

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION THROUGH
TITLE I ESEA PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN
SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Andres N. Vallado

May 1975

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am much indebted to many for the encouragement and valuable assistance during the course of my doctoral studies and this dissertation. I am especially grateful to my advisor and committee chairman, Dr. Guy D. Cutting, for his encouragement and guidance and to the other members of the committee: Dr. Phillip Bacon, Dr. V. J. Kennedy, and Dr. Albert H. Miller for their valuable assistance.

A word of appreciation is also extended to Dr. Dana Williams, the Superintendent of the Corpus Christi Independent School District, and to the district's Board of Education for providing the opportunity to participate in a program of doctoral study and a leave-of-absence. A special "thank you" is also expressed to Dr. H. Gene Bryant, the district's Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, to Dr. Ken Kyle, Director of Planning and Evaluation for the district, for their advice and encouragement during the doctoral study, and to Mrs. Rosalinda Ramirez for her patience and assistance in the preparation of the manuscript.

To my wife, Grace, Nora, and David, I am especially grateful for their understanding, support, unselfishness, and the many hours of loneliness which resulted during the course of this study. To them and to the poor children of Texas, and especially Corpus Christi, I dedicate this study.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION THROUGH
TITLE I ESEA PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN
SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

An Abstract to a Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Andres N. Vallado

May 1975

ABSTRACT

Vallado, Andres N. "Parental Involvement in Compensatory Education Through Title I ESEA Parent Advisory Committees in Selected School Districts in Texas."
Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation,
The University of Houston, 1975.

Committee Chairman: Dr. Guy D. Cutting

Purpose. The purpose of the study was to examine the role, practices, and status of Parent Advisory Committees as required by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10), and the extent of the PAC involvement in the educational decision-making process in selected school districts in Texas.

Procedures. The population in this study consisted of 176 school districts in Texas. The sample was randomly selected based on the stratified random sample procedure used by the Texas Education Agency to sample a cross section of the school districts in Texas in the evaluation of certain programs funded under Title I. The sample consisted of 637 Title I PAC members representing school districts located in 41 of Texas' 254 counties.

The data were gathered from responses to (1) an 80 item PAC member questionnaire, and (2) a 19 item administrator questionnaire. Title I PAC members were asked to complete the former and Title I administrators the latter. The PAC member questionnaire was designed to provide

(1) personal knowledge about the participant, (2) knowledge and understanding of PAC members regarding Title I guidelines, objectives, participation, etc., (3) the role and activities of the PACs, and (4) personal opinions and feelings on a variety of issues related to the PACs. The administrator questionnaire was directed at eliciting the type of problems encountered in the districts regarding parental involvement through the PACs, and the planning practices discovered in parental involvement through the Title I PACs.

The information obtained from the questionnaires was tabulated manually and through a computer. Data were sought that enabled the researcher to answer the questions stated below:

1. What are the characteristics of the PAC members?
2. Are Title I PACs recognized by the school boards?
3. What is the role of district PACs in the educational decision-making process of Title I programs?
4. Who defines the roles of PAC members as they participate in the planning, implementing, and evaluation of Title I programs?
5. Who in the district provides committee members with information regarding Title I programs on which they could make recommendations?
6. Do committee members understand what is expected of them?
7. How are committee members selected?

8. To what extent are minority groups and persons from different income levels represented in the committees?

9. Do minority committee members participate actively?

10. Do school districts implement the recommendations, where appropriate, of PACs?

11. To what extent are PACs involved

a. in the planning of Title I programs?

b. in the implementation of Title I programs?

c. in the evaluation of Title I programs?

12. How knowledgeable are PAC members concerning Title I programs?

13. What training or orientation, if any, is provided to PAC members?

14. What positive experiences have been discovered by school districts as a result of Title I PACs?

15. What problems have been encountered by school districts as a result of having initiated PACs as required by Title I?

16. What is the cost directly connected to the maintenance of the PACs?

Findings and Conclusions. An analysis of the data gathered for this study and PAC members' perceptions provide the basis for the following conclusions about the role, practices, status, and extent of involvement of the PACs:

1. Female PAC members outnumber male members by a ratio of approximately four to one. Less than one-half of the members are over 41 years old. Those PAC members who have lived in their districts outnumber those who have lived under four years in their districts by three to one. Almost three-fourths of the members have a high school education (10-12 grades). One-half of the members are housewives, two-thirds are members of a minority group, and at least 60 percent had at least one child in the Title I program.

2. Minority groups are at least "somewhat well" represented (77 percent) in the PACs. Some committee members felt (13 percent) that their PAC represented "poorly" the higher income levels of parents in their districts. Consideration, however, should be given to the fact that Title I programs basically serve educationally disadvantaged children of "low-income" families.

3. Slightly more than three-fourths of the PAC members are not employees of their districts.

4. More than one-half of the PAC members are appointed.

5. Almost two-thirds of the committees are recognized by their respective school board.

6. A large number (20 percent) of PAC members know very little or nothing about Title I programs, rules and regulations, objectives, plans, and selection of schools.

This indicates that school districts are not adequately informing PAC members.

7. A large number of members are not active in their Title I PACs while a small number were active in such school activities as field trips, volunteer work, classroom observation, etc.

8. An overwhelmingly majority of the members receive information from Title I administrators on which to make recommendations. The information given has been at least "somewhat helpful." Although a significant number of members seldom expressed their wishes or concerns to their school officials, those that had, felt that at least "some" of their recommendations had been accepted. Apparently, this information was not relayed to the PAC members as a significant number indicated they did not know how many of their committee's recommendations had been accepted. Committee members, in general, feel that they have "about the same influence" as other committee members to influence committee decisions.

9. School districts involve PAC members more in the planning process of Title I, less in the implementation, and very little in the evaluation process, however, the PACs have been "somewhat useful" to the school districts.

10. Very few districts reimburse committee members for expenses incurred in connection with Title I activities. Those districts that do permit expenditures for Title I PAC

activities apparently provided the minimum. Additional funds and allocation of funds for PAC activities will strengthen PACs.

11. The work of PAC members in their respective schools has been at least "fair" with a significant number feeling that their participation in their PACs has been a valuable experience to them personally.

12. Overall the PACs are far overrated with respect to what they can contribute and do not really help very much in the learning process.

13 A number of PAC members feel that the PACs are "paper committees." They feel that school districts often tell the committees what the program will be.

14. Parents of Title I children for various reasons do not have the time to be involved in Title I PAC meetings and activities.

15. A significant number of Spanish surname Americans often do not participate in Title I activities because they have difficulty understanding the English language.

16. The lack of interest on the part of PAC members and their lack of time for PAC activities are the greatest deterrents to the implementation of an effective and viable PAC program.

17. A significant number of Title I administrators felt that the United States Office of Education and the Texas Education Agency had not provided adequate information

regarding Title I parental involvement in Title I programs. It should be noted, however, that often the information is mailed to the districts but never reaches those at the "grass roots" level.

18. There is some feeling among school administrators that the Title I PAC was established only to meet federal guidelines rather than to go beyond this requirement. Consequently, very little effort in the implementation of an effective PAC has been shown. No outstanding Title I parental involvement programs were identified in the course of the study.

19. A number of administrators feel defensive when inquiries are directed at their PACs. There seem to be a feeling of "don't rock the boat," and that if the PACs know their rights and understand what is expected of them, they could cause problems for the district.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	xv
Chapter	
1. THE PROBLEM	1
NEED FOR THE STUDY	6
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM	8
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	10
QUESTIONS	11
QUESTIONNAIRE	12
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS	12
DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	14
OVERVIEW AND ORDER OF PRESENTATION	14
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
BRIEF HISTORY OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	16
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT THROUGH ADVISORY COMMITTEES	21
SIGNIFICANCE OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS	22
PARENTAL PRESSURE TOWARD INVOLVEMENT	25
LEVELS OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	26
TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT	27
FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONSHIPS IN TITLE I	29

Chapter	Page
BRIEF HISTORY OF FEDERALLY MANDATED PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PROGRAMS	32
NON-FEDERAL LEVEL OF INTEREST	43
LEGAL OPINIONS IN SUPPORT OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	44
EFFORTS AT STATE LEVELS	48
A DISTRICT'S ATTEMPT AT PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	53
SUMMARY	60
3. THE RESEARCH PROCEDURES	62
DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION	62
SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE	62
SOURCES OF THE DATA	64
DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT	65
TREATMENT OF THE DATA	67
THE RESEARCH DESIGN	69
REASONS GIVEN BY DISTRICTS FOR NOT WISHING TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY	69
4. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA	72
THE FINDINGS	93
5. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	109
CONCLUSIONS	112
RECOMMENDATIONS	118
BIBLIOGRAPHY	125

APPENDICES	132
A. SAMPLE COMPLAINT TO UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION	133
B. SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY	139
C. LETTER SENT TO EACH SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS REQUESTING LISTS OF TITLE I PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS	142
D. FOLLOW-UP LETTER MAILED TO EACH DISTRICT URGING THEIR PROMPT RESPONSE	146
E. ADMINISTRATORS' QUESTIONNAIRE	148
F. ENGLISH VERSION OF LETTER SENT TO PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS REQUESTING THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY	150
G. SPANISH VERSION OF LETTER SENT TO PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS REQUESTING THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY	152
H. ENGLISH VERSION OF THE TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE	154
I. SPANISH VERSION OF THE TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE	161
J. PERMISSION TO USE QUESTIONNAIRE	168
K. ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM GUIDE #44	170

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Articles Published From 1961-70 On Parental Involvement-Professional Journals	19
2. Committee Members' Responses to the English and Spanish Version of the Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 Parent Advisory Committee Questionnaire	72
3. Responses to the Administrators' Questionnaires	87
4. Characteristics of Parent Advisory Committee Members	95
5. Role of District PACs and Extent of Involvement	97
6. Extent of Involvement in the Planning Process of Title I in the Areas Listed	101
7. Extent of Involvement in the Implementation of Title I in the Areas Listed	102
8. Number and Percent of Involvement in the Evaluation of Title I.	102
9. Number and Percent of PAC Members' Knowledge of Title I and Title I Functions	103
10. Problems Encountered by School Districts in the Implementation of Their Parent Advisory Committee	106
11. Number and Percent of PAC Members That Disagreed with Responses Made by Respondents of the Title I Administrators' Questionnaire and Areas of Disagreement . . .	107

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Some administrators are increasingly being challenged with respect to their educational decisions. Many groups, including teachers, students, and parents are becoming less passive in their relationship to the schools and more vocal in their demands for "a piece of the action." In such an atmosphere, the relationship between the administrative team of the schools and their various publics has become significantly more important to the success of the school programs.

According to some educators, parental involvement in the education of their children has become an educational, political, and cultural necessity. Tokenism in educational decision-making is being less tolerated. The education of children is no longer a closed system which admits only professionals as purveyors and implementors. Instead, it has become a system which no longer segregates policy making and implementation. Many parents, especially those of disadvantaged children, want not only to exercise their right but also their responsibility to share in determining the nature of their children's education.

A number of research studies indicate that parental involvement in a child's education is a foremost predictor of the child's achievement. (30:15) Wilcox feels that it has been used mainly by ambitious, politically-oriented profes-

sionals to gain sanctions to do as they chose. He further believes that these professionals do not truly believe in legitimate parental involvement but rather believe in the use of it as a guide to achieve their own needs. In cases where parents turn down their demands or question their decisions, parental involvement becomes a luxury or a burden. (70:178)

School administrators appear to be fearful that the minute they involve parents in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of educational programs, they will lose control of their organizations. Although it seems apparent that with an increased sharing in the decision-making process, some loss of absolute control on the part of school administrators is likely to take place. Such loss is not necessarily detrimental to children. On the other hand, parent and/or citizen advisory committees are doing much more than advising; they are performing various kinds of activities. Their activities include publishing newsletters for other parents, policing streets against bullies victimizing young pupils, giving scholarships, establishing school bus stops, acting as grievance panels, and "studying problems and finding solutions" for a bewildering array of topics. (11:5) It stands to reason, therefore, that if the public schools are to serve the public, a stronger bond between schools and the communities they serve must be created so that members of the communities will genuinely participate in or contribute to

the schools which purport to serve them. Also, they will become more understanding and supportive of the schools that they have been in the past. (10:3) The belief seems to be spreading that if some parental participation is good for the schools and children, more parental participation, especially through Parent Advisory Committees, hereafter referred to as PACs, is better.

The fact that school officials have discovered they have at their disposal an abundant supply of public talent, time and willingness to work, and the fact that attempts to involve parents in school activities have proved beneficial in many instances, parental involvement has not been aimed at sharing power or in decision-making. Since only a few people are able to serve on the school board, wider parent participation in decision-making has taken the form of parent advisory groups or councils in federally funded programs such as Head Start, Follow Through, and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, hereafter referred as Title I. After all, ". . .no one really knows more about whether a program is working or not, and whether it is being properly administered than those to whom it is supposed to benefit. More important, the way to eliminate paternalism, laziness, and unresponsiveness is to share power." (14:S676) Parents appear to be saying,

. . .you professionals have failed to educate our children--they are two to four years behind in reading. We can no longer

sit back and watch our children fail under your system. We want to make sure our kids get quality education. In order for this to happen, we must have more authority in shaping school policy. We want to make public schools more public. (20:192)

Gittell points out, however, that any attempt to expand parent and community involvement in the school system will meet with resistance. She feels that, "any effort to change the school system and civic participation must face the concentration of power in the professional bureaucracy and the resistance by the bureaucracy to any plan that would evade its power." Any plan for the reorganization of a large city school system, according to Gittell, must embody a formula for the decentralization of bureaucratic authority and the expansion of outside non-professional influences. (23:57)

In the late sixties, several promising attempts and approaches to meaningful parental involvement were developed in local, university based and other federally funded experimental programs such as Parent-Child Centers, Head Start, and Follow Through. (26, 27, 46) Title I programs can be added to these lists of attempts and approaches at providing meaningful parental involvement programs. These attempts appear to have the potential for making a significant impact upon education throughout the nation.

From its inception Title I was to include appropriate activities to facilitate parental involvement and their

providing services to local education agencies, hereafter referred to as LEAs. Federal officials felt that a greater impact could be made if educators and parents worked together to reach common goals. There was good evidence that parents and educators who worked together in meeting the needs of disadvantaged students were more effective in reaching that goal than either group working alone.

Since Head Start and Follow Through, other federally funded programs have incorporated within their guidelines a strong parental involvement component which must be met if federal funds are to be initially obtained or subsequently continued. Title I has become the largest federally funded program that has made parental involvement and participation mandatory in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs funded by the grant. A review of the state education agencies, hereafter referred to as SEAs, literature reveals a lack of specific guidelines at the state level. The lack of state guidelines has resulted in a form of decentralization at the LEA level regarding the implementation of a viable parent involvement program. (74)

A study was conducted by the researcher in July, 1974, to determine the extent of leadership each state has provided their LEAs on parental involvement as required by Title I. The study revealed that 21 states have provided leadership of one type or another, however, 29 states have left parental

involvement to the initiative of each school district. The details of the study are summarized and presented in Chapter II.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Parental involvement has begun to assume greater importance in today's public schools as evidenced by increasing federal guidelines and parental interest. Parent and community participation is becoming more visible and viable as educators are constantly being reminded that parents are also teachers of their children. Educators are seeking new methods of bringing closer together the school and the home in the education of the child. Parents need to be involved in programs which facilitate their participation effectively and facilitate the development of their vital role in shaping the education of their children both at school and at home. It is important that programs of parental involvement be developed and implemented.

The SEA in Texas is one of the 29 SEAs that has left Title I parental involvement to the initiative and discretion of its LEAs. Other SEAs have supplemented federal guidelines with booklets, bulletins, handbooks, position papers, directives, and similar information. Technical assistance and general direction at the state level would be both beneficial and important to LEAs in Texas. PACs, on the other hand, have become organized to the extent that several civil rights

groups have prepared printed materials which inform parents of their rights and responsibilities under Title I.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense Fund has assembled a comprehensive package of materials for parents. This package includes a translation of the regulations and other important information, and a comprehensive six-page sample complaint form to the United States Commissioner of Education regarding the violation of Title I regulations and guidelines.

(Appendix A)

In the summer of 1972, a meeting was conducted by a non-profit organization in Austin, Texas, in which selected PAC representatives from various parts of the state were invited to a workshop to learn what to do if assistance was needed to become more involved in their respective Title I program. Several months later, in October, a meeting was called by SEA officials in the same city in which selected LEA Title I Directors were invited to discuss the LEA's and SEA's role in complying with United States Office of Education, hereafter referred to as USOE, mandates regarding parental involvement in Title I programs. No additional information or technical assistance was received by the LEAs in the form of guidelines for parental involvement.

A number of LEA Title I Directors have indicated that additional assistance and direction is needed to assist LEAs

in conducting effective programs and in providing meaningful direction in sustaining effective parental participation programs.

In an attempt to meet this need, this study has reviewed the status of parent involvement and the salient points of effective parental involvement programs by researching the literature at the national, state, and local level regarding Title I parental involvement programs. This review has been summarized by the researcher in another publication.

(74) The description, review of the literature, survey of SEA leadership, and review of the role of PAC members together with the review of the extent of Title I PAC participation in the selected school districts in Texas should enable interested school districts in initiating or strengthening ongoing Title I parental involvement programs.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Each child has an inherent right to have his parents and teachers work together for the best education possible. Whatever type of parental involvement that is to exist should include as its foremost purpose furthering the educational opportunities and achievement of the children. Parents of disadvantaged children, especially Title I, frequently have a better grasp of the psychological and physiological needs of their children than do school district personnel. This is

the result of parents having an indepth and long-term knowledge of their children, their strengths and weaknesses, their needs, and their problems. On the other hand, school district personnel are in a position to better understand the educational needs of children. The key to a harmonious relationship, therefore, is the exchanging of information, regarding the child, with the educator in an effort to plan a better, more relevant and viable school program.

In many communities the question of the role of parents in the school has brought disharmony between the educators and parents. However, it is no longer a question of role definition by one educator. It includes state legislatures, the courts, school boards, community pressure groups and recently the federal government. The Guidelines: Compensatory Education, Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10, Title I Revised 1969, require that a district that receives Title I funds "shall establish a local district advisory committee." Further, the Federal Register, Volume 32, Number 27, February 9, 1967, Washington, D. C., Part II, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Regulations Pursuant to Title I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, strongly encourages parental involvement. The same Federal Register, Volume 36, Number 199, October 14, 1971, makes parental involvement mandatory through the establishment of parent councils. Since Title I PACs have been

formed in responses to federal guidelines, they can legally exercise more clout than most other advisory committees.

It should be noted, however, that no PAC, be it Title I or other, can provide instant recommendations, especially if they have not been involved in the educational decision-making process. Such committees if they are to be effective should be nurtured in order that they may help promote the cause of education in the community.

In those cities where school administrators and boards of education have responded favorably and enthusiastically to the efforts of citizens to start advisory committees and where the school administration has cooperated in establishing ground rules and goals and in providing facts and figures, and encouragement to citizens as they try to form an advisory committee, the outcome generally has been favorable on both sides. (11:19) Where school districts have formed advisory committees for spurious reasons and when these groups have been misused, LEAs have encountered hostility and resentment.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to examine the role, practices, and status of PACs as required by Title I and the extent of the PAC's involvement in the educational decision-making process. Specifically, data were sought that enabled

the researcher to answer the questions stated below.

QUESTIONS

The following questions were developed in relation to federal guidelines about PACs for this study.

1. What are the characteristics of the PAC members?
2. Are Title I PACs recognized by the school boards?
3. What is the role of district PACs in the educational decision-making process of Title I programs?
4. Who defines the roles of PAC members as they participate in the planning, implementing, and evaluation of Title I programs?
5. Who in the district provides committee members with information regarding Title I programs on which they could make recommendations?
6. Do committee members understand what is expected of them?
7. How are committee members selected?
8. To what extent are minority groups and persons from different income levels represented in the committees?
9. Do minority committee members participate actively?
10. Do school districts implement the recommendations, where appropriate, of the PACs?
11. To what extent are PACs involved
 - a. in the planning of Title I programs?

b. in the implementation of Title I programs?

c. in the evaluation of Title I programs?

12. How knowledgeable are PAC members concerning Title I guidelines and Title I programs?

13. What training or orientation, if any, is provided to PAC members?

14. What positive experiences have been discovered by school districts as a result of Title I PACs?

15. What problems have been encountered by school districts as a result of having initiated PACs as required by Title I?

16. What is the cost directly connected to the maintenance of the PACs?

QUESTIONNAIRE

The answers to the questions asked were gathered through the use of a Parent Advisory Committee Questionnaire and/or Administrators' Questionnaire. The questionnaires are discussed in more detail in Chapter IV.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

This study contains certain words which have more than one meaning. The following definitions are presented to clarify their use:

1. ESEA, Title I, P. L. 89-10--The initials stand for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Title I

is the title of the act which provides categorical funds for the education of educationally disadvantaged children residing in districts with high concentrations of children from low-income families. P. L. 89-10 means a public law enacted by the 89th Congress of the United States.

2. Low-Income Children--Children from families who fall below the prevailing poverty index or are under public assistance.

3. Educationally Disadvantaged Children--Children of low-income families who, for one reason or another, have been unable to achieve scholastically.

4. Parent Advisory Committees (PACs)--A district-wide committee of elected or appointed persons who are organized for the purpose of assisting and advising LEAs in the planning, development, operation, and evaluation of Title I and serves as the vehicle through which school districts can involve parents in the above. Guidelines encourage PACs to be formed at each participating school, however, only district-wide committees are required for programs serving more than one campus or school.

5. Local Education Agency (LEA)--A public school district.

6. State Education Agency (SEA)--The State Department of Education of a respective state.

7. Parental Involvement--The involvement of PACs in LEAs for the purpose of planning, development, operation, and

evaluation of Title I programs. The researcher recognizes that parental involvement extends beyond this limited definition.

8. Mandated Parental Involvement--Required parental involvement as outlined in federal guidelines, regulations, and laws concerning the involvement of parents in activities outlined in Item 7 above.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was based on a stratified random sample of Title I PACs in Texas. The sample includes responses from 206 PAC members representing 50 school districts and from 50 administrators directly connected with Title I programs. During the 1972-73 school year, there were 1,049 school districts in Texas. Of this total, 1,025 participated in/or implemented Title I programs.

This study considered parental involvement in Title I funded programs through local school district PACs only as required by the federal regulations. Other PACs have different regulations and requirements and were, therefore, only considered in the review of the literature.

OVERVIEW AND ORDER OF PRESENTATION

This study examined the role, practices, and status of PACs as required by Title I and their extent of their

involvement in the educational decision-making process in Texas.

Chapter II includes a review of the literature on the history of voluntary and mandated parental involvement together with a discussion of Title I.

Chapter III presents the methodology for the study.

The analysis of the data and the findings of the study are presented in Chapter IV.

The summary of the study with appropriate recommendations, implications, and reflections are incorporated in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature relevant to the involvement of parents and members of the community in the educational process. Included in this review is a brief history of parental involvement in general, then more specifically, the emergence of mandated parental involvement guidelines. A review of federal rules, regulations, and guidelines is also included together with a review of court cases dealing with parental involvement or the lack of it. The researcher recognizes that this is not a review of the "literature" in the strictest sense. However, this chapter has compiled this information and has reviewed it and considers this as part of the literature. The chapter concludes with a history of Title I and a district's attempt at parental involvement.

Brief History of Parental Involvement

Pre-World War II

Parental involvement in the beginning days of our country meant a close relationship between the people and their schools. The lay citizens had direct control over all the schools in the community. (67:6) However, several factors have created the gap that exists between the community and its schools. (30:17) The nineteenth century, with the establish-

ment of teacher training institutions, brought in specialized knowledge and skills unknown to the townsmen who had previously determined method as well as content of the school program. Laymen began to abdicate to the professionals during this era. (30:17)

Opportunities for democratic participation were greatly diminished with the coming of industrialization and urbanization. The public's relationship to business, government, and the schools followed a similar pattern. (67:10)

Educational writers such as Dewey (18) and Hart (32) have brought out the interrelatedness of the educational functions of the home, the neighborhood, and the school. Although much was said during this time about the importance of the home in the educational development of the child, very little was done to involve the parents in the educational process.

Post World War II

The Post World War II era saw a great need for the financial support of public schools as a result of a rise in population and costs. (77:13) Lane treats the renewed interest of parents in their communities and their children's schools following World War II. She discusses different values and ideals and notes the tendency for parents to be blamed for everything that goes wrong with youngsters. The

blame had been previously shared and accepted equally between the church, the home, and the school. (45:29) In today's society the total blame for failure is placed on the school, a shift from the Post World War II period. (30:18)

Hanges asserts that many of today's goals for parental involvement have been stated 20 and 30 years ago. (30:18-19) This is partly evidenced by the 1953 official platform of the National Education Association which called "for national, regional, and local movements among parents, teachers, and other interested citizens to guard the welfare of children and to bring the school, the home, and the community into closer cooperation." (81:40) Hanges further states that the platform is still applicable today. "However, it is being applied more and more to giving voice to minority groups whose children attend schools in urban centers rather than to white middle class groups in suburban settings as was the case in the progressive period in education." (30:19)

The community school concept also received a good deal of attention in the 1940's. A number of schools were leaders in this aspect. The Ballard Memorial School in Jefferson County, Kentucky, was made into a community school by Elsie R. Clapp. Other schools who were also part of the 1940's educational scene regarding the community school concept were the Holtville School in Alabama, the George School in Philadelphia suburbs, and the community school developed by

Helen Nicholls in Nova Scotia. (64:13)

The Michigan Community School Service Program, during the period July, 1945 to October, 1953, received the financial support of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Realizing the potential of the community school concept, the Michigan Department of Public Instruction became interested in the community school concept as it saw in it a way to mobilize total community efforts in the solving of serious problems. (64:20)

A number of articles published between 1961-74 on parental involvement have dealt with parental involvement in a helping or advisory role. Hanges reviewed the articles published between 1961-70 and noted an increase in the number of articles written in professional journals on the subject as the decade of the 1960's came to an end. Table 1 (30:14) shows that in 1967 a significant increase in the number of articles dealing with parental involvement began to appear. In 1968 the number doubled. (30:14)

Table 1

Number of Articles Published from 1961-70
on Parental Involvement
Professional Journals

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>
1961	4
1962	4
1963	4

Table 1 (continued)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>
1964	8
1965	7
1966	9
1967	15
1968	30
1969	24
1970	25

In pursuing Hanges' research on the number of articles published on parental involvement, the researcher found 59 articles that were published since 1970 on parental involvement. One educational journal devoted an entire issue to the subject. The number of articles published by years since 1970 are as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Articles</u>
1971	12
1972	18
1973	9
1974	20

It should be noted that federally funded programs such as Head Start, Follow Through and Title I began to emerge in the mid sixties. These programs not only stressed parental involvement but went as far as requiring it as part of the acceptance of the federal grant.

Hanges noted that the word "control" was substituted for the words "involvement" and "participation" in the articles referenced above in late 1968. Hanges also noted a decrease in the number of articles written in 1970, and that many articles written in 1968 and 1970 were articles written on community or parent control rather than parental involvement. (30:15) Since 1970, however, less articles have been published on the subject of community or parental control. This appears to be indicative of a return to the early and mid sixties description of parental involvement.

Parental Involvement Through Advisory Committees

In his study of PACs in California, Reyes found no specific studies and almost no literature relating to the use of school district advisory committees as vehicles for parent and community involvement in the educational decision-making process. (62:14) Reyes further found that "the thirties through the fifties produced scattered programs of community participation in education, and some experimentation in community schools, but very minimal indications of funds towards parental involvement in educational advisory committees." (62:19)

The development of advisory groups resulted in broad powers. Kindred (44:43-44) discusses committees which had such functions as increased community use of schools,

recommendations for improving conditions of school buildings, a "clearinghouse" for important educational issues, informing fellow laymen of schools' needs, work in public relation programs, identifying educational needs, providing moral support for school officials undertaking innovative actions, creating confidence in the schools, and harmonizing the conflicts between schools and community. "These indeed seem to imply the forerunners of present advisory committees."
(62:17)

The growing trend towards advisory committees was perceived by Pierce (58:161-166) as a reversal of professional control of schools. He attributed this to several factors primarily related to World War II. For example, teachers serving the nation in the war effort were replaced by untrained personnel. Also, a small number of new teachers were being trained. Pierce stated that education should not be in the control of a limited few but rather under the control of the people.

Significance of Parental Involvement in the Educational Process

The Influence of the Home Environment

It is the belief of many psychologists that a child's intelligence grows as much during his first four years of life as it will grow in the next 13 years. (5) At two or three years of age, he can learn any language more easily than an

adult. During this period of extra-rapid growth, the child's surroundings exert their most powerful effect. It has also been found that by the age of four a child will have acquired 50 percent of the intellectual skills he will have acquired by age 18, and that by age 8 he will have acquired 80 percent of the intellectual skills he is likely to have by age 18. (5)

Educators in their vital effort to improve educational opportunities for disadvantaged children often neglect the key role played by parents. The fact that parents are the child's first teachers and are, therefore, potential aides in the educational process is also neglected. Although parents want their children to succeed in school, they are often unaware of what they can do to help. Disadvantaged children often do not have even the most basic materials in their homes. The provisions of such materials, although a step in the right direction, will not always guarantee their productive use. Early and continued guidance and encouragement by parents is important to the intellectual growth of the child in his early years.

R. Reissman's research into the background and environment of disadvantaged children revealed the lack of an "educational tradition" in homes, a few books, insufficient language and reading skills, inadequate motivation to pursue long-range educational goals, poor self-image, antagonism toward the school and the teacher, poor health and diet, frequent moving, noise-television dominated homes, working

mothers and absent fathers. (60)

Joseph A. Kahl's (40:186-203) study to determine what factors, aside from IQ, decide whether a high school boy goes on to college found that the boy's educational aspirations clearly relate to parental pressure to go on, or lack of it. He also found that parental pressure on the boys to get ahead was crucial to their educational aspirations. In a comparable study, Sewell and Shaw (65:571) found that "parental encouragement is a powerful intervening variable between socioeconomic class background and intelligence of the child and his educational aspirations."

In his study on the relevance of parental involvement for children's educational careers, Michael (51:32) found that 41 percent of the children of completely inactive parents dropped out of school. He contends that parents shape the educational futures of their children by transmitting certain ideas and by engaging in various activities. He believes that a child's achievement, ability, and motivations depend partly on parental involvement and the family home.

According to Michael, a decline in parental involvement will most likely affect a child's classroom behavior.

Parents removed from the school setting generally cannot motivate and control their children's conduct as well as parents frequently at school. The withdrawal of family support for compliance to the classroom's rules and the lack of visibility of pupil performance free the offspring of uninvolved parents from the needs of strict compliance in the classroom. (51:32)

Parental involvement in the educational lives of children will result in higher achievement and aspirations for children.

(30:17)

Parental Pressure Toward Involvement

LEAs have begun to experience increasing pressures from parents who wish to become involved in the educational process. The implementation of federally funded programs have increased their desires in forms of demands. Peter Milus, a Washington Post staff writer, wrote that the idea of Title I parental involvement "may disturb some local boards." On the other hand, parents are sensing a feeling of futility and frustration as they see decisions being made for them by those beyond their reach.

Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center (16:107) feel that blocked lines of communications and rigidity of institutions bring about citizen's protests and that individuals who feel they no longer control their own destiny are more prone to dissent. Richard N. Goodwin (25), a one-time Kennedy aide, asserts that the public must inevitably rise in protest as they see institutions that do not respond to the cry of the people.

In an effort to effect optimum parental involvement, the National Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children in its 1971 Annual Report to the President and the Congress

encouraged parental involvement through PACs. The council further recommended "optimum involvement" with appropriate provisions for and guarantees of technical assistance and access to Title I information.

Levels of Parent Involvement

Ira J. Gordon (27:27-28), in his book Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education, divides parental involvement in the schools' program in five levels. These are (1) audience, bystander-observer; (2) teacher of the child; (3) volunteer; (4) trained worker; and (5) participation in decision-making, especially advisory board membership (advisory committees). The following will examine levels one through five.

Level one has been perhaps the oldest form of parental involvement in that parents were not encouraged to participate and were often discouraged. Their participation usually consisted of occasional contact with the school as a bystander or observer.

At level two the emphasis is placed on making parents aware of their role as teachers of their children and formally involving them in the process. This may include bringing parents into the school or visiting parents in the home through home visits usually conducted by paraprofessionals and professionals.

At level three parents are utilized as volunteers, a

not so uncommon practice in public schools. Teachers plan those activities in which parents will participate. Many school districts have made extensive use of this method in their federally funded programs since such programs allow a set rate at which volunteers' hours can be counted towards the district's share of the total cost of the project. The Corpus Christi Independent School District, for example, contributed over 25,000 volunteer hours during one school year.

Level four goes beyond volunteer programs and involves parents as paid aides. Many federally funded programs require the employment of parents in the specific program. Paid involvement can include such activities as teacher aides, babysitting, housekeeping, record-keeping, and activities in instruction and evaluation.

The fifth level of parental involvement is the participation of parents in the decision-making process. It is at this level that this study focuses its emphasis. Since only a few persons can serve on a school's board of education, wider parent participation in the decision-making process has taken the form of PACs.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

On January 12, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson presented to the 89th Congress his proposals for aid to

education. His objectives were incorporated into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. On April 9, 1965, the United States Senate passed and sent to the President the ESEA Bill. Two days later, in a one-room school house near Stonewall, Texas, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Bill into law. Upon the signing of the Bill, President Johnson said: "I believe deeply that no law I have signed or ever will sign means more to the future of America." (38:212)

Although the ESEA of 1965 provided for several educational thrusts by way of Titles I through V, the major thrust of the Act was Title I which provided over a billion dollars to schools for financing educational programs for educationally deprived children residing in districts with concentrations of children from low-income families. (69:iv) Title I has, thus, become the largest federal aid-to-education bill ever passed.

Although its intent was rather simple--to provide categorical aid to local school districts in order that they might provide special assistance to educationally deprived children residing in poverty areas--it has become anything but simple. The provisions of the bill, amendments to the law, USOE regulations and program guides, and SEA guidelines have caused Title I to become an extremely categorical and restricted funding source. (44:43) One of the most important

federal requirements is the inclusion of appropriate activities or services in which parents are to be involved. (71:16)

Federal, State and Local
Relationships
in Title I

Every school district in Texas receives state funds to provide a basic educational program to its children. These funds, together with Title I, are used by many districts to increase the effectiveness of compensatory education programs and to also serve more of the state's deprived children.

The USOE, SEA, and the LEAs have the responsibility for administering Title I programs. The USOE conducts the program at the national level determining funding allocations for eligible districts or counties, state agencies, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of Interior, as well as American Trust Territories.

The United States Office of Education. The USOE carries out the responsibilities of the Commissioner of Education in the following ways: (15:2)

- . approves Title I applications at the state level i.e. applications submitted by the state department of education
- . makes funds available following approval of state applications
- . develops and disseminates regulations, guidelines, and other materials regarding the administration of Title I
- . provides consultative services to state department of education

- . reviews and assesses Title I programs throughout the nation
- . compiles fiscal, statistical and other type of reports for Congress and for the public.

State Education Agency. In its formal application to the USOE to participate in the Title I program, a state department of education includes assurance that it will administer the program and submit reports in accordance with the provisions of the guidelines, regulations, and the law. The state department of education's responsibilities are:

(15:2-3)

- . to make local school districts aware that the application proposal as well as their Title I programs must meet legislative requirements
- . to assist local districts in the development of projects through the provision of technical assistance
- . to review and approve proposed projects in accordance with the provisions of Title I and make payment of funds
- . to maintain fiscal records of all grant funds
- . to make statistical, fiscal, and evaluative reports for the USOE
- . to make monitoring visits to determine compliance with existing guidelines, regulations, and the law
- . to interpret Title I policy statements for local school districts.

Local Education Agencies. The LEA has the responsibility to develop and implement approved projects to fulfill

the intent of Title I. It identifies the educationally deprived children in accordance with Program Guide #44. (71) It determines the special need of these identified children, designs projects to carry out the proposes of the legislation with regard to such children, and submits applications and amendments to the state department of education for grants to fund proposed programs. Additionally, the LEA has the following responsibilities: (15:3)

- . use Title I funds for the purpose for which the projects have been approved
- . make available for inspection by the public the terms and provisions of each approved project
- . maintain adequate fiscal records on all project funds and report to the state department of education on the use of such funds
- . maintain fiscal effort with respect to total current expenditures for education and also with respect to such expenditures in the project areas.

Parent Advisory Committee. The Title I regulations state that the PAC must be involved in the planning, development, operation, and evaluation of local Title I projects. The extent of such involvement is not discussed in detail, although the guidelines do note several functions for the committee. Some of these are: (21)

- . supply information concerning the views of parents and children about unmet educational needs in the Title I project areas and establish priorities among these needs

- . recommend a general plan for the concentration of funds in specific schools and grade levels
- . participate in the development of project proposals
- . provide written concurring or dissenting comments to be forwarded with the application
- . hear complaints concerning the program and make recommendations for its improvement
- . act as a hearing committee for suggestions to improve the program
- . assist in the annual evaluation of the Title I program and services, and
- . provide suggestions on improving Title I programs and services in operation.

Brief History of Federally Mandated Parental Involvement Programs

One of the first and most popular federal programs to require parental involvement was Operation Head Start which was funded under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Head Start was primarily intended to serve five and six year old preschool children from economically deprived homes. The program was considered as educational in addition to providing such comprehensive services as medical and dental examinations, food, clothing, and social services. During the school year 1966-67, over 350 million dollars were marked for Head Start for summer and full-year programs. (1:67-68)

Two difficulties incurred by educators in Head Start programs were that the programs were not necessarily conducted

by public schools and they required parental involvement. It was a Community Action Program. (43:16) Thus, Head Start became the first major non-vocational federal program to require parental involvement.

Head Start was followed by Project Follow Through as the second of the major federal programs to require the involvement of parents in the project's activities. Follow Through was an innovative, nationwide program designed to reinforce and extend gains made in full-year Head Start and other quality pre-Kindergarten programs as children entered the Kindergarten and primary grades. The program was initially funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and administered by the USOE. (44:3) Relating to continuation of Head Start benefits, President Johnson stressed the necessity for not allowing the achievements of Head Start to fade. He felt that more was required and therefore the benefits of Follow Through were essential. (38:150-153)

A third major federal program, and the largest fiscally and in the numbers of children reached, to require parental involvement in its programs was Title I. From its passage, the USOE envisioned the involvement of parents and other citizens in Title I funded programs. Officials from the USOE had studied research fundings which reflected the positive effect of parental involvement programs such as Head Start and Follow Through on a student's academic achievement. Parents wanted to become involved in their

child's education and community leaders wanted to help. Thus, the atmosphere for parental and community involvement was established in Title I funded programs.

Although USOE officials envisioned the involvement of parents in Title I, such hopes brought arguments from educators. The arguments did not impress the states. Nonetheless, the first guidelines issued by the USOE in the spring of 1967 called for parental participation. The guidelines were general and the criteria did not define the nature and extent of the participation. (47) A second set of guidelines was issued in the spring of 1968. This time, the guidelines called specifically for the involvement of parents "in the early stages of program planning and in discussions concerning the needs of children." (49) The guidelines known as Program Guide #44 (71) contained a number of provisions specifically calling for the "involvement of parents." Criterion 3.1 states that "the priority needs of educationally deprived children in the eligible attendance areas (target populations) were determined in consultation with teachers, parents" The discussion following the criterion notes that the involvement of parents and other interested parties in such discussions will give program planners an additional insight into the needs of target population. It also indicates that parents and other community leaders will be more likely to support a program they understand and have a

say in developing.

Criterion 3.1 discusses Title I as part of a comprehensive compensatory education program involving a number of resources. The discussion following the criterion does not mention parents. However, it is clear that parents and other interested parties cited in Criterion 2.1 should be involved in the analysis of the resources available to meet the needs of the target population.

Criterion 5.1 calls for an appropriate staffing pattern in Title I projects. Indications are that parents and other community members with special skills should be among those interviewed for staff positions.

Criterion 5.4 states that "the Title I program includes appropriate activities or services in which parents will be involved."

Criterion 5.8 reviews the dissemination requirements of Title I. The discussion points out the necessity of developing "information dissemination programs to include the involvement of the community and parents of children served by the project."

On July 2, 1968, the USOE issued a separate memorandum on parental and community involvement stating that "local advisory committees will need to be established." (48) Accompanying the memorandum from the commissioner was Program Guide #46 which summarized some of the criteria dealing with parental involvement and recommended the establishment of

local advisory councils.

It soon became apparent that it was one thing to discuss parental involvement, but it was quite a different thing to call for formal committees which had to identify, count, names submitted and perhaps even some influence exerted. Some educators, thus, resented such a requirement and saw little real benefit from it. Some even felt that they already had too many community problems already without such parental involvement. The guidelines were viewed by many educators as a professional threat. On July 29, 1968, a set of "clarifying guidelines" were issued as a result of pressures from national education associations, local educators, and congressmen. (56:12) The new guidelines, in effect, told the states to do as they pleased about parental involvement. (50) Consequently, most states were contented to do nothing, although some advisory committees, often stacked with teacher aides and other paraprofessionals, continued to function. (56:12)

In 1969, the USOE, still unsatisfied, managed to convince the Nixon Administration to amend the law so as to include local advisory committees. The recommendation was adopted by the House Committee on Education and Labor only to be dropped later during floor debate in the House due to strong opposition from the South. (56:12) It was not until 1970 that such involvement became a legal mandate.

Section 415 of the General Education Provisions Act (Public Law 91-230) gave the United States Commissioner of Education the power he needed to require LEAs to involve parents in any federally financed program where he thought it would be beneficial. Such authority was explicitly stated as follows:

In the case of any applicable program in which the commissioner determines that parental participation at the state or local level would increase the effectiveness of the program in achieving its purpose, he shall promulgate regulations with respect to such program setting forth criteria designed to encourage such participation. If the program for which such determination provides for payments to local educational agencies, applications for such payments shall--

(1) set forth such policies and procedures as will insure that programs and projects assisted under the application have been planned and developed, and will be operated, in consultation with, and with the involvement of parents of the children to be served by such programs and projects;

(2) be submitted with assurance that such parents have had an opportunity to present their views with respect to the application; and

(3) set forth policies and procedures for adequate disseminations of program plans and evaluations to such parents and the public.

The decision to involve parents was soon made for Title I, and federal administrators issued regulations requiring school districts to establish parent councils. The USOE mandates were published in the Federal Register on _____

October 14, 1971. The following are the official regulations as set forth by the USOE:

Section 116.17:

(n) Each application by a local educational agency for a grant under Title I of the Act shall include specific plans for disseminating information concerning the provisions of Title I, and the applicant's past and present Title I programs, including evaluations of such programs, to parents and to the general public and for making available to them upon request the full text of current and past Title I applications, all pertinent documents related to those applications, evaluations of the applicant's past Title I projects, all reports required by Section 116.23 to be submitted to the State educational agency, and such other documents as may be reasonably necessary to meet the needs of such parents or other members of the public for information related to the comprehensive planning, operation, and evaluation of the Title I program but not including information relating to the performance of identified children and teachers. Such plans shall include provision for the reproduction, upon request, of such documents free of charge or at reasonable cost (not to exceed the additional costs incurred which are not covered by Title I funds) or provisions whereby persons requesting such copies will be given adequate opportunity to arrange for the reproduction of such documents.

(o) (1) Parental involvement at the local level is deemed to be an important means of increasing the effectiveness of programs under Title I of the Act. Each application of a local educational agency (other than a State agency directly responsible for providing free public education for handicapped children or for children in institutions for neglected and delinquent children) for assistance

under that title, therefore, (i) shall describe how parents of the children to be served were consulted and involved in the planning of the project and (ii) shall set forth specific plans for continuing the involvement of such parents in the further planning and in the development and operation of the project.

(2) Each local educational agency shall, prior to the submission of an application for fiscal year 1972 and any succeeding fiscal year, establish a council in which parents (not employed by the local educational agency) of educationally deprived children residing in attendance areas which are to be served by the project, constitute more than a simple majority or designate for that purpose an existing organized group in which such parents will constitute more than a simple majority, and shall include in its application sufficient information to enable the State educational agency to make the following determinations:

(i) That the local educational agency has taken appropriate measures to insure the selection of parents to the parent council who are representatives

(a) of the children eligible to be served (including such children enrolled in private schools) and (b) of the attendance areas to be included in the Title I program of such agency;

(ii) That each member of the council has been furnished free of charge copies of Title I of the Act, the Federal regulation, guidelines, and criteria issued pursuant thereto, State Title I regulations and guidelines, and the local educational agency's current application; and that such other information as may be needed for the effective involvement of the council in the planning,

development, operation, and evaluation of projects under said Title I (including prior applications for Title I projects and evaluations thereof) will also be made available to the council;

(iii) That the local educational agency has provided the parent council with the agency's plans for future Title I projects and programs, together with a description of the process of planning and developing those projects and programs, and the projected times at which each stage of the process will start and be completed;

(iv) That the parent council has had an adequate opportunity to consider the information available concerning the special educational needs of the educationally deprived children residing in the project areas, and the various programs available to meet those needs, and to make recommendations concerning those needs which should be addressed through the Title I program and similar programs;

(v) That the parent council has had an opportunity to review evaluations of prior Title I programs and has been informed of the performance criteria by which the proposed program is to be evaluated;

(vi) That the Title I program in each project area includes specific provisions for informing and consulting with parents concerning the services to be provided for their children under Title I of the Act and the ways in which such parents can assist their children in realizing the benefits those services are intended to provide;

(vii) That the local educational agency has adequate procedures to insure prompt response to complaints and

suggestions from parents and parent council;

(viii) That all parents of children to be served have had an opportunity to present their views concerning the application to the appropriate school personnel, and that the parent council has had an opportunity to submit comments to the State educational agency concerning the application at the time it is submitted, which comments the State educational agency shall consider in determining whether or not the application shall be approved.

(3) The State educational agency may establish such additional rules and procedures, not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, as may be reasonably necessary to insure the involvement of parents and the proper organization and functioning of parent councils.

The new regulations clearly stated that if payments are to be made to LEAs under Title I, parents must be involved in the planning, development, operation, and evaluation of ongoing Title I projects. Most of the provisions deal with the district-wide council and although the USOE has not required the establishment of councils in each school, it has made the recommendation.

Although the new regulations made only minor changes in the proposed regulations previously issued on April 27, 1971, for the first time concrete and specific regulations concerning parental involvement had the force of the law.

In Title I programs the emergence of a mandated systemwide parental involvement and PACs is evidence of the

trend, as well as an indication of the federal government responsiveness to the issue. (56:6) Although the federal government cannot control the extent of parental involvement in locally and state supported programs, it can, however, dictate the extent of it in federally financed programs such as Head Start, Follow Through, and Title I, to name only a few.

In a meeting of 8,000 parents and professionals in California in February, 1974, Alfred McElroy, Chairman of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, emphasized that "the key to wise spending of federal funds for the education of disadvantaged children was an informed and involved parent." He further stated that restrictive guidelines do not give as much assurance that the money will be spent on strong parental involvement.

The National Council on the Education of the Disadvantaged Children feels that

PACs are particularly essential in large school districts where school boards may not be elected, or where it is felt that the school board as a district-wide body may not adequately represent Title I attendance areas. (56:6)

The concept of the PACs for Title I serves as an extension of the relationship of the school building principal with his community. The main value of increased and mandated parent involvement is the intensified focus it usually generates on keeping Title I oriented to the poor children.

Parental involvement, with access to the advisory councils, intensifies the integrity of a home-school partnership in the formation of the child's destiny. (56:6) Although the parent involvement concept and practice is mandated by USOE, districts conducting programs under Title I are finding it difficult to implement successfully such a mandate.

Non-Federal Level of Interest

The push for parental involvement in Title I programs has not only come from federal administrators. In its 1971 annual report to the President and the Congress, the National Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children also encouraged early and continuing parental involvement as an application of accountability in Title I and as an additional way of broadening the integrity of the home-school partnership. (56:5) Herman Goldberg in a paper presented to the American Association of School Administrators Annual Convention at Atlantic City, New Jersey, on February 20-24, 1971, stated that the issue of community control concerns the future role of parents in a changing school environment. He further stated that some form of community councils were necessary where educators, parents and students could communicate without rancor and recriminations. (24:4)

Whenever citizens, individually or collectively, feel that they have been ignored, they have begun to exert some influence in their involvement. The popularization of

accountability has brought about the demand for more control at the local level. Citizens are desiring more active participation in the decisions which affect their lives and the lives of their loved ones. These concerned citizens seem to suffer a feeling of frustration as they see decisions being made for them by those beyond their reach.

When cries of parental involvement, under Title I, have been ignored by educational institutions, citizens have organized themselves and have initiated strong pressure and legal action to force institutions to involve them in the planning and implementation of programs which meet the educational needs of the poor. Community groups in Massachusetts have banded together to encourage the state department of education to issue guidelines governing local advisory councils. Similar groups have sought legal relief. It is interesting to note that "the majority of suits filed under Title I have challenged the failure of LEA officials to afford adequate opportunities for parental participation."

(7:30)

Legal Opinions in Support of Parental Involvement

In an important decision concerning such involvement, or lack of it, a federal court in Maine held that parents of poor and educationally disadvantaged children had standing to sue to enforce Title I guidelines regarding parental

involvement and that federal courts had jurisdiction over such action. (12) The court held that parents of Title I children had standing to seek judicial enforcement of Title I guidelines since such children are the intended beneficiaries of the Act. In a similar case in California, the plaintiffs in a Title I suit gained a significant degree of parental participation in compensatory education through a consent decree. The decree provided that the San Jose Unified School District effect "meaningful parent and community participation in the planning, operation, and appraisal of all Title I programs in the district and the regulations, guidelines, and program guides promulgated pursuant thereto." (63) The decree went as far as to include a minimum definition of "meaningful participation." The community advisory committee was to be composed of at least 75 percent parents and community representatives. The committee was given the right to participate in all policy-making for Title I programs although final approval was to remain with the school board.

Similarly, in another case, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals gave strong support to community participation in federal programs in an opinion on the administration of the Model Cities Program in Philadelphia. In reaching its opinion, the court relied on requirements in the Demonstration Cities Act of "widespread citizen participation" and on repeated policy statements on community involvement by the federal program administrators. The court ruled that both

the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the city had violated the Demonstration Cities Act by making fundamental changes in the program without community participation. It is to be noted that although the court stated that the community participation requirements were novel, they bore a striking resemblance to the Title I regulations calling for "maximum practical involvement of parents of educationally deprived children in the area to be served in the planning, developing, operation, and approval of projects" (55)

In Providence, Rhode Island, a lawsuit was also filed alleging a wide range of Title I violations which included the lack of parental involvement in the Title I process. The suit involved the lack of representation in the advisory committee and the lack of opportunity to examine the Title I proposal and related information. (4)

In California, parents active on PACs for the district Title I program went out and rang bells and got signatures on petitions to support Senate Bill 90. The bill provided \$141,250,000 for a broad range of programs for the disadvantaged. It included early childhood programs, bilingual education, reading and math, special teacher education programs, and program improvement. The bill, supported by the many PACs, serves as an example of what strong parental involvement can do.

Not only have parents and other citizens had to resort to legal and other means to force LEAs to involve them in

Title I projects but they have gone as far as to sue for the withholdment of Title I funds to LEAs that refuse to comply with Title I regulations.

On October 25, 1973, a United States District Judge approved an unprecedented stipulation between the Pennsylvania State Department of Education and a Welfare Rights Organization that turned the control of Philadelphia's Title I program over to a specifically-appointed committee of three educators. The stipulation was intended to settle a suit brought by the Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organizations against the state and its education department charging that allocation of Title I funds to the city violated federal law and USOE guidelines which demanded, among other things, comparability of services for Title I and other students before compensatory funds are handed out. The Judge ruled, in a strongly-worded opinion, that the city had in fact violated comparability requirements. The committee was given broad authority to review and assess the city's Title I program, and to insist on changes in, or termination of, any project. The state in effect cannot give Philadelphia its share of Title I money for 1973-74 or 1974-75 without committee approval.

The court order given to the Philadelphia School District marks the first time a major city school system has lost control over the educational policy decision in the use of federal Title I funds. Such a decision should provide the opportunity for educational reform in parental involve-

ment programs in which parents can have a greater voice.

The implications in this case are that parents cannot only sue to force LEAs to involve them in Title I projects but can also force LEAs to lose their control of Title I programs by either putting pressures to have the state or federal government withhold the funds or having their Title I program placed in the hands of a specifically appointed committee for failure to comply with appropriate rules and regulations.

Some states have not waited to be caught in the legal entanglement. They have proceeded to adopt guidelines for parental involvement in Title I. On October 27, 1970, the Massachusetts State Board of Education adopted guidelines that go beyond the new federal guidelines. Some states have provided excellent leadership to their respective LEAs, while others are still in the preliminary stages.

Efforts At State Levels

In an effort to determine the extent of leadership provided by states to LEAs regarding parental involvement as required by Title I and to investigate the number of SEAs that exceed USOE Title I parental involvement requirements, the researcher sent a questionnaire to each respective State Title I Director. (74) The questionnaire asked each State Director if their respective state had issued to their LEAs additional guidelines or requirements regarding Title I parental involvement or if they only followed federal guide-

lines. Each State Title I Director responded to the questionnaire. The researcher is appreciative at the responses given by all 50 SEA Title I Directors. The questionnaire also solicited a copy of any printed directive where applicable. The responses revealed that 30 states complied strictly with USOE guidelines and requirements. That is, no other requirements were established beyond those specified in the federal regulations. Twenty respondents complied strictly with USOE guidelines but supplemented these guidelines with explanatory booklets, bulletins, directives, and similar information.

A review of the literature that accompanied the responses from the various states revealed the following information: (74)

- . the majority of the SEAs have done very little, more than the USOE guidelines require
- . nationwide a "grassroots" expediency strategy seems to prevail
- . no operational innovation of profound influence is evident at the state level
- . the brevity and simplicity of the additional guidelines presented by SEAs and LEAs appeared to expedite program implementation rather than provide innovation and leadership.

Although the study revealed no nationwide consistency in presenting of USOE guidelines or additional SEA instructions, some states have developed effective approaches to the

statewide implementation of parental involvement. The paragraphs that follow are exemplary of states that offer guidelines that exceed USOE requirements.

"California has led the nation in requiring that parents be involved in planning and operating Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I Programs." (9) The SEA has prepared a booklet entitled "A Handbook for Members of School District Advisory Committee: ESEA, Title I." This 28 page handbook has been designed for all of the parents and other members of school district advisory committees and target school parent advisory groups. "It provides the information needed by parents to become active, effective committee members who will be able to work with school district personnel to advise them on planning, operating, and evaluating Title I programs." The handbook requires two types of PACs-- one at the school level and one at the school district level. The school district determines how many parents are to be nominated by each target school advisory group. The rest of the members represent the following groups and organizations:

(9)

- . school district
- . agencies other than public schools
- . community organizations
- . other agencies that provide health and welfare services to disadvantaged children or their families.

Connecticut includes Title I parental involvement as part of its "Guidelines for Compensatory Education." The value of this booklet is enhanced by the inclusion of a historical background section on the history of compensatory education which enables the members to place PACs in their proper perspective. (15)

On the other hand, Colorado concentrates its efforts, not at the implementation state, but instead has conducted an indepth survey to determine how opinions, comments and identified needs established by the state advisory committee have affected the development of some PACs or fostered change and innovations in these groups. These survey results are then reported to the LEAs with directives for the formation and effective functioning of parent groups. (12)

Kansas provides "A Guide for Title I Parent Advisory Council to LEAs." This guide covers general and basic information such as selection of members, duties, functions, and a suggested calendar of activities for parent council meetings. An interesting point in the guidelines is the mentioning of the requirement that neither administrative officials of the district nor board members can serve as members of the council and the inclusion of a statement which explain reimburseable expenses under Title I for parent council activities.

Pennsylvania has prepared a position paper entitled "The Involvement of Parent Councils in Title I" which

encompasses PAC regulations, establishment and membership of the councils, and other related information. In general, the position of the state is that parents of Title I eligible children often have a greater understanding of the physiological and psychological wants and needs of their children than do school district personnel. However, the school district personnel are often in a better position to understand the academic needs of children. According to the state, "if an effective Title I program is to result, all three of these elements must be in harmony." (57)

The state of Utah also supplements USOE guidelines with a 13 page booklet which is designed to provide LEAs with the guidelines necessary to implement PACs not only on a local school and local district level but also at the state level. The uniqueness of Utah's PAC program is a state requirement that a statewide parent council be also established. Representative districts in the state are organized to give fair representation to parents of eligible Title I students on the state parent council. Parent representation on the state council is changed each time the census data changes. According to the 1970 census data regarding the distribution of Title I students, ten representative districts were formed with 16 district representatives on the state council. Local school district councils in each of the state's ten districts elect or appoint a representative (or representatives) from

the district PACs to the state council. The guidelines further contain provisions for the appointment of students who are in or who are eligible to be in Title I programs who are voting members at large, one from each of the Mexican-American, Negro, Oriental, and Native American groups. The person selected from each of these groups becomes the liaison between said group and the State Title I Specialist and those who work with him. These members function primarily to communicate the ethnic minority point of view to the SEA as it pertains to Title I and help promote the program among their respective groups. (53)

The state of Washington has a manual entitled "Guidelines for Parent Advisory Councils: Title I (ESEA)." The manual has been prepared as a guide for local offices charged with implementing the provisions of Title I. "It describes the rationale behind the parent involvement requirements, and the logistics of starting a parent council." The manual was also designed to serve as a guide for PAC members "to assist them in fulfilling their role in becoming involved in the implementation of Title I in a meaningful way." (77)

A District's Attempt at Parental Involvement

In reviewing the literature and ongoing attempts at involving parents in the educational process the researcher reviewed a large school district's plan at involving parents,

not only in an advisory capacity but also in the preschool education of their children and the subsequent problems associated with the implementation of the plan. During the spring semester, 1972, Title I supervisors prepared an instructional guide for working with parents of preschool aged children. A pilot program was begun at Lozano Elementary School, a predominantly Mexican-American school, in Corpus Christi, Texas. The pilot program consisted of six weekly sessions. Supervisors worked with parents in small groups demonstrating games and songs, preparing simple teaching devices, and employing many activities to be used in the home with very small children to develop readiness for later academic learning.

Members of the Lozano School PTA executive board agreed to staff a nursery for infants so that parents could participate. Publicity consisted of a survey of interested parents, follow-up letters sent home with pupils, and radio and press releases. Refreshments were served, proceedings were videotaped and parents encouraged to return to view the taped activities. Approximately 50 parents attended the first session, some 20 the second, and as attendance began to dwindle, a door prize was offered. This effort improved attendance slightly, however, only six parents attended regularly. Many came only once. An evaluation was conducted at the final session with 100 percent response in favor of the program. All participants at each session seemed to

enjoy the activities, were interested, and actively joined in, but many other interests and responsibilities seemed to hinder attendance. On one afternoon in particular, a large funeral took place in the neighborhood, which drastically limited attendance.

In September, 1972, a Title I parent activities leader based at Lozano School reinstated the program offering instruction to parents at any time during the school day convenient to the parent. Parents were contacted by phone and in person at home by the Title I attendance aide and parent leader. Letters were sent to the homes repeatedly. Radio announcements were made. Results were very discouraging.

The 1972-73 Title I budget included funds for the employment of two parent activities leaders to be based at Title I focus schools, Lozano and Washington, a predominantly black school. However, efforts to fill the position at Washington were unsuccessful and the position at Lozano remained vacant following the resignation of the parent activities leader in October, 1972, to join another program.

In March, 1973, Title I supervisors again attempted to implement the program as conducted the previous spring. This time at Washington and Lozano schools. Notices were sent out to parents in area schools. Again press and radio announcements were made. The program was announced in each church in the Washington School area on Sunday prior to the

initial meeting. One parent attended. Ten parents attended at Lozano School, the majority of whom were members of Head Start parent groups from other schools encouraged by the Head Start consultant to attend.

The second meeting in the Washington School area was held in the black community at the suggestion of an area school community aide, and a Title I dropout specialist. A black community leader secured permission to use the community meeting room. The same person also extended support to the program by signing a support statement which was included with meeting notices. These were sent home with pupils, delivered to homes, and placed in each mailbox at the community meeting place. Seven mothers attended and all agreed to meet in the school the following week. One mother came the next week-- the supervisor went through the prescribed activities with her and again, as in the past, provided her with simple teaching devices to take home.

Instruction was offered at two other neighborhood schools in addition to those previously mentioned, but attendance was very poor. It should be noted that at each school the program was conducted in both Spanish and English as needed. Also, that the planning and material preparation time by supervisors involved many hours, both during the school day and at night.

Approach for 1973-74

A totally new approach toward reaching the target parent groups was recommended for the 1973-74 school year. This approach encompassed an all-out, district-wide program supported by community leadership involvement.

A step-by-step plan for program implementation was proposed with parents of school-aged children to be involved in the initial phase. The success of parent participation in federally funded programs, the Tutor Training Program, and Parent Teacher Association activities indicated that parents with children of school-age could be more easily reached.

School personnel, who worked with community groups, suggested that parent instruction would be more widely accepted by minority group parents if the instruction were provided by their peers. This suggestion was incorporated in a plan. The plan called for the mobilization of two groups: (1) district employees and (2) volunteer personnel from community groups. The former included: elementary principals, subject area coordinators and school subject area consultants, teachers, teacher aides, parental involvement personnel assigned to federally funded programs such as Title I, Head Start, Title VII, Follow Through, visiting teachers, and school social workers. The community groups were to include representation from such groups as City Council PTA, PTA Executive Board, PAC members from federally funded programs, parents involved in the district's Tutor

Training Program (a group of trained volunteers), and leaders of various community organizations.

The implementation of the new plan aimed at reaching the target parents was to be implemented in three phases. Phase 1 was to include the selection of a task force to be composed of school district personnel, one-half of which worked in Title I school assignments. Personnel to be involved in Phase 1 were to include two principals, two subject area school consultants, two kindergarten teachers, and two first grade teachers. The task force was to (1) review previously used instructional procedures and content to determine specific items to be included for parent classes as necessary for academic readiness of preschool children, and (2) prepare a brochure for distribution throughout the community informing parents of the program and how they could participate.

Training sessions were to be conducted for all subject area consultants and supervisors to be involved in the project in procedures for holding educational sessions with parents in training identified teachers and aides in parent group instructional techniques.

Phase 2 was to run concurrently with Phase 1. It was to provide the designation of elementary principals and community leaders to serve as members of an overall steering committee to determine procedures for the involvement of local community organizations in support of the program.

Active support of such groups was deemed necessary if the program was to succeed in minority group areas. Under Phase 2, the school district was to identify active parent group members within each school area who would be willing to receive training in program activities and who would provide the leadership to instruct the parent target group.

Under Phase 3, the school district was to conduct a community-wide publication of the program involving all personnel and available media. Instructional group meetings were to be scheduled within each school and continuous appraisal of the program's progress was to be made by the steering committee with alteration as necessary.

The plan also listed other recommendations which included the following:

- . training meetings in Title I schools be held at night and that district personnel involved be reimbursed
- . meetings in non-Title I schools be conducted during school hours by consultants
- . nursery care be provided to allow parents of very young children to participate
- . meetings for minority group parents be conducted in a social atmosphere with refreshments provided
- various means of attracting attendance be explored, such as awarding educational games suitable for preschool children as door prizes

- . responsibility for the success of an ongoing program be assumed by parent groups as soon as a nucleus of leaders within each area of the community has been developed and has evidenced willingness and capacity
- initially, active parent leaders would staff telephone committees, provide nursery care, and be involved in planning all meetings

As an additional method of reaching parents of pre-school-aged children and the children themselves, it was proposed that local educational television programming include learning activities for very young children.

As previously mentioned, this approach was to have begun at the beginning of the 1973-74 school year. Since the plan revolved around Title I personnel at the leaders in the implementation of the plan, the plan could not be implemented as scheduled due to a ten percent overall reduction in the district's Title I entitlement for that school year and the subsequent reassignment of Title I personnel originally scheduled for participation in the project.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature regarding parental involvement in the public schools. The literature included parental involvement before and after World War II and included the involvement of parents through school district advisory committees.

The importance of parental involvement in the educational process and parental pressure to be involved were also discussed together with the levels of parental involvement as outlined by Gordon. In order to acquaint the reader with Title I, a summary of the history of Title I, and the relationships of the USOE, the SEAs and the LEAs with Title I was also presented.

Federally mandated programs of parental involvement in federally funded programs was presented with reviews of legal opinions in support of parental involvement. Some implications for non-compliance with federal mandates regarding parental involvement were reviewed and presented.

The chapter concluded with a review of the states' efforts at parental involvement and the leadership they have provided to their LEAs in assisting them in the implementation or strengthening of their parental involvement programs. At the local school district level, the researcher presented a large urban school district's experience in the initiation of a parental involvement program aimed at involving parents in the education of their preschool-age children.

CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This chapter includes the following sections: (1) description of the population; (2) selection and size of the sample; (3) sources of the data; (4) description of the instrument; (5) treatment of the data; (6) the research design; and (7) reasons given by districts for not wishing to participate in the study.

Description of the Population

The population in this study consisted of 176 school districts in Texas. This number was randomly selected from the 1,123 school districts listed in the Public School Directory, Bulletin 738, 1973-74, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas.

Selection and Size of the Sample

The sample for this study was randomly selected based on the stratified random sample procedure used by the Texas Education Agency to sample a cross section of the school districts in Texas in the evaluation of certain programs funded under Title I. The sample consisted of 637 Title I PAC members representing 50 school districts located in 41 of Texas' 254 counties. For a complete list of the school districts used in the sample see Appendix B.

One hundred seventy six school districts were contacted to inquire if they would participate in the study. Fourteen districts replied that they had no Title I programs. Twelve declined to participate. Two districts indicated a desire to participate, however, they did not include a list of their PAC members, and one school district selected in the sample was no longer in operation. Fifty school districts indicated a desire to participate in the study and forwarded their PAC member lists as requested. Ninety five school districts did not reply.

The enrollment of the districts randomly selected for the sample is as follows:

<u>Enrollment in Sample Districts</u>	<u>Number of Districts</u>
Over 40,000	7
Over 15,000	44
Over 3,000	50
Under 3,000	<u>75</u>
Total	176

The enrollment of the participating districts used in the sample was as follows:

<u>Enrollment in Participating Districts</u>	<u>Number of Districts</u>
Over 40,000	5
Over 15,000	14
Over 3,000	18
Under 3,000	13

Total

50Sources of the Data

The school districts in the sample (N = 50) were requested by written communication by the researcher to submit the names and addresses of their Title I PAC members. The first request was made on July 1, 1974 (see Appendix C), and a follow up letter was mailed to each district urging their prompt response (Appendix D).

Most of the districts responded promptly with very few (N = 5) responding to the second request for the names and addresses of the PAC members. The final result was the submission of 637 names. The primary source of this data gathered was the lists of names and addresses submitted by the participating school districts. Additionally, 50 persons charged with the administration of Title I programs in their districts (N = 50) participated in the study by completing the Administrators' Questionnaire (Appendix E).

The questionnaire together with a letter of introduction and instructions, in English (Appendix F) and in Spanish (Appendix G), were mailed immediately after receipt of each list of PAC names and addresses to each PAC member and Title I administrator in each school district. Three hundred fifty three questionnaires in English were mailed (Appendix H). A Spanish version of the questionnaire (Appendix I) and an English questionnaire were mailed to 284 PAC members with

Spanish surnames. The respondents were asked to omit writing their names on the questionnaires. They were also assured that their responses were to be kept confidential and were provided a self-addressed postage paid envelope for returning the completed questionnaire and any comment they wished to include.

On September 27, 1974, a follow-up "thank you" type of letter in English and Spanish was mailed to each member in the sample. The letter thanked those who had cooperated and participated in the study and requested those who had not returned their questionnaire to do so at the earliest convenient time.

The following summarizes the type of and number of questionnaires that were mailed and received:

<u>Type of Questionnaire</u>	<u>English Version</u>	<u>Spanish Version</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of PAC members' questionnaires mailed	353	284	637
Number of administrators' questionnaires mailed	50	---	50
Number of PAC members' questionnaires received	176	30	206
Number of administrators' questionnaires received	50	---	50

Description of the Instrument

The English and Spanish versions of the PAC questionnaires used in this study were developed by Ramiro DeLeon

Reyes and were used by the researcher with the permission of Reyes (Appendix J). The researcher also secured the permission of Reyes to modify the questionnaire as needed for this study. The Administrators' Questionnaire was developed by the researcher using the last three items of Reyes' PAC questionnaire as the basis for the questionnaire. Reyes' original PAC questionnaire consisted of 74 items, with the last three to be answered only by the person charged with the administration of Title I in his district. The revised PAC questionnaire consisted of 80 items. All but one item called for a check mark or "X" by the respondent to the various alternate responses provided. The only item that could not be answered by the use of a check or "X" was an open-end question which called for a written statement or statements.

The administrators' version of the questionnaire consisted of 19 items. Four items could be answered by the use of a check mark or an "X". The other four were open-end questions which called for a written statement or answer.

The PAC questionnaire was designed to provide the following:

1. Personal information about the participant.
2. Knowledge and understanding of PAC members regarding Title I guidelines, objectives, participation, etc.
3. The role and activities of the PACs.
4. Personal opinions and feelings on a variety of

issues related to the PACs.

The Administrators' Questionnaire was directed at eliciting the type of problems encountered in the districts regarding parental involvement through the PACs, and the promising practices discovered in parental involvement through Title I PACs. The questionnaire also asked how the Texas Education Agency could facilitate the implementation and operation of their Title I PAC as well as an estimate of their local and Title I expenditures associated with the operation of the Title I PAC.

Treatment of the Data

The data gathered were tallied by percentages and numbers, and a tabular presentation of the data will be discussed in Chapter IV. As previously stated in Chapter I, data were sought that enabled the researcher to answer the questions stated below.

1. What are the characteristics of the PAC members?
2. Are Title I PACs recognized by the school boards?
3. What is the role of district PACs in the educational decision-making process of Title I programs?
4. Who defines the roles of PAC members as they participate in the planning, implementing, and evaluation of Title I programs?
5. Who in the district provides committee members with information regarding Title I programs on which they

could make recommendations?

6. Do committee members understand what is expected of them?

7. How are committee members selected?

8. To what extent are minority groups and persons from different income levels represented in the committees?

9. Do minority committee members participate actively?

10. Do school districts implement the recommendations, where appropriate, of PACs?

11. To what extent are PACs involved

a. in the planning of Title I programs?

b. in the implementation of Title I programs?

c. in the evaluation of Title I programs?

12. How knowledgeable are PAC members concerning Title I programs?

13. What training or orientation, if any, is provided to PAC members?

14. What positive experiences have been discovered by school districts as a result of Title I PACs?

15. What problems have been encountered by school districts as a result of having initiated PACs as required by Title I?

16. What is the cost directly connected to the maintenance of the PACs?

The Research Design

The design of this study is the cause comparative, as defined by Van Dalen and Meyer in their book Understanding Educational Research, pages 220-226, and as quoted by Reyes. (62-60) Since the study is not experimental in design, in that no independent variables were controlled or manipulated, the questions asked are intended to permit the researcher to gain insight into the perceptions of cause-and-effect phenomenon associated with parental involvement or the lack of it.

Reasons Given by Districts for Not Wishing to Participate in the Study

Subtle resistance or negative response on the part of some school districts to the study was evident from the initial replies of 14 school districts who desired not to participate in the study. Hanges (31:65-68) in her Parental Involvement in an Urban Setting study encountered resistance on the part of some parents to the study. It is interesting to note that she did not experience resistance from the staff. She feels that the parents may have felt some uneasiness with the idea of studying parental involvement even though they favored the study in the beginning. She further feels that the idea that positive as well as negative aspects of parental involvement probably would emerge in the study may have been very distressing to some of the parents.

Reyes (62), on the other hand, encountered no resistance. The researcher presumes that the reason for the lack of resistance in his study of Title I PACs in California was because his study was conducted for the California State Department of Education and as such had the official backing of the California State Department of Education.

The reasons given by the school districts who desired not to participate in the study are listed below by districts' size:

- . Responses from Districts with an Enrollment of 9,000 - 40,000
 - "It is our general practice to assist doctoral candidates in gathering information for the development of their dissertation unless it is deemed detrimental to the district. In this case, we feel that we should not plant questions and, maybe, problems where they do not exist."
- . Responses from Districts with an Enrollment of 3,000 - 8,999
 - "I feel that the Parent Advisory Questionnaire would cause problems, therefore, their names will be omitted."
 - "I regret that Blank School District is unable to participate. As a new director of Title I programs, I was unable to get any responses from the advisory committee members attended."
 - "The new superintendent has assumed his duties and is not qualified to answer your questions."
 - "I have been unable to locate the names and addresses of the PAC."
 - "Blank School District is not a good sample."

- "I do not believe that the Blank Independent School District will desire to participate."
- "Our committee is in the process of reorganizing."

. Responses from Districts with an Enrollment of Less Than 3,000

- "I regret to inform you that our committee has not been active enough to give you any information whatsoever. We will attempt to improve this part of our program this year."

CHAPTER IV

THE PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Presentation of the Data

The purpose of this study was to examine the role, practices, and status of PACs as required by Title I. The study also examined the extent of the PAC's involvement in the educational decision-making process in their school districts.

Table 2, pages 72-87, presents summaries of the responses to each item in the Parent Advisory Committee Questionnaire. Table 3, pages 87-92, presents summaries of the responses to each item in the Administrators' Questionnaire. The interpretation of the data will be presented in section "The Findings," which follow Table 2 and Table 3 on page 93.

Table 2

Committee Members' Responses to the English
and Spanish Version of the Title I of
the Elementary and Secondary
Education Act of 1965 Parent
Advisory Committee
Questionnaire

Item	Responses Number/Percent
1. Sex	
Male	40/19
Female	166/81

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
2. Age	
Under 20	2/1
21 - 30	25/12
31 - 40	86/42
41 - 50	68/33
Over 51	24/12
3. How long have you lived in this district?	
Less than 1 year	5/2
1 - 4 years	24/12
Over 4 years	177/86
4. Education - your highest grade completed.	
Less than 6 years	21/11
7 - 9	34/18
10 - 12	83/44
College/University	
Less than 3 years	31/16
Bachelors Degree	16/9
Masters Degree	2/1
Doctorate	2/1
5. What kind of work do you do?	
Business	12/6
Farmer	
Professional	34/17
Retired	2/1
Housewife	102/50
Political office holder	
Office worker	15/7
Skilled laborer	10/5
Other	28/14
6. Are you a member of a minority?	
Yes	129/63
No	77/37
7. What language/s do you speak fluently?	

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
English/Spanish	69/33
English	109/53
Spanish	28/14
Portuguese	
Other	
8. How many of your children participated in a Title I program this past year (1973-74)?	
None	83/40
One	61/30
Two	39/19
Three	10/5
Four or more	13/6
9. Do you work for the school district?	
Yes	48/23
No	158/77
10. How did you first learn about the Title I PAC?	
Teacher, principal, Title I director told me about it.	177/86
Read about it in a letter brought home by my child.	11/5
Read about it on the newspaper.	
Heard it on the radio/TV	1/0.5
Someone came to my home and told me about it.	17/8.5
11. How did you become a member of the Title I PAC?	
Appointed by the school district	130/63
Elected by Title I parents in a PTA meeting, or other meetings	76/37

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
12. About how many Title I PAC meetings have you attended during this school year (1973-74)?	
None	18/9
One	61/30
Two or three	48/23
Four or five	41/20
More than five	37/18
13. Do you think your Title I PAC has met	
Often enough	126/63
Too often	7/3
Not too often	26/13
Not as often as it should	43/21
14. On how many school advisory committees did you serve this school year (1973-74)?	
Only one	142/71
Two	31/15
Three or more	28/14
15. On how many school advisory committees have you served in the past two years?	
Only one	125/64
Two	42/21
Three or four	18/9
More than five	11/6
16. Aside from your regular committee meetings, in which of the following activities have you participated this year (1973-74)?	
Field trips	48/23
Board of Education meetings	61/30
Volunteer aide work	50/24
Attend training session for committee members	38/18
Visit Title I parents to tell them about Title I	41/20

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
Reporting to groups or individuals	61/30
Observation in the classroom	71/34
Screening of personnel to be employed under Title I	
Attend training sessions for teachers, aides, and other Title I workers	14/7
17. How much freedom do you feel the members of your committee have to disagree with the ideas of the administrators concerning Title I?	
A great deal	89/47
Some	74/39
None at all	14/7
18. What difference have the recommendations of your committee made on Title I programs in your school district?	
A great deal	52/26
Some	99/50
A little	31/15
None at all	17/9
19. Is your committee recognized by your school board?	
Yes	132/64
No	12/6
I don't know	62/30
20. How much do you know about the following:	

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent			
	<u>A Great Deal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Nothing</u>
Structure and organization of the school system	60/29	81/40	43/21	21/10
School budget	44/22	68/33	43/21	49/24
Title I budget	64/19	66/32	32/16	44/22
How decisions are made in the school district	39/19	67/33	55/27	44/21
How decisions are made in the Title I Program	56/27	71/35	49/24	29/14
The local community	70/36	61/31	42/22	21/11
History and purposes of Title I	51/25	79/39	48/23	27/13
Regulations, laws, guidelines that affect Title I	48/23	54/26	50/24	54/27
The objectives of Title I in your district	55/27	78/38	47/23	24/12
The 1973-74 Title I Program in your district	37/19	76/39	41/21	40/21

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent			
	<u>A Great Deal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Nothing</u>
Future plans for Title I in your district	42/21	63/31	52/25	46/23
How Title I schools are selected	41/20	65/32	54/26	44/22
How Title I priorities are determined	42/21	63/31	52/26	46/22
21. Do you understand clearly the purpose of your PAC?				
Very clear				92/45
Somewhat clear				91/44
Not clear				22/11
22. How well do you think your committee does in meeting the purpose of your committee?				
Very well				75/37
Fairly well				89/44
Not so well				33/16
Poor				7/3
23. How much does your committee do on any of the following:				
	<u>A Great Deal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Nothing</u>
Review Title I guidelines and regulations	74/37	81/40	31/15	17/8
Review objec- tives of Title I	71/35	84/41	33/16	15/8

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Response Number/Percent			
	<u>A Great Deal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Nothing</u>
Advise of kinds of programs needed	69/36	63/33	44/23	16/8
Work on publicity in support of Title I	55/27	73/36	43/21	31/16
Make suggestions on the operation of Title I	54/28	70/36	52/21	16/9
Help in the evaluation of the program	57/28	73/36	45/22	27/14
Other	29/26	37/33	27/24	18/17
24. Who in your district gave information about Title I to your committee on which they could make recommendations?				
Title I Director				132/66
Teacher				14/7
Principal				27/13
Superintendent				11/6
Visiting teacher				5/2
Nurse				
Counselor				
Board of Education				6/3
Other				5/3

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
25. How helpful has the information given to you by the school district been to this committee in its recommendations?	
Very helpful	90/44
Somewhat helpful	70/34
Not helpful	13/6
I don't know	32/16
26. How often have you told your wishes and concerns to your district Title I officials and administrators?	
Often	50/24
Sometimes	84/41
Seldom	48/24
Not at all	23/11
27. Do you know how many recommendations your PAC has made to the school officials?	
Many	29/14
Some	59/29
A few	29/14
None	7/3
I don't know	82/40
How many have been accepted?	
All	8/4
Many	30/15
Some	55/28
None	4/2
I don't know	80/40
The committee was not told how many	23/11
28. How much has your committee been involved in the evaluation of Title I?	
A great deal	57/29
Some	64/32
A little	62/31
None at all	17/8

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
29. Has your committee been given the opportunity to review the latest Title I evaluation?	
Yes	108/53
No	26/13
I don't know	69/34
30. How useful do you feel your committee has been to the district's Title I program?	
Very useful	74/37
Somewhat useful	78/38
Not useful	15/7
I don't know	36/18
31. How well does your committee represent minority groups in your district?	
Very well	110/54
Somewhat well	46/23
Poorly	6/3
I don't know	41/20
32. How well does your committee represent income levels of parents in your district?	
Very well	85/42
Somewhat well	54/27
Poorly	25/12
I don't know	39/19
33. Compared with other members in your committee, how much influence do you feel you have on your committee decisions?	
Much more influence	21/11
Somewhat more influence	22/11
About the same influence	120/63
Somewhat less influence	17/9
Much less influence	11/6
34. On Title I PACs, sometimes there is a person who gives the whole committee valuable leadership or directions. Who of the following most nearly does this?	

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent		
Superintendent	42/21		
Title I Director	115/58		
Principal	17/8		
Teacher	7/3		
Parent	9/5		
Other	9/5		
35. How would you say the work of the members of your committee is?			
Excellent	31/15		
Quite good	64/32		
Average	63/31		
Fair	23/11		
Quite limited	22/11		
36. Does your school district pay expenses for committee members?			
Yes	35/18		
No	160/82		
If yes, do they pay for any of the following?			
	<table> <tr> <th><u>Yes</u></th><th><u>No</u></th></tr> </table>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		
Baby-sitting	12/6		
Transportation	25/12		
Attending training meetings away from home	24/12		
If you work, are you paid back for work time lost while attending meetings or conferences	160/78		

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent	
37. If money is provided for the above, do you feel it is		
Too much	4/2	
Enough	23/11	
Not enough	12/6	
38. In general, would you say that your participation in the work of the committee has been a valuable experience to you, to the committee, to the development of educational policy in the district?		
	<div>A</div> <div>Great Deal</div>	
	Some	<div>A</div> <div>Little Nothing</div>
Valuable to me personally	110/55	50/25
Valuable to the committee	79/40	74/37
Valuable to the district	83/41	70/35
Valuable to the community	80/40	69/35
39. Please check how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:		
	<div>Strongly Agree</div>	
	<div>Agree a Great Deal</div>	
	<div>Agree Some-what</div>	
	<div>Disagree a Little</div>	
	<div>Strongly Disagree</div>	
Considering all problems, Title I PACs are far over-rated with respect to what they can contribute.	34/18	38/20
	58/30	21/11
	39/21	

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses				
	Number/Percent				
	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Agree a</u> <u>Great</u> <u>Deal</u>	<u>Agree</u> <u>Some-</u> <u>what</u>	<u>Disagree</u> <u>a Little</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
Although it would "look nice" to have more poor people on the committee, this does not help us very much.	31/16	29/14	57/29	30/15	53/26
Title I PACs are really "paper committees" on Title I programs.	20/10	18/9	57/29	29/14	76/38
School district usually tells Title I PACs what the Title I program will be instead of asking for their advice.	26/13	28/14	64/32	29/15	53/26
Parents of Title I children lack an interest in what happens in Title I programs.	30/15	28/14	71/35	40/20	33/16

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses				
	Number/Percent				
	Strongly Agree	Agree a Great Deal	Agree Some- what	Disagree a Little	Strongly Disagree
Parents of Title I children do not have time to be involved in Title I PACs and activities.	25/12	26/13	61/30	41/20	51/25
Parents of Title I children are afraid to participate in Title I activities.	22/12	24/13	46/24	55/29	43/23
Parents of Title I children have difficulty understanding the English language and that is the reason they do not participate in Title I activities.	20/11	12/6	69/36	31/16	59/31
40. Please give your suggestions of how we can make your Title I PAC more helpful to the school district's Title I program.					
Provide more information to parents and the public about Title I program and its guidelines, etc.				39/19	

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
Conduct more meetings in Title I schools or other central places in the members' language or provide an interpreter for those with limited English background.	12/6
Invite more parents and community persons to visit and participate in classroom activities as volunteers.	9/4
Provide a workshop for parents and PAC members to better understand Title I guidelines and programs.	4/2
Provide funds to PACs to defray such costs as baby-sitting transportation, refreshments, office supplies, etc.	4/2
Provide someone to do the liaison work between the Title I program and the PAC.	1/0.5
Recognize PAC members in such a way that other parents will want to discuss problems with them when they will not with school staff members.	1/0.5
Elect or appoint members that are both willing and able to serve.	1/0.5
Make parents feel more welcomed at Title I meetings and in Title I activities.	1/0.5
Involve parents in special projects in order to hold their interest for a longer period of time.	1/0.5

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
Whenever possible, work in subcommittees.	1/0.5
Provide the technical information concerning Title I over a period of time rather than in one meeting.	1/0.5
Have the PAC prepare its own agenda.	1/0.5
Form a PAC for each Title I school.	1/0.5
Elect or appoint more parents to the PAC and less school officials.	1/0.5

Table 3

Responses to the Administrators'
Questionnaire

Item	Responses Number/Percent
1. What are the problems your district has encountered in parental involvement through Title I PAC in educational decision-making?	
Lack of interest	46/92
Parents do not have time	47/94
Language difficulty	6/12
Militancy	
Pressure groups	3/6

Table 3 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
Afraid to come to school	12/24
Difficulty in maintaining continuity with people moving away	9/18
Misunderstanding of committee functions	12/24
Apprehension	14/28
Other	5/10
2. Regarding Title I parental involvement (please check as appropriate)	
The USOE has provided adequate information, guidelines, etc.	31/62
The USOE has provided inadequate information, guidelines, etc.	12/24
The USOE has not provided information, guidelines, etc.	5/10
The TEA has provided adequate information, guidelines, etc.	44/88
The TEA has provided inadequate information, guidelines, etc.	15/30
Technical assistance has not been provided by the USOE	14/28
Technical assistance has been provided by the TEA	14/28
Technical assistance has not been provided by the TEA	15/30
3. What could the TEA have done to assist you in the development of your program?	

Table 3 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
Combine the Title I and Title I Migrant programs where appropriate, so that both can work together.	2/4
Develop a model program with a guide outlining the framework and content of the program.	3/6
Have a bilingual person at TEA to provide technical assistance to school districts.	4/8
More guidelines from TEA and assistance on how to develop a good PAC program.	7/14
Provide a list of resource persons for districts to call upon for technical assistance.	2/4
Conduct regional workshops for school districts.	11/22
Provide funds to be used for PAC activities.	2/4
4. Who in your district is responsible for working with the Title I PAC?	
Superintendent	16/32
Title I Director	33/66
Principal	5/10
A Title I paid teacher	1/2
A local budget paid teacher	
A person that works full time with the committee	2/4

Table 3 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
5. What promising practices have you discovered in parental involvement through Title I PACs?	
Parents like to receive visits from school personnel if they are informative.	1/2
Neighborhood meetings attract more persons.	1/2
Combine committees if you are a small school district and have a joint committee for such programs as Title I Migrant, Head Start, etc.	1/2
Parents are willing to participate in school activities if they are well informed.	3/6
Meetings are better attended when they are held in conjunction with luncheons, dinners, etc.	4/8
PAC meetings provided additional opportunity to demonstrate school programs to parents.	1/2
Attendance improved when PAC members brought parents each time they met.	1/2
Home visits by PAC members increased attendance at PAC meetings.	1/2
Informed parents have more positive opinions.	1/2
Title I parents have become school employees.	1/2
Increased interest in home-school relationships.	1/2

Table 3 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
6. On the basis of your experience with the Title I PAC, what practices or ideas have proved to be most helpful to your Title I programs?	
Never overdress in PAC meetings.	1/2
Leave time, in your meetings, for socializing as many parents will discuss problems or some interesting experience at this time and not during the regular meeting.	2/4
Place emphasis on the educational program so that the committee will do away with the idea it is a welfare program.	1/2
Use the language that parents can understand at the meetings.	2/4
Deliver invitations to PAC meetings personally.	1/2
Have dinner meetings.	1/2
Invite community people to visit your program.	1/2
Have school committees in addition to district-wide committee.	1/2
Conduct Title I PAC meetings in the homes and provide funds for the refreshments.	1/2
Provide transportation to PAC members.	2/4
Keep members informed at all times.	1/2
Make members feel important.	1/2

Table 3 (continued)

Item	Responses Number/Percent
More interest in school matters when PAC members and teachers work together.	1/2
Provide meeting place and workroom at school for PAC members and parents.	1/2
Lend equipment to parents to use with their children.	1/2
Take parents with you to TEA and other meetings.	1/2
7. How can the TEA facilitate your Title I parental involvement and the problems associated with it?	
Fund PAC activities.	2/4
Nothing. This is a local problem.	2/4
Publish a guide book containing ways other school districts are utilizing their PACs.	4/8
Conduct training sessions for PAC members.	5/10
Provide technical assistance.	6/12
8. Approximately how much money did your district spend on the Title I Parental Involvement Program?	
Nine districts reported \$3,495 from local funds.	
Nine districts reported \$31,408 from Title I funds.	

The Findings

Summaries of the data pertaining to each question asked are presented in this section. The data includes information from the instrument administered to the PAC and the instrument administered to the administrator in each school district who is responsible for the administration of the Title I program.

1. Characteristics of the PAC members.

There were 40 male and 166 female PAC members responding to the questionnaire for a combined total of 206 with an individual percentage of 19 percent and 81 percent respectively. Two persons were under 20 years (less than one percent); 25 between 21 - 30 (12 percent); 86 between 31 - 40 (42 percent); 68 between 41 - 50 (33 percent); and 24 (12 percent) over 51 years of age. An overwhelmingly majority of the respondents had lived in their district more than four years (86 percent). Only five indicated that they had lived in their district less than one year. Educationally, 55 had less than a ninth grade education while 83 had between a tenth and twelfth grade education. Fifty one had more than a high school education with four school administrators indicating two Masters and two Doctors degrees. Nearly one half of the respondents indicated "housewife" as their occupation. Generally, the occupation of the remaining respondents (N = 104) can be categorized as follows beginning with the

highest frequency: professional, other, office worker, business skilled laborer, retired. Ethnically, nearly two thirds indicated that they were members of a minority. Slightly more than one half indicated proficiency in the English language while slightly less than one half indicated proficiency in Spanish. Forty percent of the respondents did not have any children who participated in a Title I program during the 1973-74 school year while 123 indicated that they had children who had participated in a Title I program during this past school year. Slightly more than three fourths of the respondents were not employees of the school district. Eighty six percent of the committee members first learned about the Title I PAC through either a teacher, principal, Title I Director, or from a combination of the three. Nearly two thirds of the committee members were not elected to the PACs by their own peers in some type of meeting. Ninety percent of the respondents had attended more than four meetings. Slightly more than one fourth of the committee members served one more than one school advisory committee. Table 4 summarizes the characteristics of PAC members.

Table 4
 Characteristics of Parent Advisory
 Committee Members

Category	Responses Number/Percent
Male	40/19
Female	166/81
Ages	
Under 20	2/1
21 - 30	25/12
31 - 40	86/42
41 - 50	68/33
Over 51	24/12
Residence in District	
Less than 1 year	5/2
1 - 4 years	24/12
Over 4 years	177/86
Education	
Less than 6 years	21/11
7 - 9	34/18
10 - 12	83/44
Less than 3 years college	31/16
Bachelors Degree	16/9
Masters Degree	2/1
Doctorate	2/1
Occupation	
Business	12/6
Farmer	
Professional	34/17
Retired	2/1
Housewife	102/50
Political Office Holder	
Office Worker	15/7
Skilled Worker	10/5
Other	28/14
Member of a Minority Group	129/63

Table 4 (continued)

Category	Responses Number/Percent
Languages Spoken Fluently	
English	109/53
Spanish	97/47
Parents Indicating How Many of Their Children Were Program Participants	
None	83/40
One	61/39
Two	39/19
Three	10/5
Four or more	13/6
PAC Members Employed by District	48/23
PAC Members Initial Exposure to the PAC	
Teacher, Principal, Title I Director	177/86
Letter	11/5
Radio/Television	1/0.5
Person Visited Their Home	17/8.5
Method of PAC Members Membership in PAC	
Appointed	130/63
Elected	76/37
Number of Meetings Attended by PAC Members	
None	18/9
One	61/30
Two or three	48/23
Four or five	41/20
More than five	37/18

2. Are Title I PACs recognized by the school boards?

Sixty four percent (N = 132) of the respondents indicated that their PAC was recognized by their school board. Twelve indicated that their PAC was not and 62

indicated they did not know.

3. What is the role of district PACs in the educational decision-making process of Title I programs?

The answer to this question varied from a "great deal" of involvement to "none" at all. Table 5 reflects the role and extent of involvement of PAC members.

Table 5

Role of District PACs and
Extent of Involvement

Area of Involvement	Great Deal - Little Involvement Number/Percent	No Involvement Number/Percent
Reviewing Title I guidelines and regulations	186/90	17/8
Reviewing objectives of Title I	188/91	15/7
Advising the adminis- tration of kinds of programs needed	176/85	16/8
Working to publicize Title I	171/83	31/15
Offering suggestions on the operation of Title I	176/85	16/8
Assisting in the evaluation of Title I programs	175/85	27/13

In addition to attending their regular Title I PAC meetings, 25 percent participated in Title I school field

trips, attended Board of Education meetings, did volunteer work at their school, visited their child's school and reported the outcome of their Title I meetings to other groups and individuals.

4. Who defines the role of district PACs as they participate in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of Title I programs?

More than one half of the respondents indicated that the Title I Director was the person who gave the committee its leadership and directions followed by the superintendent (21 percent). Seventy eight percent of the respondents felt that the information given to them by the district was from "very helpful" to "somewhat helpful." Sixty five percent of the committee members responding indicated that they had, at one time or another, expressed their wishes and concerns to their Title I officials and administrators, and 57 percent indicated that their PAC had made at least a few recommendations to their school districts.

5. Who in the district provides committee members with information regarding Title I programs on which they could make recommendations?

Two thirds of the respondents indicated that the Title I Director gave them the information they needed on which to make recommendations. This was followed by the principal (14 percent), teacher (seven percent), superintendent (six percent), and Board of Education members (three

percent).

6. Do committee members understand what is expected of them?

Forty five percent of the respondents felt that they understood "very clear" while 44 percent understood "somewhat clear," and 11 percent felt that they were "not clear" as to the purposes of their PAC. Slightly more than three fourths of the respondents felt that their work as a PAC member was at least "average."

7. How are committee members selected?

Respondents indicated that they were appointed by their school district in an almost two to one ratio over the elected ones (63 percent and 37 percent respectively).

8. To what extent are minority groups and persons from different income levels represented in the committees?

As previously stated under question number one, nearly two thirds (63 percent) of the respondents indicated that they were members of a minority group. Slightly more than three fourths (77 percent) felt that minority groups were "somewhat well" to "very well" represented. Only six felt that minority groups were "poorly" represented while 41 indicated that they did not know the extent their PAC represented minority groups in their districts.

Sixty eight percent of the respondents felt that their PAC represented "somewhat well" to "very well" different

income levels of parents in their districts. Twelve percent indicated that their PAC represented them "poorly." Nineteen percent indicated they did not know.

9. Do minority members participate actively?

Minority committee members participated as actively as non-minority PAC members based on a tabulation of the non-minority and minority questionnaire responses.

10. Do school districts implement the recommendations, where appropriate, of the PACs?

Sixty five percent of the respondents stated that they had at least expressed their wishes and concerns "sometimes" to Title I officials and administrators. Twenty three percent indicated they "seldom" expressed their wishes or concerns and 12 percent had not expressed wishes or concerns. Fifty seven percent of the committee members indicated that their PACs had made at least a few recommendations to school officials, while 40 percent did not know, and three percent indicated their PAC had not made any recommendations. Forty seven percent of the respondents felt that at least some of their recommendations had been accepted. Eight PAC members indicated that "all" and 30 indicated that "many" of their recommendations had been accepted. Fifty one percent indicated that they did not know how many of their recommendations had been accepted. Only four respondents (two percent) felt that none of their recommendations had been

accepted. Ninety one percent of the respondents felt that their PAC recommendations had made at least "a little" difference on Title I programs in their school districts. Only nine percent indicated that their recommendations had made no difference at all.

11. To what extent are PACs involved in the (a) planning of Title I programs, (b) implementation of Title I programs, and (c) evaluation of Title I programs?

Tables 6, 7, and 8 reflect the extent of involvement and general areas of involvement for each of the categories surveyed.

Table 6

Extent of Involvement in the Planning
Process of Title I in
the Areas Listed

Area	A Great Deal	<u>Number/Percent</u>		
		Some	A Little	None At All
Reviewing of Title I guidelines and regulations	76/37	82/40	30/15	16/8
Reviewing objectives	72/35	84/41	33/16	16/8
Advising on types of programs needed	74/36	68/33	47/23	16/8
Working to publicize and support the program	56/27	74/36	43/21	32/16

Table 7

Extent of Involvement in the
Implementation of Title I
in the Areas Listed

Area	Number/Percent
Volunteer work	49/24
Attending training sessions for PAC members	37/18
Participating as classroom observers	70/34
Attending training sessions for teachers, aides, and other paid Title I workers	14/7
Screening of personnel to be employed under Title I	

Table 8

Number and Percent of Involvement
in the Evaluation of Title I

Area	<u>Number/Percent</u>			
	A Great Deal	Some	A Little	None At All
Members assisting in the evaluation of Title I programs	58/28	74/36	47/23	27/13

Slightly more than one half of the respondents (53 percent) indicated that they have been given the opportunity

to review the latest Title I evaluation. Thirteen percent indicated they had not while 34 percent did not know if their committee had been given the opportunity.

12. How knowledgeable are PAC members concerning Title I guidelines, etc., and Title I programs?

Table 9 reflects the PAC members' knowledge of Title I and Title I functions.

Table 9

Number and Percent of PAC Members'
Knowledge of Title I and
Title I Functions

Area	A Great Deal	<u>Number/Percent</u>		
		Some	A Little	Nothing
History and purposes of Title I	52/25	80/39	47/23	27/13
Regulations, laws, guidelines that affect Title I	41/20	66/32	54/26	45/22
The objectives of Title I in your district	58/28	78/38	45/22	25/12
How Title I priorities are determined	41/20	64/31	54/26	47/23
How decisions are made in the Title I program	56/27	72/35	49/24	29/14

Table 9 (continued)

Area	A Great Deal	<u>Number/Percent</u>		
		Some	A Little	Nothing
The 1973-74 Title I program in your district	39/19	80/39	43/21	43/21
Title I budget	64/31	66/32	33/16	43/21
Future plans for Title I in your district	43/21	64/31	54/26	45/22

Briefly summarized, slightly less than 90 percent of the respondents felt that they had at least "a little" knowledge in the above areas.

13. What training, if any, is provided to PAC members?

Only 18 percent of the PAC members indicated that they had received some type of training relating to Title I and 12 percent indicated that their districts paid for expenses associated with the attendance at training meetings away from home.

14. What positive experiences have been encountered by school districts as a result of Title I PACs?

Sixteen school districts responded to this question. Among the promising practices discovered by school districts in parental involvement through their PACs include:

- . parents like to receive visits from school personnel if they are informative.

- . neighborhood meetings attract more persons.
- . combine committees if you are a small school district and have a joint committee for such programs as Title I, Title I Migrant, Head Start, etc.
- . parents are willing to participate in school activities if they are well informed.
- . meetings are better attended when they are held in conjunction with luncheons, dinners, etc.
- . PAC meetings provided additional opportunity to demonstrate school programs to parents.
- . attendance improved when PAC members brought parents each time they met.
- . home visits by PAC members increased attendance at PAC meetings.
- . informed parents have more positive opinions.
- . Title I parents have become school employees.
- . increased interest in home-school relationships.

15. What problems have been encountered by school districts as a result of having initiated PACs as required by Title I?

All 50 school districts had encountered some type of problem in the implementation of their Title I PACs. Table 10 indicates the problems encountered by school districts and the number of districts encountering such problems.

Table 10

Problems Encountered by School Districts
in the Implementation of Their
Parent Advisory Committee

Problem or Difficulty Encountered	Districts Responding Number/Percent
Lack of interest	46/92
Parents do not have time	47/94
Language difficulty	6/12
Pressure groups	3/3
Afraid to come to school	12/24
Difficulty in maintaining continuity with people moving away	9/18
Misunderstanding of committee functions	12/24
Apprehension	14/28
Other	5/10

When the PAC members' responses to problem areas (1) lack of interest; (2) parents do not have time; (3) language difficulty; and (4) afraid to come to school, listed above, were compared to the administrators' responses, the researcher found the following percent of PAC members that disagreed.

Table 11

Number and Percent of PAC Members That Disagreed
With Responses Made by Respondents
of the Title I Administrators'
Questionnaire and Areas
of Disagreement

Area of Disagreement	Number/Percent
Lack of interest	74/36
Parents do not have time	93/45
Parents have language difficulty	97/47
Parents are afraid to come to school	105/51

16. What is the cost directly connected to the maintenance of the PACs?

Nine school districts reported that they spent a combined total of \$3,495 from their local budget funds and \$31,408 from Title I funds on their PACs. This averages \$69.90 per district from local funds and \$628.16 from Title I funds respectively.

Summary

This study has covered the presentation and analysis of the data. Tables 2 and 3 have presented the PAC members' and Title I school administrators' responses to the PAC member and administrator questionnaires respectively. Table 4 has summarized the characteristics of PAC members.

Under section "The Findings" the data were summarized and the questions posed in the study were answered. The data were further supported by the use of 7 tables (Tables 5 - 11).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes the following sections: (1) summary of the study; (2) conclusions; and (3) recommendations.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the role, practices, and status of PACs as required by the ESEA of 1965 (Public Law 89-10) and the extent of their involvement in the educational decision-making process in school districts with Title I PACs.

The desired outcome of this study is to provide school districts with the benefit of the experience of a selected group of school districts and their experience with implementing a federal program which includes guidelines for parental involvement. The description, review, and analysis of the data are presented to provide school districts with a guide to initiate, maintain, and improve existing Title I parental involvement programs.

In order to achieve the purposes of the study, information was obtained which reflected the role, practices, and present status of Title I PACs. The questions examined during the course of the study were:

1. What are the characteristics of the PAC members?

2. Are Title I PACs recognized by the school boards?
3. What is the role of district PACs in the educational decision-making process of Title I ESEA programs?
4. Who defines the roles of PAC members as they participate in the planning, implementing, and evaluation of Title I programs?
5. Who in the district provides committee members with information regarding Title I programs on which they could make recommendations?
6. Do committee members understand what is expected of them?
7. How are committee members selected?
8. To what extent are minority groups and persons from different income levels represented in the committees?
9. Do minority committee members participate actively?
10. Do school districts implement the recommendations, where appropriate, of the PACs?
11. To what extent are PACs involved
 - a. in the planning of Title I programs?
 - b. in the implementation of Title I programs?
 - c. in the evaluation of Title I programs?
12. How knowledgeable are PAC members concerning Title I guidelines and Title I programs?
13. What training or orientation, if any, is provided to PAC members?

14. What positive experiences have been discovered by school districts as a result of Title I PACs?

15. What problems have been encountered by school districts as a result of having initiated PACs as required by Title I?

16. What is the cost directly connected to the maintenance of the PACs?

The population for the study consisted of 176 school districts in Texas randomly selected from 1,123 school districts listed in Texas Education Agency Bulletin 738, 1973-74.

The sample for this study was randomly selected and consisted of 637 Title I PAC members representing 50 school districts located in 41 of Texas' 254 counties. The second sample consisted of the respective Title I administrators (N = 50) in the sampled districts.

The data gathered from the PAC members and Title I administrators, using a modified version of Reyes' questionnaire, were tabulated manually and through a computer. The questionnaire respondents included representation from parents with children in Title I programs and Title I school district administrators. The questionnaire was designed to elicit personal information about the respondents, programmatic information concerning Title I, and personal perceptions of several issues related to their PACs.

Conclusions

Although the literature reviewed has indicated that parental involvement in the education of their children has become a great concern to parents, the researcher found average concern in this study. This study revealed that there is a large number of PAC members that have little knowledge about Title I programs in their respective school districts. Many PAC members are not active in their school district's Title I program. Nine percent of the PAC members surveyed had not attended a single Title I PAC meeting during the school year 1973-74. Thirty percent had attended only one meeting during the year.

The establishment of PACs and their operation have been more of a burden to the school districts than a facilitator of operating an effective parental involvement program. This may be due to the school districts' inability to maximize the use of the PACs and to the lack of a belief, on the part of the school districts, that PACs can become an integral part of the education process. The school districts' concern that PACs might become overly involved in the schools' educational program has caused some concern on the part of some educators. A feeling of doing very little with the PACs has caused a number of members to feel that their committees are nothing more than "paper committees." They further feel that school district personnel often tell the PACs what the

program will be. Very little parental involvement is actually solicited. Many PAC members have thus become frustrated and have given up in many cases. This explains, in part, the poor attendance record of many PAC members.

School districts that have gone beyond the minimum efforts of involving parents in school activities have experienced better than average attendance and participation in their meetings. These districts have received strong parental support in their overall school programs. Better informed Title I PAC members have made positive contributions to their specific Title I program.

The researcher, however, recognizes the rationale for the federal government requiring parental participation in federally funded programs. Such a requirement is of little value to a district that has neither the personnel nor the finances to devote to the implementation of an effective Title I parental involvement program. Funds and the training of LEA personnel are, therefore, a must in attempting such an endeavor.

A further analysis of the data gathered for this study and PAC members' perceptions provides the basis for the following conclusions about the role, practices, status and extent of involvement of PACs.

1. Female PAC members outnumber male members by a ratio of approximately four to one. Less than one half of the

members are over 41 years old while those who have lived in their district outnumber those who have lived under four years in their district by three to one. Almost three fourths of the members have a high school education (10 - 12 grades). One half of the members are housewives, two thirds are members of a minority group, and at least 60 percent had at least one child in the Title I program.

2. Minority groups are at least "somewhat well" represented (77 percent) in the PACs. Some committee members felt (13 percent) that their PAC represented "poorly" the higher income levels of parents in their districts. Consideration, however, should be given to the fact that Title I programs basically serve educationally disadvantaged children of "low-income" families.

3. A significant number of PAC members (23 percent) are employees of their districts.

4. More than one half of the PAC members are appointed.

5. Almost two thirds of the committee are recognized by their respective school boards.

6. A significant number of PAC members know very little or nothing about Title I programs, rules and regulations, objectives, plans, and selection of schools. This indicates that school districts are not adequately informing PAC members.

7. A large number of members are not active in their Title I PACs while a small number were active in such school activities as field trips, volunteer work, classroom observation, etc.

8. An overwhelmingly majority of the members receive information from Title I administrators on which to make recommendations. The information given has been at least "somewhat helpful." Although a significant number of members "seldom" expressed their wishes or concerns to their school officials, those that had, felt that at least "some" of their recommendations had been accepted. Apparently this information was not relayed to the PAC members as a significant number indicated they did not know how many of their committee's recommendations had been accepted. Committee members, in general, feel that they have "about the same influence" as other committee members to influence committee decisions.

9. School districts involve PAC members more in the planning process of Title I, less in the implementation and very little in the evaluation process. However, the PACs have been "somewhat useful" to the school districts.

10. Very few districts reimburse committee members for expenses incurred in connection with Title I activities. Those districts that do permit expenditures for Title I activities apparently provide the minimum. Additional funds

and allocation of funds for PAC activities will strengthen PACs.

11. The work of PAC members in their respective schools has been at least "fair" with a significant number feeling that their participation in their PACs has been a valuable experience to them personally.

12. Overall the PACs are far overrated with respect to what they can contribute and do not really help very much in the learning process.

13. A number of PAC members feel that the PACs are "paper committees." They feel that school districts often tell the committees what the program will be. The following comments by PAC members reflect that feeling:

- . "our suggestions seem to fall on deaf ears. We are only a figurehead which operates as does the Emperor of Japan or the Queen of England."
- . "my dealings with the administrative officers offered me only frustration and disillusionment."
- . "the school district sends out notices to the Title I meetings with the desire that they not attend."

14. Parents of Title I children for various reasons do not have the time to be involved in Title I PAC meetings and activities.

15. A significant number of Spanish surname Americans often do not participate in Title I activities because they have difficulty understanding the English language.

16. The lack of interest on the part of PAC members and their lack of time for PAC activities are the greatest detriments to the implementation of an effective and viable PAC program.

17. A significant number of Title I administrators felt that the USOE and the TEA had not provided adequate information regarding Title I parental involvement in Title I programs. It should be noted, however, that often the information is mailed to the districts but never reaches those at the "grass roots" level.

18. There is some feeling among school administrators that the Title I PAC was established only to meet federal guidelines rather than to go beyond this requirement. Consequently, very little effort in the implementation of an effective PAC has been shown. No outstanding Title I parental involvement programs were identified in the course of the study.

19. A number of administrators feel defensive when inquiries are directed at their PACs. There seems to be a feeling of "don't rock the boat," and that if the PACs know their rights and understand what is expected of them, they could cause problems for the district. Therefore, a feeling seems to exist that it is best to keep PACs uninformed whenever practical.

Recommendations

An analysis of the findings and conclusions of this study point out to the following recommendations as a method of increasing parental involvement in Title I PACs and offer alternatives to the implementation of a viable and effective Title I PAC program. The recommendations presented should also provide districts with suggestions on strengthening ongoing Title I PACs.

At the National Level

The poor children who are the intended beneficiaries of Title I are often denied the benefits of the Act because of a lack of compliance with Title I regulations and guidelines. Title I laws require school districts to provide assurances that they will comply with these laws. The USOE requires state departments of education to provide written assurance certifying that they will distribute Title I funds only to school districts who comply with Title I laws. When school districts fail to comply with these laws, the state agencies are legally required to withhold Title I funds from that district or terminate funding until the project is brought into compliance. When the school district corrects the deficiencies, the funding is resumed and the district is cleared.

However, during the interim period of termination or

suspension of Title I funds and the resumption of funding, the services have been withheld from those who could benefit the most from its participation--the poor children. It is impossible to make up for the "lost" services. Children have been deprived of the benefits of Title I through no fault of their own. Very little can be done to retrieve or compensate for the lost benefits. Therefore, when a school district is found in non-compliance with Title I guidelines i.e., failure or refusal to accord the PAC an opportunity to participate in Title I activities such as planning, implementation, evaluation, etc., the "trust theory" is recommended. The offending school district should be required to place in a "trust" an amount of funds equivalent to the amount of funds improperly administered. Federal auditors have a way of calculating this amount. This trust fund (derived from non-federal funds) should then be expended in an ensuing school year at the schools which qualify for Title I funds.

When a school district demonstrates inability or unwillingness to administer the Title I program in accordance with the existing Title I laws, direct and immediate divestiture of authority should be taken over all aspects of Title I grant planning and implementation. The transfer of such authority for the complete operation of Title I should then be turned over to a qualified independent administering body. Precedent for such action is not lacking as evidenced in a court case in Pennsylvania when a United States District

Judge turned the control of the Philadelphia Title I program over to a specifically appointed committee of three educators. Similarly in an analogous area, the California Supreme Court, after legislative and executive inability to agree upon a constitutionally valid legislative reapportionment plan, ordered the matter placed in the hands of a panel of "masters" and approved as its own the masters' reapportionment scheme.

In addition to the above recommendations, the following are also presented:

1. That the USOE provide a summary of current Title I rules and regulations affecting Title I parental involvement to the SEAs and LEAs so that LEAs will have an idea of what has been printed and can request those which it is missing.

2. That provisions be made at the national level to set aside a percentage of Title I funds to be used specifically for parental involvement and PACs.

3. That regional meetings to discuss Title I parental involvement be conducted and that LEAs be included in such meetings.

At the State Level

The TEA can be a very important catalyst in parental involvement. The analysis of the findings of this study can be interpreted to indicate that the Agency can do much more to facilitate the involvement of a stronger Title I parental involvement program in Texas. To help accomplish this task,

the following recommendations are presented:

1. That the TEA conduct a state-wide study to determine the status of parental involvement and the effectiveness of PACs. This study will be able to reveal state-wide trends, etc., and will not be restricted to a selected sample.
2. Prepare a book of guidelines or booklets and distribute to each school district with a Title I program to provide some basis for standardization of Title I PACs and to serve as aid to districts in developing effective and viable parental involvement programs.
3. Identify school districts with effective parental involvement programs and disseminate such information for other districts to visit and learn from them.
4. Expand or redirect technical assistance services to include more emphasis on parental involvement and that technical assistance be provided directly to PACs, when appropriate, by individuals who are bilingual.
5. Assimilate a list of resource persons throughout the state for districts to call upon for technical assistance.
6. Encourage districts to make use of existing funds to strengthen their parental involvement programs by spending Title I funds directly on their parental involvement programs, where appropriate and permissible.
7. Conduct regional meetings to assist districts with problems concerning parental involvement as required by

Title I similar to the regional meetings conducted to explain the application forms and changes each year.

8. Combine the Title I and Title I Migrant parental involvement programs, staff, etc., to increase the Agency's outreach and technical assistance services capabilities.

At the Local Level

The LEA has the greatest responsibility for insuring that parents become involved in the various phases of Title I. The following are recommended in an effort for districts to expand their parental involvement program:

1. That PACs be established in each Title I project school in addition to the district PAC.

2. That parents who are to serve on the PAC be selected by parents of children in the school rather than by school officials.

3. That PAC meetings be conducted at such times as convenient to the majority of committee members. Such meetings should include a period of time for socializing as many parents will discuss problems, etc., at this time and not during the regular meeting. The meetings should be held in a convenient place with consideration given to having some meetings in the homes and providing funds for refreshments, etc.

4. That meetings be conducted in the language that parents can understand and instructions printed or otherwise

be provided in the members' language.

5. That transportation, where possible, be provided for members that other reasonable expenses such as baby-sitting, meals, etc., be reimbursed by school districts.

6. That districts initiate a program to inform and continue the informing of parents in all areas affecting Title I. This may be accomplished through training sessions for members and continuous feedback both written and verbally to all concerned and affected parents.

7. That PACs avoid becoming pressure groups.

8. That guidelines and responsibilities become more clear and explicit, and that everybody, including the school officials and committee members, should adhere to the guidelines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "A Schoolman's Guide to Federal Aide," School Management, Vol. 10, #12 (December, 1966).
2. "A Training Program for Parent Participation in Head Start." OEO Training Manual 6108-1, Office of Economic Opportunity. Washington, D. C., 1971.
3. Auerbach, Aline B. Parents Learn Through Discussion: Principles and Practices of Parent Group Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968, p. 358.
4. Babbidge v. Richardson, Civil Action No. 4410 (D. C. R. I.), September 11, 1970.
5. Bloom, Benjamin S. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
6. Boutwell, William D. "Parent Participation in Education," The PTA Magazine. LXIII (February, 1969), pp. 12-14.
7. Browning, R. Stephen and Costello, Jack Jr. "Title I: More of the Same?" Inequality in Education. Number 17 (June 1974), Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
8. Burns, Laurel, Lucille Childs and Eileen Clark, "Parents Have Much To Give," Young Children, XXIII (November, 1967), pp. 111-114.
9. California State Department of Education, "A Handbook for Members of California School District Advisory Committees, ESEA Title I" Sacramento, California: Division of Compensatory Education, 1971.
10. California State Department of Education, "Parent and Community Participation" (Sacramento, California: Division of Compensatory Education, 1971).
11. "Citizens Advisory Committees: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs." National School Public Relations Association. Arlington, 1973.

12. Colorado Department of Education, "The Parent and the Program: A Report on Title I Parent Advisory Councils in Colorado" (Denver, Colorado: Compensatory Education Services Unit, February, 1973).
13. Colpitts, et al. v. Richardson et al., Civil Action No. 1838 (D. C. Me.), October 20, 1970.
14. Congressional Record: Proceedings and Debate of the 92nd Congress, First Session, Vol. 117, No. 7, February 21, 1971, p. 676.
15. Connecticut State Department of Education, "Connecticut Guidelines for Compensatory Education" (Hartford, Connecticut: Bureau of Compensatory and Community Educational Services, June, 1972).
16. Cutlip, Scott M. and Center, Allen H. Effective Public Relations, 4th Ed. Englewood, Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
17. Danaezko, Mary V. "100 Parents are Teachers for a Day," New York State Education, XLVIII (April, 1961), pp. 26-27.
18. Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: McMillan Company, 1916.
19. Fantini, Mario D., "Quality Education in Urban Schools," in Community Control of Schools. Edited by Henry M. Levin. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institute, 1970.
20. Fantini, Mario D. and Weinstein, Gerald. The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.
21. Federal Register, Vol. 36, Number 199, Part II, October 14, 1971.
22. Garrison, Marian. "Amateur to Pro," Pennsylvania School Journal, CXIII (February, 1965), pp. 271-272.
23. Gittell, Marilyn, Participants and Participation, New York, Center for Urban Education, 1967.
24. Goldberg, Herman R., "Community Control at the Crossroads." Paper presented at the American Association of School Administrators Annual Convention.

(103rd), Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 20-24, 1971.

25. Goodwin, Richard N. "Reflections, Sources of the Public Unhappiness," The New Yorker, Vol. XXIV, January 4, 1969.
26. Gordon, E. W. and Wilkerson, D. A., Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged, Programs and Practices: Preschool Through College. Princeton: College Entrance Exam Board, 1966.
27. Gordon, I. J., Parental Involvement in Compensatory Education. University of Illinois Press: Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, 1970.
28. Grant, Eva H., Parents and Teachers as Partners. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1952, p. 48.
29. Grayson, Jan. "Teacher Aide: Mother," The Elementary School Journal, LXII, (December, 1961), pp. 134-138.
30. Hanges, Helen. "Parental Involvement in an Urban Setting." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1971.
31. Harrington, Alma. "Parents and the School," The Reading Teachers, XXIII, (May, 1970), pp. 711-716.
32. Hart, Joseph. The Discovery of Intelligence. New York: The Century Company, 1924.
33. Hefferman, Helen and Vivian Edmiston Todd. Elementary Teacher's Guide to Working with Parents. West Nyack: Parker Publishing Company, 1969. p. 210.
34. Henderson, George, "School-Community Relations in Poverty Areas," Peabody Journal of Education. XLV (January, 1968), pp. 209-213.
35. Hillenbrand, Robert F. "Parent Volunteers, A Rich Resource for Schools," Illinois Education, LXII (December, 1968), pp. 156-157.
36. Hirsch, Phil. "How One Community Helps Its Underachievers," School Management, VI (April, 1962), pp. 97-98.
37. Johnson, Lyndon Baines, The Vantage Point: Perspectives of the President. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971).

38. Johnson, Lyndon Baines, "Special Message to the Congress Recommending a 12-Point Program for America's Children and Youth" (February 8, 1967), Book 7.
39. Jordan, William C. "How to Put Parents to Work in the Classroom," Nation's Schools, LXXXI (February, 1968), pp. 76-77.
40. Kahl, Joseph A. "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Common Man Boys," Harvard Educational Review, XXIII (Summer, 1953), pp. 186-203.
41. Kansas State Department of Education, "A Guide for Title I Parent Advisory Council" (Topeka, Kansas: Kansas State Department of Education, No Date).
42. Karowe, Harris E. "How Volunteers Can Help Disadvantaged Children," Children, XIV (July, 1967), pp. 151-155.
43. Kindred, Leslie W., "Lay Advisory Committee Puts Into Effect the Partnership Between School and Community." Nation Schools. Vol. 43 (March, 1949).
44. Kirby, William N., "Compensatory Education: A Review of Selected ESEA Title I and Project Follow Through Models and Implications for Change," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, December, 1972).
45. Lane, Bess B. Your Part in Your Child's Education. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1948. p. 252.
46. Maccoby, E. E. and Zellner, M., Experiments in Primary Education: Aspects of Project Follow Through. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1970.
47. Memorandum from John F. Hughes, Director, Division of Compensatory Education, USOE, to Chief State School Officers, April 14, 1967.
48. Memorandum from Commissioner Harold Howe, II, USOE, to Chief State School Officers, March 18, 1968.
49. Memorandum from Commissioner Harold Howe, II, USOE, to Chief State School Officers, July 2, 1968.
50. Memorandum from Commissioner Harold Howe, II, USOE, to Chief State School Officers, July 29, 1968.
51. Michael, John A., "Parental Norms and School Participation." Unpublished Manuscript, Teachers

College, Columbia University, 1970.

52. National Society for the Study of Education. The Community School. ed. Nelson B. Henry. Fifty-second Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
53. New Jersey State Department of Education, "Planning Parent-Implemented Programs" (Trenton, N. J.: Office of Federal Assistance, 1969).
54. Newton, Eunice Shaed. "Training the Volunteer Reading Tutor," Journal of Reading, VIII (January, 1965), pp. 169-174.
55. North City Area Wide Council, Inc., et al v. Ramney, No. 18, 466, (3rd Cir) July 14, 1970.
56. Parmenter, Tom, ed., "Title I and Parent Participation," Inequality in Education. Harvard Number six, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
57. Pennsylvania Department of Education, "The Involvement of Parent Councils in ESEA Title I," (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, April 2, 1971).
58. Pierce, Truman M., "The Growing Trend Toward Lay Participation," Peabody Journal of Education. Vol. 28 (November, 1950).
59. Pines, Maya. Revolution in Learning. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967.
60. Reissman, R., The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962.
61. Rempson, Joe Louis, "An Exploratory Study to Help Increase the Number of Parents Who Make In-School Contacts in Low-Income Urban Area." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1969.
62. Reyes, Ramiro DeLeon, "The Role of School District Advisory Committees in the Educational Decision-Making Process of ESEA Title I Programs for Disadvantaged Children in California." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, Flint, Michigan, 1972.

63. Sanchez et al. v. Rafferty et al., Civil Action No. C-70 1633, 1970.
64. Seay, Maurice F. and Ferris N. Crawford. The Community School and Community Self-Improvement. Lansing: Clair L. Taylor, 1954, p. 190.
65. Sewell, William H. and Vimal P. Shah. "Social Class, Parental Encouragement, and Educational Aspirations," American Journal of Sociology, LXXIII (March, 1968), pp. 559-572.
66. Sindledacker, Charles. "Volunteer Mothers Ease Teacher's Task," Educational Screen and Audiovisual Guide, XLIX (March, 1970), p. 10.
67. Storen, Helen Frances. "Lay Participation in Curriculum Planning," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1946.
68. "Titulo I En Su Comunidad." The Division of Legal Information and Community Service. NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., New York.
69. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, A Chance for a Change: New School Programs for the Disadvantaged, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office).
70. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Parental Involvement in Title I ESEA, (Washington, D. C., 1972).
71. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Title I ESEA Program Guide #44" (March 18, 1968), Section 5.4.
72. Usdan, Michael D., "Citizen Participation: Learning from New York City's Mistakes," Urban Review, IV (September, 1969) pp. 9-12.
73. Utah State Board of Education, "Utah Title I ESEA Guidelines for Parent Involvement," (Salt Lake City; November, 1972).
74. Vallado, A. N. "ESEA Title I Programs: A Guide for Involvement of Parent Councils." (Corpus Christi, Texas: Corpus Christi Independent School District, July 1974).

75. Waller, Willard. Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1932, p. 459.
76. Wartenberg, Herbert. "Parents in the Reading Program," The Reading Teacher, XXIII (May, 1970), pp. 717-721.
77. Washington State, "Guidelines for Parent Advisory Councils under Title I ESEA" (Olympia, Washington: State Department of Public Education, 1972-1973).
78. Werle, Henry Daniel. "Lay Participation in Curriculum Improvement Programs," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
79. Wilcox, Preston. "Parental Decision-Making: An Educational Necessity," Theory Into Practice. Vol. XI, Number 3, June, 1972.
80. Wille, Lois. "Moms Are a Must," American Education, VI (April, 1970) pp. 24-29.
81. Willman, Betty. "Parent Participation As a Factor in the Effectiveness of Head Start Programs," The Journal of Educational Research, LXII (May, 1969), pp. 406-410.
82. World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Professions, Parent-Teacher Cooperation. (Washington, D. C.: The Confederation, 1953).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE COMPLAINT TO UNITED STATES
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

SAMPLE COMPLAINT TO U. S. COMMISSIONER
OF EDUCATION

Dear _____:

On _____ 19 __, _____ representing the _____, requested an investigation by our office into the possible misuse of Title I funds by the _____ School District. A ____-month study has revealed that a total of _____ has been diverted from the low-income or educationally deprived children in _____. The Act of 1965 has been irrelevant to the needs of the poor in _____. The letter and spirit of this Act has not been followed by either state or local educational agencies. The regulations and guidelines as promulgated by the Commissioner of Education have been virtually ignored by state and local officials. The following is a list of our findings.

1. The local school board has supplanted state and local funds with Title I funds.
2. Title I funds have been used to benefit the students of the _____ school system as a whole rather than concentrating the monies on those who are educationally deprived.
- 2a. Title I funds have been expended in schools which had lower than average concentrations of low-income families and thus were ineligible project areas.
3. Title I funds have been used to raise the level of achievement of students already performing above the normal level rather than to raise the level of those students performing below the normal level.
4. The projects established with Title I funds are meeting the priority needs of the _____ school system rather than the priority needs of the educationally deprived students.
5. The low-income population of _____ has had no representation or expression in voicing their opinions as to the priority needs of their children.
6. The _____ School Board has made no attempt to coordinate its Title I program with other available federal programs.

*

*

*

*

SAMPLE COMPLAINT ONLY- THE DOLLAR AMOUNTS, DATES, AND OTHER DETAILS
ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY.

COMPUTER PROGRAM: Since 1965, \$26,850 has been applied in establishing the computer program. (SAMPLE)

This computer was already on lease prior to Title I funds. When Federal funds became available, they were used to replace the state and local funds formerly being used to pay for the lease. 45 C.F.R. 116.17(h), ESEA. Title I Program Guide 44 Item 7.1, 45a.

The advanced mathematics utilizing this computer is not directed to meet the needs of those children who have the greatest need for assistance. This project is limited to superior students who have completed algebra, trigonometry, geometry and calculus. A fee is required for entering this program. Such a class does not "contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children," which is defined by the regulations as follows:

Those children who have need for special educational assistance in order that their level of educational attainment is raised to that appropriate for children of their age: 45 C.F. R. 116.1(1)

Rather than serving as a compensatory scheme, Title I funds are being used to widen the already existing gap between the poor and the affluent groups. 20 U.S.C.A. 241(a), 241e(a)(i); 45 C.F.R. 116.17(a),(f),(g); ESEA Title I Program Guide 44 Item 4.6.

1965-66	\$ 4,350	
1966-67	4,500	
1967-68	6,000	
1968-69	6,000	
1969-70	6,000	
	\$ 26,850	-- total Title I sum being misused in establishing the computer program.

CAFETERIA EQUIPMENT: \$17,066 has been misapplied in purchasing equipment for the cafeteria. (SAMPLE)

In 1965 a cafeteria was constructed by the _____ school system. Title I funds were used to purchase freezers, ovens and other equipment for the cafeteria. Federal funds were substituted for local and state funds for this equipment. Prices for each school lunch are 35-40¢ which is prohibitive to many of the low income groups. In effect, the poor do not participate in the lunch program. This equipment was not purchased in conjunction with any approved project, nor was there any assurance given to the state that this equipment was essential in order to insure the success of a project. As a result of the purchase of the cafeteria equipment, benefit inured to the school system rather than being directed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children, 2d U.S.C. 241a, 241a(a)(i), 45 C.F.R. 116.17(a),(f),(g),(h),(i); ESEA Title I Program Guide 44, Item 4.2, 4.7, 45, 45a.

1965-66	\$17,066	-- total Title I sum misused in purchasing cafeteria equipment
---------	----------	--

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: \$156,972 has been misapplied in establishing a health and physical education program.
(SAMPLE)

Title I funds are deployed to pay the salary of a school psychologist. Since this psychologist was employed by the _____ school system prior to 1965, federal funds are now being used to supplant the monies previously furnished by the state and local governments. The same psychologist is also available to the schools not qualifying as project areas. Using Title I funds to give comparable services as those given in non-project areas is a penalization of that project area or of these children. 45 C.F.R. 116.17(h); ESEA Title I Program Guide No. 44, Item 711. The psychologist is available to the student body as a whole and is not directed to contribute particularly towards meeting the needs of the educationally deprived.

Prior to 1965, the local Health Department furnished one nurse to the schools. The nurse was available to all the students in the system. With the advent of Title I, two nurses were added and they were assigned to treat the students in the project area. Title I funds were used to alleviate the necessity for the Health Department to provide two additional nurses to the schools. Once again, these funds were used to remedy a problem which the school system had rather than tailored to meet the needs of the educationally deprived. The present service in the project area is comparable to the one given in the non-project areas 20 U.S.C.A. 241a, 241e(a)(i), 45 C.F.R. 116.17(a),(c),(e),(h), 116.18(a); ESEA Title I Program Guide No. 44, Item 4.7.

Title I funds were used to establish a physical education program in the project area. This program is identical to the one already given in the non-project areas. This course is not concentrated on a small number of educationally deprived but rather is designed to serve the needs of the student body as a whole. This program cannot be construed as a priority need of the poor in _____. The Board of Education merely used Title I funds to remedy an existing deficiency in their curriculum. 20 U.S.C.A. 241a, 241e(a), (i); 45 C.F.R. 116.17(f),(g), 116.18(a),(e); ESEA Title I Program Guide 44, Item 4.2, Item 4.3, 45a.

1965-66	\$ 28,318	
1966-67	29,209	(SAMPLE)
1967-68	32,612	
1968-69	33,733	These figures include funds used for the psycholo-
1969-70	<u>33,170</u>	gist, nurses and physical education program.

\$156,972 -- total sum misused in establishing the health and physical education program.

TEACHER AIDES: \$203,722 has been misapplied in the establishment of the teacher aides program.
(SAMPLE)

The scope of the teacher aides as stipulated in the _____ application is to benefit all the students in the school system. They have been placed uniformly throughout the school raising the level of the student body as a whole rather than being concentrated on those students who are educationally deprived. Some teacher aides are being utilized in nonproject schools, so that Title I funds are used to provide comparable services to those schools not eligible to receive federal funds. The large scope of this program conflicts with the requirement that

-4-

projects be applied to a limited number of children so as to give a reasonable promise of success. 20 U.S.C.A. 241(a), 241e(a)(i); 45 C.F.R. 116.17(c),(g), (h), 45 C.F.R. 116.18(a),(e), ESEA Title I program Guide 44, Item 4.2, Item 4.3, Item 4.7, 45(a).

1965-66	\$16,818	
1966-67	38,593	(SAMPLE)
1967-68	52,529	
1969-70	<u>41,511</u>	

\$203,722 -- total funds misused in establishing the teacher aides program.

SUMMER PROGRAM: \$75,412 has been misapplied in creating the summer program.

The summer program is available to all students as no effort has been made to concentrate the benefits on the educationally deprived. Classes are not held in the low-income areas, making it difficult for the poor students to reach the area where the activities are held.

A good portion of the summer curriculum includes classes for the superior student performing above the average level of achievement. Children from schools not eligible to receive Title I funds participate in the summer school activities. 45 C.F.R. 116.17(a),(c),(g), 116.18(a),(e); 45 C.F.R. 116.18(a); 45 C.F.R. 116.18(e), 20 U.S.C.A. 241e(a),(i); ESEA Title I Program Guide 44, Item 4.7.

1965-66	\$11,539	
1966-67	13,328	(SAMPLE)
1967-68	19,220	
1968-69	15,514	
1969-70	<u>15,581</u>	

\$75,412 -- total sum misused in establishing the summer program.

In 1965, _____ Junior High, _____ Elementary and _____ Elementary contained less than the average concentration (21.93% or 86 children) for the district as a whole. Nonetheless, they were included in a project area although clearly ineligible. 45 C.F.R. 116.17(d).

The parents of the educationally deprived have been systematically omitted from any participation in Title I projects. These parents have never been consulted as to the special needs of their children. The Advisory Committee is self-serving, (a member of this committee is a teacher aide under the Title I program) as three out of the four members are employees of the Board of Education. This committee is in no way representative of the educationally deprived in _____. 45 C.F.R. 116.19, ESEA Title I Program Guide 46.

The Board of Education's failure to make any effort to consult parents of educationally deprived children as to their special needs is compounded by its neglect to utilize the professional expertise of the local community action agency of the Office of Economic Opportunity to analyze those needs. Title I Application for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1970, p. 4; 45 C.F.R. 116.24(a). It is thus not

-5-

surprising that the low-income community of _____ finds the considerable expenditure of federal funds irrelevant to their highest priority needs.

ESEA Title I Program Guide #44, Item 2.1 requires that

The priority needs of educationally deprived children in the eligible attendance areas (target populations) were determined in consultation with teachers, parents, private school authorities, and representatives of other agencies which have a genuine and continuing interest in such children. The evidence of need and the basis for the assignment of priorities have been documented.

The Board's conduct at best is illustrative of a lack of sensitivity to the needs of the poor children of _____, and at worst, a blatant disobedience of your rules and regulations.

The lack of adequate planning and evaluation of the need of our educationally deprived children has resulted in an unwise allocation of resources. Even where arguably acceptable Title I programs have been established, the Board of Education has failed to coordinate the activities with other available federal programs. 45 C.F.R. 116.24(a).

For example, courses are given in carpentry and automobile mechanics to prepare high school students for attendance at an advance technical vocational school or for a job immediately after graduation. We do not dispute the possibility that such courses encourage some students who might otherwise drop out to remain in school until graduation. However, it is conceivable that the _____ Board of Education and the State Department of Education might have better allocated federal resources if they would have sought to coordinate those Title I funds with, for example, the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968, Pub. L. 88-210, Title I, as added Pub. L. 90-576, Title I 82 Stat. 1064. See Office of Education, "Programs for the Disadvantaged," January, 1969, pp. 32-39.

The State Educational Agency has made no effort to determine whether projects conform to the law. State approval is a mere perfunctory exercise. There has not been a state investigation to determine the adequacy of the program in _____. 45 C.F.R. 116.31(c), 45 C.F.R. 116.34(a).

In an era where a national effort is being made to re-establish the concept of law and order, the low-income people of _____ are dismayed at the flagrant abuse of the Title I Act on a local and state level. Funds which should be directed to the low-income people are treated as unencumbered and utilized to meet the needs of the _____ school system. When the Act of 1965 was passed, it was the general consensus (sic) that only through a compensatory type of program in education could there be a hope that the underprivileged people in America would eventually achieve the same opportunities possessed by the affluent. However, once again high-flown words were just that, the promises made to the poor were broken. We do not argue with the efficacy of all the programs established; our contention is that these programs were not those promised by the 1965 Act.

-6-

The poor people of _____ only seek to enforce their constitutional right to receive the full benefit of the aid Congress intended for them. An initial effort is being made to use the administrative channels in the hope that justice for the low-income residents of _____ can be achieved rapidly and in an amicable fashion. They hope that you will exercise your authority to investigate their grievances, 45 C.F.R. 116.52(b), and will expeditiously move to withhold funds from the _____ public school system should you find misappropriation, and re-apply misused funds to meet the special education needs of the educationally deprived children in _____. 20 U.S.C. 241j; 45 C.F.R. 116.52(a). This matter is not only vital to the poor citizens of _____, but to all poor Americans. Federal expenditures on Title I in fiscal year 1969 amounted to over 1.1 billion dollars and almost 17 million dollars in _____ alone. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, American Education, April, 1969. It is vital that you restore their confidence in the fairness of the governmental processes.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX B

SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT PARTICIPATED
IN THE STUDY

SCHOOL DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDYDistricts with an Enrollment of Over 40,000

1. Austin Independent School District
2. Corpus Christi Independent School District
3. Dallas Independent School District
4. El Paso Independent School District
5. Fort Worth Independent School District

Districts with an Enrollment of 15,000 - 39,999

1. Beaumont Independent School District
2. Brazosport Independent School District
3. Brownsville Independent School District
4. Ector County Independent School District
5. Goose Creek Independent School District
6. Grand Praire Independent School District
7. Harlandale Independent School District
8. Laredo Independent School District
9. Lubbock Independent School District
10. McAllen Independent School District
11. Pasadena Independent School District
12. Port Arthur Independent School District
13. Texarkana Independent School District
14. Wichita Falls Independent School District

Districts with an Enrollment of 3,000 - 14,999

1. Alice Independent School District
2. Big Springs Independent School District
3. Bryan Independent School District
4. Denton Independent School District
5. El Campo Independent School District
6. Greenville Independent School District
7. Gregory-Portland Independent School District
8. Henderson Independent School District
9. Jacksonville Independent School District
10. Mount Pleasant Independent School District
11. Palestine Independent School District
12. Plainview Independent School District
13. Plano Independent School District
14. San Angelo Independent School District
15. Seguin Independent School District
16. Snyder Independent School District
17. Southside Independent School District

Districts with an Enrollment of Less Than 3,000

1. Cedar Hill Independent School District
2. Hallsville Independent School District
3. Hamlin Independent School District
4. Norheim Independent School District
5. Mineola Independent School District
6. Mount Vernon Independent School District
7. Raymondville Independent School District
8. Rio Grande Independent School District
9. Riviera Independent School District
10. San Diego Independent School District
11. Three Rivers Independent School District
12. West Oso Independent School District
13. Zapata County Independent School District

APPENDIX C

LETTER SENT TO EACH SUPERINTENDENT OF
SCHOOLS REQUESTING LISTS OF TITLE I
PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

CORPUS CHRISTI INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
515 NORTH CARANCAHUA
P. O. DRAWER 110
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS, 78403

143

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTION

July 1, 1974

Name of Superintendent
School District
P. O. Box
City, State Zip Code

Dear Name of Superintendent:

I am conducting a study (Doctoral Dissertation) to examine the role, practices, and the status of Parent Advisory Committees (PACs) as required by Title I ESEA and the extent of their involvement in the educational decision-making process in selected school districts in Texas.

In order to complete this task, I am asking for your assistance in gathering the data. The data gathered will not only meet my requirements for the study but will also provide us with valuable information that could assist us in the development of guides, booklets, and practical handbooks for the PACs. The materials that could be developed out of my study will assist us in effectively utilizing parent involvement in Title I programs as required by the program.

The data will be gathered through the use of a questionnaire (copy attached) which will be completed by PAC members and the person responsible for the administration of Title I programs in your district (Administrator's Questionnaire). If you can help me, I would appreciate very much if you would

1. Send me a list of your Title I Parent Advisory Committee members with their names and addresses. (Please include zip code.)
2. Place an asterisk next to the name of each member who you feel will need a questionnaire in Spanish.
3. Complete the administrator's questionnaire, or have someone complete it.
4. Inform your PAC members that I am conducting this study and encourage their support.

You and your PAC members can expect to receive the questionnaires within a week or two after I receive the list of names and addresses. All information and data gathered will be summarized and in no case will specific districts be identified by name or location.

Name of Superintendent

Page 2

July 1, 1974

Thank you for your cooperation. Perhaps the data gathered will make our Title I work just a little bit easier. May we continue to work for more and better ways of meeting the educational needs of our many disadvantaged children in our districts.

Sincerely,

A. N. Vallado

Director of Special Programs

Is

Attachment

P.S. I shall be happy to share with you a summary of the results of my study.

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER MAILED TO EACH DISTRICT
URGING THEIR PROMPT RESPONSE

CORPUS CHRISTI INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
515 NORTH CARANCAHUA
P. O. DRAWER 110
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS, 78403

146

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTION

July 15, 1974

Name of Superintendent
School District
P. O. Box
City, State Zip Code

Dear (Name of Superintendent):

Thank you very much for indicating a willingness to participate in my study on the role, practices, and the status of Parent Advisory Committees (PACs) as required by Title I ESEA and the extent of their involvement in the educational decision-making process in selected school districts in Texas.

If you have not sent me your list of Title I Parent Advisory Committee members with their names and addresses, I would appreciate very much your sending the list at your earliest convenient time.

Once again, "thank you" for your cooperation and upon completion of my study I shall be happy to share with you the results.

Sincerely,

A. N. Vallado
Director of Special Programs

ls

APPENDIX E

ADMINISTRATORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

ADMINISTRATORS' QUESTIONNAIRE ON
PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES AS REQUIRED BY
TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

1. What are the problems your district has encountered in parental involvement through Title I Parent Advisory Committee in educational decision-making?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 Lack of interest | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 Parents do not have time |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 Language difficulty | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Militancy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 Pressure groups setting | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6 Afraid to come to school |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7 Difficulty in maintaining continuity with people moving away | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8 Misunderstanding of committee function |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9 Apprehension | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10 Other (Please Specify) _____ |

2. Regarding Title I parental involvement (Please check as appropriate)

- ☒ 11 The USOE has provided adequate information, guidelines, etc.
- ☒ 12 The USOE has provided inadequate information, guidelines, etc.
- ☒ 13 The USOE has not provided information, guidelines, etc.
- ☒ 14 The TEA has provided adequate information, guidelines, etc.
- ☒ 15 The TEA has provided inadequate information, guidelines, etc.
- ☒ 16 Technical assistance has not been provided by the USOE.
- ☒ 17 Technical assistance has been provided by the TEA.
- ☒ 18 Technical assistance has not been provided by the TEA.

3. What could the Texas Education Agency have done to assist you in the development of your program?

4. Who in your district is responsible for working with the Title I Parent Advisory Committee?

☐ 19 Superintendent ☐ 20 Title I Director ☐ 21 Principal
☐ 22 A Title I paid teacher ☐ 23 A local budget paid teacher ☐ 24 A person that works full time with the committee

5. What promising practices have you discovered in parental involvement through Title I Parent Advisory Councils?

6. On the basis of your experience with the Title I Parent Advisory Committee, what practice or ideas have proved to be most helpful to your Title I Program?

7. How can the Texas Education Agency facilitate your Title I parental involvement and the problems associated with it?

8. Approximately how much money did your district spend on the Title I Parental Involvement Program? Local Budget \$_____ Title I Budget \$_____

APPENDIX F

ENGLISH VERSION OF LETTER SENT TO PARENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS REQUESTING
THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY

A. N. Vallado
P. O. Box 110
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403

TO: Members of Title I (ESEA) Parent Advisory Committees

FROM: A. N. Vallado, Candidate to the Doctoral Degree at the University of Houston

DATE:

SUBJECT: STUDY OF THE ROLE OF PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES UNDER TITLE I, (ESEA) IN TEXAS SCHOOL DISTRICTS

I would like to introduce myself by way of this memorandum and at the same time ask for your assistance in completion of a requirement for the Doctor of Education degree at the University of Houston.

For the past 14 years, I have worked in the public schools in Corpus Christi. The past seven years I have served as the director of Special Programs. This has created in me the interest to conduct this study.

This study is being conducted to determine the role of the Title I (ESEA) Parent Advisory Committees. I have worked very closely with our committee, however, I would like to see what other committees are doing in their school districts.

I would be very grateful, therefore, if you would complete the attached questionnaire answering all the questions as best as you can. Upon completion, I would appreciate if you would mail it back to me in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope as soon as possible.

Your answers to the questions asked will be most helpful and I shall be happy to present a summary of my findings to proper school officials.

Please place an "X" (☒) in the appropriate square that in your opinion best answers the question. If you need help in answering a question, please feel free to ask a member of your family or other person. All information will be kept confidential and it will not be necessary to identify yourself or write your name on the form. Your ideas and suggestions are very important and I will assure you that they will be carefully considered.

If you have any questions, please call or write to me: A. N. Vallado, P. O. Box 110, Corpus Christi, Texas, 78403, telephone (512) 883-2154.

Thank you for your time and assistance to me. I hope that this study and your assistance can lead to better and more programs for our many disadvantaged children in our school districts in Texas and to their brighter future.

ieb

APPENDIX G

SPANISH VERSION OF LETTER SENT TO PARENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS REQUESTING
THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY

ANDRES N. VALLADO
P. O. BOX 110
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS 78403

Para: Miembros de los concilios de padres (Parent Advisory Committee) del Título I bajo el Acto Elemental y Secundario de 1965

De Parte De: Andrés N. Vallado, Candidato Al Doctorado En Educación en en la Universidad de Houston

Topico: Cuestionario Para Determinar el papel que Desempeñan los miembros de Concilios de Padres del Título I

Por medio de esta carta quisiera intruducirme a usted y a la vez pedirle su cooperacion sobre un estudio que estoy haciendo como un requisito a mi candidatura al Doctorado de Educación en la Universidad de Houston.

Por los últimos 14 años he trabajado en las escuelas publicas de la Ciudad de Corpus Christi. Los ultimos 7 años como director de programas federales. Esto me ha dado el interes para llevar acabo este estudio.

Este estudio es para determinar el papel que desempeñan los miembros, como usted, de concilios de padres bajo los programas respaldados por el Título I (Title I, ESEA). Yo he trabajado muy cerca con nuestro comité pero desco saber más del trabajo que otros concilios de padres han estado desempeñando en sus distritos escolares.

Agradecería mucho si usted llenara el cuestionario que adjunto le envio. Por favor conteste todas las preguntas del cuestionario. Al terminar con el cuestionario devuelvalo por correo en el sobre ensellado que le inclullo, lo más pronto posible.

Sus respuestas a todas las preguntas me serán muy valiosas para mi estudio y presentare los resultados a los oficiales del departamento de educacion del estado de Texas. Ademas será util a otros distritos escolares en sus trabajos con sus concilios de padres.

Por favor marque el cuadrito con un "X" (☒) que a su parecer contesta mejor cada pregunta. Si necesita ayuda para completar este cuestionario consulte con algún otro miembro de su familia o con otra persona que le pueda ayudar. Toda la información será confidencial y no es necesario escribir su nombre en este cuestionario. Sus ideas son muy necesarias y le aseguro que sus respuestas y comentarios serán considerados con todo cuidado.

Si tiene alguna pregunta, diriga toda correspondencia a vuestro servidor: Andrés N. Vallado, P. O. Box 110, Corpus Christi, Texas, 78403, teléfono (512) 883-2154.

Con anticipación le doy mis mas profundas gracias por su ayuda y esfuerzo. Espero que por medio de este estudio y con su ayuda mejores programas se puedan desarrollar que verdaderamente van ayudar a nuestros niños para un buen futuro escolar.

APPENDIX H

ENGLISH VERSION OF THE TITLE I OF THE
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
ACT OF 1965 PARENT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965
PARENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Please place a check mark ☒ or an "x" in the space which you feel best answers each question. If you feel that you need help in completing the questionnaire, you may ask a member of your family or others. Do not write your name on the questionnaire. All information will be held in strict confidence.

When you complete answering all the questions, please mail your questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed, and stamped envelope. Thank you very much for your help. All correspondence should be sent to Mr. Andres N. Vallado, P. O. Box 110, Corpus Christi, Texas, 78403.

1. SEX - ☐ 1 Male ☐ 2 Female
2. AGE - ☐ 1 Under 20 ☐ 2 21 - 30 ☐ 3 31 - 40 ☐ 4 41 - 50 ☐ 5 Over 51
3. How long have you lived in this district?
☐ 1 Less than 1 year ☐ 2 1 to 4 years ☐ 3 Over 4 years
4. EDUCATION - Your highest grade completed.
☐ 1 Less than 6 years ☐ 2 7 to 9 ☐ 3 10 to 12
College/ University
☐ 1 Less than 3 years ☐ 2 Bachelors Degree ☐ 3 Masters Degree
☐ 4 Doctorate
5. What kind of work do you do?
☐ 1 Business ☐ 2 Farmer ☐ 3 Professional ☐ 4 Retired ☐ 5 Housewife
☐ 6 Political Office Holder ☐ 7 Office Worker ☐ 8 Skilled Laborer
☐ 9 Other (Please indicate) _____
6. Are you a member of a minority group?
☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No
7. What language/s do you speak fluently?
☐ 1 English ☐ 2 Spanish ☐ 3 Portuguese ☐ 4 Other - Specify _____
8. How many of your children participated in a Title I Program this past school year (1973-74)?
☐ 1 None ☐ 2 One ☐ 3 Two ☐ 4 Three ☐ 5 Four or more
9. Do you work for the school district?
☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No
10. How did you first learn about the Title I Policy Advisory Committee?
☐ 1 Teacher, principal, Title I Director told me about it.
☐ 2 Read about it in a letter brought home by my child.
☐ 3 Read About it in the newspaper.
☐ 4 Heard it on the radio/TV.
☐ 5 Someone came to my home and told me about it.

11. How did you become a member of the Title I Parent Advisory Council?
☒ 1 Appointed by the school district.
☒ 2 Elected by Title I parents in a PTA meeting, or other meeting.
12. About how many Title I Parent Advisory Committee meetings have you attended during this school year (1973-74)?
☒ 1 None ☒ 2 One ☒ 3 Two or three ☒ 4 Four or Five ☒ 5 More than five
13. Do you think your Title I Parent Advisory Committee has met
☒ 1 often enough ☒ 2 too often ☒ 3 not too often ☒ 4 not as often as it should.
14. On how many school advisory committees did you serve this school year (1973-74)?
☒ 1 Only one ☒ 2 Two ☒ 3 Three or more
15. On how many school advisory committees have you served in the past two years?
☒ 1 Only one ☒ 2 Two ☒ 3 Three or four ☒ 4 More than five
16. Aside from your regular committee meetings, in which of the following activities have you participated this year (1973-74)?
☒ 1 Field trips ☒ 6 Reporting to groups or individuals
☒ 2 Board of Education Meetings ☒ 7 Observation in the classroom
☒ 3 Volunteer Aide Work ☒ 8 Screening of personnel to be employed under Title I
☒ 4 Attend training sessions for committee members ☒ 9 Attend training sessions for teachers, aide, and other Title I workers
☒ 5 Visit Title I parents to tell them about Title I
17. How much freedom do you feel the members of your committee have to disagree with the ideas of the administrators concerning Title I?
☒ 1 A great deal ☒ 2 Some ☒ 3 A Little ☒ 4 None at all
18. What difference have the recommendations of your committee made on Title I programs in your school district?
☒ 1 A great deal ☒ 2 Some ☒ 3 A little ☒ 4 None at all
19. Is your committee recognized by your school board?
☒ 1 Yes ☒ 2 No ☒ 3 I don't know
20. How much do you know about the following?
- | | <u>A Great Deal</u> | <u>Some</u> | <u>A Little</u> | <u>Nothing</u> |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| . Structure and organization of the school system | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>1</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>2</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>3</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>4</u> |
| . School budget | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>1</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>2</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>3</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>4</u> |
| . Title I budget | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>1</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>2</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>3</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>4</u> |
| . How decisions are made in the school district | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>1</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>2</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>3</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>4</u> |
| . How decisions are made in the Title I Program | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>1</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>2</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>3</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>4</u> |
| . The local community | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>1</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>2</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>3</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>4</u> |
| . History and purposes of Title I | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>1</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>2</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>3</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>4</u> |

- | | <u>A Great Deal</u> | <u>Some</u> | <u>A Little</u> | <u>Nothing</u> |
|---|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| . Regulations, laws, guidelines that affect Title I | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . The objectives of Title I in your district | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . The 1973-74 Title I Program in your district | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . Future plans for Title I in your district | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . How Title I schools are selected | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . How Title I priorities are determined | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
21. Do you understand clearly the purpose of your Parent Advisory Committee?
1 Very clear 2 Somewhat clear 3 Not clear
22. How well do you think your committee does in meeting the purposes of your committee?
1 Very well 2 Fairly well 3 Not so well 4 Poor
23. How much does your committee do on any of the following?
- | | <u>A great Deal</u> | <u>Some</u> | <u>A Little</u> | <u>None at all</u> |
|--|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| . Review Title I guidelines and regulation | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . Review objectives of Title I | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . Advise of kinds of programs needed | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . Work on publicity in support of Title I | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . Make suggestions on the operation of Title I | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . Help in the evaluation of the program | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| . Other | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
24. Who in the school district gave the information about Title I to your committee on which they could make recommendations? (Check one or more of the following)
1 Title I Director 2 Teacher 3 Principal 4 Superintendent
5 Visiting Teacher 6 Nurse 7 Counselor 8 Board of Education
9 Other Member
25. How helpful has the information given to you by the school district been to your committee in its recommendations?
1 Very helpful 2 Somewhat helpful 3 Not Helpful 4 I don't know
26. How often have you told your wishes and concerns to your district Title I officials and administrators?
1 Often 2 Sometimes 3 Seldom 4 Not at all
27. Do you know how many important recommendations your Parent Advisory Committee has made to the school officials?
1 Many 2 Some 3 A few 4 None 5 I don't know

How many have been accepted?

- ☒ All ☒ Many ☒ Some ☒ None ☒ I don't know
☒ The committee was not told how many.

28. How much has your committee been involved in the evaluation of Title I?
☒ A great deal ☒ Some ☒ A little ☒ None at all
29. Has your committee been given the opportunity to review the latest Title I evaluation?
☒ Yes ☒ No ☒ I don't know
30. How useful do you feel your committee has been to the district's Title I Program?
☒ Very useful ☒ Somewhat useful ☒ Not useful ☒ I don't know
31. How well does your committee represent minority groups in your district?
☒ Very well ☒ Somewhat ☒ Poorly ☒ I don't know
32. How well does your committee represent different income levels of parents in your district?
☒ Very well ☒ Somewhat ☒ Poorly ☒ I don't know
33. Compared with other members of your committee, how much influence do you feel you have on your committee decisions?
☒ Much more influence ☒ Somewhat more influence
☒ About the same influence ☒ Somewhat less influence
☒ Much less influence
34. On Title I Parent Advisory Committees, sometimes there is a person who gives the whole committee valuable leadership or directions. Who of the following most nearly does this?
☒ Superintendent ☒ Title I Director ☒ Principal
☒ Teacher ☒ Parent ☒ Other
35. How would you say the work of the members of your committee is?
☒ Excellent ☒ Quite good ☒ Average ☒ Fair ☒ Quite limited
36. Does your school district pay expenses for committee members?
☒ Yes ☒ No
 If yes, do they pay for any of the following?
 . Baby sitting ☒ Yes ☒ No
 . Transportation ☒ Yes ☒ No
 . Attending training meetings away from home ☒ Yes ☒ No
 . If you work, are you paid back for work time lost while attending meetings or conferences ☒ Yes ☒ No
37. If money is provided for the above, do you feel it is
☒ Too much ☒ Enough ☒ Not enough
38. In general, would you say that your participation in the work of the committee has been a valuable experience to you, to the committee, to the development of educational policy in the district?

	<u>A Great Deal</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Not At All</u>
. Valuable to me personally	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>
. Valuable to the committee	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>
. Valuable to the district	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>
. Valuable to the committee	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>

39. Please check how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree A Great Deal</u>	<u>Agree Somewhat</u>	<u>Disagree A Little</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
. Considering all problems, Title I Parent Advisory Committees are far over-rated with respect to what they can contribute.	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>	<u>/5/</u>
. Although it would "look nice" to have more poor people on the committee, this does not help us very much.	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>	<u>/5/</u>
. Title I Parent Advisory Committees are really "paper committees" which have little or no influence on Title I programs.	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>	<u>/5/</u>
. School district usually tell Title I Parent Advisory Committees what the Title I Program will be instead of asking for their advise.	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>	<u>/5/</u>
. Parents of Title I children lack an interest in what happens in Title I programs.	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>	<u>/5/</u>
. Parents of Title I children do not have time to be involved in Title I Parent Advisory Committees and activities.	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>	<u>/5/</u>
. Parents of Title I children are afraid to participate in Title I activities.	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>	<u>/5/</u>
. Parents of Title I children have difficulty understanding the English language and that is the reason they do not participate in Title I activities.	<u>/1/</u>	<u>/2/</u>	<u>/3/</u>	<u>/4/</u>	<u>/5/</u>

40. Please give your suggestions of how we can make your Title I Parent Advisory Committee more helpful to the school districts' Title I Program. (Use the back of this page if you need additional **space**.)

APPENDIX I

SPANISH VERSION OF THE TITLE I OF THE
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
ACT OF 1965 PARENT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

CUESTIONARIO PARA MIEMBROS DE CONCILIO DE PADRES BAJO EL TITULO I
ACTO ELEMENTAL Y SECUNDARIO DE EDUCACION DE 1965

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LLENAR EL CUESTIONARIO: Este es un cuestionario para estudiar la participación de personas en los concilios de Padres bajo el Título I de el Acto Elemental y Secundario de Educación de 1965. Al contestar todas las preguntas, usted estará ayudando a hacer más útil la participación en la comunidad de personas interesadas. Por favor ponga una "X" (☒) en el cuadrito que a su parecer conteste mejor cada pregunta. Si necesita ayuda para completar este cuestionario sientase libre para consultar algún otro miembro de la familia o con otra persona. No escriba su nombre en este cuestionario ya que toda información será confidencial y nadie sabrá quien contestó los cuestionarios.

Cuando haya contestado todas las preguntas, envíe el cuestionario por correo en el sobre que le encluimos. El sobre ya tiene la dirección y los sellos. Le doy las gracias ya por anticipación, por su ayuda y amabilidad. Toda correspondencia debe ser dirigida al Sr. Andrés N. Vallado, Cuestionario de Concilio de Padres, P. O. Box 110, Corpus Christi, Texas, 78403.

1. SEXO - ☐ 1 Hombre ☐ 2 Mujer
2. EDAD - ☐ 1 Menos de 20 ☐ 2 entre 21 y 30 ☐ 3 entre 31 y 40 ☐ 4 entre 41-50
☐ 5 Más de 50
3. ¿Cuántos Años tiene de vivir en el distrito escolar?
☐ 1 Menos de 1 año ☐ 2 entre 1 y 4 años ☐ 3 más de 4 años
4. Educación - Su grado más alto terminado
☐ 1 Menos de 6 años ☐ 2 entre 7 y 9 años ☐ 3 entre 10-12 años
Colegio-Universidad
☐ 4 Asociado de Artes ☐ 5 Bachillerato ☐ 6 Maestría ☐ 7 Doctorado
5. ¿Que tipo de trabajo desempeña usted?
☐ 1 Negocio ☐ 2 Agricultor ☐ 3 Professional ☐ 4 Jubilado ☐ 5 Ama de casa
☐ 6 Puesto Político ☐ 7 Oficinista ☐ 8 Obrero especializado
☐ 9 Otro (indique) _____
6. ¿Pertenece usted a un grupo de minoría?
☐ 1 Sí ☐ 2 No
7. Idiomas (Lenguas) ¿que habla con facilidad?
☐ 1 Inglés ☐ 2 Español ☐ 3 Portugues ☐ 4 Otro (Indique) _____
8. ¿Cuántos de sus hijos participaron en el programa de educación bajo Título I este año (1973-74)
☐ 1 Ninguno ☐ 2 Uno ☐ 3 Dos ☐ 4 tres ☐ 5 Cuatro o más
9. ¿Es usted un empleado salariado del distrito escolar?
☐ 1 Sí ☐ 2 No
10. ¿Cómo se dió cuenta del concilio de Padres del distrito escolar?
☐ 1 El profesor, principal o el Director de Título I me dijo
☐ 2 Leí un papeleta que mi niño/a trajo de la escuela

- ☐ 3 Leí en el periódico
☐ 4 Escuché la información sobre la Radio/TV
☐ 5 Una persona visitó mi hogar y me dijo.
11. ¿Cómo llegó usted a ser miembro del comité de Padres del Título I (Parent Advisory Committee)?
- ☐ 1 Nombrado por el distrito escolar
☐ 2 Elejido por los Padres de niños, que participan en programas bajo el Título I en una reunión
12. ¿Aproximadamente cuantas juntas del comité del concilio de Padres bajo el Título I asistió usted este año (1973-74)?
- ☐ 1 Ninguna ☐ 2 Una ☐ 3 Dos o tres ☐ 4 entre cuatro y cinco ☐ 5 más de cinco
13. En su opinión, se ha reunido su comité:
- ☐ 1 con suficiente frecuencia ☐ 2 con demasiado frecuencia
☐ 3 muy pocas veces ☐ 4 no con la frecuencia que debía
14. ¿En cuantos comites o concilios semejantes a este ha usted servido este año (1973-74)?
- ☐ 1 uno ☐ 2 dos ☐ 3 tres o mas
15. ¿En cuantos semejantes comites ha servido usted en los últimos dos años?
- ☐ 1 uno ☐ 2 dos ☐ 3 tres o cuatro ☐ 4 más de cinco
16. Aparte de las juntas regulares de este comite en cuales otras actividades ha participado usted este año (1973-74)?
- ☐ 1 Viaje de Estudios ☐ 6 Informando a grupos o individuos sobre los programas bajo el Título I
☐ 2 Juntas del cuerpo escolar ☐ 7 Observación en las salas de clase
☐ 3 Trabajo voluntario ☐ 8 Entrevistando a personal para empleo bajo el Título I
☐ 4 Asistiendo a reuniones de entrenamiento de miembros del comite ☐ 9 Asistiendo a reuniones de entrenamiento de maestros, etc.
☐ 5 Visitando a otros padres de niños que participan en programas bajo el Título I.
17. ¿Cuánta libertad cree usted que tienen los miembros de su comité para expresar desacuerdo con las ideas de los administradores del distrito escolar sobre asuntos y programas bajo el Título I?
- ☐ 1 Muchísimas ☐ 2 Mucha ☐ 3 Una Poca ☐ 4 Ninguna
18. ¿Cuánta influencia tuvieron las recomendaciones del comité de Padres bajo el Título I en los programas de educación bajo el Título I?
- ☐ 1 Muchísima ☐ 2 Mucha ☐ 3 Una Poca ☐ 4 Ninguna
19. ¿Es reconocido su comite de Padres bajo el Titulo I por el cuerpo escolar?
- ☐ 1 Sí ☐ 2 No
20. ¿Que tanta información tiene usted sobre lo siguiente?

Muchísima Alguna Poca Nada

- . Instrucción y organización del distrito escolar
 . El presupuesto del distrito escolar

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4

- | | <u>Muchísima</u> | <u>Alguna</u> | <u>Poca</u> | <u>Nada</u> |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| . El presupuesto del Programa del Título I | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Como se hacen las decisiones en el distrito escolar | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Como se hacen las decisiones en el programa bajo el Título I | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . La comunidad | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Historia y proposito del Programa bajo el Título I | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Reglas, leyes, guias que afectan el programa bajo el Título I | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Los objetivos del programa del Título I en su distrito escolar | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . El Programa bajo el Título I en su distrito escolar del año 1973-74 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Los futuros planes del Título I en su distrito escolar | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Como son seleccionadas las escuelas que participan en el Programa bajo el Título I | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Como se determinan los prioridades para programas bajo el Título I | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
21. ¿Entiende bien usted los propositos del concilio de Padres bajo el Título I?
☐ 1 Sí ☐ 2 No
22. ¿En su opinión que tal cumple el comité con sus propositos?
☐ 1 Muy bien ☐ 2 Algo bien ☐ 3 No muy bien ☐ 4 Mal
23. ¿Hasta que punto hace su comité cualquiera de los siguientes?
- | | <u>Mucho</u> | <u>Algo</u> | <u>Un Poco</u> | <u>Nada</u> |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| . Repasar las reglas y leyes del Título I | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Repasar los objetivos del Título I | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Aconsejar en tipos de programas necesarios | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Trabajar en publicidad para apoyar el Programa Título I | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Hacer sugerencias en como desarrollar el Programa | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| . Ayudar en la evaluación del programa | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
24. ¿Quién en el distrito escolar facilitó la información, tocante programas bajo el Título I, para hacer sus recomendaciones (marque uno o más)?
☐ 1 El Director del Título I ☐ 2 La maestra ☐ 3 El Principal
☐ 4 El superintendente ☐ 5 La maestra que visita ☐ 6 la enfermera
☐ 7 El consejero ☐ 8 un miembro del cuerpo escolar ☐ 9 otro
25. ¿Qué tan útil ha sido la información que le ha dado el distrito escolar a su comité para hacer recomendaciones?
☐ 1 muy útil ☐ 2 algo útil ☐ 3 no ha sido útil ☐ 4 No se

26. ¿ Con cuánta frecuencia han ustedes, como miembros del comité de padres bajo el Título I, han expresado sus deseos y preocupaciones a oficiales del cuerpo Escolar?
- ☐ 1 con frecuencia ☐ 2 a veces ☐ 3 pocas veces ☐ 4 nunca
27. ¿ Sabe usted cuantas recomendaciones de importancia ha hecho su comité de padres al distrito escolar?
- ☐ 1 Muchas ☐ 2 Algunas ☐ 3 Pocas ☐ 4 Ninguna ☐ 5 No Se
- ¿ Cuantas han sido aceptadas?
- ☐ 1 Todas ☐ 2 Muchas ☐ 3 Algunas ☐ 4 Ningunas ☐ 5 No se
28. ¿ Hasta que punto ha participado su comité en la evaluación del programa bajo el Título I?
- ☐ 1 Mucho ☐ 2 Algo ☐ 3 Un poco ☐ 4 Nada
29. ¿ Ha tenido su comité la oportunidad de revisar la última evaluación del Programa bajo el Título I (1973-74)?
- ☐ 1 Sí ☐ 2 No ☐ 3 No Se
30. ¿ Qué tan útil, en su opinión, ha sido su comité al distrito escolar?
- ☐ 1 Muy útil ☐ 2 Algo útil ☐ 3 No útil ☐ 4 No Se
31. ¿ Qué tan bien representa su comité a los padres que pertenecen a grupos de minoría en su distrito?
- ☐ 1 Muy bien ☐ 2 Algo ☐ 3 Mal ☐ 4 No Se
32. ¿ Cómo representa su comité los diferentes niveles economicos en su distrito?
- ☐ 1 Muy bien ☐ 2 Algo ☐ 3 Mal ☐ 4 No se
33. En comparacion con otros miembros del comité de padres del Título I ¿ Cuanta influencia cree usted tiene en las decisiones del comité?
- ☐ 1 Mucha más que las otras ☐ 2 un poco más que los otros
- ☐ 3 más o menos igual que los otros ☐ 4 un poco menos ☐ 5 mucho menos
34. En muchos comites de Padres bajo el Título I hay ocasionalmente un miembro que le da al comité dirección valiosa. ¿Cuál de los siguientes desempeña mejor ese papel?
- ☐ 1 el Superintendente ☐ 2 El Director del Título I ☐ 3 El Principal
- ☐ 4 La maestra ☐ 5 Un Padre ☐ 6 Otro
35. ¿ Como clasificaría usted el trabajo de su comité?
- ☐ 1 excelente ☐ 2 bastante bueno ☐ 3 promedio ☐ 4 justo ☐ 5 muy limitado
36. ¿ Se les pagan los gastos a los miembros del comite de padres departe del distrito escolar?
- ☐ 1 Sí ☐ 2 No
- Si la respuesta es sí ¿ se les pagan los gastos a los miembros del concilio de padres por algunos de los siguientes?:
- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| . cuidado de niños | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 sí | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 No |
| . transportación | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 sí | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 No |
| . asistir sesiones/conferencias de entrenamiento fuera de la ciudad | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 sí | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 No |
| . si trabaja, se le paga por tiempo perdido de su trabajo cuando asiste juntas o conferencias | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 sí | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 No |

37. Si existe tal fondo en el distrito escolar, le parece a usted que es
☐ 1 demasiado ☐ 2 suficiente ☐ 3 no es suficiente

38. En lo general, ¿diría usted que su participación en el trabajo de su comité de padres bajo el Título I ha sido una experiencia valiosa para usted, para el comité, y para el desarrollo de programas especiales?

	Mucho	Algo	Un Poco	Ningun
. De valor personal	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
. De valor para el comité	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
. De valor para las escuelas	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
. De valor para la comunidad	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4

39. Por favor indique si esta de acuerdo o no con las siguientes declaraciones:

	Totalmente de acuerdo	Muy de acuerdo	Más o menos de acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Mucho en desacuerdo
. A los comites de padres bajo el Título I se les ha dado más crédito que lo que contribuyen. Realmente lo que contribuyen es insignificante.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
. Aunque "se veria bien" tener más gente pobre en los comites de padres bajo el Título I eso no nos ayuda mucho.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
. Los comites de padres bajo el Título I son en realidad "para papelería" y tienen muy poca o ninguna influencia en los programas bajo el Título I.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
. Los distritos escolares, por lo general, le "dictan" a los comites de padres el programa en vez de pedirles su opinión y consejo.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
. Los padres de hijos que participan en los programas bajo el Título I faltan en interes tocante lo que se lleva acabo en el Título I.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
. Los padres de hijos que participan en los programas bajo el Título I realmente no tienen el tiempo para participar en los comites de padres.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
. Los padres de hijos que participan en los programas bajo el Título I temen participar en las actividades respaldadas por el Título I	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5

Totalmente Muy de Mas o menos En Mucho en
de acuerdo acuerdo de acuerdo desacuerdo desacuerdo

- . Los padres de hijos que participan en los programas bajo el Título I tiene dificultad con el idioma Inglés y por esa razón no participan en las actividades respaldadas por el Título I

[1]

[2]

[3]

[4]

[5]

40. Por favor escriba sus sugerencias que en su opinión podría hacer que el comité de padres bajo el programa Título I fuera de mas utilidad para el programa que las escuelas ofrecen con fondos del mismo.

APPENDIX J

PERMISSION TO USE QUESTIONNAIRE



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE EDUCATION BUILDING, 721 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO 95814

October 23, 1974

Mr. Nick Vallado
Director of Special Programs
Division of Instruction
Corpus Christi Independent School District
515 North Carancahua
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403

Dear Nick,

Please accept this letter as authorization to use the questionnaires contained in my doctoral dissertation. I am just delighted that you will be able to make good use of them.

Keep up the great work you must be doing. Good luck to you.

Sincerely,

Ramiro Reyes, Chief
Office of Program Planning
and Development
(916) 445-0306

RR:pw

APPENDIX K

ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM GUIDE #44



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

ESEA Title I Program Guide #44
DCE/P&P

TO : Chief State School Officers March 18, 1968
FROM : Harold Howe II *H.H. II*
U.S. Commissioner of Education

SUBJECT: Revised Criteria for the Approval of Title I, ESEA, Applications
from Local Educational Agencies (Supersedes Program Guide #36)

State educational agencies may approve grants to local educational agencies under Title I only upon application and after making certain determinations which, "consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish," meet the requirements of Section 105(a). Also, Section 803(c) of the ESEA, as amended, states that the Commissioner shall require the adoption by State and local authorities of effective procedures for the coordination of all ESEA programs with other public and private programs, including community action programs, having the same or similar purposes. The revised criteria (attached) reflect the requirements of both Sections 105(a) and 803(c).

The revised criteria are based on the law and are derived from the regulations. They consist, essentially, of two types of statements; (a) those requiring specific determinations with respect to size, scope, and quality of program, participation of private school children, evaluation, dissemination, and the training of education aides; and (b) items requiring a showing by the applicant that in preparing its application it has taken into account certain priorities such as the various needs of educationally deprived children, the need for both regular school year and summer programs, and the relationship of the Title I program to the regular school program.

The criterion (Item VII) in Program Guide #36 on construction and equipment has been superseded by two separate criteria, one on construction and another on equipment. The explanatory sentence referring to a specific percentage of total project costs to be budgeted for equipment and construction has been deleted.

The criteria (numbered and underlined) and the accompanying explanations of factors to be considered in the development of approvable projects, along with this letter of transmittal, have been prepared for distribution by State offices to local educational agencies. Please let us know of your arrangements for such a distribution in your State.

Attachment

cc: State Title I Coordinators, ESEA

Criteria for Applications for
Grants to Local Educational Agencies
under Title I, ESEA

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 requires that the State educational agency make certain determinations "consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish. . . ."

These determinations must be made with respect to: selection of project areas; size, scope, and quality of projects and their potential for meeting the needs of educationally deprived children; participation of children enrolled in private schools; coordination of the Title I program with other programs having the same objectives; dissemination of information; methods and procedures for evaluating the results of the program; and the training of education aides.

The following criteria are based on the law and the regulations and were formulated to meet the need for a set of general statements of the essential characteristics of an approvable Title I program. Each criterion (numbered and underlined) is stated as an affirmative "finding" and is followed by an explanation of some of the factors to be considered in developing a program that will meet the criterion.

Each local educational agency should review its Title I program to be sure that none of these criteria has been overlooked before submitting an application to the State educational agency for its approval.

The State educational agency will review the application and advise the applicant which criteria, if any, have not been met. Unless the State educational agency finds that each criterion has been met, the application may not be approved.

1. THE SELECTION OF ATTENDANCE AREAS FOR TITLE I PROJECTS

1.1 The attendance areas selected for Title I projects are those areas which on the basis of the best available information have high concentrations of children from low-income families.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

Section 105(a)(1) of Title I requires that projects be designed to meet the needs of educationally deprived children living in school attendance areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families. By regulation the attendance areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families are those areas where the concentration of such children is as high as or higher than the average concentration for the district as a whole.

An "attendance area" for the purposes of Title I is an area served by a public school. For each such attendance area data must be secured on (a) the total number of children who according to their ages are eligible to attend the public school serving that area and (b) the number of such children who are from low-income families.

In making this determination it is not necessary for the LEA to use a particular income level, although a level of \$2,000 or \$3,000 would be appropriate, but the same level should be used for all attendance areas. In some cases income data are not available or are out-of-date and the number of children from low-income families will need to be estimated on the basis of the number of such children who are in families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), or who are receiving free lunches. Housing, health, or employment statistics may also be used in estimating the number of children from low-income families in each attendance area. Whatever data are used must be used uniformly throughout an applicant's district.

Normally the attendance units should be ranked according to the percentage of children from low-income families. However, in districts with extremely large variation in the sizes of the populations of its attendance units, such units may be ranked according to the average number of children per attendance unit. If necessary for reasons of equity the attendance units determined to have high concentrations of children from low-income families may include some areas ranked on one basis and some on the other. In such a case, however, the total number of attendance areas accepted as eligible areas for Title I purposes should not exceed the number of such units that would have been eligible if only one basis, i.e., percentage or average number of children from low-income families, had been used.

Elementary and secondary school attendance areas in the same school district may be ranked separately on the basis of the percentage or numerical concentrations of children from low-income families among the children eligible to attend such schools.

In all cases the number of children considered eligible to attend a particular school consists of all children of the appropriate ages including children attending private schools and children who have dropped out of school.

In some cases a whole school district or a group of contiguous school attendance areas may be regarded as a single area of high concentration of children from low-income families. This may be done, however, only if there are no wide variances in the concentrations of children from low-income families.

Some schools have no well-defined attendance area boundaries or receive numbers of children from outside the areas that have been designated for those schools. It may be necessary to base the ranking of the attendance areas for such schools on the percentage or number of children from low-income families actually enrolled in those schools while recognizing that other children, as explained below, will be included in the "target population" if the area is found to have a higher than average concentration of children from low-income families.

The purpose of the attendance area requirement is to identify the "target populations" of children who are to be considered for participation in Title I activities on the basis of educational deficiency and need for special services. Thus, for schools without well-defined boundaries or where children have been transferring in or out on open enrollment or freedom-of-choice plans, the "target population" should include (a) all of the children who are attending the particular public school which on the basis of enrollment has a high concentration of children from low-income families; (b) children who have been attending that school; and (c) children who would be attending that school if they were not attending a private school or another public school under a freedom-of-choice, open enrollment, or another plan designed to bring about desegregation.

2. COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS

- 2.1 The priority needs of educationally deprived children in the eligible attendance areas (target populations) were determined in consultation with teachers, parents, private school authorities, and representatives of other agencies which have a genuine and continuing interest in such children. The evidence of need and the bases for the assignment of priorities have been documented.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

The term "educationally deprived children" has been defined in the Title I regulations as:

". . . those children who have need for special educational assistance in order that their level of educational attainment may be raised to that appropriate for children of their age. The term includes children who are handicapped or whose needs for such special educational assistance result from poverty, neglect, delinquency, or cultural or linguistic isolation from the community at large." 45 CFR 116.1(i)

The first step in the development of a compensatory program to meet the needs of such children is to evaluate the evidence concerning the educational deficiencies of children who live in the eligible attendance areas. If necessary, additional evidence should be secured before extensive programming is undertaken. The evaluation of the previous year's Title I program often provides considerable information concerning the educational deficiencies of children in the areas where Title I projects have been conducted. Specific attention should be given to the information available on educational retardation, results of educational tests, linguistic or racial isolation, welfare and nutrition, physical and mental handicaps, and other pertinent information on which the incidence and severity of the needs of children in the project areas can be established.

It is essential that public and private school teachers and other staff members, parents, and representatives of related programs and agencies be involved in the early stages of program planning and in discussions concerning the needs of children in the various eligible attendance areas. They are often able to corroborate or offer insights concerning the evidence of educational deficiencies. They will be much more likely to lend support to a program of special educational services if, as a result of their involvement, they understand the premises on which such a program is based.

Officials of community action, welfare, juvenile protection, and other agencies which have responsibilities for helping people--children or adults--overcome the effects of poverty are among those to be consulted concerning their views on the needs of the children in eligible attendance areas.

The objective of the consultations concerning the educational needs of children in the eligible attendance areas should be the development of a carefully documented list of needs in order of priority for the following groups of children:

Preschool Children

The general need for early diagnosis and for compensatory educational services for preschool children in predominantly low-income areas is widely recognized. Many of these children, while yet without regular school experience, already show a lack of intellectual and social growth. Unless they can be motivated and stimulated they are not likely to experience much success in their first years in the regular school program.

The applicant should definitely consider the needs of preschool children in planning its Title I program. Opportunities for children to participate in Project Head Start should be fully explored with the local community action agency, and full advantage should be taken of the availability of this resource. Where Head Start funds are not available or are insufficient, the applicant should give priority consideration to meeting the needs of preschool children through the use of Title I funds or, if possible, through the coordinated use of Head Start and Title I funds.

Community action groups are often interested in programs for preschool children, particularly if they are involved or have been involved as grantee agencies for Head Start programs funded under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Every effort should be made to assist such groups to secure Head Start grants and thus reduce the demand for similar programs under Title I. In highly impoverished areas a community action agency may be able to provide health and welfare services for preschool children on the basis of financial need while the school-oriented program for all of the children of preschool age living in that area is provided under Title I.

Where Day Care Centers have been established for children in families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the local educational agency in consultation with the Head Start program grantees should explore the possibility of their adding needed educational components to the programs to be conducted in those Centers.

Children in Early Elementary School

The needs of children in the early elementary school grades should be carefully assessed. These children already manifest in their behavior the intellectual and social deprivation that has characterized their lives. There is considerable evidence that special programs can be helpful for educationally deprived children in those grade groups. The development of such a program will require a careful assessment of the particular characteristics, behavioral patterns, and needs of the children who live in the applicant's eligible attendance areas.

Applicants should identify the needs of children in the early elementary school grades to preserve and build on progress they may have made in Head Start and Title I preschool classes. Priority consideration should be given by the applicant to such children in the Title I program in order to avoid interruption of needed enriched services, including health and welfare services which they had been receiving under Head Start or other quality preschool programs. Applicants should be encouraged to consider programs of instruction and services outlined in the criteria for the Follow Through program to assure that sequential learning experiences are made available to children based on preschool and kindergarten preparation for cognitive growth and development.

Children in Later Elementary School and Secondary School Years

It is in the later elementary and secondary school years that educational deficiencies become most apparent and most difficult to treat. By this time many of the children are no longer responding in any positive way to their school environment and are well on their way to becoming dropouts. Their academic and behavioral problems are extremely varied and complex and will require the most careful study in order to establish the needs on which an effective compensatory program can be developed. Remedial programs should be built on a thorough consideration of the potential of individualized instruction, tutoring and personalized guidance services.

Dropouts

The needs of children who have actually dropped out of the regular school program should also receive specific attention. With the help of other agencies these children should be located and identified and every effort should be made to evaluate their educational needs in order to provide a sound basis for the planning of special educational programs to meet those needs.

Children in Institutions

Children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children who have been counted in determining the applicant's allocation, even though they may not be living in an eligible attendance area, are to be considered as eligible for participation in Title I projects. Opportunities should be provided for the participation of such children in services designed to meet their needs.

Handicapped Children

The unmet needs of handicapped children should be considered. It is expected that such children will be included in Title I programs in project areas where the existing level of services for such children is recognized as being inadequate. Diagnostic procedures should be required as a part of all service programs for these children. Coordination with Title VI, ESEA, programs must be demonstrated.

Non-English Speaking Children

Every applicant should be aware of the needs of non-English speaking and bilingual children who live in the eligible attendance areas. Special efforts should be made to meet the needs of these children through Title I or through another program in order that they may learn to participate fully in the life of their community. The strengths of their ethnic backgrounds should be utilized in the development of special programs related to their needs.

The needs of the children in each of the foregoing groups should be stated in behavioral terms and, when appropriate, with reference to objective measures of educational growth or achievement. These needs must be set forth on the Title I application in order of priority.

3. PLANNING

3.1 The Title I program was planned as an integral part of a comprehensive compensatory educational program involving the coordinated use of resources from other programs and agencies.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1) and 883(c)

While the authority of Title I is directed solely toward the special needs of educationally deprived children, there are other programs and agencies which are also authorized to provide services to meet some of those same needs. It is important, therefore, when the priority needs of the children have been determined, that the various other agencies and program representatives be aware of those needs, particularly with respect to needs for improved nutrition, treatment and prevention of diseases and disabilities, and other needs indirectly related to the educational process.

Program representatives in the local educational agency and in the other interested agencies should develop the broad objectives for the comprehensive compensatory educational program. Once these objectives have been agreed upon, consultations should begin on the organization and utilization of all available resources to realize these objectives. This will require careful examination of the authority and responsibility of each of the various agencies. Each agency, however, should explore how it can most effectively, within its authority and responsibility, contribute to the realization of the objectives of the compensatory educational program.

Many of the other agencies involved in assessing the needs of children have been serving children and parents in various ways and may be receptive to new ideas about how their services can be more effective. If these agencies have new funds or are reprogramming the use of existing funds, it is very important that this be made known to the local public school authorities so that Title I funds are not inadvertently programmed for the same purposes.

The local educational agency itself should also examine the possibility of using other Federal grant programs, such as other titles of ESEA, NDEA, and EPDA, to meet the needs of children in the project areas. For some local educational agencies additional State funds or private funds may be available for this purpose. The Title I application should provide information concerning related programs and the specific provisions that will be made for coordination.

Some of the other agencies may have to follow economic criteria with respect to the selection of children and families for services, whereas the local educational agency must use educational criteria in selecting children from among those who live in areas that meet required economic criteria. Many of the same children, however, will be found to be in need of services on grounds of both economic and educational deprivation. Under these circumstances it is important that the agency with the major responsibility and the best resources deliver each of the needed services in coordination with, but without duplication of, the work of the other agencies.

Some program objectives, therefore, will be the primary responsibility of the local Title I program; others will fall to other Federal (direct grant or State plan) programs to be conducted by the local educational agency, to the federally financed programs of other agencies, to various State and local programs and, in some cases, to private agencies. If a Model Cities program or a Neighborhood Services Center is in operation or is being planned, the appropriate program representatives should be consulted concerning the need for the coordination of their programs with the compensatory education program.

The Title I application should present sufficient information to show that the resources available to the local educational agency and to other local agencies have been considered in planning the program and that where appropriate those resources have been committed to certain program objectives. The application should show not only that the resources of other programs were considered in planning but also that there will be appropriate coordination of related services in the actual operation of a comprehensive program.

All proposals to provide health, nutrition, welfare, and recreation services under Title I should be fully justified on the basis that the resources of other agencies are not adequate to meet high priority needs for these services.

4. PROGRAM DESIGN

- 4.1 Consideration has been given to the relationship of the Title I program to the regular school program and to the possibility of modifying that program so as to provide a better base for the addition of supplementary compensatory educational services.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

Probably the most obvious indication of a child's need for special educational assistance under Title I is his inability to respond constructively to the regular school program. In many cases this program can be modified and integrated with the services to be

provided under Title I so as to provide the child with a total program adapted to his special needs. In this connection, the requirement that applicants maintain regular school programs in the project areas at the same levels as they would have been maintained if Title I funds were not available applies only to expenditures and not to the program itself.

The Title I program, if it is to be truly supplementary, must be designed to extend and reinforce the regular school program. Insofar as possible, the regular school program, the Title I program, and any other special programs should be designed as a total program to meet the needs of the children to be served. This may require revision of the regular school curriculum and will in any event require communication between regular school and Title I staff concerning their respective programs and the ways in which they can be improved to better meet the needs of the educationally deprived children involved in both programs.

- 4.2 The application shows that the Title I program is based on a consideration of the relative needs of children at all ages and grade levels and is designed to meet a limited number of high priority needs which cannot be met through the regular school program or other programs.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

Title I resources should be concentrated on those children who are most in need of special assistance. Normally this process will involve determinations of both the needs of individual groups of children and of the possibilities for success in working with those groups. Decisions should be made in terms of the effectiveness of providing comprehensive services to a limited number of children in a few groups as opposed to the ineffectiveness of spreading diluted services over all eligible children in all groups. Consideration must also be given to the availability of assistance from other agencies and programs for specific groups of children.

- 4.3 The Title I program is based on clearly stated objectives and desired outcomes and, if executed as planned, will very likely result in reduction of educational deficiency.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

The compensatory education objectives to be met through Title I should be clearly and realistically stated in terms of the types of changes that are sought and the degree of change that is expected by the end of the year as a result of each major activity. Where appropriate, reference should be made to evaluations of similar activities carried on during preceding years, the program changes that have been made as a result of such evaluations, and

the types of improved performance expected by the end of the new program year. As applicants gain more and more experience they should become more precise concerning what they expect to accomplish through their Title I programs.

- 4.4 Due consideration has been given to the provisions of Title I services not only during the regular school year but also during the summer.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

Applicants should examine closely the possibility for meeting urgent needs through summer programs. The summer period provides opportunities for new activities which, while designed to overcome educational deficiency, can be more specifically and extensively adapted to the needs of the children to be served. Special efforts should be made, however, to be sure that the children who participate receive assistance designed to continue the gains they have made in the preceding school year or to prepare them for the next school year's activities under the regular school or the Title I program.

- 4.5 Educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools will have genuine opportunities to participate in the Title I program on the basis of need as determined by the comprehensive assessment of the needs of all children in the eligible low-income areas. The high priority needs of private school children residing in those areas will be met with services that are comparable in scope and quality to those provided to meet the high priority needs of public school children.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(2)

The applicant's assessment of needs of children at various grade and age levels must include the children in the eligible public school attendance areas who are enrolled in private schools. This assessment is to be carried out in consultation with private school authorities and to provide the basis for (a) determining the special services in which private school children will have genuine opportunities to participate, and (b) selecting the private school children for whom such services are to be provided.

The needs of private school children in the eligible areas may not be identical with those of public school children and, hence, may require different services and activities. Those services and activities, however, must be comparable in quality, scope, and opportunity for participation to those provided for public school children with needs of equally high priority. "Comparability" of services should be attained in terms of the numbers of educationally deprived children in the project area in both public and private schools and related to their specific needs, which in turn should produce an equitable sharing of Title I resources by both groups of children.

The application should provide sufficient evidence to assure the State educational agency that the local educational agency will maintain administrative direction and control over Title I activities conducted on private premises. Title I instructional activities and related services, the use of equipment, and all personnel performing services on private premises under the Title I program are to be under the active supervision of the applicant local educational agency.

- 4.6 The applicant's Title I program will be conducted in a limited number of eligible attendance areas and will provide relatively higher concentrations of services in areas having the highest incidence of poverty.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

The applicant should make sure that the needs of children in eligible areas with the highest incidence of poverty have been met before considering the needs of children in eligible areas in which the incidence is much lower. The program in the areas with the highest incidence should be designed to serve a larger proportion of children and to provide them with a greater variety of services than programs in areas with lesser incidences of poverty.

- 4.7 Title I services will be programmed so that those services will be concentrated on a limited number of children.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

The Title I program, if it is to have "sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress," as required by the Act, must be concentrated on a limited number of children. Furthermore, it should be expected that each child will need not a single service but a variety of services which should be provided under Title I and, if possible, through other agencies.

The proposed Title I expenditure per child is an indication of the concentration of effort. The greater the concentration of effort, as indicated by investment per child, the greater the likelihood that the program will have a significant impact on the children in the program. The investment per child on an annual basis for a program of compensatory educational services which supplement the child's regular school activities should be expected to equal about one-half the expenditure per child from State and local funds for the applicant's regular school program. The investment per child per year for a program such as a preschool program which provides all of the services for the child involved should be expected to equal the applicant's full expenditure per pupil from State and local funds.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE I PROGRAMS

- 5.1 The proposed staffing pattern is appropriate for the activities and services to be provided.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

The ratio of project staff to the number of children to be served should be high enough to provide concentrated, individualized services. Use should be made of a variety of personnel other than professional classroom staff. Parents of participating children, volunteers, and persons in the community with special skills should be considered in the selection of the staff needed to provide the specified services.

5.2 Inservice training will be geared specifically to the requirements of the Title I program and the needs of the Title I staff.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

The orientation, indoctrination, and development of the personnel who have been selected to conduct the Title I program is probably the most critical phase of the Title I program. The concentration of the Title I program on children who have not been developing satisfactorily under the regular school program indicates the need for new approaches to the development of teaching and other personnel.

The methods of preparing personnel to undertake specific Title I activities and for their continued inservice development should be closely geared to those activities. Furthermore, the inservice training program should be of sufficient size and depth to have an impact on the participant and the Title I program. Case studies of other ongoing programs, "sensitivity" training, and other approaches specifically designed to help teachers do a better job of providing special services for and relating to children with special needs should be tried and evaluated. Institutions of higher education should be involved in conducting training programs for Title I personnel and in following up with the evaluation of those programs. The use of old ready-made courses not related to problems confronting the Title I staff should, of course, be avoided.

5.3 Specific provision has been made for professional staff members and education aides assigned to assist them to participate together in coordinated training programs.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(11)

The 1967 amendments to Title I specifically require as a condition for the approval of projects involving the use of education aides the presentation of well-developed plans for training programs in which the aides and the professional staff members they will assist participate together. The program provided for such staff members and their aides should, as stated in item 5.2, Inservice Training, be closely allied to the tasks they will be performing. Each Title I application involving the use of education aides should set forth (a) definite proposals for the joint training of those aides and the professional staff members with whom the aides will work or (b) a detailed description of such a program in which most

of the aides and the professional staff members they will assist have already participated. Special attention should be given to the development of the most effective ways the professional staff members and their aides can work together and of ways in which a long term training program may assist both professional staff members and aides to take on increasing responsibilities. If appropriate, consideration should be given to providing the aides with training leading toward teacher certification. Such training may begin with Title I funds and continue as long as the aides are employed in Title I activities. After this, other appropriate funding should be sought.

5.4 The Title I program includes appropriate activities or services in which parents will be involved.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

The applicant should demonstrate that adequate provision has been made in the Title I program for the participation of and special services for the parents of children involved in the programs. The employment of parents in the Title I projects is but one way to implement this provision. The primary goal of such activities and services should be to build the capabilities of the parents to work with the school in a way which supports their children's well-being, growth, and development.

5.5 Title I activities or services will be offered at locations where the children can best be served.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

All Title I program activities must be designed for educationally deprived children who live in eligible attendance areas but should be offered at locations where those children can best be served. Any proposed Title I activities (including the construction of school facilities) which, because of location or for other reasons, would in effect prolong the racial, social, or linguistic isolation of the children to be served would be self-defeating and should not be approved. Applicants for Title I funds should design effective compensatory education programs which include, where appropriate, measures for fostering integration in the community.

In some cases, the locations where the children can best be served will be outside the project area. The application should indicate clearly the locations both inside and outside the project areas where Title I services will be offered and the number of children from inside and outside the project areas who will participate at each such location.

No child who lives in a project area and who would otherwise receive Title I services is to be denied such services because of his exercise of a right to enroll in another school. Children residing outside the project areas who can benefit from the services may participate on a space-available basis.

5.6 Expenditures for equipment will be limited to the minimum required to implement approved Title I activities or services.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

All requests for the approval of funds for the purchase of initial or replacement equipment must be fully justified. This means that the applicant must show that (a) equipment has been selected and designated for specific purposes in connection with proposed project activities, (b) the proposed equipment is essential to the effective implementation of the project, (c) such equipment is not available in the applicant's regular or Title I inventories for use in the project, and (d) the applicant has the trained staff to utilize the proposed new equipment effectively or that arrangements will be made to prepare staff for such use. The State educational agency will review existing Title I inventories and insure that equipment already purchased with Title I funds is being effectively used for Title I purposes. Equipment that is no longer appropriate for use in Title I projects should be sold or transferred to the applicant's regular inventory and the appropriate amounts refunded to the Federal Government.

5.7 Title I funds will be used for construction only when necessary to implement projects designed to meet the highest priority needs of educationally deprived children in the applicant's district.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(1)

Whenever possible Title I activities and services should be organized and scheduled for operation in existing facilities. If existing facilities cannot be used, consideration should first be given to the rental of space in ready-made permanent or portable facilities. Rental or construction of school facilities (including portable units) not specifically related to a Title I project activity should not be allowed except in unusual situations where (a) such construction is necessary in order to bring children together at locations where they can be served effectively under Title I and (b) the local educational agency is unable to provide such facilities with its own funds. The construction of permanent new facilities should be regarded as a local responsibility except in extreme cases of financial need.

- 5.8 The Title I program includes provisions for the dissemination of information to teachers and administrators for their use in planning and conducting projects.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(9)

In addition to the dissemination that takes place through inservice training programs for the Title I staff, relevant information concerning compensatory education from such sources as research and demonstration reports should be made available through appropriate forms of communication to Title I and other school personnel servicing participating children. Emphasis should be placed on the dissemination of information which will contribute to improved program planning and operation both in the applicant's district and in other districts. Conversely, applicants should be able to demonstrate that their Title I staff members in planning program activities have considered the information that has been made available to them. Applicants should develop information dissemination programs to include involvement of the community and parents of children served by the project. Dissemination procedures should include such things as annual reports, newsletters, news releases and other material for newspapers, magazines, radio, and television for the purpose of informing the public and other educators about program objectives and procedures and gain support of the project.

6. EVALUATION

- 6.1 The Title I program includes specific evaluation procedures that are appropriate for the services to be provided and consistent with approved program objectives. Adequate staff and other resources will be provided to implement the procedures.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(6)

The Title I application must include a description of the methods and procedures to be used to evaluate each major activity. No application can be approved unless these procedures are described in sufficient detail to enable the State educational agency to appraise their potential effectiveness.

The application should also contain sufficient information for the State educational agency to determine the adequacy of the resources the local educational agency expects to use in carrying out the evaluation of its major program activities. Private school officials should be involved in the formulation of evaluation procedures for any activity in which private school children are expected to participate.

The adequacy of the applicant's plans and resources for evaluation must be assessed in terms of the objectives that have been approved for the program and the nature of the major activities.

7. TITLE I FUNDS SUPPLEMENTARY TO STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS

- 7.1 The Title I program and the regular school program have been planned and budgeted to assure that Federal funds will supplement and not supplant State or local funds and that State and local funds will be used to provide services in the project areas that are comparable to the services provided in non-project areas.

Authority: 20 USC 240e(a)(1)

It is expected that services provided within the district with State and local funds will be made available to all attendance areas and to all children without discrimination. The instructional and ancillary services provided with State and local funds for children in the project areas should be comparable to those provided for children in the non-project areas, particularly with respect to class size, special services, and the number and variety of personnel. Title I funds, therefore, are not to be used to supplant State and local funds which are already being expended in the project areas or which would be expended in those areas if the services in those areas were comparable to those for non-project areas. This means that services that are already available or will be made available for children in the non-project areas should be provided on an equal basis in the project areas with State and local funds rather than with Title I funds. It is intended also, in the application of this policy, that as services initiated in the project areas under Title I are extended to children residing in non-project areas the applicant will assume full support of those services under its regular school budget. This will release Title I funds to provide new activities for eligible children.

7. TITLE I FUNDS SUPPLEMENTARY TO STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS

- 7.1 The Title I program and the regular school program have been planned and budgeted to assure that Federal funds will supplement and not supplant State or local funds and that State and local funds will be used to provide services in the project areas that are comparable to the services provided in non-project areas.

Authority: 20 USC 240e(a)(1)

It is expected that services provided within the district with State and local funds will be made available to all attendance areas and to all children without discrimination. The instructional and ancillary services provided with State and local funds for children in the project areas should be comparable to those provided for children in the non-project areas, particularly with respect to class size, special services, and the number and variety of personnel. Title I funds, therefore, are not to be used to supplant State and local funds which are already being expended in the project areas or which would be expended in those areas if the services in those areas were comparable to those for non-project areas. This means that services that are already available or will be made available for children in the non-project areas should be provided on an equal basis in the project areas with State and local funds rather than with Title I funds. It is intended also, in the application of this policy, that as services initiated in the project areas under Title I are extended to children residing in non-project areas the applicant will assume full support of those services under its regular school budget. This will release Title I funds to provide new activities for eligible children.