

6-9-1972

Report on the Model Schools Program of School District No. 1

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "Report on the Model Schools Program of School District No. 1" (1972). *City Club of Portland*. 271.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/271

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

**REPORT
ON
THE MODEL SCHOOLS PROGRAM
of
SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1**

*The Committee: Anthony J. Barker, Walter G. Brown, Norman M. Janzer, M.D.,
Paul F. Mielly, Melvin N. Olson and John F. Williams, Chairman.*

This report published
with financial assistance of the
PORTLAND CITY CLUB FOUNDATION, Inc.

Published June 9, 1972
Vol. 53, No. 2
Portland City Club Bulletin
505 Woodlark Building
Portland, Oregon 97205

**REPORT
ON
THE MODEL SCHOOLS PROGRAM
of
SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1**

To the Board of Governors,
The City Club of Portland:

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1969 the Project Planning Board of The City Club of Portland proposed the establishment of a committee to study the program, effects and prospects for the Model Schools Program of Portland's School District No. 1.

"The report should detail and analyze the objectives and contents of the program as created and administered by the School Board and the administrative staff of the District and should examine the actual operation of the affected schools."

The charge further went on to say the study should specifically relate the present program to alternatives and pay appropriate attention to the availability of resources to carry them into effect. The proposal was also to inquire, to the greatest feasible extent, into the effects of the program on the children and their families in the neighborhoods served by the program.

The Committee's plan of investigation was to review the Race and Education Report conducted by a group of Portland citizens under the direction of Judge Herbert W. Schwab, 1964-65, examine the Portland School administration's program, conduct interviews with school personnel, conduct a mail survey on attitudes and opinions of teachers and other classroom instructors, and examine literature from government sources and independent researchers wherever possible.

Other than looking at what money was spent on the Model Schools, the Committee chose not to undertake the momentous task of investigating financial resources to fund alternatives or continue the program. The voters of the School District turned down an administration request for money for "middle schools" and three times turned down requests for operating funds for the District. The School District attempted in the May primary to secure a change in the District's tax base to provide additional monies for operating, but it does not currently have any plans for "extra" money for additional special programs. The May proposal failed.

History

Briefly stated, the challenge given the Board of Education in 1965, by the report on *Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland Public Schools*¹ was: Find effective ways of helping low-income children learn; give them the basic intellectual skills to be more successful in schools and help them compete more successfully for jobs and rewarding positions in the adult community.

The Schwab Report identified many community and school-related problems, including:

1. lack of coordination between social agencies and schools;
2. frequent transfers of students;
3. excessive tardiness;
4. frequent absences;

¹*Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland Public Schools*. A Report to the Board of Education, Portland School District No. 1 by its Committee on Race and Education, Herbert W. Schwab, Chairman, October 29, 1964. Hereinafter the Report is referred to as the "Schwab Report", for its chairman.

5. few organized youth programs;
6. high turnover of teachers;
7. learning problems with disturbed children, and
8. low achievement levels on standard tests.

Black children were found to have less than adequate preschool language skills. *Social-economic environment was said to be a chief factor in creating disadvantaged students.*

The accompanying chart shows a school-by-school achievement comparison in the District.

TABLE 1 ²

(A comparison of Average Composite Achievement Rates for Grades 3, 5 and 7 in 1959-60 and 1965-66. The "achievement rate" is the ratio of achievement output to instruction input. A pupil who has attended school for 5 years and who is functioning at the 4th grade level would have an achievement rate of 4/5 (80%). (Note: There are nine grade schools listed below; the tenth school in the Program was Jefferson High School).)

Average Achievement Rate			
<u>Model School</u>	<u>1959-60</u>	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>% of Decline</u>
Boise56	.45	19
Buckman79	.70	11
Eliot49	.45	8
Holladay62	.50	19
Humboldt72	.60	16
Irvington97	.70	27
King75	.40	46
Sabin99	.70	29
Woodlawn86	.70	18
Area75	.60	20

The average decline in the achievement rate during the first five years of the 1960s was 20 percent. The Committee was told by Dr. James Holmes, the record-keeper for the Program, that the decline was symptomatic of a change in the socio-economic base of the population in the area of the Model Schools, rather than to changes in instructional procedures.

The Schwab Report recognized the broad scope of the social and educational problems it had under consideration. Its recommendations, however, were primarily directed at the formal educational process. The Portland School District has made an effort to achieve the goals of the Schwab Report. The schools have attempted to (or have been permitted to) bear almost the entire burden of achieving these goals.

The Model Schools Program

In 1965 the Portland Public Schools started a "compensatory" education program for "underachieving students" who lived in a "disadvantaged" section of Portland, stretching generally from Columbia Boulevard on the north to Hawthorne Boulevard on the south, and from the Willamette River on the west to about 21st Street on the east.

The general goals of the program were to:

- increase the quality of instruction.
- increase achievement as measured by standard tests in the "Three Rs".
- increase achievement in science and arts as tested by locally developed tests.
- increase pupil motivation for academic success.

²Obtained from the records of School District No. 1 as compiled by Dr. James Holmes.

- give students a positive view of themselves in the community and their personal lives.
- stabilize teacher and staff turnover rates.

Some specific program goals were to:

- improve classroom performance in reading.
- improve classroom performance in other skill areas.
- improve the children's background and understanding of the world in which they live.
- improve the children's self image.
- change in a positive direction their attitudes toward school and education.
- raise student occupational and/or educational aspiration levels.
- increase student expectations of success in school.
- increase experiences that help children appreciate their culture and develop increased understanding of their relationship to other people.
- provide integrated educational experiences for more minority race children.
- help children conduct themselves appropriately in various social settings.
- improve the physical health of the children.
- increase parent understanding of the school's role and enlist parental support in the interest of their children's success.

Project I Program Plans

The Portland Schools prepared to meet their challenge by organizing specific programs, including:

An open enrollment program in which students of any Model School were allowed to attend any other school in the city, with the parents supplying necessary transportation and other needs. (Previously, a student was restricted to attending the school in his own neighborhood district.)

Administrative transfer of students which allowed the administration to select the students to be transferred, with parental approval, and with the School District providing transportation and other resources.

An outward-bound program which transferred students from the "core" area to schools outside the City of Portland.

Head Start and Follow-Through programs in which Early Childhood Education (Head Start) would provide education, medical care, social services and nutritional health to preschool children from low-income families.

Reading specialists who were to work at primary grade levels with regular classroom teachers in planning reading instruction programs.

Instructional Television which would be introduced in the third and fourth years of the program in the hope it would be an additional resource to aid classroom teachers.

Teacher aides to be added in schools to perform routine tasks to free the teacher so the teacher might devote more time to actual instruction and teaching of children.

Teacher corps interns to be added for additional instructional resource.

Community agents to be assigned each school with responsibility for strengthening relationships between the school and the home.

Tutors from local colleges and upper grades to be added to the Program.

Field trips to be emphasized. (Although field trips have long been a part of the Portland program, it was felt additional experiences could aid in the Model Schools Program.)

An extended day program to give remedial enrichment and recreational opportunities to children considered to be educationally deprived, such program going beyond regular school hours and developed to meet the specific interests of the children.

A reading improvement center at Eliot School for the pupils of the other nine grade schools in the Program. (This was discontinued.)

Parent and adult education in an attempt to increase the children's opportunities at home and to increase parental understanding of a child's growth and development patterns. (Never implemented.)

Since the creation of the Model Schools Program in Portland, hundreds of experimental compensatory education programs have been started in the United States, mostly with the aid of Title I funds (1965, Elementary and Secondary Education Act). ESEA was touted as significant because it was the first time the federal government had recognized, with money, the disadvantaged student who was usually a product of low-income status.

The processes of determining which children should receive the Federal Title I funds are spelled out in the legislation, *Federal Regulation and Program Criterion*. The law says money should go to:

- individual children, not whole school populations.
- children who have one or more educational handicaps and who come from low-income families, but not all children in all poverty area schools.
- programs that seek primarily to raise the educational attainments or skills of children, but not exclusively to projects or services dealing with health, welfare or recreational needs of poor children.

Funding

In Portland, monies came from several sources:

- Title I funds from the Federal government (approximately \$700,000 per year).
- Local school funds (approximately \$500,000 per year).
- State school funds (approximately \$1.3 million per year).

On the average, \$500 per student per year was put into "compensatory education" for the 5,000 students of the core area. The average Portland student cost was \$750 for the same years. The total for a "Model School student" was \$1,250.

Other Background Material

Our Committee examined reports of Health, Education and Welfare Office of Education programs, books, pamphlets, articles and statements made about these programs, and examined some of the alternatives which have been suggested both by experts and non-experts from all parts of the United States.

Your Committee also took cognizance of the Model Cities Education Committee³ report on the Model Schools Program, dealing mostly with the disadvantage of race in education.

In support of the Schwab Report and the Model Cities Educational Committee Report, the Coleman Report,⁴ covering 650,000 students and 60,000 teachers in 3,000 schools across the country, speaks directly to the program of race and education. Coleman says:

"School integration is vital not merely for some vague generalized social purposes, but because it is the most consistent mechanism for improving the quality of education of disadvantaged children."

³The Model Cities Program organized a Citizens' Committee to investigate schools and the educational needs of minority students.

⁴"Survey of Educational Opportunities," 1966, James S. Coleman, U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

The Coleman Report also found that *all aspects of school combined are less important* to a child's educational achievement than *non-school factors*, particularly family background. (Emphasis supplied.)

Coleman also found that children learn more from each other than from their teachers. Research done by Joseph A. Cobb of Oregon Research Institute would tend to substantiate Mr. Coleman. In a bulletin on his work he says:

"Thus, the child who talks about academic material to his peers, as well as attends to his work, is more likely to succeed than the child who attends without interacting with his peers."

And he continues:

". . . the successful child receives more practice in academic skills through his social interaction than do peers whose social interactions are less concerned with academics."⁵

A mail survey was conducted to sample the attitudes of teachers, teacher aides and other classroom participants. An "in-person interview" was attempted with each of the principals of the ten schools in the Model Schools Program. Information interviews were made with teachers, principals, aides, nurses, social workers, etc., by your Committee's Research Intern and Chairman.

Your Committee interviewed Dr. Robert W. Blanchard, Superintendent of Portland Public Schools and was told about the proposed reorganization plan and that "Model Schools", as an administrative unit, had been abolished, but that "the best parts of the program would be retained." Dr. Blanchard said subsequently the same thing during the public hearings on the plan.

Dr. Blanchard told the Committee that the curriculum developments and techniques employed in the Model Schools will be "evaluated" at the superintendent level, and it is expected that the curriculum will be altered in light of this evaluation. Those aspects of the Model Schools Program which are specialized, such as preschool education, are likely to be retained and developed as exemplary programs for eventual incorporation into the District-wide educational plan.

According to Dr. Blanchard the plan involves no sacrifice of any federal or state funding. He says the level of funding is based upon the economic level of the children living in a designated area, regardless of where they go to school.

II. COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION

Your Committee finds the evaluation of educational programs, particularly a program with overtones of race and social class, is like grasping a handful of smoke. The Committee was particularly frustrated by the traditional professional educational concept of evaluation. This concept counts input into schooling (such as better equipment, better space, more men teachers, lower teacher-student ratios, portables, desks, etc.) as a measure of "success", when really the only "counting" measure should be what effect this input has on the *output*. Do we really get better students, better learners? Your Committee is unable to shed much light on whether the "hardware", the new facilities or the increased salaries, had a direct influence on the achievement level of the culturally deprived child.

Dr. James Holmes, Research Supervisor for the Model Schools Program, reported to the Committee, ". . . the testing of the students in the Model Schools Program shows . . . some encouraging gains as well as some discouraging declines." He said: "It is clear that much has been accomplished, but there is more to be done to bring about better achievement for disadvantaged children."

Dr. Holmes also said he could make no comparison between schools of the Model Schools Program and other Portland schools, other than District-wide "norms" and national "norms". "Area II (Model Schools) doesn't really have the kind of evaluation programs to really tell the story in any subject but reading," Holmes added, "and in 1969-70, over the total area, achievement at the end of the school year was at about the same level as at the beginning—about 70 percent."

⁵The Relationship of Discreet Classroom Behaviors to Fourth Grade Academic Achievement, Oregon Research Institute Bulletin, Vol. 10, Nov. 1970, Joseph A. Cobb.

The following charts come from a report by Dr. Holmes entitled "Portland Public School Program, #1 Evaluation, 1965-70":

TABLE 2

A Comparison of Average Composite Achievement Rates for Grades 3, 5 and 7 in 1965-66 and 1969-70. "Achievement rate" is the ratio of achievement output to instruction input. A pupil who has attended school for five years and who is functioning at the fourth grade level would have an achievement rate of 4/5 (80%). No test evidence was presented on the tenth school, Jefferson High School.

Model School	Achievement Rate Means		
	1965-66	1969-70	% of Increase
Boise45	.60	33
Buckman70	.85	21
Eliot45	.65	44
Holladay50	.55	10
Humboldt60	.65	8
Irvington70	.75	7
King40	.60	50
Sabin70	.80	14
Woodlawn70	.65	-7
Area60	.70	17

Dr. Holmes expressed the belief that the "population was more stable" during this 1965-1970 period than the 1959-1966 period which showed the drastic decline in achievement rate and prompted the Schwab Report.

In other statistics, Dr. Holmes projected a "25 percent increase" in the achievement rate for students in Grade 3 from 1965-66 to 1969-70. Students in Grade 3 had fallen to a rate of achievement only a little better than one-half the Portland norm.

In Grades 5 and 7, test evidence quoted demonstrated a "4 percent increase" from 1965-66 to 1969-70. The average 5th grade in the Model Schools had fallen even lower than the 3rd grades, so in 1969-70, even with a "4 percent increase", a 5th grader was 40 points below the Portland norm.

Grade 7 did not suffer as drastic a drop as the others, but even with a slight increase in achievement, the average 7th grader is achieving at 70 percent of his Portland counterpart.

Another method of evaluating results would be to follow the progress of former Model Schools students in high school. Apparently such information was not compiled by the administration. However, a recent report in the *Oregonian* offers some insight.

Three of the eight feeder schools for Jefferson High School (Boise, King, Woodlawn) were Model Schools for the entire five year experiment. Reporting on testing given by Portland schools the *Oregonian* says: "The incoming classes at Jefferson registered lowest in the city in all subjects each year from 1965-1970. Though a boundary change in 1970 may have eased the problem slightly, area evaluation specialists feel impact in the past two years has probably been nominal."

And the article continues, "In reading, Grade 9 scores have declined faster at Jefferson than the District average during the 1965-70 District-wide test period, and the gap between Jefferson and the schools above it appears to be widening."⁶

If Dr. Holmes and your Committee seem confused as to testing results of the Portland compensatory education experiment, they are not alone. McDill, McDill and Sprehe⁷ in their comprehensive evaluation of compensatory education across the United States in the past few years say:

⁶"School Analysis; Jefferson," by Robert Landauer and Bill Keller, *The Oregonian*, May 22, 1972.

⁷*Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education*, Elward L. McDill, Mary S. McDill, S. Timothy Sprehe, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

"The evidence regarding the effectiveness of compensatory education is ambiguous. We . . . discovered few projects which demonstrated persistent and consistent results."

Singling out people for special attention (The Hawthorne effect) has been shown to affect their behavior. A 4 percent increase could be the result of the "special attention" paid to students and not of the "special programs" provided for them. It cost an additional \$500 per student per year expenditure to achieve a 4 percent change in these two grades. (Assuming the testing is valid).

There seems to be hope in the 25 percent increase in "learning rate" of primary grade (in this case, third grade) children. It supports the theory that compensatory programs are more effective on younger children.

McDill, McDill and Sprehe said further:

"Our analysis of the existing evaluation research on compensatory education programs has led us to conclude that, overall, it fails to meet even minimum standards for program design, data collection and data analysis."

The Portland Model Schools Program follows the national pattern and had few measurable goals or standards from which to judge the success or failure of its various programs. For instance, school administrators contended that there were more "adults-per-student" in the ten model schools (often stated in a "student-teacher" ratio). This would seem like a "success" for the program, reducing class loads. However, there is serious question that this increased the number of hours a student was confronted with a certified teacher.

A University of Oregon economist, Eaton Conant, in a study of some of Portland's ghetto schools⁸ concluded that a teacher in a single-teacher classroom during a five-hour class day actually taught 94 minutes.

"In fact", he says, "teachers get so little time in the classroom to teach that it's almost astounding." The assumption is that teachers spend too much time operating movie projectors, mimeographing lessons, disciplining students or doing clerical work.

His study was the result of a two-year effort and is much more comprehensive than the investigation conducted by your Committee. To quote Conant, ". . . The division of labor in education is simply so badly organized that teachers have little relative time to teach."

The administration has made efforts to give every child in the ten schools an "equal opportunity" to the resources of the Program, but, because of the obvious non-school differences between sociological groups, results from opportunity vary greatly. Statistical material supplied by school administrators could be used to show that the downward drift of the educational achievement in the Model Schools area from 1960 to 1965 has been arrested because the *neighborhood itself* has not experienced much further socio-economic decline during the past five years.

The economic conditions of school neighborhoods were given by the Schwab Committee as perhaps *the* most important element in the list of factors in the education of a child. (Hence the word "disadvantaged"). Unfortunately, there are few population statistics to demonstrate what Dr. Holmes referred to as a "more stable population".

A booklet published by the Metropolitan Planning Commission⁹ (now under CRAG) shows that during the period 1956-1960, the inbound migration to Portland came chiefly from towns and cities *smaller* and more rural than Portland. Portland outbound migration left the neighborhoods for the suburbs. Those particular population statistics did not tabulate population mobility by race.

Similar studies are not available for the years of the Model Schools. No factual

⁸A *Cost Effectiveness Study of Employment of Non-Professional Teaching Aides in Public Schools*, Eaton H. Conant, University of Oregon, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

⁹*Population Mobility*, published by Metropolitan Planning Commission, 1966.

verification can be made. However, it is the opinion of the Committee that the advent of such federal programs as Model Cities, the growth of E-CAP and other neighborhood programs, new housing programs by the Housing Authority of Portland, and low-cost aid provided for homeowners in such areas, have all had a strong stabilizing effect on the Model Schools neighborhoods.

The same test is given both "advantaged" and "disadvantaged" students as well as students of high or low intelligence. It is difficult to interpret the test results as the natural outcome of intensified school programs. The Committee was not given the results of any comparative tests of *individual* students from one year to the next. (A request was made in writing for such a study.) All the tables given here show is that, for example, 3rd grade students tested in 1971 are better achievers than those tested in 1966. The 1971 3rd grader may be brighter because his environment is better. Indeed since the 3rd grader of 1966 is now an upper grader, where testing shows only minor improvement, one could conclude his five year experience has not had much influence on his *learning* rate.

Interpretation of testing, which has been used as "proof" that the program at least put a floor under achievement levels, was viewed by the Committee as questionable because of the many variables and because of the lack of any statistically accurate way to compare children with themselves or any control group.

Specific Program Evaluation

Your Committee attempted to evaluate each phase of the program on its own merit, tie those comments to the total effect of the six years, look at this in light of the national experience and come to some conclusions and/or recommendations.

Reduction in Class Size. Almost everyone interviewed subscribed to the plan of giving disadvantaged children better education through reduction of the average class size. The original goal of the Model Schools Program was no more than 20 per class.

School	Average Class Size		
	1964-65	1967-68	1971-72
Boise	29.2	20.3	26.1
Buckman	30.7	25.0	21.3
Eliot	25.6	21.0	24.6
Holladay	27.6	19.4	22.0
Humboldt	28.9	24.1	25.6
Irvington	29.0	27.1	18.8
King	29.2	24.1	20.9
Sabin	29.1	26.9	23.8
Woodlawn	30.9	26.4	26.7
Average	28.9	23.8	23.3

Class size has been reduced. Teacher aides, tutors, team leaders, etc., were added and space rearranged, but there is a question if this actually increased the number of minutes a teacher spent with each child.

There may be fewer students per classroom, but as found by Dr. Conant's research, the additional help given only raised the "student-teacher" instruction time from 90 minutes to 109 minutes per day.

P. Rossi, writing for the National Opinion Research Corporation,¹⁰ refers to "over 200 large-scale research projects have been reported on the relation between class size and learning. They go back to the 1920s. The latest was the Coleman Study. By and large they found that class size has no effect on learning by students, with the possible exception of the language arts."

¹⁰P. Rossi, *The Study of Man, Evaluating Social Action Program*, Transactions, 51-53, June, 1967.

Some examples of classroom size in 1969 Holladay School had a total enrollment of 212 students, plus 90 children in kindergarten. There were 15 full-time teachers with five traveling specialists and two professional auxiliaries (a social worker and a nurse). The staff was further complemented by one community relations worker, five full-time and one half-time teacher aides, and several other miscellaneous personnel in charge of the office, cafeteria and custodial work. With the principal, this brought the total staff of the school to 35½, whereas only 28½ were actually involved with the students. On an average basis, this gives a student-teacher ratio of approximately 11 to 1, although the average classroom size turned out to be about 14 students.

The principal was noncommittal as to the educational results of reducing student-teacher ratios, but he stated that they had "less discipline problems."

The decrease in class size at Holladay resulted from at least two situations: (1) the Head Start and Follow-Through programs at Eliot School take kindergarten children from Holladay to Eliot, (2) a population shift. Of approximately 200 children in Holladay School, 85 live within the neighborhood. The others are bussed in. Not all would be classified as "poverty children." Small businesses, warehousing and light industry are replacing residential buildings in the area.

Buckman School serves predominantly white lower-income and working class areas of Portland. It has been gradually declining in population for the last several years. A high degree of population turnover is reflected in school enrollment statistics. In 1969, 225 children moved into the Buckman area and enrolled at Buckman after the first day of school, and about the same number left school before the end of the year. The Model Schools Program has had only secondary effects on Buckman class size, the decrease mainly resulting from area population decrease and turnover.

At Jefferson High School, student population has been reduced from nearly 2,400 to approximately 1,400. The principal (during 1969) credited many of the innovations and much of the progress to the reduction, not only of the classload, but of the total high school population. The reduction in the number of students reduces the possible number of conflicts and permits individual teachers to more fully examine circumstances of classroom disorder.

Sabin School has a ratio of 64.8 percent blacks to 35.2 percent whites, the reverse ratio in 1965-66. There has been a decrease in "class size" with the addition of portable rooms. The kindergarten and part of the first grade have been transferred to Eliot.

The mail survey taken suggests that most classroom workers are very concerned with the size of classes. Seventy-four percent of those replying said classroom size was important. Forty percent recommended further decrease in size. It might be said, however, that teachers seem to relate class size to problems of discipline rather than improvement in achievement. Even if discipline were improved, statistical evidence provided by Dr. James Holmes, research supervisor, does not clearly indicate any commensurate improvement in scholastic achievement.

Enrollment and Racial Distribution. One of the goals of the Model Schools was to provide a more integrated educational setting for all students. Open enrollments, administrative transfers, and outward bound were methods suggested to make a change. Between 400 and 600 students a year living in Model Schools areas have attended other schools, either in Portland or surrounding districts through the three transfer programs. The reactions to these programs have been mixed.

It was reportedly a very difficult recruiting job to get parents of students to participate in any of the programs.

No statistical evidence is available on these students to show success or failure of the transfer program, except information from Dr. Holmes which showed slightly higher achievement scores for transfer students. However, it was usually the better students which were first to be put into the program by their parents.

The following chart shows the school population of the nine grade schools in the Model Schools Program:

Comparison of Black Student Enrollment during Model Schools Program Years

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	1964-65			1967-68			1971-72		
	TOTAL	BLACK	% of Black	TOTAL	BLACK	% of Black	TOTAL	BLACK	% of Black
Boise	941	899	96	658	614	93	538	520	96.7
Buckman	706	11	2	615	32	5	416	78	18.8
Eliot	344	325	94	255	217	92	479	278	58.0
Holladay	301	203	67	429	236	55	387	196	50.6
Humboldt	352	324	92	863	812	94	374	314	84.0
Irvington	757	366	48	733	378	51	469	296	63.1
King	1013	884	87	863	812	94	711	650	91.4
Sabin	683	224	33	645	342	53	619	401	64.8
Woodlawn	805	218	27	766	291	38	711	344	48.4
Total	5902	3454	59	5386	3305	62	4704	2676	54.8

Head Start and Follow-Through. The Head Start Program prepares children for kindergarten. It assists their parents in providing needed home services. To give Head Start students an additional boost, approximately 400 children have been served each year, 90 percent from families of low-income as defined by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1969.

The Follow-Through Program was conceived to provide intensive education to Head Start graduates through first, second and third grades. Due to limited funds, only 150 of each year's Head Start students were given Follow-Through help.

As with other compensatory programs, there is little objective proof to be compiled on Head Start. The Committee observers were impressed with the dedication of the individuals running, and teaching in, the program. All the administrators interviewed thought Head Start was beneficial, especially when coupled with Follow-Through.

Since the program is federally-supported, its continuation is at the discretion of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). A six-year study which would have provided evaluation was cancelled for "economic and political" reasons. There are no definitive test measurements of Head Start.

Teachers reported better attitudes and abilities from students attending regular schools after having had Head Start background. Dr. Blanchard told the Committee it was a "plus" in school performance for its alumni.

Instructional Television. Investigation of Instructional Television (ITV) showed as many opinions as there were users of the system.

The studio in the Eliot School was found to be barely adequate, a combination of open work space, floor space and storage, with a fairly well-equipped control room.

Programs were provided for classroom instruction as a "stimulus" to teacher and students, with "open-ended" discussions to follow the video presentation.

Committee members found little evidence of use of ITV in classrooms and schools. Some teachers had never used the system. Others found it useful. Programming was aimed at lower grades.

The staff was made up of educators, a non-educator with no TV experience, and studio crews with no TV experience of consequence. The ITV manager has had no special training for TV instruction or station operation.

Teacher Aides. Your Committee found confusion in the execution and future of the idea of using para-professionals as aides to the classroom teacher. There is no clear picture of what is happening with teacher aides in the Portland system.

In the survey, some teachers commented they spend too much time teaching teacher aides; others have described the program as a training ground for future teachers but not necessarily of great value now in the classroom.

The Model Cities Education Committee has allocated some funds for teacher aides and is in the process of selecting them, chiefly from the black community. The concept differs from an "assistant." The Model Cities idea is to provide a "classroom aide" who will "explain student problems to the teacher, to the pupil, and to the parent, and would plan routines to meet the needs and well-being of the students." The classroom aide as seen by the Model Cities Education Com-

mittee would also, ". . . help in such areas as black history and culture and do this more adequately because he is black."

At Eliot School, parents and young adults are employed as teacher aides. Teacher aides there are both black and white, some with college training. Most are dedicated to the performance of what they feel is an important service. From the interviews it appears some aides feel they are personally benefitting from the experience of association with teachers and the school system. Some go on to supplement their own education by participating in night school or college courses. The benefit appears to be two-fold in that the aide program not only improves the student-teacher ratio but inspires some aides to further their own education.

Sixty percent, in response to the mail survey, indicated a positive reaction to the "aide" program. Nineteen percent (included in the 60 percent above) indicated a need for increasing the number of aides and/or the quality, but 10 percent expressed a negative response. No other question received such a high negative mention. Perhaps the connection here is the very human reaction to resent "interference in one's own domain."

Teacher Turnover. Teacher turnover in some Model Schools was about 60 percent six years ago. The turnover now has been reduced to 30 percent, an acceptable rate.

Figure 1

Staff Stability

The approximate percentages of teachers electing to remain in Project I Schools in 1965-66 (40%) compared with the percentage of teachers remaining in 1969-70 (70%).

	Percentage of Teachers Electing to Remain in Project Schools	Percentage of Teachers Requesting Transfers from Project Schools
Project 1965-66	40%	60%
Project 1969-70	70%	30%
District Norm	75%	25%

Starting salaries in the Model Schools average \$1,000 per year more than salaries in other Portland schools. About \$350,000 per year went to "premium pay". There were mixed comments regarding "premium pay" (sometimes referred to as "Combat Pay" by parents). Some interviewees felt staff turnover would increase if additional pay were dropped; others thought a cut in pay would not have any drastic effect.

Out of 286 Committee questionnaires returned, only five individuals mentioned premium pay, two in favor and three opposed to the extra pay. One black teacher interviewed indicated the pay incentive was well deserved. Extra pay is being phased out in the ten Model Schools over three school years (1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74).

Black Teachers. There has been an increase in the number of black teachers in the Model Schools Program and in the Portland system:

Year	Number of Black Teachers in Portland Schools or Administration
1965-66	55
1968-69	113
1969-70	132
1970-71	160

The District has made efforts to find black teachers and administrators. In spite of the activities of the two recruiting teams who made trips across the country, only two black teachers were recruited. There is a national scarcity of qualified black educators, and the Portland salary scale is not competitive. A school principal can make \$2,000 a year more in the New York State System.

Discipline. Most reports from the school principal interviews stated that disciplinary problems are not as great as they once were. At Buckman, the interviewer related the improvement to a renewed enthusiasm, both student and staff. Parental contacts are more easily made and sustained through the school Community Agent.¹¹ The teacher has more physical and staff resources at his disposal through teacher aides, the school nurse, and social workers. In general, the teacher is no longer alone in discipline situations but has a "team" of aides and specialist support.

One interviewer had the feeling that a number of the disciplinary problems in previous years at Jefferson High School were solved by the gerrymandering of students into Adams High School, and with the malcontents (students and non-students) focusing their attention on Adams, it helped to relieve the pressure from Jefferson. It gave the principal, the teachers and the students a chance to reformulate and reacquaint themselves with the real reasons for being in school.

There appears to be a direct relationship between discipline and class size as noted in the following quote from an interviewer's report on Holladay School:

"The class sizes as I reviewed them had been reduced so there was a low teacher-to-student ratio. With the aides being utilized, a lot of the classes were broken up into two or three sections with individual attention going to about five or six students. The faculty was unable to verify that any educational benefit had been realized as a result of this class size reduction, but they all agreed that it certainly had improved disciplinary problems."

One interviewer had the advantage of being a regular visitor to Boise School several years ago. Excerpts from his report included the following observations:

"The building itself seemed quieter, with pupils and teachers apparently more relaxed than five years ago. The school population has gone from approximately 950 students in 1965 to 650 students at present. One hundred sixty to 200 students are bussed out of the area.

"During the past five years, the staff has doubled in number. There are now 76 positions, with one-third occupied by black people. The staff includes 49 certified teachers, eight of whom are black. Among the new positions are the administrative assistant to the principal and an intern who is training to become an elementary school principal. According to the principal, the staff is more stable and more involved. He reported that on the first day of school five years ago, three teachers did not appear. In contrast, in 1970, two had to be transferred out of the building to make room for the teacher training program. Among the factors considered responsible for the improvements are: pay incentive, fewer discipline problems, and group involvement through sensitivity training and other programs. Team teaching (I believe) begins in the fourth grade. This permits a more effective utilization of teaching skills."

It is interesting to note that "discipline" was the special interest of the Portland Association of Teachers (PAT) in 1970-71. The PAT made a special survey to report to the Portland School Board on discipline. The report classifies discipline as a barrier to effective teaching.

Dr. Willard Fletcher, Superintendent of Area I and head of Model Schools through most of its history, supplied the following statistics on Model Schools "referrals to courts" because of "attendance":

1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
314	508	103	66

He says, "Court referrals of Model Schools youngsters dropped dramatically due to better staffing and closer contact with youngsters and families."

¹¹A Community Agent helps explain school programs and problems to parents, deals with discipline problems, helps students with problems, etc.

Curriculum. The evidence as viewed by your Committee does not show that any significant new programs or ideas in curriculum have been introduced into the Model Schools Program. An over-all impression is that the ten schools have tried hard to do better in all the traditional techniques and subjects. Special emphasis has been placed on reading and arithmetic.

At Sabin, a full-time reading specialist is attached to the primary unit, and a remedial reading specialist is attached to the intermediate unit on a half-time basis. The principal believes that the teachers in the units have improved their reading programs. The reading specialist works with students and does not train teachers. The unit leaders for each unit have some responsibility for improving programs.

Sabin School uses both older students and outside adults as tutors. The adult tutors were quite useful and their work was integrated into the curriculum and supervised by the teachers. The principal did not find them disruptive in any respect.

Some of the teachers who did not understand the techniques of using Instructional TV found that it interfered. Others had indicated they liked ITV.

The principal at Sabin thought the reading and math programs had been most successful, but that the science and social science programs had not been quite as successful. He thought this could be explained very largely in terms of the allocation of effort and time on the part of the teachers and planners. It was a matter of priorities. While additional science materials were available, the real push was in the area of reading and mathematics.

At Holladay School, the reading specialists program was highly praised by the principal. He stated that this was one area where he felt the need of more concentration of personnel and money. There was no tutoring program in Holladay. A review of classrooms indicated television sets installed but not a single one was in use, nor did any teacher actively utilize movies or listening equipment during the period of observation.

The principal at Jefferson High School (1969) believed they did have innovative curriculum developments, such as the restaurants for training cooks, waitresses and managers and the shop for mechanical training with actual work on automobiles (adopted from the Benson Polytechnic High School concept). Another example was a program where a student worked in industry part-time and went to school part-time. This program appeared to be of value.

A reading teacher at Buckman complained that the Model Schools Program did not provide enough variety or flexibility in curriculum. For the most part, Buckman must order the same books and materials as other Portland elementary schools, even though at Buckman they may be of less instructional value. A mathematics teacher stated she no longer used any text at all, getting better results devising her own problems. Both teachers emphasized the equal importance of autonomy in curriculum as in the other program areas. Both felt the Program should support staff efforts to tailor the curriculum to the interests and experiences of disadvantaged children. A child who has never even seen Downtown Portland derives little from a closed-circuit television program about Australia.

Of the 286 questionnaires returned, only 12 percent made specific notation of "curriculum revision", that is, tailoring content to meet the needs, experiences and abilities of the disadvantaged and minority group children. Only 20 percent made special note of even the broad area of curriculum, i.e., planning time, new instructional methods or programs, or unit approach.

Community Participation. Community and adult participation in school activities appears to be a common problem in the schools visited.

At Buckman School over-all community involvement has decreased steadily over the last fifteen years. High population turnover may be responsible. Yet there have been some individual breakthroughs as a result of program efforts. The Buckman Parent Advisory Committee spends much of its time acquainting parents with the school and making it accessible.

At Holladay, even with the addition of community relations personnel, the principal still complained of lack of adult participation. He stated there is a real problem in getting most of the parents involved in the school activities of the children, and that they have even increased the frequency of evening meetings for the benefit of the parents, but the response was negative.

Less than six of 286 questionnaires returned mentioned parent involvement in schools. Either the majority did not see this as a problem or considered the problem so overwhelming in proportion as to be beyond their ability to attempt a solution.

There was no evidence presented to your Committee, nor has any evidence been reported on a national scale, to show parent participation in schools means an increase in the learning rate. Parent involvement with students, yes, but with schools, no.

Teachers' and Principals' Evaluation of Model Schools Program. Evaluation of the Model Schools Program was expressed in several ways and degrees by principals and teachers.

At Boise School a black teacher in one of the upper grades was fairly disillusioned about the Model Schools Program which he regarded as "no answer". He pointed out that his class was still large (25) and disproportionately composed of "troublemakers". He believed the administration discriminated against black teachers in this regard because of the attitude "you can handle them". This teacher has the firm conviction that the pay incentive was well deserved. A team leader in upper grades was generally satisfied and believed that "the fewer number of students makes learning easier". He is particularly proud of the reading laboratory which was installed.

In the course of a visit to Boise an aide was observed operating a slide projector for three students. Although the children tried to tell her it was not in focus, she continued to show slide after slide with barely perceptible images.

One teacher of a special class has mixed opinions about the program. She likes the smaller classes which are quieter than before. She believes this is due to the adults now paying more attention to the children. On the other hand, she is disappointed by the lack of materials and "inventiveness".

One team leader with 12 years experience in the same building has the unqualified opinion that "things are better."

A kindergarten teacher views the Head Start program as making noticeable improvement. Her new students are not frightened of school itself. They are able to listen and learn facts faster than children who have not had the benefit of Head Start.

At Boise, during a general discussion with teachers at lunch, various opinions were expressed. Some thought the Model Schools Program lived up to its promises. Others believed teaching conditions were only slightly better. Some complained there was no really advanced equipment to work with; others, that teachers were not sufficiently involved in policy-making decisions. On the other hand, many believed classroom behavior had improved.

Like the black teacher who felt exploited by the unfair share of "troublemakers", other black teachers said black teachers were not involved in planning or administering the school. One pointed out a white advantage in communication. When there are vacancies in various programs, the whites know about them before the blacks. In his opinion, this accounts for the disproportionate number of whites in the teacher training program.

A Committee observation of Boise School is that there is a perceptible improvement in student and teacher morale, with more learning and more teaching occurring now than five years ago.

III. LITERATURE RESEARCH

Thousands of pages of words have been written about compensatory education programs around the nation. Your Committee read a great deal of this material, including "success" stories from other cities reviewed in HEW reports (see Bibliography) and other government sources, reports from associations and groups interested in disadvantaged children and those of private researchers and investigations.

In their appraisal of evaluation research in compensatory education, McDill, McDill and Sprehe¹² say in their concluding paragraph:

"Compensatory education programs now bear the burden of justifying their existence. No public school system in history has ever been abolished because it could not teach children to read and write, yet some compensatory programs, aimed at the very children who would probably be losers in the regular school program, could be in just this situation. They are being asked to succeed in less time than that allowed the regular school system. Perhaps this is healthy: insistence on nothing less than success as a condition of survival can indeed provide great motivation. But those who condemn all compensatory programs out of hand should temper their criticism with the realization of the magnitude of the task confronted, the brief experience in coping with it, and the pitifully small fund of scientific knowledge relevant to the programs of disadvantaged children."

With that in mind, what are researchers and writers in other parts of the country saying about compensatory education?

At Stanford University, A.M. Jenson raised a national furor when he said federally-funded compensatory education efforts have been unsuccessful for reasons built into the programs themselves. He said compensatory programs have been aimed at changing what cannot, in fact, be changed appreciably. Jenson says too many programs have been based on the premise that differences in intelligence are primarily a consequence of environmental variations, rather than genetic factors. He says compensatory education should be directed toward teaching specific academic skills (what Jenson calls "associative learning") dependent on the mental abilities more amenable to change than the IQ.

In the Saturday Review of Literature, Colin Greer¹³ said, "The assumption that extended schooling promotes greater academic achievement or social mobility is, however, entirely fallacious. School performance seems consistently dependent on the socio-economic position of the pupil's family."

Greer was building a supposition that American schools have *never* been the melting pot that is claimed, and that applying more resources to bigger and better programs of the same kind will not be an answer.

A. J. Hunt, writing in the Harvard Education Review on Compensatory Education,¹⁴ differs from Jenson when he says that the environment does affect a child's behavior and that its impact begins to be felt when the child is still an infant in the crib. He would argue that compensatory education should be begun when the child is a few days or a few months old. The child should be subjected to an enriched environment, offering a variety of stimuli and providing reinforcement for those who are conducive to mental development. In his view, the failure of compensatory education is the result of the delay in introducing it into the life of the disadvantaged child.

In still another article, D. Elkind¹⁵ reviewing the work of the Frenchman, Piaget, says that preschool instruction has failed because the intellectual development of children cannot be accelerated by compensatory schooling. He says what is being taught at this young age should be left for elementary school. Elkind

¹²McDill, McDill & Sprehe, *supra*.

¹³"Public Schools, The Myth of the Melting Pot", by Colin Greer, *Saturday Review*, November 15, 1969.

¹⁴"Has Compensatory Education Failed? Has It Been Attempted?", J. Hunt, *Harvard Educational Review*, 39: 278-300.

¹⁵"Piagetian and Psychometric Conceptions of Intelligence", *Harvard Educational Review*, 39: 319-337.

claims that the years from 6 to 12 are the crucial ones with respect to later achievement. Elkind would restructure the elementary school during that period of development.

Much has been said and written about the Coleman Report.¹⁶ It did not deal specifically with compensatory education programs but was more concerned about the effect of integration on the learning rate of black children. The Coleman Report finds that a "control of environment" is the single variable most highly correlated with the academic achievement of disadvantaged children. He says that of strictly school-related factors such as teacher-student ratios, quality of buildings, etc., integration is by far the most significant. Coleman's report seems to be saying that alternative approaches, such as compensatory education, in which spending is increased heavily in disadvantaged schools, shows no evidence of consistent success. Coleman would place the emphasis on the integration of black and white to raise the educational gains of students. Coleman says integration can and does work so long as "middle class" students remain in the majority in a given school. (This is emphasis on "class". The report does not say racial composition, *per se*, affected achievement.) He says that class establishes the achievement tone, and the disadvantaged student attending such a school makes more consistent educational gains than from any other mechanism.

Coleman acknowledges that in some cases white students might lose slightly from integration, although far less than black students gain.

Relevant to how children learn, the report of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare of January 1969,¹⁷ said:

"How much a child learns depends on his mother's diet before he was born, his own nutrition and health, his access to books, and the psychological and intellectual influence of the home. Most psychologists seem to agree that the pre-school years are a period of particularly rapid development, and that attitudes acquired in these years can have enduring effects. Even after he reaches school age, a child spends only one-third of his waking hours in school . . . TV programs, parents, playmates, take up most of the child's time. The motivation to learn is obviously important, and there is every reason to believe it is decisively influenced by the home environment."

To quote David Cohen, writing in *Commentary*:¹⁸

"The concept of compensatory education favored by most educators represented an effort to avoid this fatal circularity (The political problem of getting a program which appealed to the self-interests of both the whites and blacks). Since compensatory programs operated only in slum schools, they seemed indeed to offer happy political alternatives. Whites could assume a progressive stance by supporting improved ghetto education—and better schools for poor whites too — while opposing or remaining neutral on demands for bussings, Princeton plans, and other politically volatile integration tactics. For these reasons—to say nothing of the substantial Negro support the remedial programs enjoyed—a powerful coalition of moderate and liberal reformers and school men came together behind such legislation as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act."

Cohen goes on to give his evaluation:

"How do these programs fare? Over the past two years a succession of evaluations has been unable to find much evidence of improved achievement. To be sure, their sponsors have proclaimed the programs a success: the litanies of praise which have been issued cited improved school conditions, brighter attitudes, better attendance, reduced vandalism, happier teachers, etc. Nonetheless, to judge by the main criterion which the programs were designed to satisfy, the general absence of gains and achievement makes all these claims seem trivial or disingenuous."

¹⁶Coleman, *supra*.

¹⁷"Toward a Social Report," Department of Health, Education and Welfare, p. 70, January, 1969.

¹⁸"The Price of Community Control," by David Cohen, *Commentary*, July, 1969.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Has the Model Schools Program of compensatory education met its own goals? —the goals of the Schwab Report?

It is difficult to judge such subjective generalities as "increase the quality of instruction", "increase motivation", etc. (as listed in the beginning of this report), especially when there is little *objective* information available from the Program. The conclusions reached here are best described as a "collection of the subjective opinions and reactions of the researchers."

Statements by Portland school authorities and the publications reviewed lead to the conclusion that economic standing (class) is critical to a child's abilities to absorb formal education in schools. Being poor may be a handicap which cannot be "compensated" for by programs instituted by schools.

There is a strong feeling the most important factors in "how a child learns" have to do with diet (especially in the first months and years of life), the mother's influence, family circumstances, economic standing and a host of other influences. School training is playing a less important role in the "education" of today's child. Hence:

1. The Model Schools Program did not increase the opportunity for a black child to be educated in an "integrated" setting. It failed to meet this goal of the Model Schools Program.

Intensification of traditional school techniques without a change in "other than school factors" will probably not lead to any increase in the school success of students. Compensatory education in lower class neighborhood schools has not shown any real success.

2. There has been apparent success of the Outward Bound transfer program. Students, teachers and parents are saying there have been definite social gains for the students involved. Your Committee feels this approach is significant. Outward Bound transfer apparently improves the students' desire to achieve and learn. It should be noted as a disadvantage of the transfer program that the better motivated students (with more concerned parents) gravitate to this new opportunity for learning.

Opinion research, educator comments, and just plain intuitions lead to a conclusion that a child learns more from his peers than from any other source. If true, it is important to place underachievers with more successful students whenever possible.

3. The program failed to reach its goal of 20 students per classroom. The major fault may be, however, with the *goal*. Literature research on programs across the nation seems to indicate that only a very substantial reduction in class size makes any radical improvements in the achievement rate or level of a "disadvantaged student". (The suggestion has been made for class sizes of five or ten.)¹⁹

Lowering the "student-teacher" ratio—fewer kids per class—is probably not a practical *educational* goal. There is little evidence to demonstrate a classroom size of 20 is any more conducive to "education" than one of 30 or 40.

4. Evidence, as presented to the Committee by school evaluators, that the five-year program increased the learning rate of the disadvantaged child is inconclusive. A "4 percent gain" in upper grades is statistically insignificant. Since there were no control groups against which to measure it is difficult to say what was accomplished. Since the Program was administered to most poverty area children, your Committee does not know what the effect of "no program" would have been.

Apparently, little valid research has been conducted in Portland schools on how students learn. Anyone studying the Portland system is dependent on national studies and research for direction and evaluation.

5. The Model Schools Program did stabilize teacher populations. Additional pay and the challenge gave these students better student-teacher relationships which probably was of some benefit to both.

¹⁹McDill, McDill & Sprehe, *supra*.

6. The Head Start Program is a highlight. It has potential and should be expanded. Apparently early age programs, including supplemental health services, social services, counseling, nutritional and food planning services and direct parent involvement in early age education, can do more to increase student achievement than later school programs.

7. Research and analysis show great potential in the Model Schools Teacher Aide Program. There seems to be benefit to the learning equation from the use of teacher aides, tutors and other para-professionals. Such techniques put an instructor in front of more individual students more minutes per day than traditional teacher-student practices used in Portland schools.

8. The tutoring program of the Model Schools was found to be a superior idea. There was some administrative confusion in its execution. Some of the Model Schools use tutors well, but have not shared their experiences with those schools which have not.

9. It seems that special programs, twice as much money, advisory committees and all, were unable to improve parent participation in school matters. A continued complaint of principals and teachers was the lack of community interest. Parent participation appears to be a function of economic standing.

10. The concentration of resources in the ten schools has reduced the conflicts between children and schools (referred to as "discipline".) Court referrals are down. Teachers are less apprehensive. This aim of the program has been satisfactorily reached. The question remains whether this has increased achievement.

11. There is no evidence to show the program has met the Schwab Report goal of "changing the socio-economic environment," said to be a chief factor in creating disadvantaged students.

V. ALTERNATIVES

How do schools really work? Have schools performed the "miracles" generally ascribed to them? Did the immigrant Europeans who have integrated into our society really find their way into American economic society through "education" and public schools? Scholars such as Colin Green in his studies of the public schools²⁰ present convincing arguments to the contrary.

Schools may never have served the disadvantaged classes of our society very well. Formerly, lower class children who dropped out could find work in industry. Now they cannot. They are forced to stay in school, but the schools are really not doing very much for them.

To quote the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare:²¹

"It is generally assumed that these increases in the length of schooling and expenditures on education have brought about an increase in the amount children have learned. There is, however, almost no evidence on this point . . ."

What, then, can change the equation? Would the Middle School concept²² be better? Would "community control" be a better answer? Would a radical improvement in the socio-economic conditions of the cities' disadvantaged, black and white alike, increase the achievement of their children?

Middle Schools?

Superintendent Blanchard described his task as ". . . to design an educational program that meets the needs of the individual child in Portland . . . the goal must be no less than to become the first truly successful urban school system in the nation."

Would the reorganization of all Portland's schools into a "4-4-4" plan answer the problems of the education of the disadvantaged child?

²⁰Green, *supra*.

²¹U.S. HEW, January, 1969, *supra*.

²²Portland Public Schools for the 70s (Summary of Blanchard Plan).

As proposed, it would leave neighborhood schools to handle kindergarten through 4th grade. Such an arrangement would not substantially change the chances for an education in "an integrated setting" for those students in the previous Model Schools projects, although it could provide some balance for upper grades. The question unanswered is where will the middle school or schools for the "Albina" children be located? The Blanchard Plan calls for no more than 25 percent black in any middle school.

Albina area schools would be converted to "early childhood education centers" where children from throughout the School District could come as volunteers.

The past history of the exodus of white students from Model Schools would not give much hope for a high "volunteer rate."

The "4-4-4" plan did not receive the support of the voters and therefore does not seem to be a viable alternative.

Evidence and opinion as provided in this report would also lead one to believe that most hope for success in compensatory education will come in the early ages. The middle school program puts emphasis on the upper grades.

The Middle School Plan did not speak with any detail of compensatory education except to say, "Programs of special assistance to students with educational problems must be sustained."

Open Enrollment/Administrative Transfer?

Some cities have proposed "freedom of choice" plans where students are free to choose whatever school they wish to attend. Residence would have no bearing on school of attendance. The limits to this alternative are obvious—transportation and individual school capacities. And there is the human tendency to group together by background, attitudes and philosophy, the kind of social groupings now achieved by residential patterns.

Your Committee cannot find much eagerness now for use of the present administrative transfer program. In fact, it was a hard selling job to achieve the present minimal participation.

Performance Contract?

Dr. Holmes had proposed and conducted some experiments in "performance contracts," a method of paying instructors for student progress.

A recent OEO press release says it is discontinuing all of its contracts and experiments in this area as "unproductive." Trials with private contractors have not shown any hope for this method of compensatory education.

Integration of All Schools?

The spokesman for the Model Cities Education Committee urged your Committee to consider racial integration of the system as an alternative. That Committee's opinion was given that students from integrated model schools were better achievers than those from all-black model schools. However, the Committee saw neighborhoods and economic class differences as the strong factor in student differences in such cases.

The Coleman Report supports integration as a better alternative than compensatory education in non-integrated schools. However, the Coleman Report shows that unless such integrated settings are with middle and upper class students, the benefit to blacks is not necessarily present.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Portland Schools should disperse concentrations of underachievers.

Compensatory education as conducted in the Model Schools Program has not demonstrated it can overcome the shortcomings of such concentrations when they are based upon economic deprivation.

2. The Portland School Board should put immediate, concentrated efforts into planning and organizing parent education programs to help parents of underachievers understand how they can help their own children.

3. Portland's schools should undertake immediately a program to test new classroom arrangements using teacher aides, tutors and other para-professionals to increase the actual time a student receives "teaching".

4. Head Start and Follow Through should be expanded in the "poverty areas" and extended throughout the school system as soon as possible.

5. The Portland schools should set up and maintain better procedures for getting and maintaining data and reporting related to experimental education proposals and programs.

6. The Portland School Board should investigate how it can use the strength of those agencies which can bring other resources to bear on the "non-school" factors which retard educational development.

The schools cannot assume more than a limited burden of changing the "environment" surrounding the child away from school. Nonetheless, it will be counter-productive to undertake any new scheme for education in the school (no matter which plan) without an attack on the basic life problems of the poor and deprived.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony James Barker

Walter G. Brown

Norman M. Janzer, M.D.

Paul F. Mielly

Melvin N. Olson *and*

John F. Williams, *Chairman*

Approved by the Research Board March 3, 1972 for transmittal to the Board of Governors.

Received by the Board of Governors and, on May 25, 1972, ordered published and circulated to the membership for presentation, discussion and action on June 16, 1972.

APPENDIX A

MAIL SURVEY RESULTS

The Model Schools Study Committee of The City Club of Portland undertook a mail survey of people working in the Model Schools Program. The questions were open ended. They were devised by Dr. Norman Janzer, member of the Committee, and Richard Rosenfeld, Research Intern. The results are shown below:

1. 286 questionnaires sent to nearly all program staff, excluding aides.
2. 12 returned unopened (moved: no forwarding address).
3. 30 percent completed and returned (83).
4. Teachers—77 percent of return (64).
Auxiliary (reading teachers, counselors, social workers, etc.)—8 percent of return (7)
Unit Leaders—7 percent of return (6)
Librarians —4 percent of return (3)
Community Agents, Administrative Assistants, P.E. teachers—4 percent of return (3).
5. No precise way of knowing return breakdown by school, age, experience, race, etc.
6. Results:

	<u>Positive Response</u>	<u>Negative Response</u>	<u>Other Recommendations</u>
A. Smaller class loads	74%		Further decrease (40%)
B. Aide program	60%	10%	Increase number and/or quality (19%)
C. Materials and equipment	52%	1%	Increase (17%)
D. Auxiliary staff	51%	2%	Increase (26%)
E. Administrative Assistance and support	43%		Increase (19%)
F. Community relations	25%		More progress (13%)
G. Specific resources to deal with behavior and/or emotional problems	25%		Increase (17%)
H. Plant renovation	24%		Increase (24%)
I. Better behavior (Heavy response interlock with items A, B, D, E, G,)	23%		Further progress (1%)
J. More planning time provided during school hours	22%		Increase (20%)
K. New instructional methods and/or programs	20%	6%	Increase (4%)
L. Provision of free break-and/or lunch	16%		Increase (4%) (i.e. snacks, better meals)
M. Unit approach	13%	12% *	Increase (0%)
N. Teacher and administrative freedom to innovate	13%	11%	Increase (1%)
O. More accurate, individualized evaluation procedures	13%		Further progress; Elimination of current grading system (7%) (5%)
P. Curriculum revision—tailoring content to the needs, experiences, abilities of poor or minority group children	12%		More progress (10%)
Q. Teacher morale and cooperation	12%		Increase (4%)
R. Implementation of Blanchard Program	8%	1%	
S. Field Trips	8%		Increase (5%)
T. Strength, caliber, dedication of teachers	8%		Increase (1%)
U. The following comments, statements, recommendations were each mentioned by six respondents or less:			

*Most refer to uncoordinated supervisory structure

Progress had been made in:

- Achievement gains
- Student-teacher rapport
- Teacher-parent rapport
- Extended day program
- Summer School Experience
- Greater Student Freedom

“Combat” pay was favored by 2 respondents, opposed by 3.

Transfer Program satisfied 2, 2 others were opposed and 1 recommended following improvement random selection of pupils, involvement in extra-curricular affairs of receiving school.

Recommendations:

- Orientation program for new staff
- Meeting physical needs of the child
- Male volunteers
- More black and minority group staff
- Greater teacher involvement in education decisions (6); in aide selections (2)
- Adult education courses
- Social activities for students, staff, parents
- More telephones
- Employment of experienced personnel only
- Better record-keeping
- Decrease number of staff meetings (5); increase (1)
- Stop “automatic” pupil promotion
- Vocational education program
- Immediate city-wide racial integration (all grades)
- Free transportation for children during emergencies.

**APPENDIX B
BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- “Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland’s Public Schools”.
Committee on Race and Education, Herbert M. Schwab, Chairman, 1964.
- “Title I of ESEA—‘Is It Helping Poor People?’ ” Bob Fletcher, 1966
Washington Research Project, 73 pages.
- “Toward a Social Report”, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, July, 1969.
- “The Unheavenly City”, Edward C. Banfield, Little, Brown & Company, 1970.
- “Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education”, Elward L. McDill, Mary S. McDill,
S. Timothy Sprehe, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
- “The Relationship of Discreet Classroom Behaviors to Fourth Grade Academic Achievement”,
Oregon Research Institute Bulletin, Volume 10, Nov. 1970, Joseph A. Cobb.
- “A Cost Effectiveness Study of Employment of Non-Professional Teaching Aides in Public
Schools,” Eaton H. Conant, University of Oregon, U.S. Department of Health, Education
and Welfare.
- “Psychiatric Aspects of Racial Issues in an Elementary School”,
Norman M. Janzer, M.D., Portland, Oregon.
- “Public Schools: Myth of the Melting Pot”, Colin Greer, *Saturday Review*, Nov. 15, 1969.
- “Why Whitey Is Failing in the Cities”, *Readers Digest*, October, 1969.
- “The Price of Community Control”, David K. Cohen, *Commentary*, July, 1969.
- “Survey of Educational Opportunities”, James S. Coleman, U.S. Civil Rights Commission, 1966.

The following papers from the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare were reviewed:

- “Infant Research,” Washington, D.C.
- “Early Childhood Project,” New York, N.Y.
- “Perry Preschool Project,” Ypsilanti, Michigan
- “Academic Preschool”, Champaign, Illinois
- “Preschool Program,” Fresno, California
- “Intensive Reading,” Hartford, Connecticut
- “Programmed Tutorial Reading Project,” Indianapolis, Indiana
- “Junior High Summer Institute,” New York, N.Y.
- “Project R-3”, San Jose, California
- “College Bound Program,” New York, N.Y.
- “Communication Skills Center Project”, Detroit, Michigan.
- “Homework Helper,” New York, N.Y.
- “Speech and Development Program”, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Others

- "Report on Problems of Racial Justice in Portland",
Portland City Club Bulletin, Vol. 49, No. 2, June 14, 1968
- "ESEA, Is It Helping Poor Children", Washington, D.C.
- "Dynamic Evaluation of Title I Program", James N. Holmes, January, 1968,
Portland Public Schools
- "Report to the Board of Education", School District No. 1, Portland, Ore., August 1968
- "Portland Public Schools for the '70s" (Summary of Blanchard Plan)
Minutes, Education and Recreation Working Committee, July 11, 1968,
Model Cities Program
- The New York Times*, Monday, March 9, 1970 (story by Jack Rosenthal,
Urban Affairs Editor)
- "Population Mobility," Metropolitan Planning Commission, 1966
- Eugene*, a bi-monthly magazine of Facts, May-June 1970, Volume 1, No. 1
- "Model Cities, Citizen Planning for Citizen Needs", An Interim Report, 1968,
Model Cities Committee, Portland
- "The Study of Man, Evaluating Social Action Program," P. Rossi, *Transactions*, 51-53,
June, 1967
- "Alienated Youth", Report of the Mayor's Special committee on Alienated Youth,
Portland, Oregon, June 1969
- "Follow-Through Proposal", School District No. 1, Revised, March 1969
- "Early Childhood Education" (Head Start) 1969, Portland Public Schools
- "Portland Teachers Look at Discipline", Portland Association of Teachers,
September 1969
- "Southern Education Report", November 1968.
- "Central City Education Project", 1969, U. S. Office of Education
- "School Analysis: Jefferson", by Robert Landauer and Bill Keller, *The Oregonian*, May
22, 1972.
- The Oregonian*, Forum, "Head Start", January 24, 1971
- The Oregonian*, "School Analysis: Jefferson" by Robert Landauer and Bill Keller, May 22,
1972
- New York Times News Service*, "Survey Shows Results of Severe Malnutrition",
June 14, 1970 (*Oregonian* reprint)
- Eugene Register Guard*, May 10, 1971, Jim Sellers
- "Has Compensatory Education Failed? Has It Been Attempted", J. Hunt,
Harvard Educational Review, 39:278-300
- "Piagetian and Psychometric Conceptions of Intelligence", *Harvard Educational Review*,
39:319-337

APPENDIX C

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Administrators of School District No. 1:

- Dr. Robert W. Blanchard, Superintendent
Dr. William Fletcher, Area II Supervisor during Model Schools Program
Dr. James N. Holmes, Area II Research Supervisor
Dr. Robert C. Hugily, Director of Community Services
William Proppe, then principal, Jefferson High School
Joe Nunn, Dean of Men, Jefferson High School

Educators who were at the time of the interview associated with the respective Model Schools grade schools:

- Clinton Thomas, Principal, Boise
Ralph Wampler, Principal, Buckman
Robert Harold, Principal, Eliot
Ronald Christiansen, Principal, Holladay
Herbert Dale, Principal, Humboldt
William Gerald, Principal, Irvington
Roger Wilder, Principal, Sabin
William Gunn, teacher and team leader, Woodlawn

In addition, Committee members and the research intern interviewed many teachers, parents and students informally in the schools, in the lunchrooms, in the neighborhoods, and in homes.