

11  
76  
163  
35



# SELECTED STATE PROGRAMS IN MIGRANT EDUCATION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE  
U. S. DEPOSITORY COPY

Office of Education

OE-23030  
Bulletin 1963  
No. 35



**SELECTED**

# **STATE PROGRAMS IN MIGRANT EDUCATION**

**BY GEORGE E. HANEY, SPECIALIST  
EDUCATION FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,  
AND WELFARE**

**Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary**

**Office of Education**

**Francis Koppel, Commissioner**

## Foreword

**B**ECAUSE OF THE INCREASED interest in and current publicity given to the problems of agricultural migrant workers and their families, there has been a growing concern in our Nation regarding the lack of educational opportunities offered to migrant children. Since the programs for the education of children of migrant workers vary from State to State, it is the intent of this study to identify procedures of school organization and administration and the educational problems encountered by the States participating in this survey.

The chief State school officers in seven States were requested to cooperate in providing pertinent information on the problem of programs of education for migrant children. The study included those States which provided financial assistance to local school districts for the operation of summer schools and which had an enrollment impact of migrant children during the regular school year. The information requested was intended to be useful to States having migrant education problems and to be of particular value in event of the passage of Federal legislation for improving educational opportunities for migratory children. The study was approved by the State school officers and a staff member in each State department of education was designated to cooperate in conducting the survey.

A questionnaire was designed for the purpose of obtaining reliable information on State organization and administration of migrant programs, migrant programs during the regular school year, summer programs, and recommendations for further research and planning to improve the quality of education offered to these children. The questionnaires were completed by the following State personnel who provided the information for this study:

Mrs. Afton Dill Nance.....	California
<i>Consultant, Elementary Education</i>	
Dr. Alfred M. Potts.....	Colorado
<i>Section Head, Section on Education of Migratory Children</i>	
Miss Anne Hoppock.....	New Jersey
<i>Director of Elementary Education</i>	

## FOREWORD

Mr. Robert E. Minnich.....	New York
<i>Associate in School Attendance</i>	
Miss Phylla Humphreys.....	Ohio
<i>Elementary Supervisor</i>	
Mr. Ronald G. Petrie.....	Oregon
<i>Supervisor of Migrant Education</i>	
Dr. Kathryn Dice Reier.....	Pennsylvania
<i>Director of Bureau of Special Services</i>	

The Office of Education appreciates the cooperation of the chief State school officers and State department personnel who assisted with this survey which is the first of its kind to be made by the U.S. Office of Education.

ERIO R. BABER,  
*Assistant Commissioner and  
Director of Elementary  
and Secondary Education*

FRED F. BEACH,  
*Director, Administration of  
State and Local School Systems*

# Contents

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Foreword</i> .....	III
<b>Chapter I. Awareness of the Problem</b> .....	1
Background of the Study.....	2
Method of Study.....	4
<b>Chapter II. The States Provide Leadership</b> .....	5
Regular School Year Programs.....	5
Responsibility for Migrant Education.....	6
Percentage of Time Devoted to Programs.....	7
<b>Chapter III. Regular Year Programs for Migrant Children</b> .....	8
Advance Estimates of "Children on the Move".....	8
How to Keep Migrant Children in School.....	10
The Grade-Placement Problem—"Overgrown and Undereducated".....	12
The Problem of Providing Facilities.....	13
The Problem of Providing Teachers.....	15
Providing School Lunches.....	16
The Vanishing Transfer Records.....	16
<b>Chapter IV. Summer School Programs—A New Chance</b> .....	18
Responsibility for Organization.....	19
Personnel Responsibility.....	20
Administration Problems.....	21
Number and Size of Summer Schools.....	24
Length of Sessions.....	25
Number of Personnel and Pupil-Teacher Ratio.....	25
Financing Summer Programs.....	27
State Support.....	27
The Lure of School Lunches.....	30
<b>Chapter V. Research and Planning Needed</b> .....	33
<b>Chapter VI. Comments and Views on Migrant Problems</b> .....	36

## Tables

	<i>Page</i>
1. State department personnel responsible for and percentage of time devoted to migrant education in seven States.....	7
2. Methods used for grade placement of migrant children in seven States.....	13
3. Persons responsible for organization and administration of summer schools in seven States.....	20
4. Persons responsible for establishing the summer school curriculums in seven States.....	21
5. Enrollments of summer schools for migrants by school size, number of schools, and participating States.....	25
6. Number of summer schools enrolling migrant children by number of days in operation and by participating States.....	26
7. Number of teachers, principals, other personnel, and pupil-teacher ratio in summer schools for migrant pupils, by State..	26
8. Current expenditures, pupil transportation, and total expenditures (exclusive of rentals for facilities) for summer schools for migrant pupils in five States.....	28
9. Average current expenditures per teacher, per pupil, and daily cost per pupil (exclusive of rentals for facilities but including transportation) for summer schools for migrant pupils in five States.....	30

## CHAPTER I

# Awareness of the Problem

**M**IGRANT AGRICULTURAL workers are often described as America's forgotten people and their children are referred to as "the most educationally deprived group of children in our Nation." They enter school late, their attendance is poor, their progress is slow, they drop out early; consequently, their illiteracy is high. Studies indicate that most migrant children are far below grade level and that their school achievement is usually under fourth grade. The plight of these children has become a national problem, since illiteracy or lack of an elementary education could condemn them to a life of ignorance, poverty, and dependence on our society.

As there has been an increased public awareness of this problem, more study and research has been stimulated. Many of these studies have indicated that since migration is statewide and also interstate in character, effective action by communities alone is not sufficient. Cooperation, therefore, is needed in all levels of government including the local, State, and Federal agencies.

It is recognized that the improvement of educational opportunities for migratory children attacks only one phase of the total problem created by mobility and the migratory way of life. Other Federal agencies and voluntary organizations, too numerous to mention in this study, have been vitally concerned with the problem of migratory labor and have made considerable progress in providing some of the services, benefits, and facilities to migrant families which have long been available to other citizens in our society.

This report is concerned primarily with the progress made at the State level by the seven participating States confronted with the problem of providing educational programs for large impacts of migratory children. The States providing the information and data for this study are California, Colorado, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. These States were selected because they have an organized State program of providing financial assistance to local school systems for the operation of summer schools for migratory pupils.

## Background of the Study

It is estimated that migrant workers are concentrated in 31 States which employ 4,000 or more domestic agricultural laborers each year, and that approximately 150,000 migrant children accompany their parents from community to community and from State to State. Domestic migratory farm workers in the United States include Spanish-speaking Americans, Negroes, native whites, Puerto Ricans, and some Indians. The majority are of Mexican origin. For many years, local and State school authorities have been faced with serious educational problems because of impacts of large groups of migratory children of school age who enter their school districts during the harvest season seeking enrollment in overcrowded classrooms and schools. Because of the high rate of retardation and low educational attainment of migrant children, mostly due to nonattendance, the problem of providing adequate educational facilities for these pupils is compounded. The inability of some educational agencies to meet these problems has contributed to the further educational deprivation of migrant youth.

As the States participating in this survey are providing financial assistance for the operation of summer schools in order to improve the educational programs for migratory children, data were requested concerning the many problems affecting the organization of such schools at both the local and State levels.

From estimates prepared by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the number of migrant children in the various States, this survey of the seven largest migrant-populated States is concerned with approximately 28 percent of these children.

The problem of State organization and administration, personnel responsible for establishing the curriculum and employment of teaching staff, enrollments, financing, costs of operation and transportation, school lunches, school attendance, and other items concerning summer sessions are presented in chapter IV.

The problems concerned with planning and research, interstate agreements, and corrective legislation are considered by educators to be of the utmost importance in providing equal educational opportunities for migratory children who cross State boundary lines each year.

As our system of government makes each State responsible for the administration of public education within its borders, the problems concerning the organization and administration of educational opportunities for migratory children have been recognized by many State departments of education. While the local school district is the basic unit responsible for the education of its children, the problems created

by migrancy are both interstate and intrastate in character and are so complex that many local school districts are seeking financial and organizational assistance at the State level. This has stimulated many States to seek corrective legislation and to provide support to local school districts for the education of migratory pupils. Definite legislation for the education of migratory children has been enacted in at least nine States. Other States provide financial assistance to local school districts for migrant children attending the regular school session on the basis of average daily attendance. In 1961, there were seven States which were providing operating expenses to school districts for summer school programs. In 1962, the States of Washington and Wisconsin were also operating summer schools to which migratory children were eligible to attend.

Many State departments of education have also recognized the importance of planning and organization at the State level for migrant education by designating members of their staffs with the responsi-



**Migrant children gathering sugar beets. They enter school late, their attendance is poor, their progress slow, and illiteracy high.**

bility of coordinating the State educational program for migratory children.

### **Method of Study**

This study was made by means of a questionnaire sent to designated staff members of seven State departments of education who had some responsibility for the programs of education for migratory children within their respective States. The questionnaire included questions concerning the State's responsibility for migrant programs, personnel responsible for organization and administration, programs and procedures for the regular sessions as well as the special summer schools, suggestions for research and planning, and views on the total program of migrant education. Questions were designed to provide information for other school districts and States who might be interested in organizing summer schools for migrant youth. Data were also requested to provide information on successful procedures and practices used to solve some of the major problems such as transfer records, regular school attendance, grade placement, providing school facilities, and others. Each respondent also had an opportunity to express his views concerning the problems and solutions of providing improved educational opportunities for this deprived group of children. These comments are summarized in chapter VI under general problem areas in migrant education.

## CHAPTER II

# The States Provide Leadership

**A**N INCREASING NUMBER of State departments of education are recognizing the need for a statewide plan of organization of migrant education to cope with the many complex problems created by migrancy and its effects on children attending both the regular and summer school sessions. Since some migrant children may enroll in as many as four or five different schools in one State during the regular school year, many problems arise which can only be solved by planning and organization at the State level. Many transient children may not migrate beyond the boundaries of a State but will travel across school district or county boundary lines. This mobility has created a demand for State educational policies, regulations concerning school attendance, and other school programs and practices relative to migratory children.

### Regular School Year Programs

All of the States included in this survey indicated considerable progress in providing school facilities, and in promoting regular attendance of migratory children during the regular school term, even though the period of attendance may only be 2 weeks. These States have assumed the responsibility of providing leadership and assistance to the local districts to improve the educational programs of children of agricultural workers within their boundaries during the harvest season. Several States participating in this survey provide appropriations to school districts for the education of migrant children during the regular school year on the basis of average daily attendance. In Pennsylvania the school districts receive special reimbursement of \$1 per day per migrant child up to 40 days. Other services provided by State departments of education include studies on advance estimates of migrant enrollments, attendance, grade placement of pupils, retardation and achievement, and interstate agreements on school transfer records.

## Responsibility for Migrant Education

The first question in this survey was designed to determine if there was a designated person on the staff of the State departments of education charged with the responsibility of coordinating migrant education and the estimated percentage of time spent in this specialized area at the State level.



These children are happy to attend a school "up the road."

The States of Colorado, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania indicated that there was such a designated person on the staff of the State department of education, California and New York answered negatively, and New Jersey did not answer the question. Only the States of Colorado and Oregon, however, provided full-time coordinators of migrant education who have the responsibility for and devote most of their time to this program.<sup>1</sup> The State coordinator's title in Colorado is section head, education of migrant children; while in Oregon

<sup>1</sup> New Jersey, Texas, and Washington have recently appointed staff members on the State departments of education charged with the responsibility of migrant education.

he is the supervisor of migrant education. In California, New Jersey, and Ohio the State elementary supervisors have divided responsibility with two or more staff members sharing the responsibility for the State program. In New York, the State coordinator carries the title of associate school attendance officer; and in Pennsylvania, the director, bureau of special services, and the curriculum specialist have this responsibility. All of the States surveyed, however, indicated that the State elementary supervisors have some responsibility for migrant education.

### Percentage of Time Devoted to Programs

The percentage of time devoted to the programs of organization and administration of migrant education by State personnel varied in numbers of staff members and total time spent by personnel in the problems of migrant education. The total staff time spent on migrant education varied from one-fifth of a full-time person in Pennsylvania to one and one-seventeenth in Colorado. Only one State (Colorado) had more than the equivalent of one full-time person. Colorado and New York each had three staff members with a divided responsibility. The persons on the staffs of the State departments of education who have some responsibility for migrant education and the percentage of time devoted to these programs are given in table 1.

Table 1.—State department personnel responsible for and percentage of time devoted to migrant education in seven States

State	State department personnel responsible for migrant education	Percent of time devoted to work
California	Elementary supervisor	25
	Consultant, elementary education	( <sup>1</sup> )
Colorado	Section head, Education of Migratory Children	95
	Elementary supervisor	20
	Director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education	2
New Jersey	Elementary supervisor	( <sup>1</sup> )
	Bureau of Migrant Labor—summer schools	( <sup>1</sup> )
New York	Elementary supervisor	7
	Associate school attendance officer	10
	Assistant school attendance officer	10
Ohio	Two elementary supervisors	15–20
Oregon	Supervisor of migrant education	66
Pennsylvania	Director, Bureau of Special Services	5
	Curriculum specialist	15

<sup>1</sup> No response.

## CHAPTER III

# Regular Year Programs for Migrant Children

**P**ROVIDING FOR THE EDUCATION of migratory children during the regular school year has been a most complex and serious problem with many social and economic implications. Educational opportunities for migrant children may be affected by both child labor and school attendance laws. In some States, the school laws pertaining to compulsory attendance may apply only to permanent residents. Some communities have attitudes of indifference or rejection of migrant families. Because of the nature of seasonal farm employment, the migrant families are subjected to long and hazardous journeys, substandard and crowded housing, and unsanitary living conditions, all of which have their deleterious effects on the education of children during the regular school year.

This chapter on migrant programs during the regular school year deals with school practices, techniques, and procedures used by the seven participating States to assist migrant children with their educational problems during the regular school sessions. The migrant education program raises many problems for school personnel, such as providing school facilities during the seasonal influx, grade placement of pupils, promoting regular attendance, providing teachers who understand the cultural background of migrant children, adapting the curriculum to meet the needs of these children, obtaining school transfer records, and providing school lunches. The answers given by respondents concerning the above problems show many similarities in methods used to provide improved educational opportunities for the children of migrant farmworkers.

## Advance Estimates of "Children on the Move"

One of the problems faced by school administrators is to estimate the number of school age migratory children who will reside in their school districts during the harvest season. The school administrator must be able to anticipate the approximate enrollment in order to provide adequate teachers, classrooms, textbooks, and instructional materials. This presents a difficult problem as the number of migrant



Migrant children frequently travel across State lines and enroll in as many as five different schools during the regular school year.

children of school age entering a community usually varies greatly from year to year. This variance exists because some migrant parents may leave their children at the home base State while they are migrating from one community to another. Other areas may employ the "braceros"—Mexican nationals who are imported into the United States to work in agriculture under contract with the Mexican Government.<sup>1</sup> These Mexican workers do not bring their families with them.

<sup>1</sup> Public Law 78, the "bracero" program, will expire at the end of 1963 unless new legislation is enacted. Recent congressional action in May 1963 defeated legislation to extend the program for two additional years.

It is, therefore, difficult for the school officials to anticipate enrollments of migrants from year to year.

Some States have developed methods for estimating the enrollments of migrant children for the ensuing school year which have been comparatively accurate. One item in the questionnaire included various statements describing methods used and requested the respondent to check those which were used in his State. All States used more than one method of estimating enrollments. All of the States, with the exception of New York, made estimates by checking with the growers in the communities as to the number of migrant workers they plan to employ. The State of New York uses a method which is most accurate in determining the number of school age migrants in the State. A school census of all children (including migrants) from birth to 18 years of age is taken each summer. This provides an accurate count of school children and enables school officials to make adequate plans to accommodate all the children residing within the State. Both making estimates from the previous school year's enrollment and checking with the State labor employment service as to the number of workers and their families who contracted to work in their communities were methods used by five of the seven States. In addition to other methods, Colorado secured estimates of crop acreages planned from the county agricultural agent.

## How To Keep Migrant Children in School

"The cause of retardation—67 percent in our Colorado migrants—is centered in lack of school attendance. It definitely is not due to lack of scholastic ability," states Alfred M. Potts of the Colorado State Department of Education.<sup>2</sup>

The Michigan study in 1957 revealed that the number of years in migrancy and the number of moves made each year, increase the degree of retardation among migrant children.<sup>3</sup>

As there has been considerable speculation and guesswork concerning school attendance of migrant children, each respondent was requested to estimate the percentage of migrant children of school age who did not enroll in school but lived in communities in their State while the regular schools were in session.

The answers varied from "no data" or "good attendance" to 50 percent enrollment based on studies made in the communities during the

<sup>2</sup> Louisa R. Shotwell. *The Harvesters, The Story of Migrant People*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1961. p. 163.

<sup>3</sup> Jerome G. Manis. *A Study of Migrant Education*. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Western Michigan University Press, 1958. p. 11.

harvest peak. Oregon and Ohio estimated that 50 percent of the migrant children did not enroll in school, while Colorado estimated 25-30 percent. California reported that failure to enroll in school is unusual. New York estimated 10 percent and Pennsylvania 6 percent.

All seven responses indicated that there was sporadic attendance of migrant children in school, but the reasons for irregular attendance varied from State to State. However, some of the reasons given as to why these children did not attend regularly were common in all States.

Respondents answering this question indicated that the lack of education and attitude of migrant parents toward the importance of education for their children were probably paramount reasons why migrant children did not attend school regularly or, in many cases, never enrolled during the school year.

In areas where Spanish-speaking migrants were working, the "language barrier" was checked as an important factor contributing to irregular attendance. All respondents agreed that the need for the migrant child to care for younger brothers and sisters while the mother works was another major cause of poor attendance.

Other reasons given for irregular attendance of these nomadic children are as follows:

1. Child's earnings needed by the family.
2. Lack of acceptance of migrants by communities.
3. Lack of enforcement of school attendance and child labor laws.
4. Lack of adequate school facilities.
5. Lack of proper food or clothing for children.
6. Lack of school transfer records.
7. Lack of financial assistance to provide school supplies and facilities for migrant children.
8. High rate of retardation among migrant children.
9. Failure (of some school officials) to see the importance of getting "migrant kids in school for a few days."

All of the participating States reported that attendance officers were employed in some school districts and counties which have a large influx of migrant children. Under the new Migrant Children Education Act of 1961 in Colorado, the State will reimburse the salary and expenses of attendance supervisors. In some districts, interested principals and superintendents of schools often "beat the bushes" themselves.

It was emphasized by all of the respondents that a personal visit by school personnel was the most effective method to persuade migrant children to attend both the summer schools and the regular sessions.

## The Grade-Placement Problem—"Overgrown and Under-educated"

One of the serious obstacles in planning a suitable program for migrant children is the problem of knowing the level of academic achievement of each child and the proper grade in which he should be placed in order to progress and benefit the most from his educational experiences. When the migrants do not bring records from the previous schools attended, an evaluation must be made by the teacher or other school personnel.

The findings in this survey show that methods used to determine the grade level of migrant pupils who arrive in midterm vary from school to school and State to State. If adequate transfer records are not available, valuable schooltime can be lost in placing them in grades or classes where they can profit most from their experiences.

Miss Elizabeth Sutton, supervisor of a pilot project conducted in the States of Florida and Virginia writes:

In the process of evaluation, first consideration was given to the age, physical maturity, and social development of each child, and he was placed in a classroom accordingly. Records may have designated enrollment in a primary grade, but usually the procedure was to place a child in a more advanced grade and adapt the curriculum by taking into account his individual levels of attainment.

Respondents were asked to check the methods used for grade placement of migrant children, such as appraisal of teacher, test results, chronological age, reading ability, physical maturity, and social adjustment. This summary is shown in table 2. Most respondents used a combination of all the methods including previous school records, if such were available. Appraisal by the teacher was the method most commonly used.

The report from New Jersey stated that the methods of grade placement differed in some localities, but the same methods which apply to all new entrants would apply to migrants—namely on the basis of an overall study of the child and available records. In New York the migrants were placed on the bases of appraisal of the teacher and chronological age, and then transferred as ability indicated the placement most useful for the child. In Ohio, these children are usually placed according to age and reading ability, if there is no transfer record. The Colorado report indicated that each year more children bring records and fewer have gone the entire year without schooling. In this case, the child is placed according to his previous school record.

---

\* Elizabeth Sutton. *Knowing and Teaching the Migrant Child*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Department of Rural Education, 1960. p. 53.

It was generally agreed by all the States reporting that migrant children should not be separated from the resident children except for short periods of time for remedial work or in case of emergencies when classroom space was not available. Both California and Oregon have remedial classes for these children.

The report from California noted that some children are given help by special teachers during part of the schoolday, after which they return to their regular classes. While other studies have reported that some schools place migrant children in special classrooms for special instruction to meet their specific needs during their stay in the community, none of the respondents in this survey checked this item.

Table 2.—Methods used for grade placement of migrant children in seven States

Methods used	California	Colorado	New Jersey	New York	Ohio	Oregon	Pennsylvania
Appraisal of teacher.....		X		X	X	X	X
Test results.....	X	X			X	X	
Chronological age.....	X			X	X	X	
Reading ability.....	X				X	X	X
Physical maturity.....	X				X	X	
Social adjustment.....					X	X	
Overall study of child and available school records.....			X				
School record.....		X					

## The Problem of Providing Facilities

The school administrator must determine the present and future needs for school facilities in accordance with the number of transient families which may enter the school district each year. As explained above, the migration of families does not remain constant year by year and overexpansion of school facilities could be costly and wasteful. The costs of providing transportation is also a most baffling problem, especially to those districts with low taxable valuations. Because of the influx of migrant children during the peak of the harvest season, some enrollments have increased as much as 200 percent.<sup>5</sup> This presents a serious problem to school officials with restricted budgets who must provide additional school facilities for migratory children who may be in the community for only a short period of time. Some rural communities have not faced this problem because of the practice of declaring "crop vacations" during the peak of the harvest season. During these vacations the schools are closed so that school children

<sup>5</sup> Janet M. Jorgenson, David E. Williams, and John H. Burma. *Migratory Agricultural Workers in the United States*. Grinnell, Iowa: Grinnell College, 1960. p. 24.

may assist with the harvest. The U.S. Department of Labor reported that one or more scheduled crop vacations occurred during 1959-60 in 14 States.<sup>6</sup> However, many States including those participating in this survey, have made noble efforts to accommodate all the children of migrant farmworkers during their stay in the various agricultural communities.

In order to determine the most common and successful methods used in communities in the various States to provide school facilities for migratory pupils during the peak of the harvest season, 10 possible methods were listed in one item of the questionnaire. The respondents were requested to check the practices now being used and which have been most effective during the migrant influx. The responses to the methods used are summarized as follows:

1. All respondents indicated that most school districts within their States tried to organize small classes at the beginning of the school year so that migrant children could be absorbed without overloading classes. But because of large impacts of children in some districts, other provisions had to be made.
2. California, New Jersey, Ohio, and Oregon reported that it was sometimes necessary to overload classes to 35 or more students during the influx of migrant children. (A 1961 survey in California, included in their report, showed that out of 80 school systems queried, 27.5 percent reported having one or more grades on half-day sessions.)
3. Ohio and Oregon indicated that temporary facilities such as gymnasiums, auditoriums, music or other rooms, were used during the migrant influx. Ohio reported that, so far, all classes were held in school buildings. Oregon reported that temporary facilities have been used occasionally but not normally.
4. Colorado reported that one school system reopened a surplus school building during the harvest peak to accommodate migrant children.
5. Oregon reported that some migrant children were placed in regular classrooms as long as they were not overcrowded, and others in remedial rooms. Those in remedial rooms are placed in the regular classes as soon as they are able to do the required work.
6. Pennsylvania indicated that migrants are enrolled as regular school attendants for as long as they remain in the community.
7. New York indicated that while students who entered at the opening of schools were placed in regular classes, late entrants were placed in newly organized classes.

It is interesting to note that none of the respondents indicated the use of portable classrooms, temporary classrooms located at labor camps, or mobile classrooms which move with the children.

<sup>6</sup> *Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, 87th Congress, First Session, April 1961. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 155.*

## The Problem of Providing Teachers

One of the critical problems concerning the education of migratory children is to provide teachers who understand the cultural background, socioeconomic, and educational needs of such children. When migrant children enter school late and leave early, it is most difficult for teachers with overcrowded classrooms to adapt these children to an established curriculum or to initiate a different program of studies for the new arrivals. This presents a difficult task for the experienced teacher and an almost impossible problem for the unprepared or inexperienced teacher.

When school districts have an unusual large influx of migrant children during the harvest season, the problem of providing teachers as well as classrooms, may become a serious handicap. Migratory children may enter a community from 2 to 8 weeks after the opening of schools. Unless previous plans have been made, qualified teachers to augment the regular teaching staffs would be difficult to find in late September or October.

The purpose of this item in the questionnaire was to seek information about the methods used by the participating States to provide teachers for migrant children. The respondents were asked to mark a checklist which described the methods used to provide such teachers. Only two States—Oregon (in some districts) and Ohio—reported that extra teachers were employed during the migrant influx. California, Colorado, Ohio, and Pennsylvania reported that surveys were conducted in the community each year to determine which teachers would be available for either part-time or regular employment. Part-time teachers may be employed for part of each day, usually one-half day, or for a full day—but only during the period of attendance of migrant children. Teachers employed for part of a school day usually assist the regular teacher, while teachers who teach a full day have full charge of the classrooms. It is sometimes difficult to obtain qualified personnel who might be available for part-time employment.

Colorado reported that qualified teachers are employed from the school district's regular substitute list, including recently retired teachers. New York State reported that certified teachers are employed to assist where regular classes become too large for the regular faculty. California, New Jersey, and Oregon (in some districts) employ extra teachers at the beginning of the school year to teach classes with small enrollments so that they can absorb the migrant children when they arrive. A California survey in 1961 revealed that 18 percent of the teachers serving migrant children were working on provisional credentials. The Oregon report indicated that quali-

fied and experienced teachers were recruited from local school districts and preference was given to teachers who have training in special education areas.

### Providing School Lunches

The questionnaire in this survey includes items concerning the serving of free lunches to children of migrant farmworkers during both the regular and summer sessions. With the exception of California, the States included in this study operate special summer schools expressly for the education of migrant children. The responses to the items on free lunches indicated that there is a greater tendency to serve lunches free of charge to these children attending summer schools than those attending during the regular school year. During the regular session, they are usually integrated with resident pupils and, in order to avoid favoritism, the migrant children are subject to the same free-lunch policy as the resident children.

Four States—California, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania—indicated that free lunches were given only to those migrant children who gave evidence of financial need while attending the regular session. A few States reported that milk and snacks were furnished in some districts without charge. Colorado and Oregon charged a minimum fee, while New York and Ohio gave free lunches to migrants during the regular session.

### The Vanishing Transfer Records

It is not uncommon for migrant school children to be notified upon arriving home from school at the end of the day that they must immediately get ready to move on to the next community. Thus, the school personnel has no advance information about the children leaving or where they are going. If the child enters school in the next "stop up the road" the new teacher may write for the transfer record card. In many cases, however, the children do not reenter schools in other communities while on the trek. By the time they arrive at the home-base State in November, some pupils have forgotten the name of the schools perviously attended.

In answer to a question on the methods used to obtain transfer records, five respondents replied that they were encouraging the children and the parents to bring school records with them while on the trek. Two States noted a definite improvement in the problem of transferring school records. Oregon reported that most report cards

have little information. Colorado reported that their interstate agreements were not very successful but were improving on a district-to-district basis. Most responses indicated that it was necessary when the children enroll to write for their records from the previous schools attended. California and Colorado have agreements with other communities in- or out-of-State to send records by mail when children move.

California has a State regulation in regard to transfer records of transient children within the State, whereby officials must forward immediately the school records of children transferring from one school to another. The transferring student is given a school-addressed post card to present at the next school he attends. School officials must also write for records soon after the transient child enrolls in school. Most respondents indicated an urgent need for interstate agreements on the information to be presented on the transfer records and the methods of sending records from school to school.

## CHAPTER IV

# Summer School Programs—A New Chance

**S**TUDIES HAVE SHOWN that because of mobility and other disadvantages inherent in the migratory way of life, most children from families "who follow the crops" find it most difficult to attend school more than 6 or 7 months during the regular school year. As migratory pupils leave school early in the spring and do not return to their home base until late in the fall, they are unable to be promoted from grade to grade. Even though some of these children may attend schools along the major migrant routes, their attendance is irregular and the problems of adjusting to several new schools each year do not provide sufficient opportunity for them to meet requirements for grade promotion. Many studies and State reports have shown that the high rate of retardation among migratory children is highly correlated with school attendance. Many notable efforts have been made by local communities and the States to solve these problems. Several northern States initiated a movement to establish summer session programs to provide these children an opportunity to make up time lost from school. These schools for migrant children were first organized by voluntary and religious organizations in the early 1940's. Most of them were pilot projects organized on an experimental basis.

Experimental schools made significant contributions to migrant education by departing from the traditional curriculum to experiment with school programs designed to meet the individual needs of migrant children. In addition to the three R's, other subjects were introduced such as music, art, homemaking, health, citizenship, and others. These schools also attempted to develop in the child a feeling of being welcome, loved, and respected. In spite of the fact that classes were held during the summer months when children were not forced to attend and when their wages were needed to help support their families, the enrollments increased and many children tended to return the following year. Case studies in several participating States reveal that many migrant children have been able to meet sufficient standards to enable them to make up one or more grades of schooling. A 1962 report on the summer school program for migrant children in Oregon cites an excerpt from a summer school teacher: "Children who at-



Summer sessions provide migrant children an opportunity to make up time lost from school.

tended regularly for 3 weeks or more made distinct gains scholastically of from 2 to 4 months. Two boys advanced a full grade in reading and all made some progress.”<sup>1</sup>

Most of the respondents in this survey have indicated that there is a need for additional summer schools in their respective States to accommodate the migrant pupils who enter their communities each year. Table 5 shows 50 summer schools operating for migrant children in seven States in the summer of 1961. In the Hearings on Senate Bill 1124, April 1961, it was estimated that “about 205 summer schools are probably needed for the 20 States which use the largest number of migrant workers with children.”<sup>2</sup>

### Responsibility for Organization

Considering that the responsibility for the organization and location of summer schools for migratory children might vary in the seven States included in this survey, a question was asked to determine which agencies had the legal responsibility for establishing and locating such schools.

California and Colorado indicated that the State department of education had the legal responsibility for organization, but the location of such schools was a joint responsibility of the State department of education and the local school district. Oregon stated that this re-

<sup>1</sup> Ronald G. Petrie. *The Education of Migrant Children in Oregon*. Salem, Ore.: State Department of Education, 1962. p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Hearings Before Subcommittee on Migratory Labor*, op cit., April 1961. p. 283.

sponsibility was a coordinated, contractual agreement among the district or county and the State department of education. In Ohio, it was the legal responsibility of the local school district; and in Pennsylvania, the legal responsibility of the county. In New Jersey, the State department of labor was responsible for organizing and locating summer schools. In most of the States, however, it was indicated that the local or county school district had the legal responsibility, with the approval of the State school officer, for determining where the summer schools were to be located.

### Personnel Responsibility

**Organization and Administration.**—A question was asked concerning the duties of school personnel in regard to organization and administration. (See table 3.) With the exception of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, each State reported a divided or coordinated responsibility for the summer sessions. In most of the States, there is a joint responsibility of the State school officer with the county superintendent, local superintendent, and/or the principal of the school. In most States, the local school district makes application for the operation of summer schools with the cooperation and approval of the county superintendent and the State school officer. California reported that in the past, the district application for summer schools went through the Bureau of Adult Education.

Table 3.—Persons responsible for organization and administration of summer schools in seven States

States	State coordinator	State elementary supervisor	County superintendent	District superintendent	Principal	Teacher and county superintendent
California.....		X	X	X	X	
Colorado.....	X		X	X	X	
New Jersey <sup>1</sup> .....						
New York.....		X				
Ohio.....		X	X	X	X	X
Oregon.....	X	X	X	X	X	
Pennsylvania.....			X			

<sup>1</sup> Until recently, summer schools in New Jersey were operated by the State Department of Labor.

**Establishing the Curriculum.**—Studies indicate that the curriculum for summer sessions for migrant children should be quite different from that of the regular school term in that it should be flexible enough to meet the specific needs of migrant children and should also

assist in filling in the schooling missed during the regular school year. One question was designed to determine which persons had the responsibility for establishing the curriculum for summer schools.

Table 4 indicates that the person most often responsible for establishing the curriculum, with the approval of the district or county superintendent and the State supervisor, is the principal of the school. In California, Ohio, and Oregon, it is a shared responsibility of the local personnel with the State department of education. In Colorado, it is the primary responsibility of the principal. New York shows a joint responsibility between the principal and the district superintendent.

Table 4.—Persons responsible for establishing the summer school curriculums in seven States

States	State coordinator	State elementary supervisor	County superintendent	District superintendent	Principal
California.....		X	X	X	X
Colorado.....					X
New Jersey <sup>1</sup> .....					
New York.....				X	X
Ohio.....		X		X	X
Oregon.....	X	X	X	X	X
Pennsylvania.....					X

<sup>1</sup> No response to this question.

**Employment of Teaching Staff.**—All respondents indicated that the employment of teachers for summer schools was primarily a local responsibility. In most States, the principal of the school assists the district or county superintendent in obtaining teachers for the summer sessions. In Colorado, the principal recommends teachers to the local superintendent. In other States, it is a joint responsibility on the local level. Several States indicated that teachers were recruited for summer schools from those employed during the regular session. This provides an opportunity for the principal and the local or county superintendent to obtain first-hand information concerning the ability and qualifications of teachers to instruct migratory children.

## Administration Problems

The findings in this survey clearly indicate that the problems of voluntary organizations or local school personnel in organizing summer schools for migratory pupils vary from community to community and

State to State. However, the responses indicated that the common problem in organizing such schools appears to be that of developing favorable attitudes in the communities toward the welfare of migrant workers and the education of their children.

Many other problems have been encountered by school administrators and others who have attempted to organize summer schools for migrant children. As ironic as it may appear, the findings also indicate that the attempts to organize summer schools for the education of children of agricultural migrant workers have been met with opposition in many communities by both the permanent residents and the migrant agricultural families. This has been an important factor in the slow progress made in the organization of such schools by school personnel and voluntary organizations. Four States reported that the local residents were mostly opposed to spending school district tax money for special schools for migrants when no provision was made for such schools for resident children. The migrant parents were chiefly opposed because the wages of the children were needed to help support the families. Two States indicated that some migratory children did not wish to attend summer schools and that when the pupils did enroll for the summer sessions, the attendance was not compulsory and it was most difficult to encourage them to attend regularly.

While the unfavorable attitudes of many communities are diminishing because of State financial support of summer schools for migrants, Colorado, New York, Ohio, and Oregon report that this is still a factor in some communities.

All States with the exception of Pennsylvania indicated that another problem in organizing summer schools was the economic need of the migrant families for the wages of the children. Five States—New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania—reported that the reluctance of some local school boards to permit the use of school facilities for summer schools for migratory children was another problem in organizing such schools. The unwillingness of migrant parents to send their children to summer schools was indicated to be a factor in the States of California, New York, Ohio, and Oregon.

The respondents also checked the following as being problems which were often met when organizing summer school programs:

1. Lack of proper food and clothing for migrant children.
2. Children's need for health and welfare services.
3. Lack of financial support for the organization of summer schools.
4. Difficulty in recruiting trained teachers.



All children are assured a nutritional lunch in summer schools.

**Methods of Promoting Attendance.**—One of the problems encountered by school personnel in organizing summer sessions is persuading migrant children to enroll and to attend regularly. While methods vary in different States and communities, it was agreed by all respondents that a personal visit by school personnel to the residence of migrant children was the most effective method to encourage attendance.

The questionnaire contained a list of methods which might be used to promote attendance at summer schools, and respondents were requested to check the statements which described the methods they used. Other methods used are listed below in the order in which they were most frequently checked:

1. Write newspaper articles about the operation of summer schools in the community for migrant children.
2. Broadcast announcements on radio and television.

## 24 SELECTED STATE PROGRAMS IN MIGRANT EDUCATION

3. Place notices about summer schools for migrant children at labor camps and other migrant residences.
4. Obtain the cooperation of the crew leaders and growers to encourage children to attend school.
5. Enlist help of health and welfare workers in day-care centers to make lists of all the eligible children in the camps and to encourage children to attend.
7. Conduct a special school census of all children from birth to 18 years of age.
8. Seek cooperation of the Farm Placement Service.
9. Enlist the aid of the Migrant Ministry and other voluntary agencies.

**Admission Policies.**—Since all of the States participating in this survey reimburse local school districts for operating expenses of summer schools, contractual agreements are usually made between the State agency and the local school districts. This presents an opportunity for the State agency to organize uniform policies throughout the State for the admission of pupils attending summer schools. Other studies have reported instances where such schools were established without State assistance, and attendance was restricted to pupils living within the boundary lines of the school district. It is interesting to note, however, that all of the seven responding States replied that migrant children were admitted to all summer schools regardless of school boundary lines and without prejudices or restrictions relative to length of residence, previous schools records, color or creed. While some communities have been prejudiced against migrant children attending the regular school sessions because of rumors of diseases, morals, and improper language which might contaminate resident children, such objections are usually not raised for migrants attending summer schools, because resident children are not customarily in attendance at these sessions.

### Number and Size of Summer Schools

The wages of migrant children are very often needed to help sustain the family, and the older children are often required to remain at home to care for their smaller brothers and sisters while their mothers work in the fields. This presents a serious obstacle to school personnel who are trying to encourage migrant children to attend summer schools. Migrant parents who have little or no education have difficulty in understanding the importance of education for their children. It is, therefore, necessary for school personnel to make personal contact with the parents to encourage them to enroll their children in summer schools.

With so many problems involved in operating summer schools for migratory children, it is interesting to note in this survey that there were 50 summer schools in seven States enrolling approximately 3,855 migrant children during the summer of 1961. One-third of all these schools enrolled from 30 to 59 students. Eight summer schools had enrollments of fewer than 30 students and five enrolled 160 or above. The enrollments, school size, and number of schools by State are given in table 5.

Table 5.—Enrollments of summer schools for migrants, by school size, number of schools, and participating States

States	Total enrollments	Enrollment					Total summer schools
		Under 30	30-59	60-99	100-159	160 and above	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,855</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>50</b>
California <sup>1</sup>	1,359		2	2	4	3	11
Colorado	761	1		1	4	1	7
New Jersey	268			3			3
New York	350	3	5	1			9
Ohio	695	5	8	3			16
Oregon	377		1		1	1	3
Pennsylvania	45		1				1

<sup>1</sup> In California, 22 districts operated schools for all children, but only 11 were used for this survey. Data on the exact number of migrant children were not available, but it was estimated that 35 percent were migrants. The 35 percent estimated figure is used in this survey.

### Length of Sessions

Results of the survey showed that the length of summer school terms ranged from 19 to 36 days during the summer of 1961. Of the 50 summer schools reported by the seven States, 13 were in session for 36 days. The median length of term was 30 days. New Jersey and New York reported that all of their summer schools for migrant pupils were in session for 36 days. California was the only State reporting schools operating less than 20 days.

### Number of Personnel and Pupil-Teacher Ratio

The number of employees required to operate summer schools for migrant children is a major item in determining the total operating cost. The States which provide free lunches to children in attendance would obviously require more nonteaching personnel and additional funds. Some summer schools, however, furnish only cookies and milk which are served by the teachers.

26 SELECTED STATE PROGRAMS IN MIGRANT EDUCATION

Table 6.—Number of summer schools enrolling migrant children by number of days in operation and by participating States

Days	Total schools	California	Colorado	New Jersey	New York	Ohio	Oregon	Pennsylvania
<b>Total</b> . . . . .	<b>50</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
19 . . . . .	2	2						
20 . . . . .	9	4				3	1	1
24 . . . . .	4	4						
25 . . . . .	5		1			4		
29 . . . . .	1	1						
30 . . . . .	13		5			6	2	
32 . . . . .	1					1		
35 . . . . .	2					2		
36 . . . . .	13		1	3	9			

While some of the data on school personnel employed for the operation of summer schools for migratory children were not available, estimates show that approximately 193 full-time and 11 part-time teachers and principals were employed in the seven States surveyed. By estimating two part-time teachers as equivalent to one full-time teacher, the average pupil-teacher ratio would be approximately 19 pupils. The State variations in teacher-pupil ratio ranged from 8 in New York to 32 in California. It should be noted that the California summer schools are operated for all the children (local residents as well as migrants). The breakdown of summer school employees is tabulated in table 7.

Table 7.—Number of teachers, principals, other personnel, and pupil-teacher ratio in summer schools for migrant pupils, by State

States	Number of teachers and principals		Number of custodians, lunch-room personnel and others		Pupil-teacher ratio
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	
California <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	42				32
Colorado . . . . .	46	4	12		16
New Jersey <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	14				19
New York . . . . .	43		29		8
Ohio . . . . .	30	7	25	20	21
Oregon . . . . .	15		5		25
Pennsylvania . . . . .	3		6		15

<sup>1</sup> As only 35 percent of the enrollment in California was counted in table 6, only 35 percent of the teachers and principals are used in this table.

<sup>2</sup> New Jersey did not list the number of teachers and principals but reported 14 classrooms. It is estimated that there is one teacher for each classroom.

NOTE. . . . . indicates no response.

## Financing Summer Programs

Although the need for summer schools for migratory pupils has been recognized for many years, the statutory provisions in many States did not authorize expenditures by the State or local school systems for that purpose. Whenever such prohibitions existed, summer school programs for migrant youth had to be organized and financed by voluntary and religious organizations. Many of these summer programs were highly successful even though financial problems were encountered. The summer sessions providing supplementary school time for migratory children provided an opportunity for many of these educationally neglected children to receive a more coordinated program of education. Some of these programs had to be eventually discontinued due to the need for a sound and continuous source of revenue.

## State Support

As the summer sessions gave evidence of their worth towards improving the educational achievements of children of migrant farm-workers, the States gradually assumed the responsibility for their financing and operation. Available records indicate that in 1947, New Jersey became one of the first States to provide financial assistance for the operation of summer schools for migrant pupils,<sup>3</sup> New York State subsidized a summer program in 1951, Colorado in 1955, Ohio and Oregon in 1959, and Pennsylvania in 1961.

In 1927, the California legislature passed an act providing subsidies to rural school districts for migrant educational programs,<sup>4</sup> (during the regular sessions). It now provides 75 percent of operating costs of the local school district for operating summer schools for all children which may include migrants. The States of Colorado, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania provide 100 percent reimbursement of current operating expenses for the operation of such schools.

**Expenditures for Summer Schools.**—In order to determine the costs of operating summer schools, the respondents were asked to list the current expenditures for each of the summer schools which operated in their States during the summer of 1961. As some of the States participating in this survey were required to pay rentals to school

<sup>3</sup> New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry. *Bureau of Migrant Labor Report*. Trenton, N.J.: The Department, 1955. p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Marion Hathaway. *The Migratory Worker and Family Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

districts for the use of local school buildings and other facilities during the summer months, it was requested that such rentals be excluded from current operating expenditures. Respondents were also asked to show expenditures for pupil transportation separately from other expenditures. The total current expenditures in this study includes the cost of transportation of pupils, but excludes rentals for school facilities, debt service, and capital outlay. Five of the seven States were able to provide this data. The current expenditures shown in these five States showed considerable variance depending upon the number of students enrolled, number of staff members employed, number of days in operation, and the type of school lunch programs provided. Schools which furnished free hot lunches at noon employed additional personnel. The current expenditures, less rentals for school facilities, ranged from \$2,988 for one school in Pennsylvania to \$44,092 for seven schools in Colorado as shown in table 8 by the five reporting States.

**Transportation of Pupils.**—The transportation of migrant children to summer schools is a major item in the total costs of operating summer schools in large school districts where the children must be transported long distances to school. Where schools are located near migrant labor camps, the costs are less, but all expenditures for transportation are considered a part of the total current costs of operating summer schools in most States. However, California reported that costs for transportation cannot be defrayed from State funds in their reimbursement programs.

As shown in table 8, the costs of transportation ranged from \$440 in Pennsylvania to \$6,150 in Colorado. The average cost of transportation in the five reporting States was 11 percent of the total expenditures, and ranged from 8 percent in New York to 14 percent in Oregon.

**Cost per Teacher.**—In order to determine a practical measure of comparison, the cost per teacher or professional staff member, and per

Table 8.—Current expenditures, pupil transportation, and total expenditures (exclusive of rentals for facilities) for summer schools for migrant pupils in five States

States	Current expenditures, exclusive of rentals, and pupil transportation	Pupil transportation expenditures	Total current expenditures, including transportation and excluding rentals
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>\$132, 632</b>	<b>\$16, 956</b>	<b>\$149, 588</b>
Colorado.....	44, 092	6, 150	50, 242
New York.....	38, 503	3, 440	41, 943
Ohio.....	28, 046	3, 606	31, 652
Oregon.....	19, 003	3, 320	22, 323
Pennsylvania.....	2, 988	440	3, 428

pupil appeared to be the most feasible. In determining the cost per teacher, only the regularly employed principals and teachers were included. This is not a true measure of comparing school programs as the type of summer school services offered to migrant children vary in each State. Some schools employ school nurses, attendance officers, lunchroom personnel, or clerks. Other schools provide only light lunches, such as cookies and milk, which are served by the teachers.

Other factors which must be considered in the costs of operating summer schools are the voluntary help and private grants. Ohio reported that some schools received voluntary help at noon. California reported a grant to the Sebastopol Union Elementary District from the Rosenberg Foundation to pay for a special consultant in reading and arithmetic for the summer school program.

The cost per teacher also varies with the number of students assigned to each teacher and the teacher's salary schedule. Some of these factors are apparent in the five reporting States. Ohio reported seven part-time teachers in seven different schools but did not indicate the length of time taught by each teacher. In table 7, they were counted as half-time teachers. Two States (Colorado and Ohio) employ teachers for part-time, usually one-half day, to assist the regular teacher with special reading groups or other makeup work. The cost per teacher ranged from \$944 in Ohio to \$1,488 in Oregon, with an average cost per teacher of \$1,057 in all reporting States.

**Cost per Pupil.**—The cost per pupil for summer schools varies according to the pupil unit of measure used in computing the per pupil expenditures. In this survey, the pupil enrollment was used because the attendance of migrant children is usually irregular. The teachers and adequate school facilities must be available at all times for all the children enrolled. The number of days in which the school is operated must also be considered when determining the per pupil cost. The per pupil cost ranged from \$45 in Ohio to \$119 in New York. The average cost per pupil in the five reporting States was \$67.

In order to determine the costs of operating summer schools for migrant children, another method of comparison can be made by showing the daily cost per pupil for each of the five States. As shown in table 9, the daily cost per pupil ranged from \$1.50 in Ohio to \$3.80 in Pennsylvania.

**Rental Fees for Use of School Facilities.**—As previously stated, the summer school programs for migrant children were originally started by voluntary organizations. These organizations indicated that as there was considerable resistance in some school districts to using the local school facilities, temporary space for classrooms had to be rented. Such voluntary groups were refused permission to use the

Table 9.—Average current expenditures per teacher, per pupil, and daily cost per pupil (exclusive of rentals for facilities but including transportation) for summer schools for migrant pupils in five States

State	Cost per teacher	Cost per pupil	Daily cost per pupil
Colorado.....	\$1,068	\$66	\$1.90
New York.....	975	119	3.30
Ohio.....	944	45	1.50
Oregon.....	1,488	59	2.10
Pennsylvania.....	1,142	76	3.80
Average.....	1,057	67	2.50

school facilities because of rumored suspicions concerning uncleanness, destructiveness, and diseases of migrant children which might harm the schools and have a bad influence on resident children.

In other districts, where permission was given to use the local classrooms, a rental fee was charged to the sponsoring organization. The States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania reported that school districts charged a rental fee for the use of school facilities for summer schools for migrant children. In the above-mentioned States, the rental fees were paid by the State Department of Labor. The other five States reported that no rental charge was made by the local district for summer school sessions. These five States do not pay rental fees for the use of school facilities as the local district assumes the responsibility for this service. Some communities feel that because migrant families make an economic contribution to the wealth of the community by harvesting local crops, and through direct spending, the local school district should provide school facilities for educationally deprived migrant children.

## The Lure of School Lunches

The importance of providing school lunches for migrant children attending summer schools has been emphasized in other State reports on summer sessions such as the following from Colorado:

The value of the school lunch to children of low income families and those from economically depressed areas is tremendous. The meal at school is, in many cases, the only real meal they get all day, and almost without exception it is the only nutritionally balanced meal . . . Truancy and disciplinary problems have consistently diminished where a good lunch is available, and a special effort is made to see that all children needing a lunch get it.\*

\* Colorado State Department of Education. *Learning on the Move, A Guide for Migrant Education*. Denver, Colo.: The Department, 1960. 220 p.

Other reports on summer sessions have indicated that serving hot lunches provides an opportunity for instruction in health, manners, and social relations with other children. They also provide an opportunity for children of other cultural backgrounds to have the experience of eating new types of food and learning about healthful and balanced diets.



The school lunch often provides the only adequate meal the migrant child receives during the day.

In this survey, respondents reported that noon lunches, or snacks and milk, were served to all the children attending summer schools. Four States—New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—indicated that lunches were served free of charge; two States—Colorado and Oregon—have a minimum token fee; and one State—California—served free lunches only to those children who showed evidence of financial need. A few respondents indicated that a token fee should be charged so that the migrant child would not be made to feel that he was accepting charity. It was also reported that some schools do not have the necessary facilities for preparing hot lunches.

## CHAPTER V

# Research and Planning Needed

**A** SECTION on research and planning was included in the questionnaire in order to identify the existing problems in each of the participating States, to receive recommendations from the respondents on possible solutions to these problems through research and study, and to provide necessary information to educational, governmental, and voluntary organizations desiring to improve the educational opportunities of children of migrant farmworkers.

Even though there has been some research and considerable planning in regard to the education of migrant children, the many complex and baffling problems inherent in migrancy show a desperate need for more intensive and coordinated efforts in this area of education. Many State reports, including the proceedings of regional and national conferences and workshops concerning the education of migrant children, point out the need for more organization, planning, and research at the local, State, and Federal levels. Most of these reports indicate the need for studies and research on interstate agreements concerning standardized transfer records and educational programs for migrant pupils who cross State boundary lines each year.

This study includes the above suggestions and others such as methods of acceptance of migrant pupils in the schools, agreements on information to be recorded on transfer and permanent record cards, methods for storing and transmitting such information, short standardization units of study in the basic skills to improve the continuity in subject matter, policies regarding State responsibilities for the education of migrant children within the States, developing "on the road projects" for transient children and developing curriculum materials to meet the needs of these pupils.

The respondents were asked to check each of the statements as listed describing research items which needed further study in order to improve the educational programs for migratory pupils. These are listed in the order by which they were most frequently checked. All respondents checked the following three statements:

1. Establish interstate agreements on educational programs for migrants as described above.

2. Provide textbooks and library books with a high interest and low reading level to meet the needs of these children.
3. Plan an improved curriculum to meet the needs of migratory children. This would include subject matter to meet their immediate needs such as information on health, cleanliness, foods, and vocational instruction.

In addition to these three needs, California, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania indicated that there was a need for interschool agreements between schools within the State or along the same migratory route which enroll a large percentage of the same migrant pupils each year. Such agreements may include the immediate transmittal of information concerning grade placement, social adjustment, reading ability, and other scholastic achievements of migratory pupils. California, Colorado, Ohio, and Oregon checked the need for developing standardized transfer records between communities and States.

Four States—California, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania—also indicated a need to develop short units of study for migrant children to improve the continuity and articulation of subject matter in basic skills in each subject area, with consideration for individual differences. California, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania checked the need for study of methods for enforcing the present school attendance and child labor laws. California, Colorado, Ohio, and Oregon indicated that plans for improving the teacher-training program for teachers of migrants should be developed.

Other items checked by three or fewer State respondents were:

1. Develop aptitude, achievement, and intelligence tests for Spanish-speaking children.
2. Develop short units of study for Spanish-speaking migrants.
3. Study methods to promote and standardize new school attendance and child labor laws.
4. Plan central clearinghouses for school records in each migrant stream.
5. Plan programs for improving the organization and administration of education for migrant children in order to fill the gaps in their educational program.
7. Obtain Spanish-speaking teachers for Spanish-speaking children.

Other recommendations made for further study and research by the California report are:

1. Study practices regarding grouping, discipline, and promotion in selected schools. Schools from which all or most of the graduates enter the next level of education and perform successfully should be selected.
2. Study secondary school opportunities available to migrant youth, problems of dropouts, and programs with successful holding power.
3. Study effective means of teaching English as a foreign language to children of Spanish-speaking background.

• • •



**Educational opportunities for migrant children can be improved through research, planning, and interstate cooperation.**

All of the seven States were unanimous in their responses concerning the need for State and interstate planning and coordination of programs for improving the educational opportunities for migratory children. Migratory children usually attend schools in various different communities and States each year where the curriculums, teachers, methods of instruction, textbooks, and transfer records may vary from school to school. Because of the above reasons, the respondents indicated a need for more planning, coordination, and research at all levels of government (local, State, and Federal) in order to provide these children with a continuous program of instruction.

## CHAPTER VI

# Comments and Views on Migrant Problems

**T**HE FINAL QUERY of the questionnaire stated that any comments or recommendations regarding the views of the respondents on the problems of migrant education would be welcome. The following statements are typical of those made by respondents and have been classified under the general headings: attendance, attitudes, curriculum, finances, and summer schools.

### Attendance

1. The biggest factor in attendance is that migrant children are educationally retarded and are 16 years of age or older before they complete the sixth, seventh, or eighth grades. So they drop out.
2. One of the major reasons why migrant children do not attend school is the lack of cooperation in getting the migrants to understand the education programs and the education law requirements.
3. The biggest education problem exists in the area of education for Anglo-migrants. These problems are more severe in most cases than the problems of Spanish-speaking children. They will not go to school in most cases unless they are forced.
4. The fact that the migrant child's earnings are needed by the family is a rapidly receding cause for nonattendance in school.

### Curriculum

1. Regional conferences should be held on the education of migrant children, focused on ways of adjusting the curriculum to meet their needs and of establishing guidance procedures which build good mental health.
2. Another big problem is the lack of continuity of educational programs between States. It seems almost impossible to get educators to agree as to what constitutes a good educational program.

### Attitudes

1. "Do-gooder" attitudes must be avoided.
2. True and total facts of the need for education are best supporting instruments. Wide circulation (of the facts) should be given among citizens.
3. There are educators, as there are lay citizens, who refuse to believe that short-period school experiences are worth the effort and expense for these youngsters—summer or regular terms.
4. More effective ways need to be developed for communicating with families in each school district. More and more of these parents send children to school when it is available and when they feel welcome.
5. Pennsylvania has already developed channels and materials for welcoming migrant children to the schools. Teachers-in-training at Bucknell University have a committee on migrant children. These young prospective teachers are eagerly offering their services.

### Finances

1. Provide financial assistance on a per capita basis on both State and national levels.
2. One of the current problems is trying to devise a formula (for State reimbursement) for use during the regular school year which fits the needs of all districts affected.
3. Schools which receive migrant children in numbers and which require hiring of extra teachers incur far greater expense than the schools which receive so few that they can be absorbed in the established facility.
4. Provide funds to maintain classes small enough so that individual instruction can be given.
5. Provide funds for counties and districts enrolling a significant number of migrant children to employ school social workers to coordinate health, welfare, and education services.
6. Since State level support for programs is available, reluctance, both on the part of migrant families and on the part of the community, is rapidly diminishing.

### Summer Schools

1. Local school districts are often reluctant to finance summer schools for migrant children.
2. Colorado's experience has proven the acceptability of using formulas for determination of budget allowances from State funds for summer terms. They are more practical than non-restrictive budget making.
3. It should be possible for migrant children to attend school wherever they are.
4. In the summer school program last year, Oregon had 377 children enrolled. There were not over 15 children registered who were Anglos, although there are twice as many Anglos as Spanish-speaking children (in the community).
5. It is New Jersey's opinion that the program for children should be extended in a marked way, since at present it is not reaching anything like the total group. For example, about one-seventh of the children between the ages of 5 and 16 were included in the program last summer. This does not include all youth, pre-school children, or adults.

