as teacher assistants in third grade classrooms in low-income areas of the City. They assist the students with reading and mathematics skills and assume many of the nonacademic classroom roles. They keep attendance records, help in the lunchroom and on the playground, and assist with clean up, thus freeing teachers to spend more time in academic matters.

The aides are required to have high school diplomas (or a satisfactory equivalent) and to be community residents meeting certain low-income requirements. The majority of the aides are referred to the individual schools by local community groups. The final selection is made by the principal of each school. They are assigned to third grade classes with a low pupil achievement level, where students need intensive remedial assistance in the basis skills.

The program is an extension of a Title I program which finances Educational Assistants in kindergarten and first grade in the City, and, therefore, the recruiting and training machinery was already set up. However, the training program developed for the Title I assistants was written for aides in kindergarten and first grade, and according to several persons interviewed, does not always meet the needs of the third grade assistants.

The training program developed by the Auxiliary Education Career Unit of the central Board of Education provides for comprehensive preservice and inservice training sessions for both professional and paraprofessional personnel. Through an agreement with the City University of New York, the assistants are eligible for a work-study program in which they may ultimately receive college degrees. This "career ladder" has been set up to enable the paraprofessionals to continue working and studying until they receive college degrees.

Two weeks of orientation were planned for the paraprofessionals. Half the sessions were reserved for group training and the remainder were reserved for guided observation and limited classroom participation. Inservice training meetings were scheduled once a month. However, because of the delay in funds, the program did not begin until February. The preservice training was cut short in

many schools and the inservice sessions were restricted because the staff and school schedules were already set for the term.

The training sessions are based on the philosophy and goals of education and child development as well as on clerical and monitorial skills. The assistants are taught how to help the students with their handwriting and with their arithmetic drills, and they are exposed to techniques for teaching reading, as well as materials for teaching English-as-a-Second-Language.

As in many programs in New York City, the payroll presented the largest problem in the program. Salary checks were delayed while the City processed the applications. When pay checks did arrive, they were often inaccurate. The delays and errors were unfortunate because they worked against one of the primary aims of the program -- the improvement of school and community relations.

## v. Bilingual Programs

### Critical Points:

- These projects provide instruction in all the academic areas in the student's first language and instruction in English-as-a-Second Language.
- Programs costing over half a million dollars and serving primarily elementary school students were visited.
- Often, there are not enough certified bilingual teachers to fill the existing positions.
- Additional training is needed because many of the project teachers and paraprofessionals were not familiar with the needs of the non-English speaking students.

---

Bilingual programs fill a vital role in the education of Spanish- and Chinese-speaking children, primarily in New York City. Generally, these projects provide two kinds of assistance, instruction in all the academic areas in the students' first language and instruction in English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) to enable the students to understand the regular classroom activities. Five programs costing over a half million dollars and serving primarily elementary school students were visited. In **one** case, paraprofessionals tutor Spanish-speaking students in English in reading centers in 25 schools; in another, Spanish-speaking teaching assistants go into the regular academic classrooms and assist non-English-speaking students in the regular academic subject.

Often, there are not enough certified teachers to fill the existing positions. Because of the city certification requirements, many qualified persons fluent in Spanish or Cantonese are not permitted to teach. In some cases, certified teachers who do not have the language ability are hired. In other cases, paraprofessionals or teaching assistants are used instead. In one program on the lower east side of Manhattan, the

central Board of Education transferred Spanish-speaking graduate students who were already on the school system's payroll to the Urban Education program. These teaching assistants, who studied at night at either Brooklyn College or Lehman College in the Bronx, took on many of the duties of the regular classroom teachers.

Also, the programs lack texts and materials geared to the interests and experiences of the non-English-speaking children. With the exception of one activity where materials were developed by an outside consultant for Spanish-speaking students, the project staff uses the standard textbooks written for English-speaking students. Several project staff interviewed said there are no books and curriculum materials on the market for Chinese-speaking students.

With one exception, the staff interviewed said, the preservice and the inservice training programs in the activities were relatively weak. Additional training is needed because many of the project teachers and paraprofessionals are not familiar with the needs of the non-English-speaking students. They said training sessions also are necessary for the regular school teachers who often resent the bilingual specialists in the classroom. The exception is a bilingual program in New York City which has developed a comprehensive training program since it was set up under Title I funds in 1967. Lead teachers attended special workshops in Texas and the staff members of participating schools attend general orientation meetings organized by the central Board of Education.

City New York City

Activity No. 41401

Activity Title Language Helper Program

Population Served  
1,150 elementary and 25 secondary students — about 5 to 10 percent of those eligible — are reached by this activity.

Date Began March 1969

Date Visited May 14, 15

Budget: State \$277,359 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

A total of 115 paraprofessionals tutor about 1,150 students, most of whom speak Spanish as a native language, in reading and language skills in 20 elementary and five secondary schools in District 14 in Brooklyn. Five paraprofessionals work under the Corrective Reading Teacher at each school, where a miniature laboratory is set up. The paraprofessionals work with the students on a one-to-one basis, using reading machines, other audiovisual equipment, and English-as-a-Second Language programmed materials. Additional materials at the District Reading Clinic in one of the schools also are available. Four full-time coordinators direct the program.

The program is designed to teach English to non-English-speaking students and other students whose English is weak, to improve their language and reading skills, to motivate them to speak and study, and to increase their self-confidence in class. According to the project coordinators, many teachers commented favorably on the improvement in academic performance, attendance, and behavior of participating students in the first months of the program's operation. An evaluation is planned using achievement tests, behavioral ratings, tapes of classroom activities, and a survey of the paraprofessionals' effectiveness developed by Fordham University staff. No data from this evaluation were available at the time of the site visit.

The paraprofessionals are hired by the principals of each school. The majority are bilingual and, whenever possible, their language abilities reflect the linguistic makeup of the surrounding community. If 60 percent of the school population is Spanish speaking, then three of the five paraprofessionals are required to speak Spanish. Many are referred to the schools by parent associations or community groups. The training for the paraprofessionals varies from school to school. However, the assistants generally receive a short orientation in school operating procedures and instruction in the use of the materials and equipment.

The students are selected by the school principals on the basis of recommendations by the non-English-speaking coordinator and the corrective reading teacher at the school. The coordinators screen each student's records, including forms filled out by the regular classroom teachers and ratings on a standard citywide scale measuring his ability to speak English. Only a small percentage (5-10) of the total student population in need of tutoring in reading and language skills is presently being served.

Because of a delay in funding, the principals did not begin recruiting staff until February and the program did not begin operating until March. The project coordinator said they had difficulty recruiting assistants because many community residents were unwilling to work for the short period remaining in the school year. The coordinators said the paraprofessionals criticized the low salary scale and the overcrowded facilities. Additional problems arose when their salary payments were delayed for as long as 4 or 5 weeks.

City New York City

Activity No. 40303

Activity Title Bilingual Program

Date Began March 1969

Population Served  
60 preschool, 288 elementary, and 65 secondary students are assisted by this activity — an estimated 10 to 20 percent of the District's eligible population.

Date Visited May 21, 23

Budget: State \$51,327 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

A bilingual program in Spanish and Cantonese serves 414 children in District 3 in Manhattan, where the population is 50 percent Puerto Rican and 20 percent Chinese. The students receive instruction in English-as-a-Second Language and tutorial assistance in their native language. Classes with a high percentage of students with low ratings in the standard tests given to non-English-speaking children are selected for the program.

Because of a scarcity of certified bilingual teachers, only one of the five proposed bilingual teachers was hired. The director also was unable to find bilingual paraprofessionals and only two of the proposed 11 educational assistants were hired. The three members who were hired speak Cantonese.

To help meet the needs of the Spanish-speaking population, the central Board of Education transferred 12 Spanish-speaking graduate students who were already on the school system's payroll to the Urban Education program. Most of them had come from Puerto Rico or Santo Domingo where they had taught or served as school administrators. However, because of the city's English proficiency requirements, they were unable to be certified in New York. They worked full time during the day and studied at night at Brooklyn College or Lehman College in the Bronx. They continued to be paid with city funds while they worked as teaching assistants in the Urban Education program. As a result, \$26,500 in Urban Education money marked for salaries is not used. This assistance by the Board of Education considerably aided the implementation of the program.

On the preschool level, classes are conducted in the child's native language with bilingual teaching assistants assigned to each class. At the middle level, bilingual assistants are teamed with the regular classroom teachers on a roving basis. The assistants work approximately 30 minutes a day in each classroom on lessons planned by the regular teachers.

The functions of the bilingual assistants vary from classroom to classroom. In some cases, they drill the students in vocabulary and perform many of the duties of the regular teachers. They hold small group and individual tutorial sessions in Spanish for students who needed the additional help. However, in many instances, the teacher

assistants are relegated to clerical and nonacademic duties: keeping attendance records and supervising in the lunchroom.

Several persons interviewed suggested that a training program is needed for the assistants and for the regular teachers who apparently feel threatened by the presence of the bilingual specialists in class and resist their help. Such training is necessary, they said, to make the proposed team teaching effective. In addition, certain changes in the City regulations were suggested to facilitate the hiring of bilingual staff. One person suggested that the English proficiency requirements for certification be eased for the Spanish-speaking graduate students who have prior teaching experience. The director said that the pay scale for the paraprofessionals should be raised to attract qualified bilingual community residents.

City New York City-Central

Activity No. 3135

Activity Title English-as-a-Second

Language

Population Served

2,500 elementary pupils are reached by this activity.

Date Began September 1968

Date Visited May 28, 29

Budget: State \$223,118 Local \$15,000 Federal \_\_\_\_\_

This program is designed to provide assistance to disadvantaged children who are learning English-as-a-Second Language or who use nonstandard speech patterns. It is coordinated by staff of the central Board of Education and serves approximately 2,500 disadvantaged pupils from kindergarten through second grade in nine elementary schools — three in Manhattan, one in the Bronx, and five in Brooklyn. The program reaches approximately 100 kindergarten children, 1,700 first graders, and 700 second graders.

Because this program is a continuation of a previously successful Title I activity, the staff is well equipped to assess the utility of specific techniques. The content remains the same under Urban Education funds. The New York City Board of Education contributed \$15,000 to pay the salaries of three administrators and rent office space.

This program is being developed in cooperation with Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas. SEDL materials in English and in Spanish in the areas of Self-Concept and Science are being used by the nine elementary schools. The teaching techniques include the aural-oral approach for all grades, drills in sentence patterns, and small group sessions with the bilingual teacher.

The director feels that since materials in the area of the social studies are not being used, the problem of their relevance and adaptability to pupils in New York City has been eliminated.

There are nine full-time professional instructors attached to this program; five are demonstration teachers (who demonstrate techniques used in the program to the regular classroom teachers) and four are Spanish-speaking teachers. The regular classroom teachers of pupils participating in this program can be classified as a secondary target group because the demonstrations serve as ongoing training for them. Demonstration teachers have attended the Bilingual Institute in San Antonio, Texas and the program director attended curriculum development sessions at the SEDL in Austin, Texas as well as a Teacher Training Workshop in San Antonio, Texas.

There were workshops for the demonstration teachers in New York City at central Board offices and general orientation meetings for the entire staff of participating schools.

The evaluation will consist of the Ott test of Spoken English which will be administered through the use of two special testing units: the Language Capacity Index and the ratings of pupils by their regular classroom teachers.

Meetings were held during the spring to explain the project to the parents and the community residents. Demonstration classes in which the children participated were presented to the parents, who were also invited to observe the regular classrooms. The impact of the program in general seems to be good and several parochial school administrators inquired how a similar program could be brought into their schools.

City New York City-Central

Activity No. 3146

Activity Title Project PROGRESS

Date Began March 1969

Population Served  
30 elementary pupils attended the special school — a very small percent of those who need this assistance.

Date Visited April 1969

Budget: State \$31,560 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Thirty students in the fourth and fifth grades participate in a bilingual school which was set up in Chinatown for children who have come from Hong Kong within the past year. The program is designed to teach English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) to the Cantonese-speaking children, to help them adjust to the United States, and to enable them to fit into the regular school system. During the school day, the children study ESL and the regular academic subjects in English and Cantonese in facilities at True Light Lutheran Church in Chinatown. In addition, they attend an afternoon recreation and study program at an elementary school several blocks away. One day a week is reserved for field trips to museums, parks, and tourist attractions in the City.

The students are selected from two schools in Chinatown where many have poor behavior or truancy records. They speak little or no English. However, according to the project directors, their achievement level in reading and mathematics would be equal to or higher than the average English-speaking student if the language barrier were removed. The majority have an unstable home life: almost all the mothers work and most of the fathers are no longer with the family.

The project staff includes the director, five teachers (three full- and two part-time), a social worker who holds meetings for the parents and assists them with their difficulties, and a community resident who helps with the clerical work and supervises the children outside of class.

The program was developed by the project director, a psychologist on leave from the Bureau of Child Guidance in New York City. In early 1968, she suggested the idea of a school for new entries from Hong King to the administrative assistant to the New York City Schools' Executive Deputy Superintendent. They recognized that such a program would be vitally needed when the new immigration law altering the old quota system went into effect. When Urban Education funds became available, the administrative assistant asked the psychologist to write the proposal. She submitted the project description in the spring. At the same time the administrative assistant organized several meetings of leaders in the Chinese community. A job training program for young adults was set up and the school for new entries was discussed.

In the fall, the project director located the facilities at the True Light Lutheran Church. The classrooms were inspected and recommended by the district office and approved by the central Board. In January 1969, she was notified that the funds were available; but the budget was cut from \$53,000 to \$31,560 and several staff members were eliminated.

The psychologist, now project director, handpicked 16 children from School 130 from a group of more than 100 new entries. She selected youngsters who needed the additional attention and yet would not be too disruptive. Fourteen more students were chosen by the principal of School 23.

Just before the school was scheduled to open, the project director learned that the facilities at True Light Lutheran Church could not be used until a fire alarm system was installed. The Fire Department during a routine check on the building, noticed that the church failed to meet the city requirements. The principal of School 23 then offered several rooms at her school.

On March 11, 14 students from P. S. 23 started in the special classes on the fifth floor of the school. One classroom was available only from 8:40 until 9:30 in the morning; other classes were vacant only on certain days of the week; on Monday and Wednesday there was no space available at all. In April, after the fire alarms were installed, the program moved to True Light Lutheran Church, and the 16 students from P. S. 130 joined the group.

According to the director, delays in funding caused several operational problems. She said that she was forced to hire teachers who did not speak Cantonese and who lacked the experience to handle the highly excitable children because experienced bilingual teachers were already committed to other jobs. (Three of the five teachers did not speak Cantonese.) She said she began the program without the necessary materials or facilities in order to put the school into operation as quickly as possible. She explained that the discipline problem grew as the school shifted from classroom to classroom in the elementary school and then moved into the unrenovated church facilities.

The director also said that many city regulations and the unwieldiness of the City bureaucracy increased the problems. Because of City certification requirements for teachers, three of the five teachers were not able to begin until they obtained certificates of competency. As a result the school opened with only two teachers. In addition, she suggested that the machinery of the central Board of Education made it difficult to obtain supplies and equipment quickly. She first ordered a telephone for the church in January. After five or six letters were sent and many telephone calls were made to both the district and the central Board of Education office, a telephone was finally installed at the end of March. Similar troubles developed when textbooks were ordered -- materials ordered in February finally arrived in May.

The director said the program suffered because there are no textbooks available for Cantonese-speaking children. The teachers developed their own techniques, using standard methods such as dialogues, drills, and games. They said that they

do not coordinate their programs and they admitted that the instruction in one class rarely supports that in another. When an outside consultant was hired to develop an ESL curriculum for the Chinese youngsters, he wrote a series of dialogues which were almost identical to those developed by the teachers on their own. Even the director said she doubted the curriculum would be of use.

Despite the problems, the director and the staff said that students made unusual progress during the spring. She pointed out that, without "Project Progress," the youngsters would have been thrown into the regular school system where there were only limited bilingual programs. However, the director made several suggestions to improve the school in the future. She said that the program needs a well-planned curriculum with materials written for the Cantonese-speaking children and a larger staff including a full-time psychologist and experienced teachers who speak Cantonese. She emphasized that the program ought to continue. "The students are now beginning to learn to act out and control their anger. They are learning inner control. They read much more and they are learning the pleasure of reading. The parents also are responding. They never went to the other schools, but they feel they can come here and talk with me. But we haven't been assured of additional funds, and I don't know what will happen next year," she said.

City New York City

Activity No. 2083 - IS-201 (CEC)

Activity Title Bilingual Program

Date Began Non-Operating

Population Served

The total Spanish-speaking population of the IS-201 demonstration district will be eligible for this activity.

Date Visited May 28, 1969

Budget: State \$110,452 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

This bilingual program is one of 12 projects to be run by the IS-201 Community Education Center in Harlem. Its objective is to provide the student with a functional bilingualism -- not to eradicate the mother tongue in favor of English but to maintain and improve comprehension of both languages -- and to help academic achievement by improving their knowledge of the language of instruction. Secondary objectives include creating a positive self-image for the students and providing their parents with an opportunity to learn the language of their neighbors.

As planned, six bilingual teachers will run self-contained bilingual classes in three of the IS-201 Complex schools. At one school, two teachers will set up separate classes teaching the regular elementary school curriculum in both English and Spanish. One class with two bilingual instructors teaching the regular academic subjects will be set up at the other two schools. Students will take part in the regular school activities in areas such as physical education and home economics. Another bilingual teacher, who will coordinate the program, also will develop materials. To evaluate the program, teachers will prepare progress reports for the respective principals and for the district Governing Board.

In addition, the bilingual teachers will develop a bilingual adult education curriculum in Spanish and English for the parents of the children involved. A portable language laboratory will be used to reach parents who are only available in the evenings.

This program was not operating at the time of the evaluation visit because the Community Education Center director, who had been on the job for only two weeks, had not had time to hire a project coordinator. She said she doubted the program would begin before the fall. However, a candidate for the position of bilingual coordinator had been identified and the Governing Board was to take action on an appointment within a week. (See description of the process whereby the IS-201 was developed.)

## vi. Human Relations and Sensitivity Training

### Critical Points:

- The projects offer neighborhood counseling and sensitivity training or discussion workshops for parents and school staff.
- Four projects costing approximately \$157,000 and serving about 1,500 adults were visited.
- Several New York City programs have the more specific objective of counteracting the polarization of teachers and community residents as a result of the United Federation of Teachers' strike in the fall of 1968.

---

This category includes programs designed to improve communications between community residents and the schools and to help the residents solve their family and community problems. In general, the projects offer two types of assistance: neighborhood counseling in which school staff work with parents on a one-to-one basis, and sensitivity training or discussion workshops for parents and school staff. Four projects costing approximately \$157,000 and serving about 1,500 adults were visited.

In the parent counseling programs, the school systems' guidance staff works with the parents who have special problems. For instance, one project is designed to help Spanish-speaking parents who have recently arrived in the United States. The project staff often functions as a referral unit and sends the families to the housing, welfare, and health agencies in the city.

The parent-teacher workshops are designed to increase the communication between the community and the school through an exchange of views and a discussion of common problems. Several New York City programs have the more specific objective of counteracting the polarization of parents and teachers as a result of the teachers' strike in the fall of 1968. Some of the programs have small discussion

groups made up of parents and teachers, blacks and whites, and English and non-English-speaking adults. Some have closed sensitivity or T-group sessions while still others have formal meetings with outside speakers and prepared programs.

Preservice training did not appear to be as critical an element here as in other categories because most of the staff used in the counseling programs are already guidance counselors. Preservice training for teachers in a human relations workshop in New York City was provided by guidance counselors.

According to the project staff and the participants, the workshops were not always successful in the eyes of both parents and teachers. In one program, for example, the parents (who volunteered) were enthusiastic about the discussion groups while the teachers (who were required to attend) said the program was not stimulating.

City New York City

Activity No. 41305

Activity Title Human Relations Work-  
shop for Teachers and Parents

Population Served  
Approximately 90 parents and  
125 teachers participate in this  
activity.

Date Began February 25

Date Visited May 13, 14, 15

Budget: State \$29,597 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 90 parents and 125 teachers participate in a series of workshops in six areas of District 13 on topics relating to race, education, and other issues of general concern in the District. Two types of meetings are held each week: one where parents and teachers meet together for their discussions, and one where only teachers are present. The reason given for the separate meeting for the teachers was that those meetings would also fulfill a training requirement set by the Board of Education.

The objectives of the program, in addition to the training of teachers mentioned above, were to increase participants' understanding of the dynamics of the group process and to increase understanding of causes of differences between the schools and the community.

The program was designed as a mix of lectures by well-known and qualified people, discussion of the lecture content, field trips, and exploration in group discussion of some differences in viewpoints and their possible causes. For example, parents and teachers discussed the role of the United Federation of Teachers in desegregation, or lack of it, in the community schools. There was no preservice training for staff, nor is there an inservice training program. The discussion periods are under the general direction of a teacher-trainer. Each of the teacher-trainers was selected for his or her human relations background with the assumption that since they are all school counselors they all must possess that background.

One major difficulty mentioned by the program administrator, staff, and participants was the large size of the discussion groups. Most felt that meetings would be more productive if group size could be reduced.

Evaluation of the program is to be made through appraisals furnished by participants and staff. In addition, arrangements have been made to have a joint, consultative evaluation by staff members from a university and by community residents. Neither of these evaluations was available at the time of the visit.

City New York City

Activity No. 40701

Activity Title Sensitivity Communica-  
tion Workshops

Population Served

1,000 adults, representing approximately 25 percent of the eligible population, are served by this activity.

Date Began March 1

Date Visited May 16, 17

Budget: State \$93,919 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

About 1,000 parents and teachers participate in sensitivity workshops in District 7 in New York City in a program designed to improve communications between school and community, between parents and school staff, and between community organizations and teachers' professional organizations.

The District contracted with private training organizations for a series of two day "sensitivity training" or communications workshops. Approximately 95 percent of the funds allocated for the program were used to pay those organizations. The remaining funds financed salaries of the program director and part-time clerical help.

The original target group, made up of parents, community residents, and school staff, was estimated at 1,800 persons. Because of difficulties in publicizing the program, however, only 1,000 took part. The director said that many community residents resisted any experience labeled as "sensitivity training" and that the information that was distributed failed to describe the workshops in terms which the residents could understand. According to the director, the staff also had the usual troubles in reaching a large number of residents who were not in contact with the school and many of whom did not speak English.

The workshops themselves have a relatively standard format: opening exercises designed to elicit the usual behavior of participants; an assessment of the communications difficulties arising from that behavior; an integration, with the aid of a qualified trainer, of that new knowledge of some causes of communication difficulty; and the expressed concern of the different groups represented.

Evaluation of the program is to be in the form of questionnaires to be completed by school administrators and participants. In addition, records of attendance at workshops and anonymous self-ratings are to be administered to a random sample of participants. An overall assessment through interviews is to be completed by an outside consultant 30 days after program completion.

City Port Chester

Activity No. 3068

Activity Title Neighborhood Counsel-  
ing

Population Served  
Parents of 100 elementary school children, 200 secondary school children, and 8 dropouts receive counseling.

Date Began January 1

Date Visited April 15, 16

Budget: State \$12,561 Local \$2,000 Federal \_\_\_\_\_

In this parent counseling project, elementary and junior and senior high school guidance counselors meet individually with parents of students with academic or behavioral problems to discuss the students' and the families' needs. The program operates three nights a week, one night for each age group, at the local OEO office. Two counselors and an aide work during each session. At the time of the site visit, parents of about 100 elementary and 200 secondary students had received help since the program began in November 1968.

According to the local coordinator the project has several major strengths. It is operating in the community of its target group and reaching parents who otherwise would not avail themselves of counseling at the school. Facilities in the local OEO office are made available and the OEO staff assists in locating and making contact with parents when the guidance counselors have difficulty. In addition, the program operates at times convenient to the target group parents -- evenings generally, but special hours are arranged on request.

The major goal of the program is to improve the general rapport between the parents of disadvantaged students and the school. It is also designed to improve student achievement levels by eliminating family problems. The project coordinator anticipated that more people would be served than was originally anticipated.

City White Plains

Activity No. 2002

Activity Title Parent Counseling on

Early Education

Population Served

250 parents of preschool and early elementary school children receive counseling in this activity.

Date Began September 1968

Date Visited May 19, 20

Budget: State \$20,284 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

The school system's psychologist and a small staff assist non-English-speaking parents of children in the early grades with family and school-related problems. The program is designed to involve the parents in their children's education, to encourage them to pursue their own education, and to help them solve their difficulties. In particular, the program is designed to assist Spanish-speaking families who have just arrived in the United States.

The psychologist, who is paid half time through Urban Education funds, works at an adult community center at one of the schools. His staff includes a preschool specialist, a social worker, and a Spanish-speaking paraprofessional who work part time on the program. Parents are referred to the center by school principals, classroom teachers, and outside groups and agencies. The staff meets with the parents, discusses their problems, and visits their homes when necessary. Participants are frequently referred to other agencies such as the Department of Welfare, the County Health Department, the Mental Health Clinic, and the White Plains Housing Authority for additional help. Approximately 250 parents have received assistance during the year.

The staff has regular meetings with kindergarten and first grade teachers to discuss students whose families may need help. The staff also meets with a parent planning advisory board, a community group on which six local agencies are represented. According to the project director, the program has been successful largely because of the communication among the project staff, the teachers, and the community groups. Plans have been made to open a center in a storefront next year, rather than in a school in order to increase the opportunity for community residents to participate.

## vii. Cultural Enrichment Programs

### Critical Points:

- Six programs funded by over \$500,000 serve 12,000 participants.
- The major emphases are student observation of performances of live groups and student participation in music lessons.
- Guidance counselors said that discipline problems decrease while the programs are in operation.

---

Six programs, four in New York City and two elsewhere in the State, were funded by over \$500,000, and serve 12,000 participants. The range of activities is wide. In Newburgh, individual music lessons are offered, while in New York City, students were taken on one-day bus trips to historic sites to heighten their interest in American history and broaden their first-hand experiences. The major emphasis, however, is student observation of performances of live groups and student participation in music lessons.

Staff and participants interviewed in a majority of the programs are enthusiastic. At one New York City program where music laboratories are set up in 11 schools, the regular teachers said that the students' interest in the academic subjects is increasing as a result of the music program. Furthermore, guidance counselors said that discipline problems decrease while the program is in operation. In a program in Albany, a radio broadcast of classical music for public school classes is so successful that it was picked up by several private schools in the area. Live performances of music, dance, and drama drew such a response that it was suggested that parents and other members of the community be invited to attend in the future.

Two activities in the South Bronx never became operational, and none of the other activities began operating until after January 1. Programs were naturally

shortened and there were recruitment difficulties where special staff had to be acquired. This was a problem notably in the New York City American History Bus Trip program, where it was difficult to recruit staff because they did not want to be committed to a program with limited duration, and were also fearful of a reduction in their welfare payments.

The evaluation procedures differ widely from project to project. Generally, the music teachers appraise student performance on the musical instruments. Student response to the live performances is measured in several ways. Evaluation of the programs may be completed by the students themselves, or, as in one case, their improvement in aural discrimination after attending live music programs may be measured.

City Albany

Activity No. 3087

Activity Title Cultural Enrichment

(Music, Dance, Drama)

Population Served

1,700 seventh through ninth grade students participate in this activity.

Date Began January 1969

Date Visited May 26, 27

Budget: State \$17,153 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Approximately 1,700 seventh, eighth, and ninth grade students in three schools participate in this cultural enrichment program. Live performances of music, dance, and drama are presented to all the students. The performances have included a musical drama of the "Connecticut Yankee" by the National Theater Company, a ballet by the Harlem School of Arts, chamber concerts by the Albany Symphony Orchestra, and African and American Indian dance presentations. In addition, 600 seventh grade students are given lessons on the melodica and are taught the basic theory of harmony. About 500 eighth grade students take part in a music listening course using classical music tapes of a local FM station. Small workshops on the cultural arts are offered by some of the performing artists.

The program is designed to stimulate student interest in music, dance, and drama and to expose the disadvantaged youngsters to the arts. It is also designed to increase the children's retention capacity and to increase their motivation in the academic subject areas. For example, the historical and cultural setting of the music is discussed when possible prior to the preannounced broadcasts. Thus, the broadcasts stimulate a broader discussion of the history of the times.

There are several other indications of the program's success. The classical music FM program was picked up by several private schools in the area for similar music listening courses, and the live performances drew such a favorable response that it was suggested that parents and other members of the community be invited to attend in the future.

A systematic evaluation plan has been established. Questionnaires have been developed to assess both the students' and the teachers' attitudes toward the program and toward the live performances. In addition, a standard music test, the Follett Music Test, is to be given at the beginning and the end of the activity. It was too early at the time of the visit to assess the success of the program regarding student outcomes, but it is apparent that students and parents who would otherwise have virtually no exposure to some aspects of the performing arts are being given such an opportunity.

City Newburgh

Activity No. 3043

Activity Title Instrumental Music

Instruction

Population Served

38 elementary and 14 secondary students receive instruction in this activity.

Date Began January 1, 1969

Date Visited May 5, 6

Budget: State \$19,935 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

Approximately 52 students from three schools receive private instruction in musical instruments and students at many of the city schools attend performances by singers and instrumental groups in this cultural enrichment program in Newburgh. The purpose of the project is to provide these experiences to children whose parents cannot normally afford them.

Six part-time music teachers, including several members of the U. S. Army Band at the U. S. Military Academy, give lessons to the students. Each student receives at least one-half hour of individual instruction a week. The teachers intend to strengthen the existing music instruction financed through City funds. Students who volunteer for the activity select their own instrument. The majority study the brass instruments.

Live performances of singers, instrumentalists, and musical groups are presented at many of the city schools. Such performers as the New Art Singers, the New York Brass Sextet, Luis Garcia-Renart, and an electronic music group have appeared on the program.

An evaluation is planned using an appraisal of the pupil's performance on the musical instrument, a pre- and post-test of the aural discrimination of participating students using a simple device designed by the music teacher and information on pupils participating in organized school music groups such as the school orchestra.

City New York City

Activity No. 41503

Activity Title American History

Bus Trips

Population Served

3,500 fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students - all the students in those grades in the District - benefit from the trips.

Date Began January 1969

Date Visited June 4

Budget: State \$164,009 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

All the fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students in District 15 in Brooklyn are taken on one-day bus trips to historic sites in a program designed to increase their interest in American History and broaden their experience through travel. Places visited include Philadelphia, Hyde Park, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, and Mystic, Connecticut. Students are briefed for each trip and receive further information during the bus ride.

The program is designed to serve the intellectual and cultural needs of both children and local residents. In general, however, the teachers were not informed about the program's aims and were inadequately prepared for specific trips because they did not receive adequate preservice or inservice training sessions. Although an historian was hired to develop material for each excursion, most persons agreed that the information is too academic for the children. They said the teachers also are unable to provide relevant material.

The regular classroom teacher and two paraprofessionals accompany each class. A total of about 80 community residents are employed as paraprofessionals under the grant. Because of a delay in funding, the project director had difficulty hiring paraprofessionals. Recruitment did not begin until February. At that time each school sent out letters describing the available jobs and contacted local community groups. However, many community residents did not want to work for the short period that the program would operate. Other potential candidates refused to work because they were afraid of losing their welfare benefits. Despite the problems, the students, teachers, and parents were all very enthusiastic and strongly supported the project.

At the time of the visit, no formal evaluation procedures existed.

City New York City (District 12 CEC)

Activity No. 2058 and 2072

Activity Title Afro-American History  
and Culture - Musical Training

Population Served

500 preadolescent and adults  
and 200 elementary and second-  
ary school students will par-  
ticipate in these activities.

Date Began Non-Operational

Date Visited June 5

Budget: State \$215,684 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

The Community Education Center in District 12 located in the Bronx contains 22 programs, none of which was operational at the time of the interview visit. Two programs within this Center are the Afro-American History and Culture Program and the Musical Training and Performing Workshop.

The Afro-American History and Culture Program is designed to provide an intensive familiarization with African History and Culture and its relationship to this society. Four groups of students ranging from under 12 years to over 21 years will participate. The majority of the instruction was planned to take place in two elementary schools and one high school between the hours of 2:00 p. m. - 10:00 p. m. Monday through Friday and 9:00 a. m. - 5:00 p. m. Saturdays. A central materials supply base will be established to provide history books, visual aides, teaching machines, and art objects.

The Musical Training Program will utilize six music teachers and eight teacher aides to provide private and semiprivate lessons on two cycles for 200 elementary and secondary school children -- an afternoon cycle for elementary students and an evening cycle for secondary students.

Each student will receive at least one private 1-hour lesson weekly and two half-hour sessions. He will also be assigned to a practice room with his chosen instrument at least 2 hours weekly.

The Director of the CEC has been on board since November 1968 and was the only person interviewed. He stated that funding was made on an unrealistic time schedule which meant the number of staff required could not have been recruited and trained and the program put into full operation as quickly as was suggested by the District Superintendent. The Community Advisory Board, District Superintendent, and CEC Director have different opinions concerning the operational phase of these programs. This organizational fault was one of the reasons for the "deadlock" situation which has resulted in lack of approval of the staff hired by the CEC Director.

City New York City

Activity No. 42003

Activity Title Music Laboratory

Date Began March 1969

Population Served

5,500 elementary school students participate in this activity in 11 schools in the District. 14 other schools are not served.

Date Visited June 2, 3

Budget: State \$109,715 Local \_\_\_\_\_ Federal \_\_\_\_\_

In New York City, 11 out of 25 elementary schools in District 20 participate in a music laboratory program designed to present various musical experiences to 5,500 elementary students. A music teacher in each of the 11 schools gives courses in music appreciation and lessons in specific instruments, using the recorder as a basic tool. The program serves the entire student body in each of these schools with each class scheduled for a music period. The regular classroom teacher attends the music period and often assumes a role in the preparation or actual presentation of a music activity.

The activities include singing, listening to music, reading music, and playing the various instruments. The program is designed to improve the students' self-image by providing a vehicle through which the children can express themselves and to add to the students' general learning experience. Among the instruments are drum, tamborines, and cymbals, melody resonator bells of all ranges, song flutes, and the piano (which is provided by each school). The electric organ also is to be part of the music laboratory, but none had arrived at the time of the site visit.

The Music Supervisor for Elementary Schools said that participating students are able to "transfer" skills acquired in the music program to other curriculum areas-- especially reading. She gave several examples of students who had read very poorly before taking part in the music laboratory and who were reading with more accuracy and comprehension. Several school administrators in different schools stated that the overall atmosphere of their schools has become calmer and disciplinary problems have decreased since the program began in March 1969.

The evaluation is planned, based on performance tests by the students in the presence of the music teacher and the regular classroom teacher. No information was available at the time of the site visit.

### III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the descriptions of program operations presented here, it is evident that residents of urban areas in New York State are having new doors opened to them as a result of the Urban Education program. However, it would be premature at this point to attempt a comprehensive assessment of the real changes in behavior, attitudes, and abilities which have resulted from the program. Projects and activities have not been operating long enough in most cases to produce reliable indicators of measurable change. The focus has been on "getting off the ground" and "smoothing out the rough spots." This should not be disconcerting. In a venture as massive as the Urban Education program, time for early "shakedowns" must be allowed. To expect immediate positive results from these programs would be contrary to what has been learned about implementing innovative or new programs.

Nevertheless, these are some aspects of program implementation which are worthy of examination after this first phase of operations. Such an examination can bring to light procedural modifications that subsequently will both encourage and induce a greater degree of quality in individual programs. Necessarily, these findings and recommendations are based on data collected on the site visits. However, there is reason to believe that the implementation problems encountered in the activities visited are generic and broadly characteristic of the Urban Education program as a whole.

#### The Objectives of the Board of Regents

Three objectives of the Board of Regents' 1967 position paper provided the overall guidelines for the establishment of programs under the new legislation:

- Strong emphasis must be placed upon community participation in the planning and governance of local programs.
- Programs must be coordinated with other agencies (health, welfare, employment, etc.) and local resources such as universities and colleges.
- Preparation of personnel to serve the needs of the poor must be fostered through the training of indigenous talent to serve in local programs.

These are key elements in providing programs which are relevant for urban area residents, and although they were not the only objectives of the new legislation, they are the ones to which we can speak most readily regarding program implementation.

The reports on site visits lead to the following observations regarding the preceding objectives:

1. Community participation is a multifaceted problem. Although many projects and activities have sincerely sought the participation of local residents, too often such participation has been limited to those already active in school and civic affairs, to the exclusion of many segments of the community who consider themselves socially and politically disenfranchised. We must also face the fact that some projects have not openly and actively solicited real community support or taken any pains to assure that such support comes from a representative community profile. Lastly, some projects have fallen under the domination or control of one community group to the exclusion of others and occasionally such groups have put great emphasis on gaining control over programs, funds, and personnel hiring to the neglect of the content and potential impact of the program.

2. The coordination of programs with outside agencies and local resources was limited. In the set of reports presented here, we are hard-pressed to cite many examples of effective marshaling of program design and operating resources beyond the local school system. The White Plains psychological services program did utilize graduate students from Columbia Teachers College, and faculty members from local universities were used in the Operation WARD'S ISLAND faculty training program in Manhattan, but other attempts at coordination with outside agencies have been sparse. This is especially true in New York City, where resources are great.
3. A particularly outstanding element of the entire Urban Education effort has been the apparently successful attempt to train indigenous talent to serve the needs of the poor. Many examples can be cited:
  - The New York City activity (3090) to train local residents to serve as aides in high failure third grade classrooms was particularly noteworthy since it encompassed over 600 paraprofessionals in one effort;
  - In Lackawanna, six paraprofessionals received two weeks of preservice training to serve in a teacher aide program in high failure elementary and junior high classes;
  - Twenty seven parents were trained in Mount Vernon in a program to assist teachers in kindergarten through third grade in five elementary schools in the city.
4. There was a particular weakness in some of the programs which called for new innovative methodology in preparation of staff. This was the lack of adequate preservice or inservice training where these appeared to be desirable elements. In some cases, this was due to late funding even when such

training had been originally proposed. Administrators and staff alike emphasized the need for more formal training suited to particular activities. Staff members may not be familiar with the use of specialized machines, or may be unaware of the administrative structure of a school system, or they may not know some of the fundamentals of behavior of the very young child. Many activities demand that staff acquire these and other particular kinds of information and skills.

### Other Observations

There are other aspects of the implementation of the Urban Education program, both pro and con, which are worthy of mention here because they are either critical for the development of educational programs of this kind or because they are symptomatic of some larger problems in American education relevant to New York State programs.

1. Most programs did not receive funds until midway through the school year or later. This created numerous difficulties:
  - Preservice training was cut short or eliminated for the sake of getting programs started;
  - Staff members - particularly professionals and specialists - were difficult to find in the middle of the school year;
  - Local residents were unwilling to serve in programs of such short duration, for fear of being left stranded at the end of the school year.
2. The difficulty of late funding was compounded by the lag that occurred between proposal submission and final approval. Understandably, as pointed out in discussions with the staff of the Office of Urban Education, procedures for implementation of the program at the State level were being worked out

concurrently with initial review of local proposals. Standards for proposal acceptance and modification had to be established as operations progressed. These factors slowed down the approval process. In addition, local school systems often waited until the last minute to submit proposals, and were not always quick to resubmit after modifications had been requested.

3. The Office of Urban Education and the Bureau of Urban Programs Evaluation were obviously understaffed for their mission. Especially in the first year of operation frequent field visits to every program are necessary. An inordinate though necessary amount of time had to be spent in Albany working out the administrative details. This prevented State Department personnel from spending time in the field aiding local agencies in starting up their programs, assisting them in interpreting State requirements, and seeing that more effective evaluation procedures were established.
4. Project and activity objectives were in most cases inadequately constructed because they did not specify behavioral outcomes, i. e. , exactly what behavior the participants were expected to exhibit as a result of the program. Consequently, evaluation methodology was poor, since it is difficult to identify meaningful and relevant evaluation procedures without knowing precisely what is to be measured or assessed.

It is understandable that this shortcoming was due in large part again to the inability of staff at the State level to work with local personnel in stating objectives and designing evaluation. Many programs were approved quickly in order to get them started with the hope of improving them later.

There were cases where evaluation designs appeared quite sophisticated, but because of late starts and the lack of program monitoring by Urban Education staff, some of these designs have not yet been implemented.

5. Several programs displayed laudable innovations. Their designs generally reflected creative thinking with attention to the special needs of the poor, as opposed to programs which try to inculcate middle class values. The "Fathers in Charge" program in Brooklyn made a creative attempt to compensate 38 young boys for the lack of a real father. Project GIANT STEP in Ocean Hill-Brownsville was based upon the concept of immediate reward for work successfully completed. The Gardener Trainee program in the Bronx attempted to provide relevant work experience for boys which encouraged a positive self-image.
6. In several cases, most noteworthy being the after-school study centers, the opportunity to provide new and relevant experiences for children was missed. Most of the after-school study centers simply permitted the extension of the school day with "more of the same." There were few examples of new relationships evolving between child and teacher, or child and school.
7. Some programs have been severely curtailed because of the attempt to incorporate them into existing administrative structures. For example, internal conflicts have resulted when the administrative responsibility for programs was not clear. Local personnel cannot operate at high efficiency when the programs are put on the shoulders of already overburdened staff. Acquisition of materials has proceeded at a regrettably slow pace in places such as New York City, where purchasing for special projects must be

incorporated into the existing procurement process. Since the turnaround time for purchasing in many systems is several months and is based upon yearly planning, existing purchasing procedures proved to be inadequate. Site visitors also had difficulty in many cases in acquiring summaries of financial transactions for individual activities because it appeared that separate accounts were not being maintained. It must be recognized that special procedures are needed for special programs.

### Recommendations

The preceding observations and the site visit reports presented earlier provide a foundation for recommendations regarding overall program implementation.

1. The manpower availability of the Office of Urban Education and the Bureau of Urban Programs Evaluation must be increased. Where the acquisition of full-time personnel is not a viable alternative, serious attention should be given to providing funds for the acquisition of professionals on a per-diem or temporary basis during intervals of peak activity and to carry on specialized activities such as program review and evaluation.
2. A greater effort must be made by State and local officials to involve community residents in the planning and governance of local programs. One aspect of this involvement must be that the power to develop certain kinds of policy shall pass to the community. At the same time, local residents must be willing to assume the responsibilities that accompany the authority they seek.
3. The Legislature and the State Education Department should now plan for the future to see that decisions for program funding and approval are made well

in advance of actual operations. It is sufficient to say that late funding and program approval was one of the most serious drawbacks of the Urban Education program for 1968-69.

4. To encourage early program approval, proposal submission dates must be established which would provide at least 3 months for review, modification, and approval prior to scheduled starts. This should allow ample time for staff and materials acquisition. Furthermore, local school districts should be encouraged not to await even these deadlines if possible.
5. Considerably greater attention must be given to statements of program objectives and program evaluation. This recommendation, however, should not be interpreted to reflect a shortcoming unique to Urban Education programs. It is well known that this matter reflects an important shortcoming of programs within the American education system. Evaluation procedures are relatively unsophisticated, disproportionately concerned with "significant differences," and have little relevance to the program's objectives.

An effective way of improving program evaluation is to provide training for local personnel which will equip them with the competencies for carrying out an effective evaluation. This training would cover the design of objectives and the identification of appropriate evaluation instruments and procedures.

6. The attempts to train indigenous talent for local programs and actually involve them in the operations has been commendable. To encourage broader community involvement, more formal attempts should be made to reach the community and to provide follow-up information and contact in a sustained and systematic way.

7. More intensive efforts must be made towards formal training programs for staff members, especially for paraprofessionals. Results can be unfortunate when local residents who have never been in a classroom on the other side of the desk are suddenly asked to relate to children in a highly structured fashion. Such things as introductory discussions on such seemingly fundamental matters as the personal habits of preschool children can be vital to the success of certain kinds of programs. The need for such training is critical and is now a realistic goal because of the expectation that operations for 1969-70 will begin on schedule.
8. Greater effort must be made to utilize local agencies and resources in program planning and operations. One method of encouraging this is for the State Department to request and favor proposals that include some evidence of commitment or intent to participate from local agencies that have been identified within the proposal. This would encourage broad community involvement, utilization of specialized resources, and new approaches to problems that have not been responsible to traditional solutions.
9. Greater attention must be given to proposals for after-school study centers. These proposals should carefully detail the planned operations. It is unfortunate that the opportunity to acquire the services of teachers and paraprofessionals for additional time at the end of the school day has not led to more creative programs.
10. In the development of proposals, the management of an activity must be clearly detailed as part of the total school system's operations. This will encourage the anticipation of major stumbling blocks to smooth implementation. Some specific needs are evident:

- The lines of authority and responsibility for programs must be made clear. Individuals must be designated who will make final operational decisions;
- The required work load attributable to the new program must be carefully examined in light of existing responsibilities;
- Special procedures for purchasing must be identified when it appears that the existing purchasing cycle will be too long to satisfy the needs of the new program;
- Separate fiscal accounts must be maintained for each activity, for control, evaluation, and planning.

#### IV. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey presented in this chapter was prepared from reports submitted by consulting teams which visited selected activity sites across the State. The consulting teams were made up of personnel from the General Learning Corporation with the addition of faculty members and graduate students of various universities in the State. Their principal method of collecting information was the structured interview, reinforced by observation of program operations where appropriate.

The survey instrument was designed to elicit information on whether programs were proceeding according to plan, and in what way they appeared to be satisfying the objectives of the Board of Regents for the entire Urban Education program as stated in their 1967 position paper.

##### Site Selection

Approximately 460 activities and projects comprise the entire program approved by the Office of Urban Education for the school year 1968-69. The contract between the General Learning Corporation (GLC) and the State Education Department called for visits to 60 of the activity sites. Since the result of the visits was to be a survey report of operations rather than an evaluation of program success, an arbitrary but pragmatic method of program selection was utilized. Since it was not the purpose of the report to provide a basis for generalizing to the entire Urban Education program, no attempt was made to select a scientifically representative sample of all the state-wide programs. Therefore the activities to be visited intentionally reflect the choice of field supervisors of the Office of Urban Education.

Twenty-one local school districts outside New York City were selected, some of which included more than one activity or project to be reported upon. In all,

28 of these activities were visited outside New York City in addition to the studies of Community Education Center development in Poughkeepsie and Rochester.

The remainder of the site visits were conducted in New York City. Most local decentralized districts were visited -- with the exception of districts 11, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 28 -- along with two of the three experimental demonstration districts: IS-201 in Harlem and Ocean Hill-Brownsville in Brooklyn. In addition to the 31 local activities and projects visited in a total of 22 decentralized districts, five central Board of Education activities, and the three CEC's, studies were prepared for CEC development in IS-201 and a Chinese bilingual activity on the lower east side.

#### Site Visits

In March, after identification of the programs to be visited, the Office of Urban Education announced the planned visit to each of the local school district Urban Education coordinators through the superintendent of schools. This preliminary notification was followed by a letter from GLC confirming the intended visit and identifying specific dates for that purpose. This letter was then followed up by a personal call from members of the visiting team. The introductory letter from the Office of Urban Education and the call by the visiting team member in fact provided for a clear understanding by program personnel of the purpose of the visit. The objective of conducting a program survey as contrasted with an evaluation report was emphasized. The preliminary efforts at broad communications resulted in an open reception by program personnel to the visiting teams. As a matter of fact, many staff members were eager for the opportunity to "spread the word" about the programs, their successes, and difficulties. The frequency of hostility was inconsequential.

The visiting teams included at least one person from the General Learning Corporation, and in many cases one outside consultant. Of the total of nine outside personnel utilized, each of whom visited several sites, most were mainly faculty members from New York City metropolitan area universities who in their current professional activities were involved in the issues of urban education. A total of 215 man-days was spent on the visits, which began April 1 and ended during the week of June 16.

### Procedures

Site visitors usually began with an attempt to dispel any fear that the people being interviewed and their programs were being judged. By emphasizing this idea frequently, the consultants were rewarded with an open discussion of program operations.

The procedures to be followed during the visit were spelled out in the interview guidelines and the survey instrument provided each member of the visiting team. After examination of the guidelines, each consultant going on his first visit met with GLC personnel to discuss the purpose of the visit and the purpose of the total survey. This afforded them an opportunity to develop a complete understanding of their role and to have their questions answered.

Prior to their visits, team members were provided with copies of the local district's program proposal to the Office of Urban Education, which detailed all the program elements ranging from broad objectives to requested budget. Thus the team members came on site cognizant of the nature of the local program and prepared with specific questions. In some cases, the program administrators even prepared formal itineraries to permit discussion and observation of different aspects of the program.

The initial interviews generally began with program administrators and centered around the matter of program planning and implementation. In some instances, discussions were then conducted with teaching or support personnel. Where possible, program operations were observed, such as classroom activities, evening group counseling sessions with parents, etc. Appropriate discussions with participants were pursued when this process held the promise of gathering further information. Visiting team members generally conducted opening interviews together, but may have continued individually in subsequent interviews. Their combined observations were then submitted in a single report after the site visit.

Although the consultants attempted to maintain a reasonable uniformity in their interviews around the State, each of the activities visited offered its own options and peculiarities. Some of the most interesting opportunities extended to the consultants included the chance to visit the homes of children participating in the "Dial-a-Drill" program in New York City, of attending a New York City central Board of Education meeting with Community Education Center personnel, and sitting in on an evening meeting of the Community Education Center advisory council in Rochester.

INDEX OF PROJECTS VISITED BY  
THE GENERAL LEARNING CORPORATION

<u>City</u>	<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Project Title (or Description)</u>	<u>Page</u>
Albany	3087	Cultural Enrichment (Music, Dance, Drama)	117
	3088	Project for Improved Pupil Achievement and Success	90
Binghamton	2004	Home and School Study Centers	50
Buffalo	3054	Emphasis on Reading	31
Elmira	2041	Developmental and Educational Activity Centers for Disadvantaged Students	51
	2042	Drop-In Center for Dropouts	52
Hempstead	3110	Reading Seminars for Teachers	92
Lackawanna	3075	Paraprofessional Assistance to High Failure Classrooms	93
Middletown	3061	Contemporary Home and Neighborhood Environment Program	74
Mount Vernon	3128	Parent-Teacher Aides in the Classroom	94
Newburgh	3043	Instrumental Music Instruction	118
New Rochelle	3060	Reading and Language Skills	32
New York City	3089	Project READ	36
	3090	Educational Assistance Program	95
Operated out of the Central	3092	Elementary Education Programs	55
	3119	"Dial-A-Drill"	53
Board of Education	3135	English-as-a-Second Language	101
	3146	Project PROGRESS	105
<u>Decentralized District #</u>			
1	40106	Early Reading Incentive	38

<u>City</u>	<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Project Title (or Description)</u>	<u>Page</u>
2	40202	Operation WARD'S ISLAND	61
3	40303	Bilingual Program	101
4	40404	After-School Study Center	59
5	40501	Brandeis Reach Out	78
6	40607	Library Use Incentive	33
7	40701	Sensitivity Communications Workshops	112
8	40801	After-School Tutoring	60
9	40905	Assisting Students With Serious Behavior Problems	80
10	41010	Gardener Trainee	75
12	41203	Experimental Mathematics Laboratories	
13	41305	Human Relations Workshops for Teachers and Parents	
14	41401	Language Helper Program	99
15	41503	American History Bus Trips	119
16	41604	Extended Day Kindergarten	63
18	41807	Intersensory Reading	40
20	42003	Music Laboratory	121
21	42105	"Fathers-In-Charge"	76
24	42404	After-School Study Center	58
27	42701	Operation SEARCH	82
30	43001	Project REAL	77
32	43201	Project GIANT STEP	34
<u>Demonstration Districts</u>			
IS-201	2083	Bilingual Program	108

<u>City</u>	<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Project Title (or Description)</u>	<u>Page</u>
	Study	Community Education Center Process	10
Ocean Hill- Brownsville (CEC)	2048	Community Based Homework Study Centers	64
	Study	Planning Process	16
South Bronx (CEC)	2058	Afro-American History and Culture	120
	2072	Musical Training	120
Niagara Falls	3095	Operation Prekindergarten	65
	3097	Individualized Instruction In Mathematics and Science	66
Port Chester	3068	Neighborhood Counseling	113
Poughkeepsie	2029	Prekindergarten Social Psychologist Interaction Specialist	84
	Study	Community Education Center Process	17
Rochester	2026	East Side/West Side Community Education Centers	67
	2027		67
	Study	Community Education Center Process	22
Rome	3074	Project REACH	41
Schenectady	3106	Reading and Language Development	42
Syracuse	3046	Corrective Reading	43
	3047	Special Classes for Problem Students	85
Troy	3078	Operation BOOTSTRAPS: Up-grading Basic Skills	69
	3080	Operation BOOTSTRAPS: Remedial Reading	44
Utica	3131	Nongraded Primary and Early Intermediate Program	70
White Plains	3042	Psychological Services	87
	2002	Parent Counseling On Early Education	114
Yonkers	3064	Quality Incentive Remedial Reading	45