

Federal Compensatory Education Programs of the 1960s:
The Implementation of Head Start and Title I Services in Roanoke County Public Schools

Juliette Burke Myers

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

David Parks, Chair

Bonnie Billingsley

Dale Margheim

N. Wayne Tripp

November 4, 2008

Blacksburg, Virginia

Key Words: Federal Compensatory Programs, Economic Opportunity Act, Head Start,
Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, Roanoke County, Virginia

Federal Compensatory Education Programs of the 1960s:
The Implementation of Head Start and Title I Services in Roanoke County Public Schools
Juliette Burke Myers

ABSTRACT

The federal government has taken an increasingly active role in its involvement in public education since the turn of the twentieth century. Prior to World War II, federal intervention in public education was a result of war initiatives. Following World War II, the United States experienced a number of social and economic conditions that had implications for public education. Among these were a rapid increase in student enrollments resulting from the post World War II baby boom, continuing racial segregation, and chronic inferior education for African Americans and economically disadvantaged students of all races and ethnic groups. To combat the economic, social, and political implications associated with these conditions, the federal government worked with states and local departments of education to formulate plans for educational reform.

During the 1960s, federal aid to public schools grew from half a billion dollars in 1960 to 3.5 billion in 1970 (Kantor & Lowe, 1995). Federal aid was increased to provide support for educational facilities and to provide compensatory educational programs for economically disadvantaged students through Head Start of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Educators were encouraged to develop programs to meet the needs of the minority, disadvantaged, and special education populations through the provisions of these acts and subsequent appropriations. This is the report of a historical study of the federal response to the needs of the identified students as implemented through Roanoke County Public Schools.

The purpose of this study is to provide a historical account of the development of Head Start and Title I programs in Roanoke County Public Schools within the national context of Head Start and Title I programs. The potential impact of this study includes a greater understanding of the influences that led to the development of Head Start and Title I at the national level and the subsequent educational services implemented through Head Start and Title I programs in Roanoke County Public Schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Conducting this study would not have been possible without the support, encouragement, and patience of my husband, John. Our wedding vows included him washing the dishes, but it did not include me getting a Ph.D. With the accomplishment of each degree, I've asked that the diploma state, "the Myers family" receives the degree of, although he has no need for the recognition. He has quietly remained in the background supporting me through each endeavor. He is a model of integrity and love to me and to our children, Drew and Austin.

Drew and Austin have been subjected to their mom working on various degrees since the times of their births. As an infant, Drew was taken to class with his dad while he taught so I could attend class. John had a playpen stationed in his office for the boys so I could take "one more class". Our boys have learned through example the importance of perseverance and devotion. They have contributed to my accomplishment of this goal through their understanding, kindness, and willingness to assume responsibilities within the family. My hope is that they will pursue life-long learning opportunities and to impart the same values to their children.

My parents, Richard and Judith Burke, have supported me through every accomplishment in my life. They sparked my interest in life-long learning by providing travel opportunities to me in my youth. They didn't tell me "no" when I wanted to back-pack through Europe as a teenager, although they probably should have done so. They are a model of devotion to their children and to the goals we have established. If only every child could be so fortunate as to have parents like mine.

My chair, David Parks, has pushed and prodded me to not only complete the requirements of the degree, but to engage in ongoing reflective practices that have led to a greater understanding of the significance of historical events within the context of the educational setting. He has patiently waited as I have struggled to make sense of the information. He has challenged me to grow beyond my initial capacity and has never allowed me to settle for sub-standard work. He is largely responsible for creating in me an educator who participates in ongoing reflective practice for the benefit of the learning community.

The members of my committee, Bonnie Billingsley, Dale Margheim, and Wayne Tripp have provided insightful feedback over the past two years. They have allowed me to continue to work towards the goal of accomplishing the requirements of the degree even though the scope of

the study has, at times, been unmanageable and unfocused. Their patience and commitment is sincerely appreciated.

Hugh Tucker, Joseph Kyle, Fred, Eichelman, Carolyn Eichelman, Cabell Brand, Marty Robison, Gary Kelly, Lorraine Lange, Ben Williams, Deedie Keagy, Joan Farley, and BJ Brewer, have each devoted their time to the completion of this study. They have graciously allowed me to interview them, assisting the gathering of evidence, and the sharing of materials to enhance the validity of the study.

The faculty and staff at Cave Spring Middle School and Glenvar Middle School have patiently endured my journey to the completion of this degree. They have listened to my stories, my frustrations, and have supported me through every leg of this journey. Roanoke County Public Schools is fortunate to have generations of educators who support life-long learning opportunities for the members of the learning community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSEix

METHODOLOGY ix

LANGUAGE OF THE TIMES.....xi

LEADERS OF ROANOKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS.....xii

PROLOGUE.....xiii

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF FEDERAL FUNDING OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS: 1900-1965xiii

CHAPTER I CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES PROMPTING FEDERAL INTERVENTION IN EDUCATION 1

 INCREASED STUDENT ENROLLMENT 1

 INCREASED AWARENESS OF POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES 1

 INFERIOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS 6

Equality of Educational Opportunity: The Coleman Report 12

 Segregation 14

School Facilities and Curriculum..... 15

Teachers..... 16

Student Body 17

Achievement 17

Findings 18

 INFERIOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS 18

Relationship Between School Personnel and Students 19

Remedial Services 20

Relationship Between School and Life..... 21

CHAPTER II LYNDON B. JOHNSON’S GREAT SOCIETY: FEDERAL COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS OF THE 1960S..... 23

 GREAT SOCIETY 23

War on Poverty: Economic Opportunity Act of 1964..... 25

War on Poverty: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965..... 28

CHAPTER III A CLOSER LOOK AT THE DEVELOPMENT OF HEAD START AND TITLE I SERVICES IN THE UNITED STATES 32

 HEAD START OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964 32

 TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 36

 EVALUATION OF TITLE I SERVICES 38

CHAPTER IV SETTING THE STAGE: LOCAL CHANGES AFFECTING ROANOKE COUNTY EDUCATION PROGRAMS 41

 INCREASED POPULATION IN ROANOKE COUNTY, VIRGINIA 41

 INCREASED STUDENT ENROLLMENT 42

School Construction in Roanoke County 43

 RACIAL DESEGREGATION 45

DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS	47
<i>Total Action Against Poverty in the Roanoke Valley</i>	48
ACCEPTANCE OF FEDERAL FUNDS BY ROANOKE COUNTY.....	52
CHAPTER V THE LOCAL SCENE: IMPLEMENTATION OF HEAD START IN ROANOKE COUNTY (VIRGINIA) PUBLIC SCHOOLS.....	54
APPOINTMENT OF FRED EICHELMAN AS HEAD START COORDINATOR.....	55
IMPLEMENTATION OF HEAD START IN ROANOKE COUNTY	55
<i>Head Start: Summer 1965</i>	57
<i>Head Start: Summer 1966</i>	58
<i>Head Start: Summer 1967</i>	58
<i>Evaluation of Head Start Services in Roanoke County</i>	59
<i>Transition from Head Start to Kindergarten in Roanoke County</i>	60
<i>Kindergarten: 1967-1968</i>	61
<i>Kindergarten: 1968-1970</i>	62
<i>Kindergarten: 1970-1971</i>	63
<i>Kindergarten: 1971-1972</i>	65
SUMMARY	65
CHAPTER VI THE LOCAL SCENE: IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE I SERVICES IN ROANOKE COUNTY (VIRGINIA) PUBLIC SCHOOLS.....	66
TITLE I PROGRAM IN VIRGINIA	66
TITLE I PROGRAM IN ROANOKE COUNTY.....	68
APPOINTMENT OF HUGH TUCKER AS COORDINATOR OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS	69
TITLE I SERVICES IN ROANOKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS: 1967-1971	70
<i>Title I Services: 1966-1967</i>	70
Personnel to Support Title I Services.....	71
Special Education Services	71
Remedial Services.....	72
<i>Title I Services: 1967-1968</i>	72
Personnel to Support Title I Services.....	72
Special Education Services	73
Remedial Services.....	73
Food & Health Services	73
<i>Title I Services: 1968-1969</i>	74
<i>Title I Services: 1969-1970</i>	74
Personnel to Support Title I Services.....	74
Elementary Guidance Services	75
Migrant Services	76
<i>Title I Services: 1970-1971</i>	76
EVALUATION OF TITLE I SERVICES	77
SUMMARY	78
CHAPTER VII FEDERAL COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS OF THE 1960S: ROANOKE COUNTY (VIRGINIA) RESPONDS TO FEDERAL FUNDING OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS	79
SUMMARY	79

CONCLUSION.....	82
EPILOGUE	86
NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001	86
NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001 IN VIRGINIA.....	87
FEDERAL COMPENSATORY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN ROANOKE COUNTY IN 2008.....	88
<i>Head Start/Kindergarten</i>	88
<i>Title I Services</i>	89
REFLECTIONS ON THE OUTCOMES OF FEDERAL COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS IN ROANOKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS.....	90
REFERENCES.....	93
APPENDIX A LIMITATIONS	103
APPENDIX B FUTURE RESEARCH.....	105
APPENDIX C FEDERAL COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF THE 1960S: THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HEAD START AND TITLE I SERVICES IN ROANOKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS CONSENT DOCUMENT	106
APPENDIX D IRB AMENDMENT APPROVAL.....	112

List of Tables

Table 1 *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 - Office of education expenditures:*
Fiscal years 1965-1971 [in thousands of dollars]30

Table 2 *Roanoke County Schools, Student Enrollments, 1950 – 1975*43

Table 3 *Virginia: Title I Allotment 1966-1970*67

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to provide an historical account of the development of Head Start and Title I programs in Roanoke County Public Schools within the national context of Head Start and Title I programs. A brief historical overview of federal funding of educational programs is provided, including the conditions that led to the development of compensatory programs by the federal government during the 1960s, a description of the implementation of Head Start and Title I programs at the national level, and a description of the implementation of Head Start and Title I in Roanoke County Public Schools. The potential impact of this study includes a greater understanding of the influences that led to the development of Head Start and Title I at the national level, an understanding of the subsequent implementation of Head Start and Title I in Roanoke County Public Schools, and a better understanding of the economic, social, and political outcomes associated with the acceptance of federal funding to provide Head Start and Title I services.

METHODOLOGY

Barzun and Graff (2004) stated that history is an integral part of our lives, forming our beliefs, speech, institutions, and feelings. Barzun and Graff argued that because history largely defines who we are, the historical researcher must be connected with every aspect of learning, being both a *specialist* and a *generalist* in an attempt to capture the essence of the shared experiences reflective of the time. As a specialist, information is triangulated through the use of primary sources to confirm the validity of evidence. Primary sources may include information gathered from interviews, original documents, and artifacts. As a generalist, interpretations are made from selectively gathered historical facts.

Gathering information for this study has been fragmented and derived from primary sources, from interviews conducted with Hugh Tucker, Joseph Kyle, Fred Eichelman, Carolyn Eichelman, Cabell Brand, and Gary Kelly; conversations with Lorraine Lange, superintendent of Roanoke County Public Schools; BJ Brewer, associate director of instruction of Roanoke County Public Schools; Ben Williams, director of testing of Roanoke County Public Schools; Marty Robison, former assistant superintendent of Roanoke County Public Schools; and Joan Farley, guidance counselor in Roanoke County Public Schools; newspaper articles at both the national and local levels; literature written at the time of the development of programs from the national

and local levels; federal and local government documents; Virginia Superintendent of Public Education memos; Virginia and Roanoke County annual reports; Roanoke County school board minutes; Roanoke County census reports; and Roanoke County economic and base analysis reports.

Those interviewed for this study are products of history and of society; they cannot be removed from either history or society, thus creating potential bias from personal experiences (Carr, 1969). To minimize bias, information gathered through the interview process was triangulated with newspaper articles, literature, government documents, memos, annual reports, school board minutes, census reports, and economic analysis reports.

As the researcher, I have made interpretations from selectively gathered historical facts as they relate to the economic, social, and political conditions of the time. As a product of my own social environment, my interpretations are biased, and it has been my responsibility to identify these biases and to attempt to correct them with evidence. I have attempted to understand and to communicate the social conditions reflective of the time and actions taken, without projecting my own personal bias for the reasons decisions were made.

I have accepted the responsibility of accurately reporting the facts in a logically organized manner and of honestly communicating information with a willingness to concede hypotheses if evidence proves contrary to initial beliefs. It was my understanding prior to interviewing Hugh Tucker that it was his responsibility to assist in the coordination of Head Start. This perception was incorrect. Hugh Tucker, coordinator of federal programs, did not coordinate Head Start efforts. Head Start was coordinated by Fred Eichelman until the program was eliminated prior to the summer of 1968.

The research process has been a constant narrowing process from a broad literature review of the influence of principal preparation programs on the development of educational programs, 1820-2005; to the influence of Arnold R. Burton, superintendent of Roanoke County Public Schools, on the development of educational programs, 1965-1980; to the influence of federal educational compensatory programs on the implementation of Head Start and Title I services in Roanoke County Public Schools during the 1960s. The common theme that has remained in each of these research efforts has been the influences leading to the development of educational programs, but with a more manageable and specific topic of inquiry with each attempt.

Through my research, I have explored new leads, made connections, and formed interpretations from the evidence. Those interviewed shared with me information that led me to conduct additional interviews that I did not initially intend to conduct. I have studied documents that referenced additional documents which led me to new evidence. Each of these endeavors has contributed to a greater understanding of the social, economic, and political conditions contributing to the development of federal educational compensatory programs of the 1960s.

Reflecting on the philosophies of Collingwood (1993), Carr (1969), and Barzun and Graff (2004), I have learned that the creation of a historical document is not limited to a chronological listing of events or eras, but is rather an interpretation of those events. As a historian, I have investigated social, economic, and political problems for the purpose of illuminating a phenomenon within the confines of the influence of federal compensatory educational programs on the implementation of Head Start and Title I services in Roanoke County Public Schools. By combining the practice of logical and orderly research with the art of meaningful interpretation, I have made new discoveries about Head Start and Title I programs in Roanoke County Public Schools from the implementation of these services beginning in the 1960s.

LANGUAGE OF THE TIMES

In the course of this study, terminology is used that is reflective of the period of time. During the 1960s, African Americans were either referred to as Blacks or Negroes. Black people are defined to be individuals of a racial group with dark skin color (Davis, 1966). Negroes are defined to be individuals of a black African ancestry (Davis, 1966). During the 1960s, the term Negro was considered an acceptable term to refer to individuals of African descent, but was later considered an ethnic slur unless the term was used within an historical context (Major, 1994). In 2008, individuals living in the United States who are of Sub-Saharan African descent are either referred to as Blacks or African Americans. For the purpose of this study, individuals who are of black African descent will be referred to as African Americans.

Economically disadvantaged persons are racially diverse individuals who live below the poverty level, as determined by federal poverty guidelines. Culturally disadvantaged persons are racially diverse individuals who have limited opportunities due to the location of their residence (National Education Association, 1962). During the 1960s, individuals living in portions of the southern states were considered to be culturally disadvantaged. Racially disadvantaged persons

are individuals whose opportunities are compromised due to their racial origin. During the 1960s, racially disadvantaged persons were predominately African Americans, but included Spanish speaking migrants (National Education Association, 1962). Disadvantaged persons are individuals who have inferior opportunities because of their income, place of residence, or race.

During the 1960s, political terms included *war on poverty*. To encourage political support for federal initiatives to fund education, President Johnson intentionally used the term *war* to conjure the same sense of urgency and protection needed to defend economically disadvantaged students. Politicians attempted to find a term other than *poverty* to refer to those individuals with limited incomes, but no other term conveyed the true status of these individuals and so *poverty* was the term ultimately used to describe individuals living below a determined income level. *Compensatory education* was a term coined by President Johnson’s administration to refer to federal assistance provided to economically disadvantaged students living in economically disadvantaged areas.

LEADERS OF ROANOKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The following individuals served in a leadership capacity for Roanoke County Public Schools during the time of the implementation of federal compensatory programs.

1955-1965	Herman Horn	Superintendent, Roanoke County Public Schools
1965-1980	Arnold Burton	Superintendent, Roanoke County Public Schools
1956-1975	Con Davis	Assistant Superintendent, Roanoke County Public Schools
1960-1969	Oren Counts	Director of Instruction, Roanoke County Public Schools
1953-1970	Charles Jennings	Director of Personnel, Roanoke County Public Schools
1964-1983	Hugh Tucker	Coordinator of Federal Programs, Roanoke County Public Schools
1966-1996	Joseph Kyle	Assistant Coordinator of Federal Programs, Roanoke County Public Schools
1965-1967	Fred Eichelman	Coordinator of Head Start, Roanoke County Public Schools

PROLOGUE

Historically, elementary and secondary education in the United States has been reserved as a function of local and state governments. The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution restricts the role of the federal government in its power to regulate matters not prescribed by the Constitution. “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people” (U.S. Const. amend. X, 1791, p. 14). Excluded from the text of the Constitution, education is the responsibility of individuals, and local, and state governments. The federal government’s only means of influencing public education pertains to its power “to raise and support Armies” and “to provide and maintain a Navy” (U.S. Const. art. I, § 8., 1791, p. 5) or to ensure that local and state governments do not violate individual rights (U.S. Const. amend. XIV, 1868). During the twentieth century, military defense efforts and the protection of individual rights led to federal involvement in the financing of supplementary educational programs.

Brief Overview of Federal Funding of Educational Programs: 1900-1965

The beginning of the twentieth century marked an increase in federal involvement in educational reform as industrialists and organized labor activists encouraged legislators to financially support the formation of vocational education programs in elementary and secondary schools to compete with foreign economies. In 1907, the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education (NSPIE) was established by business and labor groups. With the support of President Roosevelt, the NSPIE lobbied for vocational education legislation. In 1914, the members of Congress established a National Commission on Aid to Vocational Education. The members of the commission recommended that federal legislation be created to authorize direct aid for the promotion of vocational programs in local school districts (Kaestle, 1995).

The commission’s recommendations were introduced to the members of Congress by Senator Hoke Smith (D-Ga.) and Representative Dudley Mays Hughes (D-Ga.) on December 6 and 7, 1915 (Kaestle, 1995). The authors of the bill proposed grants to states ranging from \$1 million in the first year of the program to \$6 million in the ninth year and thereafter to provide salaries for teachers of agriculture, trade, and industrial subjects. Funding for training of teachers in the amount of \$500,000 the first year to \$1 million the fourth year and thereafter was included in the bill. The authors of the bill proposed that states be required to match federal grants dollar-

for-dollar and to fund all other expenses related to the implementation and development of vocational programs (Kaestle, 1995).

President Woodrow Wilson, a supporter of the bill, included in his State of the Union address to the members of Congress on December 7, 1915, the following statement,

What is more important is that the industries and resources of the country should be available and ready for mobilization. It is imperatively necessary, therefore, that we should promptly devise means for doing what we have not yet done: that we should give intelligent federal aid and stimulation to industrial and vocational education, as we have long done in the large field of our agricultural industry. (Wilson, 1915, p. 308)

In an attempt to align national defense efforts with economic development, President Wilson followed his State of the Union address with a speech to the members of the Railway Business Association in January, 1916, with the following comment,

There are two sides to the question of preparation. There is not merely the military side, there is the industrial side. And the ideal which I have in mind is this, gentlemen: We ought to have in this country a great system of industrial and vocational education under federal guidance and with federal aid, in which a very large percentage of the youth of this country will be given training in the skillful use and application of the principles of science in manufacturing and business. (Wilson, 1916, p. 13)

Providing federal aid to vocational education received bipartisan support during the summer of 1916 at both the democratic and republican conventions. Members of the Democratic Party stated, “We favor the development upon a systematic scale of the means to assist laborers throughout the Nation to seek and obtain employment, and the extension of the Federal government of the same assistance and encouragement as is now given to agricultural training” (Kurian, 1997, p. 503). Members of the Republican Party stated, “We favor vocational education” (Kurian, 1997, p. 478). The Smith-Hughes bill passed both the House of Representatives and the Senate in 1916. President Wilson signed the Smith-Hughes National Vocational Education Act into law on February 23, 1917 (Congressional Quarterly, 1969). The passage of the Act marked the first direct federal support for elementary and secondary public schools and the first national approval of vocational education in public schools (McCluskey, 2007).

In 1938, the Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, recommended that financial assistance be provided to states based upon the disparity of educational opportunities available dependent upon state resources. A bill to implement the committee's recommendations was introduced by senators Pat Harrison (D-Miss.) and Elbert D. Thomas (D-Utah), but the bill never came to a vote by the members of Congress (Congressional Quarterly, 1969).

The United States entry into World War II highlighted the low educational standards in many states as men were denied the opportunity to join the war on grounds of illiteracy. In response, new legislation was introduced by Senator Thomas (D-Utah) and Senator Lister Hill (D-Ga.). The proposed bill included \$200 million a year until the end of World War II to increase public teachers' salaries, to hire additional teachers, and to allow schools to remain open for at least 160 days a year. The bill was debated for six days in the Senate until Senator William Langer (R-N.D.) offered an amendment to the bill, suggesting that states should provide equitable funds for White and African American schools. The amendment offered by Senator Langer led to a break-down in support from southern senators. Senator Robert A. Taft (R-Ohio) made a successful motion to send the bill back to the committee (Congressional Quarterly, 1969).

In 1945, Congressmen Everett McKinley Dirksen (R-Ill.) and Jennings Randolph (D-W.Va.) formed a bipartisan caucus to support federal aid to education. The senators declared that America's schools could not provide an adequate education without federal assistance due to increasing enrollments resulting from the World War II baby boom. Two years later a federal aid to education assistance bill, sponsored by Majority Leader Taft (R-Ohio), passed the Senate, but the bill did not pass in the House of Representatives (Congressional Quarterly, 1969).

On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union launched Sputnik. Sputnik was the world's first man-made satellite to orbit the earth. The successful launching of Sputnik had the effect of raising fears of many Americans that the Soviet Union was technologically superior to the United States. James Killian, the president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and later the White House science advisor wrote that Sputnik caused "a crisis of confidence" among the American people (Divine, 1993, p. xv).

In response to the perceived crisis, President Eisenhower signed into law the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) on September 2, 1958. NDEA was created to strengthen education in mathematics and science, but also supported increased development of foreign

languages, technical, geography, English as a second language, guidance, and media services. The Act prohibited the federal government from having control of the development, implementation, or supervision of curriculum (Divine, 1993). Over a four-year period, the Act provided almost \$1 billion a year to all levels of education, including public and private schools.

In 1961, a political scientist, Richard Fenno, recounted that with the exception of the National Defense Education Act, the passage of federal education aid bills in the Congress since World War II had been largely unsuccessful:

Since 1945 alone, its [Congressional] committees have recorded 6.5 million words of testimony on seventy-seven different legislative proposals. The Senate has passed each bill debated in the postwar years – in 1948, 1960, and 1961, but majorities have been extremely hard to achieve at those points in the House as they must be produced, in committee, and on the floor. In the past, the Education and Labor Committee has reported out a bill six times, but were blocked by the Rules Committee in three of those instances, and twice defeated on the House floor. On the one occasion in 1960 in which the House passed a bill, it was prevented by the Rules Committee from going to conference with the Senate. (Munger & Fenno, 1962, pp. 195-196)

Munger and Fenno concluded by stating that the members of the House of Representatives had not attempted to resolve conflicts or to build consensus in the area of federal aid to education due to the sensitivity involved in the control of the educational system, controversy surrounding aid to non-public schools, and the continued support for segregated public schools by southerners (Munger & Fenno, 1962).

During President Kennedy's first State of the Union Address to Congress in 1961, President Kennedy stated that federal aid to education was, "probably the most important piece of domestic legislation" (Kennedy, 1961a). President Kennedy went on to say:

Our classrooms contain 2 million more children than they can properly have room for, taught by 90,000 teachers not properly qualified to teach. One third of our most promising high school graduates are financially unable to continue the development of their talents. The war babies of the 1940s are now descending in 1960 upon our colleges, and our colleges are ill-prepared. We lack the scientists, the engineers, and the teachers our world obligations require. (Kennedy, 1961a)

A month after Kennedy's first State of the Union address, he submitted a *Special Message to the Congress on Education*, tying educational opportunities with national greatness (Kennedy, 1961b). In the document, Kennedy stated, "Our progress as a nation, our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself...all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity" (Kennedy, 1961b).

Kennedy's plan called for a three-year program of federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools for the construction of classrooms, increases in teachers' salaries, construction of college and university facilities, college scholarships for students, and financial assistance for the improvement of vocational education (Kennedy, 1961b). The bill was tabled by the Rules Committee, which included six Democrats and five Republicans (Congressional Quarterly, 1969). The Republican-dominated Congress of the Kennedy administration resisted providing federally funded educational aid to states and to localities despite increasing pressure for financial assistance to support public education.

In President Johnson's State of the Union Address, in 1965, he listed as the first item on his national agenda, "a program to ensure every American child the fullest development of his mind and skills" (Johnson, 1965a). President Johnson went on to say:

Every child must have the best education this nation can provide. Thomas Jefferson said that no nation can be both ignorant and free. Today no nation can be both ignorant and great. In addition to our existing programs, I will recommend a new program for schools and students with a first year's authorization of \$1,500 million. It will help at every stage along the road to learning...For the primary and secondary school years, aid will serve low income families and assist students in both public and private schools. (Johnson, 1965a)

Johnson's State of the Union Address requesting federal aid to support public education was followed by a message to Congress entitled, *Toward Full Educational Opportunity* (Johnson, 1965d). Johnson's request included more than \$8 billion in educational programs. Johnson remarked, "Now this is a large expenditure, but it is a small price to pay for preserving this nation, for saving our free enterprise system, and for developing our country's most priceless resource, our young people" (Johnson, 1965d). Johnson appealed to the members of Congress to increase their involvement in supporting public education. Johnson stated, "Poverty has many roots, but the taproot is ignorance" (Johnson, 1965d).

CHAPTER I
CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES PROMPTING
FEDERAL INTERVENTION IN EDUCATION

A culmination of social factors prompted President Johnson's administration to advocate for increased involvement by the federal government in financially supporting public education. Factors included increased enrollments after the World War II baby boom, resulting in the need for additional school facilities and teachers, an increased awareness of the prevalence of poverty throughout the United States, and an acknowledgement of inferior educational opportunities for African American and disadvantaged students.

Increased Student Enrollment

After World War II, the United States experienced an increase in birth rates. Between 1946 and 1964, approximately 76 million babies were born in the United States. In 1946, live births in the U.S. grew from 222,721 in January to 339,499 in October. By 1954, annual births boomed to over four million and did not drop below that figure until 1965. In 1965, four out of ten citizens in the United States were under the age of twenty (National Center for Health Statistics, 1965, Table 1-1).

Increased birth rates resulted in increased school enrollment at both the elementary and secondary levels, creating a strain on educational facilities and staff (Bailey et al., 1968). In 1946, 2,200,000 students were enrolled in the first grade in the United States. By 1953, the number of students enrolled in the first grade had risen to 3,700,000. In 1949, there were 6,453,000 students enrolled in grades 9-12. By 1965, the number of students enrolled in secondary schools had doubled. Between 1954 and 1965, the number of students graduating from high school had leapt from 1,351,000 to 2,567,000 (Simon & Fullam, 1968, p. 35). The increased number of students prompted federal legislators to take a more active role in developing a plan to support states and localities in housing, staffing, and educating students.

Increased Awareness of Poverty in the United States

In December of 1962, President Kennedy asked Walter Heller, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors [CEA], to gather statistics on poverty in the United States. Kennedy shared with Heller his concern over why civil rights demonstrations being focused more on

access to political and economic systems rather than on economic inequality or poverty. Kennedy stated, “In England, if the unemployment rate goes to two percent, citizens march on Parliament; but, in the United States, poverty can be six percent, and no one seems to care” (Heller, 1962, box 34). In a strategy to advance civil rights, Kennedy requested that Heller develop a program that aligned the eradication of poverty with civil rights legislation.

Republicans and southern democrats dominated congress during the Kennedy administration, making it difficult to pass civil rights legislation, but Kennedy was hopeful that, by proposing public policy focused on reducing poverty aligned with civil rights legislation, progress could be made in each of this area. Kennedy was aware that southern members of Congress largely opposed civil rights legislation, but would potentially be supportive of measures to reduce poverty due to high concentrations of poverty in the southern states (Heller, 1962).

Heller, who believed that by reducing poverty, economic productivity could be increased, shared with President Kennedy that a publication, issued by the Conference on Economic Progress, entitled, *Poverty and Deprivation in the U.S.*, indicated that in 1962 non-White citizens represented ten percent of the total population in the United States, but comprised more that twenty-five percent of the number of citizens living below the poverty level (Heller, 1962, box 34). In 1962, those citizens earning less than \$3,000 per year were considered to be living below the poverty level (Conference on Economic Progress, 1962).

Heller began working with Robert J. Lampman, a fellow staff member at the Council of Economic Advisors, to develop a strategy to align the eradication of poverty with civil rights legislation. Lampman had led a study for the Joint Economic Committee in 1959 and found that between 1947 and 1956 poverty levels had dropped from 33 percent to 23 percent, but had only reduced by two percent between 1956 and 1958 (Lampman, 1959, p. 7). In his report to the congressional committee, Lampman estimated that eleven million of the poor were beneath the ages of eighteen (Lampman, 1959, p. 7). He shared with the members of the committee that,

The character of poverty had changed, and it has become more deadly for the young. It is no longer associated with immigrant groups with high aspirations; it is now identified with those whose social existence makes it more and more difficult to break out into the larger society. Even when children from poor families show intellectual promise, there is nothing in the values of their friends or families to encourage them to make use of it.

Out of the top 16 percent of high school students scoring 120 and over in I.Q. tests, only half go on to college. The explanation for this is amazing and alarming. The situation is as much cultural as economic. The children of the poor now tend to lack what the sociologists call *motivation*. (Lampman, 1959, p. 9)

On April 11, 1963, Heller shared with President Kennedy that he and Lampman were working on a potential administrative *assault on poverty* (Heller, 1963a). Lampman stated that the “civil rights message covers a lot of ground, but there may well be room for a broader program not limited to race” (Heller, 1963a, box 34). Heller noted that “disadvantaged groups other than Negroes now deserve our attention” (Heller, 1963a, box 34). Heller and Lampman proposed a plan to President Kennedy that included developing a program that worked to provide the means, especially for young people to exit poverty, and to prevent retreats back into poverty. Strategies included employment training programs, anti-discrimination efforts, better schools and public facilities for low income children, community-based support services and quality public housing. Heller and Lampman recommended that intervention efforts avoid providing those in poverty with *hand-outs*, but recommended providing those in poverty with the resources and means to work their way out of poverty, with a focus on youth living in poverty (Heller, 1963a). Lampman stated,

It is possible that by a tremendous, educational effort or family allowance or retraining programs for the children of the present poor that we would drastically improve the exit from poverty rate for the youngsters. Can we imagine spending twice as much public money on the education and health of poor children as we do on non-poor children? Perhaps it is fair to say that until we do we aren't dedicated to the eradication of poverty. (Lampman, 1963, roll 37)

Lampman shared his concern that poverty in the United States was largely invisible to most citizens, but racial conflicts and increased enrollments in schools had the potential of heightening awareness of the problems associated with poverty. He believed that through early intervention services provided through the public schools and community efforts, poverty could be reduced in the United States (Lampman, 1963). According to Heller, President Kennedy was supportive of the strategy developed by Heller and Lampman and considered making a trip to Appalachia, an area populated by Whites living below the poverty level, to announce his attack on poverty (Lampman, 1963).

On November 22, 1963, President Kennedy was assassinated. Three days later, Heller met with President Johnson to share the details of the poverty program that he and Lampman were in the process of creating under the direction of President Kennedy (Johnson, 1971). President Johnson shared with Heller his beliefs that three conditions had to be met for social change to occur: “a recognition of need, a willingness to act, and someone to lead the effort” (Johnson, 1971, p. 70). Johnson commented that he understood that America was in need of social change, and President Kennedy’s assassination provided the catalyst for this change. President Johnson stated that he was ready to lead the effort (Johnson, 1971). Johnson concluded his conversation by stating:

Now, I wanted to say something about all this talk that I’m a conservative who is likely to go back to the Eisenhower ways or give in to the economy block in Congress. It’s not so, and I want you to tell your friends – Arthur Schlesinger, Galbraith and other liberals – that it is not so. I’m no budget slasher. I understand that expenditures have to keep rising to keep pace with the population and help the economy. If you looked at my record, you would know that I am a Roosevelt New Dealer. As a matter of fact, to tell the truth, John F. Kennedy was a little too conservative to suit my taste. (Johnson, 1971, p. 71)

President Johnson vowed to continue with civil rights and federal aid to education legislation that was being developed during the Kennedy administration. The poverty program had not been publically announced during Kennedy’s time in office, so Johnson established this program for his own administration. Johnson believed that racial problems were economically driven. He believed that if the government could eradicate poverty through culturally responsive social programs, then racial discrimination could be eliminated. If African Americans had a good education and a good income, then Whites would respect African Americans and allow them the opportunity to exercise their civil rights (Billington, 1977).

In President Johnson’s first State of the Union address to Congress on January 8, 1964, he declared an unconditional *War on Poverty*. He stated,

It will not be a short or easy struggle, no single weapon or strategy will suffice, but we shall not rest until that war is won. The richest nation on earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it. One thousand dollars invested in salvaging an unemployable youth can return \$40,000 or more in his lifetime. (Johnson, 1964a)

Without any specific plans for implementation of the poverty program, President Johnson emphasized an improved coordination of federal and local programs. Johnson explained,

The War on Poverty will not be won here in Washington. It must be won in the field, in every private home, in every public office, from the court house to the White House. The program that I shall propose will emphasize this cooperative approach to help that one-fifth of all American families with incomes too small to even meet their basic needs. (Johnson, 1964a)

President Johnson called for, “better schools, better health, better homes, better training, and better job opportunities to help more Americans, especially young Americans, escape from squalor and misery and unemployment rolls where other citizens help to carry them” (Johnson, 1964a). He shared with the members of Congress that if the poor were given the tools to lift themselves out of poverty, then working Americans would no longer have to support the poor through relief efforts. President Johnson went on to say that lack of money or employment were the symptoms of poverty, and not the cause. He believed that roots of poverty were deeper and were potentially related to society’s failure to give all citizens a fair chance. He concluded by stating, “whatever the cause, our joint Federal-local effort must pursue poverty, pursue it wherever it exists” (Johnson, 1964a).

President Johnson requested legislative action that included financial aid to Appalachia, youth employment opportunities, a broader food stamp program, and a higher minimum wage. He also emphasized the need to eliminate poverty through educational and employment opportunities, but conceded that food stamps and increases in the minimum wage were necessary to provide immediate relief efforts to citizens living in poverty (Johnson, 1964a).

John Pomfrets, a reporter from the New York Times, commented on President Johnson’s first State of the Union address by stating,

There was scarcely a sentence in the speech that was not applauded, but most of the 80 demonstrations from the floor of the House came from the Democratic side, and it was obvious that there was strong opposition on the Republican side, precisely because his poverty program was so reminiscent of the New Deal programs the G.O.P. fought for so many years. ‘War on Poverty’ is the President’s new and disarming name for a whole bundle of old programs leavened with a few new wrinkles. (Pomfrets, 1964, p. 17)

Critics of President Johnson's anti-poverty program aligned President Johnson's proposal with President Roosevelt's *New Deal*. This included programs designed to stimulate the American economy through relief efforts for its citizens after the Great Depression, which began in 1929. President Johnson believed that it was the government's responsibility to solve problems for its citizens and admired President Roosevelt for his capacity to successfully develop and implement the New Deal. President Johnson remarked that his administration's program would be called the *Great Society*, a social program focused on the elimination of poverty and racial injustice (Congressional Quarterly, 1969).

In 1964, Lyndon Johnson defeated Republican presidential candidate Barry M Goldwater with 61 percent of the popular vote, winning all but six states. The Republican dominated Congress of the Kennedy administration was replaced by a Democratic majority. In the Senate, the Democratic majority controlled two-thirds of the seats with a 68-32 margin. In the House of Representatives, the Democratic majority grew from 258 to 295 members, while Republican representatives decreased from 176 to 140 members (Congressional Quarterly, 1969). During the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress of 1965, President Johnson's administration submitted eighty-seven bills to Congress. Eighty-four of the bills were passed by the members of Congress and signed into law by President Johnson. The foundation of President Johnson's Great Society initiatives was confirmed by the Eighty-ninth Congress of the United States (Unger, 1996, p. 104).

Inferior Educational Opportunities for African American Students

Prior to 1954, schools in the United States operated under the ruling of Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) which stated that racial segregation was permissible if schools were *separate but equal* (Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896). The term *separate but equal* relating to racial segregation first appeared in the court case, Roberts v. City of Boston, in March of 1850. Sarah Roberts was a five year old African American child. Sarah's father, Benjamin F. Roberts, argued that Sarah should be allowed to attend the primary school closest to their home instead of the primary school established for African American students, which was located farther from the Robert's home. The members of the general school committee of the city of Boston, confirmed by the members of the supreme court of Massachusetts, stated that the teachers in the African American schools had the same qualifications and compensation as those teachers in the White schools,

thus providing an equivalent education to that of their White counterparts. The members of the supreme court of Massachusetts made the following ruling,

Resolved, that in the opinion of this board, the continuance of the separate schools for colored children, and the regular attendance of all such children upon the schools, is not only legal and just, but is best adapted to promote the education of that class of our population. (Roberts v. City of Boston, 1850)

The members of the supreme court of Massachusetts concluded by stating, It is urged, that this maintenance of separate schools tends to deepen and perpetuate the odious distinction of caste, founded in a deep-rooted prejudice in public opinion. This prejudice, if it exists, is not created by law, and probably cannot be changed by law. Whether this distinction and prejudice, existing in the opinion and feelings of the community, would not be as effectually fostered by compelling colored and White children, to associate together in the same schools, may well be doubted; at all events, it is a fair and proper question for the committee to consider and decide upon having in view the best interests of both classes, of children placed under their superintendence, and we cannot say that their decision upon it is not founded on just grounds of reason and experience, and in the results of a discriminating and honest judgment. The increased distance to which the plaintiff was obliged to go to school from her father's house, is not such, in our opinion, as to render the regulation in question unreasonable, still less illegal. Given the facts stated in court, the jury decided the action could not be maintained. (Roberts v. City of Boston, 1850)

The United States Supreme Court confirmed the decision made in the Roberts v. City of Boston (1850) case that separate schools for African Americans and Whites were permissible as long as the races received an equivalent education based on their ruling of Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) on May 18, 1896. Homer Plessy, who was seven-eighths White and one-eighth Black, attempted to purchase a first-class ticket from the East Louisiana Railroad to travel from New Orleans to Covington, Louisiana. Plessy was denied the opportunity to ride in first-class, which was reserved for White citizens. Plessy brought a legal suit against the railroad company, stating that the East Louisiana Railroad company had violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution (Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896). Judge John Ferguson, of the supreme court of Louisiana, ruled that the statute did not violate the equal protection clause.

Plessy was successful in appealing his case to the United States Supreme Court, where Ferguson's ruling was upheld in a seven to one decision by the members of the Supreme Court. Supreme Court Justice Brown summarized the court's ruling by stating,

The White race deems itself to be the dominant race in this country. And so it is, in prestige, in achievements, in education, in wealth, and in power. So, I doubt not, it will continue to be for all time, if it remains true to its great heritage, and holds fast to the principles of constitutional liberty. But in view of the constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant, ruling class of citizens. There is no caste here. Our constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law. The humblest is the peer of the most powerful. The law regards man as man, and takes no account of his surroundings or of his color when his civil rights as guaranteed by the supreme law of the land are involved. It is therefore to be regretted that this high tribunal, the final expositor of the fundamental law of the land, has reached the conclusion that it is competent for a state to regulate the enjoyment by citizens of their civil rights solely upon the basis of race. We consider the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff's argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the Act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it. (Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896)

In January 1896, Homer Plessy pleaded guilty and paid a fine for the violation. The Supreme Court ruling in Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) solidified the establishment of separate but equal facilities for African Americans and Whites. Members of the Supreme Court justified segregation as a means of classification and inferred that beliefs of inferiority by African Americans were an individual's responsibility and not the responsibility of the courts (Commission on Civil Rights, 1979).

Beginning in the 1930s, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) challenged the concept of *separate but equal* facilities by encouraging African American graduate students to apply to all-White graduate schools. The members of the NAACP understood that to truly provide separate but equal graduate schools for a small number of

African American graduate students would be difficult and expensive for university officials (Keenan, 1988).

In 1938, officials at the University of Missouri Law School denied admission to an African American student even though equivalent accommodations were not available. The school offered to pay tuition and living expenses for the student at a northern law school. The student filed a charge against the school for violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The case, Missouri ex. rel. Gaines v. Canada (1938) was heard by the members of the Supreme Court who ruled in favor of the student, thus providing the African American student admission to the University of Missouri (Missouri ex. rel. Gaines v. Canada, 1938).

In 1948, the members of the Oklahoma Supreme Court ruled that the University of Oklahoma must admit African American graduate students for any course not offered by its State College for Negroes (Sipuel v. Board of Regents of University of Oklahoma, 1948). This ruling was followed two years later by officials at the University of Texas attempting to establish a separate African American law school to avoid admitting African Americans to their existing law school. An African American student who applied for admission in the law school at the University of Texas refused to attend the African American law school and proceeded to file a case against the University. In Sweatt v. Painter (1948) members of the Supreme Court of Texas ruled in favor of the African American student, stating that Texas could not provide African American students with equal educational opportunities in a separate law school (Sweatt v. Painter, 1948).

Within the same year, officials at the University of Oklahoma were forced to admit an African American student to their school of education, but allowed him to be roped off from White students in the classroom, in the dining room, and in the library. The African American student sued the University for violating the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution in McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1950) (McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 1950). Members of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma ruled in favor of the student stating that African American students deserved to be treated like all other students and were not to be segregated within the institution (McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 1950).

In 1953, Earl Warren was appointed by President Eisenhower as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Chief Justice Warren, who had served as a three-term governor of California prior to being appointed to the Supreme Court, advocated for a court that was more involved in defending individual rights. Known for his ability to build consensus among his constituents, Chief Justice Warren was instrumental in establishing a Supreme Court that worked to defend the civil liberties of its citizens (Cray, 1997).

In the early 1950s, Linda Brown was a young African American student in Topeka, Kansas, who had to walk through a railroad switchyard to get to her African American school, Monroe School. Her parents applied for admission to the all-White school, Sumner School, because it was closer to her home; however, Linda Brown was denied admission by the Board of Education of Topeka because of her race. Linda's parents sued the school system for violating the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. The U. S. District Court for the District of Kansas heard the case and determined that segregated schools did not violate the Fourteenth Amendment because facilities, transportation, and teacher qualifications were equivalent.

The Brown family was successful in appealing the case to the United States Supreme Court, where the case was combined with similar cases from Virginia, South Carolina, and Delaware. Thurgood Marshall, who later served as a member of the Supreme Court, represented the Brown family in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka Kansas in 1954. Under the leadership of Chief Justice Warren, the members of the United States Supreme Court unanimously ruled that the plaintiffs had been deprived of equal protection of the laws, as prescribed by the Fourteenth Amendment. In describing the opinion of the court, Chief Justice Warren stated that segregation harms African American children because,

It generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. We conclude that in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. (Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka Kansas, 1954)

After the Supreme Court Justices determined that segregated education was inherently unequal, the Justices began the debate of how to achieve desegregation in public education. In May of 1955, the Supreme Court ruled that schools should be desegregated "with all deliberate speed" (Arrington, 1981, p. 14). The Supreme Court ordered that public schools begin the

process of desegregating schools under the supervision of federal district courts (Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka Kansas, 1955).

Despite the ruling by the Supreme Court, close to ten years after the decision made in Brown v. Board of Education (1954), many localities were still resisting the process of desegregation in public schools with few school districts fully desegregated. School districts in the southern states were especially resistant to desegregation, with 98 percent of African American students attending all African American schools, and a 100 percent of White students attending all White schools during the 1963 school year (Hannah, 1967, p. 12). As of 1963, there were twenty-one African American students in Alabama attending desegregated schools, nine students in South Carolina, and no African American students in Mississippi attending public schools with White students (Hannah, 1967, p. 12).

President Kennedy in a radio address to the nation on June 11, 1963, requested legislation that would provide, “the kind of equality of treatment which we would want for ourselves” (Kennedy, 1963). Kennedy went on to say,

The Negro baby born in America today, regardless of the section of the Nation in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing a high school as a White baby born in the same place on the same day, one-third as much chance of completing college, one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man, twice as much chance of becoming unemployed, about one-seventh as much chance of earning \$10,000 a year, a life expectancy which is 7 years shorter, and the prospects of earning only half as much. (Kennedy, 1963)

President Kennedy appealed to the members of Congress to create legislation that would ban discrimination against African Americans. On July 2, 1964, the Civil Rights Act was passed, just seven months after Kennedy’s death. The signing of the Civil Rights Act into law became the mandate for the eradication of segregation in public schools (Sarratt, 1966). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 enforced the constitutional right of all citizens, including Blacks, to vote, to provide relief against discrimination in public facilities, to authorize the Attorney General to sue state governments if segregated school systems continued to exist, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish the Commission on Civil Rights, and to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity (Civil Rights Act, 1964). Four years after the implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, considerable progress had been made toward

desegregation efforts. In 1964, 1.2 percent of African American students attended school with White students. By 1968, thirty-two percent of African American students attended school with White students (Commission on Civil Rights, 1979, p. 112).

The process of desegregating schools highlighted the social and economic conditions of African Americans. During the 1950s and 1960s, economic, social, and cultural deprivation prompted thousands of African Americans to migrate out of the south to northern and western industrial cities (Bailey et al., 1968). The influx of African Americans to cities prompted middle class Whites to move to the suburbs, segregating students based upon socio-economic status. Concern of increasing numbers of high school drop-outs in the northern and western industrial cities led to a nationwide investigation of enrollment rates of public school students. In 1965, the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Office of Education investigated enrollment rates of children of various ages, races, and socioeconomic categories based upon the 1960 census data. The study included the number of high school dropouts using the October 1965 Current Population Survey of the Bureau of the Census. The survey was based on a selected sample of 35,000 households (Simon & Fullam, 1968).

The bureau indicated that 6,960,000 persons, ages 16 and 17, were living in the United States in October 1965. Of this number, 300,000, or 5 percent, were enrolled in college. Of the remaining population, 681,000 persons, approximately 10 percent, had left school prior to completion of high school. Seventeen percent of high school dropouts were African American students, while nine percent were White students (Simon & Fullam, 1968, p. 21). In the southern states, African American and White enrollment rates were approximately the same, with the discrepancy between African American and White enrollment rates existing primarily outside of the south. In the north and west, 20 percent of African American students were not enrolled in school (Simon & Fullam, 1968, p. 21). Many of the African American students who had left the southern states to escape racial discrimination were dropping out of school. In response, members of Congress ordered a nationwide study be conducted to better understand the availability of equitable educational opportunities for all public school students (Coleman, 1966).

Equality of Educational Opportunity: The Coleman Report

Title IV, Section 402, of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, required the Commissioner of Education to conduct a study then report to the President and the members of Congress within two years of the enactment of the title as to availability of equal educational opportunities for

public school students based upon race, religion, or national origin (Civil Rights Act, 1964). To develop the study, the United States Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, ordered attention directed toward six racial and ethnic groups: African Americans, American Indians, Oriental Americans, and Puerto Ricans living in the continental United States, Mexican Americans, and Whites (Coleman, 1966). The survey addressed four broad categories of questions including,

1. To what extent are racial and ethnic groups segregated from one another in public schools;
2. Do public schools offer equal educational opportunities based upon the criteria of number of laboratories, textbooks, libraries; academic, commercial, and vocational curriculums; characteristics of teachers including achieved level of education, teaching experience, salary level, verbal ability, and attitudes toward education; characteristics of students including socioeconomic backgrounds, education of their parents, attitudes toward academic aspirations;
3. How much do students learn as measured by their performance on standardized achievement tests;
4. What is the relationship between students' achievement and the kinds of schools they attend (Coleman, 1966, pp. iii-iv).

The staff at the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Office of Education employed independent consultants and contractors to administer and to interpret the results of the study. An advisory committee was appointed to coordinate the design of the study and to develop procedures required to conduct the study, but the members of the committee did not participate in the analysis of the data or in the preparation of the final report (Coleman, 1966).

Independent consultants and contractors included educators, statisticians, sociologists, and attorneys throughout the United States. James Coleman of Johns Hopkins University served as the director of the study. He was instrumental in designing and analyzing the results of the survey. Robert J. Solomon and Joseph L. Boyd of the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, led a team in administering the survey to public school students. Albert E. Beaton of Educational Testing Service conducted the computer analysis for the survey. Charles Nam, Lewis Rhodes, and Robert Herriott of Florida State University collected and analyzed the data from the non-enrollment survey. The non-enrollment survey included questions related to student

attendance to determine the number of students who dropped-out of school. The results of the non-enrollment survey were included in the 1965 census. Raymond W. Mack of Northwestern University led a team of sociologists to conduct case studies of educational opportunities for minorities in ten cities in the United States. G.W. Foster of the University of Wisconsin led a team of attorneys to conduct case studies of the legal and political problems associated with segregation in seven cities in the United States (Coleman, 1966, p. 1).

The study was conducted in September and October of 1965 and included, “4,000 public schools, 645,000 students, and 60,000 teachers and administrators. Students in grades 3, 6, 12, and 12 participated in the study” (Coleman, 1966, p. 3). First grade students in half of the schools participated in the study. Approximately 30 percent of the schools selected chose not to participate in the study. Analysis of the nonparticipating schools revealed that their participation would not have significantly altered the results of the study (Coleman, 1966, pp. 3, 8).

Participation rates by region of the Nation included: “north and west 72 percent; metropolitan south and southwest 65 percent; nonmetropolitan north and west 82 percent; nonmetropolitan south and southwest 61 percent. Metropolitan area is defined to be a city of over 50,000 inhabitants including its suburbs” (Coleman, 1966, p. 8).

The study, entitled *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, became known as the Coleman Report, in honor of the director of the study, James Coleman. The results of the study were released in 1966 and included the following findings:

Segregation

The majority of American students attended schools that were racially segregated. Of minority students, African Americans were the most segregated. Considering all groups, Whites were the most segregated.

Almost 80 percent of all White pupils in 1st grade and 12th grade attend schools that are from 90 percent to 100 percent White. And 97 percent at grade 1, and 99 percent at grade 12, attend schools that are 50 percent or more white. (Coleman, 1966, p. 3)

Segregation was most prominent in the southern states with almost complete segregation in public schools for African Americans and whites. Segregation between African Americans and whites in public schools also existed in the urban North, Midwest, and West (Coleman, 1966).

More than 65 percent of all Negro pupils in the 1st grade attend schools that are between 90 and 100 percent Negro. And 87 percent at grade 1, and 66 percent at grade 12, attend schools that are 50 percent or more Negro. In the south, most students attend schools that are 100 percent white or Negro. (Coleman, 1966, p. 3)

Segregation existed between teachers of African American and white students. In the United States, Negro elementary students attend schools in which 65 percent of the teachers are Negro; white elementary students attend schools in which 97 percent of teachers are white. White teachers are more predominant at the secondary level, where the corresponding figures are 59 and 97 percent. (Coleman, 1966, p. 3)

In the southern states, the majority of African American teachers taught African American students while white teachers taught white students. Nationwide, white teachers may have taught African American students, but African American teachers rarely taught white students (Coleman, 1966).

School Facilities and Curriculum

The majority of minority students attended larger classes as compared to white students. Nationwide, the average white elementary student has 29 students in a class, while the average minority elementary student has between 30 and 33 students in a class. In the metropolitan Midwest, the average white high school student has 33 students per class. The average Negro high school student has 54 students in a class. In the United States, the average white high school student has one teacher for every 22 students and the average Negro high school student has one teacher for every 26 students. (Coleman, 1966, p. 9)

Nationwide, minority students had less access to physics, chemistry, and foreign language laboratories. Regionally, students in the far west had greater access to laboratories as compared to students in the southern states.

Regional differences between minority and white access to laboratories reflect that 95 percent of Negro and 80 percent of white high school students in the metropolitan Far West attend schools with laboratories. Negro high school students in the metropolitan South have 48 percent access to laboratories, while 72 percent of white high school students in the metropolitan south have access to laboratories. (Coleman, 1966, p. 9)

The authors of the survey stated that limited access to laboratories in the southern states was despite the fact that a higher percentage of schools in this region were less than twenty years old (Coleman, 1966).

Minority students had fewer books in school libraries and fewer textbooks, less access to college preparatory or accelerated curricula, and fewer extracurricular activities. African American high school students were less likely to attend regionally accredited schools, especially in the southern states. African American and Puerto Rican students had less access to college preparatory curricula. Puerto Rican students had less access to vocational curriculums (Coleman, 1966). Intelligence testing was less likely to be conducted in schools predominately attended by African Americans and Puerto Ricans (Coleman, 1966).

Remedial services varied by the region of the county and were predominately available to students in the northern states and metropolitan areas as compared to students in the southern states.

For example, 100 percent of Negro high school students and 97 percent of whites in the metropolitan Far West attend schools having a remedial reading teacher (this does not mean, of course, that every student uses the services of that teacher, but simply that he has access to them) compared with 46 and 65 percent respectively, in the metropolitan South – and 4 and 9 percent in the non-metropolitan Southwest. (Coleman, 1966, p. 14)

Teachers

The average white student attended an elementary school where, “40 percent of the white teachers have spent most of their lives in the same locality, while 53 percent of the teachers in a predominately Negro school have lived their lives in the same locality” (Coleman, 1966, p. 14). The majority of teachers of Negro students did not have a broad experiential background. Teachers of Negro students consistently scored lower on vocabulary tests, attended less competitive colleges, and had fewer professional experiences as compared to teachers of white students. The average white student attended a school where 51 percent of white teachers would not have chosen to move to another school as compared to 46 of Negro teachers who would not have chosen to move to another school. (Coleman, 1966, p. 14)

Student Body

“The average white high school student attends a school in which 82 percent of the students report having encyclopedias in their homes, as compared to 69 percent of minority students” (Coleman, 1966, p. 14). The average African American student had fewer classmates whose mothers graduated from high school. African American students came from larger families and were less often enrolled in a college preparatory curriculum. African American students took fewer courses in English, mathematics, foreign language, and science. Other minority students were reported to have fallen between whites and African Americans, with closer alignment to whites. White and minority students in southern states were consistently reported to have the greatest variation in access to academic curriculums and achievement (Coleman, 1966).

Achievement

Achievement tests were administered in reading, writing, calculating, and problem-solving to students in grades 1, 3, 6, 9, and 12. The results of the standardized tests revealed that minority students, with the exception of oriental-Americans, scored lower at every grade level than white students (Coleman, 1966).

The achievement gap grows with the number of years in school. At grade 6 the differences in achievement between minority students and white students is 1.6 years; at grade 9 the differences in achievement between minority students and white students is 2.4 years; and at grade 12 the differences in achievement between minority students and white students is 3.3 years. (Coleman, 1966, p. 20)

The authors of the report acknowledged that standardized tests were not without cultural bias, contributing to differences in scores between minority and white students (Coleman, 1966).

Discrepancies in achievement existed not only between minority and white students, but between students based upon where they lived in the United States. By grade twelve, both African American and white students in the south scored below African American and white students in the north. Southern African Americans scored further below whites in the south than northern African Americans scored below northern whites. The authors of the report acknowledged that a greater percentage of African American high school students dropped out of

school prior to high school graduation in the north and west as compared to the south, potentially artificially elevating success rates by students in the northern and western states (Coleman, 1966).

Findings

The authors of the Coleman Report summarized their findings by stating that performance of minority groups was positively correlated with the quality of facilities and the competence of teachers. Achievement was related to school attendance with peers of higher educational backgrounds and motivation. The authors concluded:

Thus, if a white pupil from a home that is strongly and effectively supportive of education is put in a school where most pupils do not come from such homes, his achievement will be little different than if he were in a school composed of others like himself. But if a minority pupil from a home without much educational strength is put with schoolmates with strong educational backgrounds, his achievement is likely to increase. (Coleman, 1966, p. 22)

Academic achievement, as it related to school characteristics, confirmed the decision by the members of the Supreme Court that separate schools for African American and white students were inherently unequal. The federal government entered into a campaign to continue desegregation efforts and to provide compensatory educational programs for racially disadvantaged public school students.

Inferior Educational Opportunities for Disadvantaged Students

The National Education Association [NEA] released a publication in 1962 entitled *Education and the Disadvantaged American* (National Education Association, 1962). This publication stated that problems for economically disadvantaged students were not confined to financial limitations, but included cultural disadvantage. Culturally disadvantaged citizens were defined as those individuals who lived in areas of the United States where industrial organization was minimal, poverty was prevalent, education was devalued, and opportunities for advancement were limited (National Education Association, 1962). Areas throughout the United States were identified as meeting these criteria, with the highest concentrations in inner city slums and portions of southern states. Inner city slums were dominated by African Americans who migrated out of the southern states in an attempt to escape racial discrimination and whites who were living below the poverty level. Southern states included uneducated African

Americans and whites who lacked the technological skills to advance the industries of agriculture that dominated the southern regions (National Education Association, 1962).

To eradicate cultural disadvantage citizens were to be provided with an opportunity to develop skills that were compatible with the technological expectations of a modern society. Education was viewed as the cure to the discrepancy between opportunities for prosperity versus continued poverty and disadvantage. Educators were faced with the challenge of not only providing an appropriate education to students, but providing the additional resources necessary to assist culturally disadvantaged students and their families in receiving a culturally responsive education designed to eliminate the disparity that existed between students based upon family dynamics (National Education Association, 1962).

“Schools are useful only for children who are able physically, mentally, and emotionally to respond to them” (National Education Association, 1962, p. 15). Meeting these needs was the responsibility of the family or community agencies, but became the responsibility of the schools when families and agencies failed to meet the basic needs of the child. To successfully combat these areas of deficit, educators were encouraged to establish with the student, “a close relationship between school and life, including remedial services necessary for academic progress, arousing aspirations, and constructively altering the courses of young lives” (National Education Association, 1962, p. 16).

Relationship Between School Personnel and Students

“The heart of the educational process is found in the skill, dedication, and personality of the teacher. Foremost among the needed qualities of the teacher is respect for the pupil” (National Education Association, 1962, p. 19). The researchers believed that if students lived in a home where they were not expected to succeed, the positive influence and respect shown by a teacher was instrumental in cultivating a sense of purpose and motivation in the student. “True respect for pupils requires persistent confidence in their potential. It is based on the knowledge that just as the behavior and attitudes which hinder individual development are learned, so they can be replaced” (National Education Association, 1962, p. 19). Students who were considered culturally disadvantaged were potentially viewed by teachers as lacking in the capacity to learn and incapable of realizing success based upon family dynamics. Teachers were challenged to focus on small academic gains in the culturally disadvantaged student, realizing that successes

may not be comparable or at the same pace to that of other students, but were to be valued (National Education Association, 1962).

To meet the needs of culturally disadvantaged students, schools were encouraged to include the services of not only well-informed and supportive teachers, but also guidance counselors, remedial teachers, psychologists, nurses, and school social workers. Principals of schools with culturally disadvantaged students were encouraged to be well informed of the specific needs of disadvantaged students, guiding the efforts of the staff, and having the organizational skills to capitalize on support services potentially available to the population of students (National Education Association, 1962).

Remedial Services

In the 1962 publication it was stated that one of the greatest contributing factors to success in school was the ability to read (National Education Association, 1962). Without support in the home, students potentially lacked the motivation to read. Early intervention in supporting students to develop the capacity to read was viewed as critical in avoiding a developing sense of detachment between students and school. Kindergarten and other early intervention programs designed to foster reading readiness opportunities were viewed as instrumental in cultivating a sense of confidence and motivation in students.

To effectively provide remediation services, it was determined that class sizes needed to be small enough to individualize instruction. The Educational Policies Commission (EPC) published an essay in 1959 entitled, *An Essay on Quality in Public Education* (National Education Association, 1959). The Commission stated that adequate personnel size was at least fifty professional persons per one thousand students. Professional persons were defined to be teachers, administrators, librarians, counselors, psychologists, and other support personnel. Based upon these figures, class sizes would be between twenty to twenty-five students. In a school with culturally disadvantaged students, class sizes should be no more than twenty students to effectively remediate deficits in learning. According to the Commission no city in the United States had the ratio of fifty professionals per one thousand students (National Education Association, 1962, p. 23).

Relationship Between School and Life

The National Educational Association (NEA) stated that culturally disadvantaged students often came from a home where the importance of education was not understood. Culturally disadvantaged students did not understand how education was relevant to their lives. To overcome this obstacle, educators were encouraged to develop strategies to assist students in understanding the relevance of school through participation in school-related activities, including clubs, sports, and field trips. By forming a relationship with the school community, students would grow in their confidence, eventually leading to academic growth (National Education Association, 1962).

To motivate culturally disadvantaged students in understanding the importance of receiving an education, students needed to have the opportunity to participate in activities beyond the confinements of the school and their homes. The NEA stated that students benefited from learning experiences they may not have experienced in the home. “Visits to factories, farms, zoos, movies, plays, and concerts, if adequately prepared, are helpful” (National Education Association, 1962, p. 18). As students grew older, educators were encouraged to provide age appropriate opportunities for students to continue to connect the importance of receiving an education with successful opportunities later in life.

To successfully meet the needs of culturally disadvantaged students, educators were challenged to create learning environments that fostered positive relationships with students, to provide remedial instruction early in the students’ education, and to assist students in connecting the importance of receiving an education with the realization of a successful life (National Education Association, 1962).

Culturally disadvantaged students were restricted by the expectations that had been placed upon them by a society who expected less because of their living conditions, family dynamics, or economic resources. A cultural shift in expectations was necessary to assist students in understanding that they could accomplish the same level of achievement as that of their more fortunate counterparts. To accomplish this shift, better facilities and programs were needed, including teacher training, counseling, nutrition, and welfare services. Providing these programs early in the student’s life was instrumental in accomplishing the goal of reversing the negative effects of diminished expectations.

President Johnson acknowledged that state and local educational authorities had been inconsistent in their approach to resolving issues associated with increased student enrollment and educational opportunities provided to African American and disadvantaged public school students. He believed that federal intervention was necessary to ameliorate the discrepancies that existed at the state and local levels (Johnson, 1965c). With the support of the majority of the members of Congress, President Johnson's administration led the Great Society social reform effort to provide disadvantaged students with compensatory educational programs.

Federal compensatory education programs were introduced to states and its localities as a means of providing disadvantaged students with supplementary educational programs for the purpose of eliminating the educational discrepancies that existed between disadvantaged students and their more fortunate counterparts.

CHAPTER II
LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S *GREAT SOCIETY*:
FEDERAL COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS OF THE 1960S

President Johnson, who taught in an economically disadvantaged school in Cotulla, Texas, 38 years prior to becoming President, believed that education was the basis for creating effective social reform to combat problems associated with poverty and racial injustice (Johnson, 1971). Modeling his social welfare reform movement after President Roosevelt's New Deal, President Johnson billed his social reform effort as the *Great Society*.

Included in the Great Society social reform effort was the development of legislation to fight the *war on poverty*. President Johnson publically coined the phrase *war on poverty* in his State of the Union address on January 8, 1964, as a means of communicating the need for federal legislation to combat social problems associated with the prevalence of poverty in the United States (Johnson, 1964a). War on Poverty legislation included the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. Included in the EOA and ESEA were federal educational compensatory programs designed to provide disadvantaged students living in low-income areas with federal assistance. Head Start of the EOA and Title I of the ESEA were two of the federal compensatory programs developed by legislators through the Great Society initiative.

Great Society

The focus of President Johnson's Great Society was the elimination of poverty and racial injustice. Reform efforts included the improvement of education, medical care, urban problems, and transportation. President Johnson first articulated the goals of the Great Society in a graduation speech at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Michigan on May 22, 1964. President Johnson stated:

The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time. But that is just the beginning. The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents. It is a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect, not feared due to boredom and restlessness. It is a place where the city

of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community.

The place to build the Great Society is in the classrooms of America. There your children's lives will be shaped. Our society will not be great until every young mind is set free to scan the farthest reaches of thought and imagination. We are still far from that goal. Today, 8 million adult Americans, more than the entire population of Michigan, have not finished 5 years of school. Nearly 20 million have not finished 8 years of school. Nearly 54 million--more than one-quarter of all America--have not even finished high school. Each year more than 100,000 high school graduates, with proved ability, do not enter college because they cannot afford it. And if we cannot educate today's youth, what will we do in 1970 when elementary school enrollment will be 5 million greater than 1960? And high school enrollment will rise by 5 million. College enrollment will increase by more than 3 million.

In many places, classrooms are overcrowded and curricula are outdated. Most of our qualified teachers are underpaid, and many of our paid teachers are unqualified. So we must give every child a place to sit and a teacher to learn from. Poverty must not be a bar to learning, and learning must offer an escape from poverty.

But more classrooms and more teachers are not enough. We must seek an educational system which grows in excellence as it grows in size. This means better training for our teachers. It means preparing youth to enjoy their hours of leisure as well as their hours of labor. It means exploring new techniques of teaching, to find new ways to stimulate the love of learning and the capacity for creation.

We are going to assemble the best thought and broadest knowledge from all over the world to find these answers. I intend to establish working groups to prepare a series of conferences and meetings—on the cities, on natural beauty, on the quality of education, and on other emerging challenges. From these studies, we will begin to set our course toward the Great Society. (Johnson, 1965b, pp. 704-707)

Central to President Johnson's Great Society concept was the launching of an unconditional *war on poverty*. President Johnson believed through equitable educational opportunities poverty could be eliminated. He directed Walter Heller, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, to create a task force formed from the Bureau of the Budget and the Council

of Economic Advisors, to develop legislation to fight the War on Poverty. The task force proposed two different poverty bills to President Johnson. The first bill included community action programs, while the second bill included education grants for those living in poverty. Before either bill could be fully developed, President Johnson established a new task force in February of 1964, replacing Walter Heller with Sergeant Shriver, director of the Peace Corp and brother-in-law to the deceased President Kennedy (Jeffrey, 1978). Under the direction of Sergeant Shriver, the task force submitted to President Johnson legislation that became the foundation for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

War on Poverty: Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

The Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) was passed by the members of Congress on August 20, 1964. The purpose of the Act was *to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States* (Johnson, 1964b). Upon signing the Act into law, President Johnson remarked:

My fellow Americans, on this occasion the American people and our American system are making history. For so long as man has lived on this earth, poverty has been his curse. Today, for the first time in all the history of the human race a great nation is able to make and willing to make, a commitment to escape poverty among its people. Our American answer to poverty is not to make the poor more secure in their poverty, but to reach down and to help them lift themselves out of the ruts of poverty and to assist the large majority along the high road of hope and prosperity.

Although the economic well-being and prosperity of the United States have progressed to a level surpassing any achieved in world history, and although these benefits are widely shared throughout the Nation, poverty continues to be the lot of a substantial number of our people. The United States can achieve its full economic and social potential as a nation only if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society. It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. It is the purpose of this Act to strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in furtherance of that policy. (Johnson, 1964b)

Programs included in the Act were Job Corps, Community Action Program (CAP), Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), and Head Start. Job Corps was a residential youth program designed to provide disadvantaged youth, ages sixteen through twenty-one, with the skills necessary to assume a career. The residential program provided education, vocational training, and mentorship opportunities. The program was modeled after the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), which was established by President Roosevelt's New Deal efforts. The CCC program provided room, board, and employment to thousands of unemployed youth during the 1930s. The CCC was discontinued after World War II (Paige, 1985).

The Community Action Program (CAP) encouraged disadvantaged citizens to become advocates in their endeavor to overcome poverty. CAP programs included employment opportunities, educational services, and support services for economically disadvantaged citizens. Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), a domestic form of the international Peace Corps organization, was a volunteer organization focused on providing educational and vocational training programs for disadvantaged citizens. Volunteers enlisted in the program for one year, assisting local agencies and organizations in serving low-income communities throughout the United States. Head Start was a preschool program designed to provide economically disadvantaged children, ages three to five, with early intervention services, including education, health, and social services. Through the Head Start program, local officials worked with low-income families to teach them the importance of providing educational, social, and nutritional services to their children (Examination of the War on Poverty Program, 1965).

The EOA provided additional services to disadvantaged citizens, including basic education classes for adults, work-study programs for college students, family planning services, community health centers, food services, foster grandparent services, legal services, neighborhood centers, summer youth programs, and senior citizen centers (Examination of the War on Poverty Program, 1965).

After the passage of the EOA, Sergeant Shriver became the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity [OEO]. The purpose of the OEO was to administer the majority of the War on Poverty programs established as part of President Johnson's Great Society legislative agenda. The EOA established Community Action Agencies (CAAs) in localities throughout the United States. The purpose of the CAAs was to implement Great Society programs in every community throughout the nation. CAAs varied in their structure. Some CAAs were nonprofit

groups; others were large city agencies; while some were community-controlled groups. By 1968, there were over 1,600 CAAs located in two-thirds of the counties in the nation. Funding to support the community programs was distributed directly from the OEO to the CAAs, bypassing state and local governments (Chamberlin, 1971).

States were involved in the implementation of EOA programs, but did not control the distribution of funds to community-based programs. Each state had an EOA office so governors could be involved in Great Society programs. Governors had the power to veto grants thought to be inappropriate to advance the War on Poverty, but all vetoes were subject to override by OEO Director Sergeant Shriver. In the southern states, it was not uncommon for southern governors to veto a grant, only to be overridden by Shriver (Chamberlin, 1971).

The EOA required that CAAs involve those living in poverty to be an integral part of planning and implementing community-based reform programs. Neighborhood centers were established to recruit and train community leaders to advocate for social reform within their own community. As the influence of leaders working with CAAs grew, some local and state government leaders began to feel threatened by the growing power of CAA groups. Mayors and political leaders successfully lobbied the members of Congress to control the distribution of additional funds intended for CAAs. Entitled *National Emphasis Programs*, CAA funds were controlled by Congress, successfully undermining the OEOs intention of distributing federal funds directly to communities (Chamberlin, 1971).

In 1967, the Green Amendment was passed by the members of Congress, granting locally elected officials the authority to determine the local CAA for their area. The amendment required that funds not be distributed to CAAs without the official recognition determined by local leaders (Clark, 2002). The Quie Amendment of 1967 stipulated that one-third of CAA boards be composed of elected officials, one-third be composed of private sector representatives, and one-third be represented by disadvantaged citizens. This ratio limited the influence of disadvantaged citizens in advocating for their own social reform (Chamberlin, 1971). As the power by the members of Congress to control the function of CAAs grew, President Johnson's support of the OEO declined (Clark 2002). Many of the War on Poverty programs were transferred to other governmental agencies when the OEO was dismantled by President Nixon in 1973 (Clark, 2002).

War on Poverty: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

In June of 1964, President Johnson charged John Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corporation, later the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare [HEW], with the task of developing federal compensatory legislation designed specifically for disadvantaged students. Working with Francis Keppel, United States Commissioner of Education, planning staffs from the department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), and outside educational consultants, Garner led members of the task force to design educational legislation targeted specifically for disadvantaged students (Keppel, 1966). From June through November of 1964, members of the task force worked to develop legislation to provide federal aid to disadvantaged students.

The task force presented three options for providing federal educational aid to President Johnson in November, 1964. The first option was to provide federal aid to public schools, but concern was expressed over the negative reaction from Catholic schools. The second option was to provide federal aid to both public and private schools, and again, concern was expressed over potential constitutional obstacles as well as generating negative reactions from the National Education Association (NEA) over providing funds to private schools. Keppel expected that members of the Democratic Party would be opposed to providing federal aid to religious schools. The third option was to provide educational aid to economically disadvantaged students attending schools in low-income areas. This option was adopted because of its focus on disadvantaged students rather than providing federal aid to either public or private schools. The resulting legislation, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, was submitted to the members of Congress in January, 1965 and received approval three months later in April, 1965 (Keppel, 1966).

The passing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 marked the first significant contribution of federal aid to public education providing \$1.3 billion to students living in low-income areas (Keppel, 1966, p. 78). Sitting in the rose garden of the White House, President Johnson, along with his first grade teacher, Miss Kathryn Deadrich Loney, signed the act into law on April 11, 1965 (Bailey & Mosher, 1968). The act authorized federal funds to improve educational services in elementary and secondary schools, including professional development, instructional materials, resources for educational programs, and parental involvement. The eight titles of ESEA were designed to target four educational tasks as determined by President Johnson:

1. To bring better education to millions of educationally disadvantaged youth who need it most.
2. To put the best educational equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all students.
3. To advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers.
4. To provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966b).

Once ESEA was passed by the members of Congress, legislators had two choices in proceeding with the implementation of the Act. The federal government could provide general aid to schools with limited parameters, alleviating fears by opponents that the federal government would take over school districts, or it could target the assistance to those students most in need, tightly controlling the distribution of funds. Title I of the ESEA represented a compromise of these two approaches. Through Title I, the federal government provided federal funds to school districts and allowed some flexibility in the use of funds, but required that funds be limited to those schools within the district with the highest concentrations of economically disadvantaged students (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966b). Through Title VI, the federal government was restricted from participating in the development and implementation of instructional programs at the state and local levels (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966b).

Title I of ESEA had approximately eighty percent of the total authorized funds. Title I provided funds for economically disadvantaged students in targeted low-income schools. Low-income schools were determined by the percentage of students, from low-income families, who exceeded the low-income percentage from the county or city as a whole; Title II provided funds for textbooks, library books, audio-visual aids, and instructional materials; Title III provided funds to develop in-service opportunities for teachers, funding for fine and performing arts, and diagnostic services for handicapped students; Title IV provided funds for the creation of regional research centers designed to disseminate information related to instructional strategies; Title V provided funds to strengthen state departments of education, including curriculum development and in-service training for administrative staff; Title VI provided funds to implement and expand upon handicapped programs; Title VII provided funds to support the development of bilingual education; and Title VIII provided funds to support the development of drop-out prevention

programs (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970). The information included in Table 1 reflects funding provided by the federal government from 1965 to 1971 to support the implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

After the passage of ESEA, President Johnson stated, “Congress had been trying to pass a school bill for all America’s children since 1870 and had finally taken the most significant step of this century to provide help to all school children” (Graham, 1984, p. 5). He argued that, “it will offer new hope to tens of thousands of youngsters who need attention before they ever enroll in the first grade,” and will help “five million children of poor families overcome their greatest barrier to progress: poverty”(Graham, p. 5). He contended that there was no other single piece of legislation that could help so many for so little cost: "for every one of the billion dollars that we spend on this program, will come back tenfold as school dropouts change to school graduates” (Graham, p. 5).

Table 1

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Office of Education Expenditures: Fiscal Years 1965-1971 [in thousands of dollars]

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Total	1,712	816,982	1,303,127	1,438,694	1,473,115	1,562,133	1,562,133
Title I		746,904	1,056,621	1,049,116	1,073,033	1,139,572	1,249,300
Title II		47,871	92,505	91,054	64,530	---	---
Title III		10,938	74,961	161,256	194,058	209,000	172,774
Title IV			50,916	103,104	91,184	138,491	176,000
Title V	1,712	11,269	28,121	26,297	27,463	34,150	35,900
Title VI			3	7,867	22,088	26,520	24,900
Title VII					456	7,500	9,000
Title VIII					303	6,900	10,200

Note. Adapted from “The Digest of Educational Statistics” By US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970, p.112.

ESEA was the most visible component of President Johnson's War on Poverty, providing one billion dollars a year to schools with a high concentration of low-income students. Linking ESEA to the War on Poverty allowed President Johnson the opportunity to respond to civil rights pressures by requiring local school districts to submit a plan for desegregation to receive federal educational aid. By the end of the summer of 1965, President Johnson remarked, "one week ago there were 172 school districts which had taken no action to meet the requirements of the Civil Rights Act. Today the figure is 135 – and it is shrinking rapidly" (Woolley, Peters, & University of California Santa Barbara, 1999).

CHAPTER III
A CLOSER LOOK AT THE DEVELOPMENT OF HEAD START AND TITLE I SERVICES
IN THE UNITED STATES

Two federal compensatory programs--Head Start of the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965--were designed to provide disadvantaged children with an opportunity to receive an education that was comparable to their more fortunate counterparts. Both programs were focused on providing early intervention services to disadvantaged children for the purpose of counteracting the potentially negative effects of poverty in the education of the child.

Head Start of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

In the mid-twentieth century it was believed that early intervention services could potentially raise the IQ level of a child (Zigler & Valentine, 1979). Sergeant Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and chief general of the War on Poverty, had a personal interest in raising the intelligence capacity of students. Shriver's wife, Eunice Kennedy Shriver, had a mentally retarded sister. The Kennedy family had established the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation to investigate issues related to mental retardation (Zigler & Valentine, 1979). Eunice Shriver served on the President's Panel for Mental Retardation. The members of the panel began field testing public preschool programs for mentally retarded students in 1962 (Zigler & Valentine, 1979).

One such program, the Early Training Project, was an early intervention strategy targeted towards 60 preschool African American students outside of Nashville, Tennessee, who were at risk for academic failure due to mental retardation (Gray & Klaus, 1969). The coordinator of the program, Susan Gray, was a psychologist at George Peabody Teachers College (later included as a division of Vanderbilt University) (Gray & Klaus, 1969). The program was designed to stimulate students' intellectual capacity by providing academic opportunities not readily found in the home. Shriver believed that if it were possible to increase IQ levels of mentally retarded preschool students then it was possible to achieve academic readiness for disadvantaged students (Gray & Klaus, 1969).

Shriver had previously served as the president of the Chicago School Board (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). He proposed to the board a summer program designed to provide teachers

with summer employment, to make school facilities more efficient by operating during the summer months, and to introduce disadvantaged preschool students to the school environment prior to the beginning of the school year (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). He argued that the program would be beneficial to all stakeholders.

Shriver believed that disadvantaged students were more likely to fear attending school due to the likelihood that their parents were uneducated and unfamiliar in the school environment (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). Shriver reasoned that a school “must be as intimidating to these disadvantaged students as the inside of a bank to a pauper” (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992, p. 6). Shriver summarized his concept of Head Start by stating: “Everybody has been in some kind of a foot race, where one group, by reason of a handicap, is given a head start. We were trying to give these kids – a running head start” (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992, p. 6).

The Head Start planning commission was formed by Sergeant Shriver in the fall of 1964. Shriver asked his family physician and Kennedy Foundation science advisor, Dr. Robert Cooke, to chair the planning commission (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). Cooke was the Chairman of the Department of Pediatrics at Johns Hopkins hospital in Baltimore, Maryland (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). Like Shriver, Cooke had a personal interest in mental retardation. He had two severely mentally retarded students and devoted much of his research to the biomedical causes of mental retardation (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). Cooke was formative in designing a Head Start planning commission that included not only educators, but also representatives from the medical and mental health professions. The planning commission consisted of two early childhood educators, “...four physicians, a professor of nursing, an associate dean of social work, a nun who was a college president, a dean of a college of education, a clinical psychologist, and two research psychologists” (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992, p. 8).

The members of the commission recommended that Head Start include comprehensive child development services, including health, social services, and education (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). The proposed program included assessments of nutrition, vision, hearing, and speech. Immunizations and dental care were provided for students in need (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992).

Parental involvement was an integral component to the design of Head Start. Members of the planning commission stated, “Parents should be involved both for their own and their student’s benefit; these parents need successful experiences along with their students” (Zigler &

Muenchow, 1992, p.19). Parents were encouraged to apply to serve as teacher aides in schools providing Head Start. Community-based educational programs were created to introduce parents to services available to their families.

Even though mental retardation was the impetus for developing Head Start, the planning commission did not include a provision for students with special needs. The committee considered the possibility of screening students for mental retardation by conducting IQ tests, but Mamie Clark, the only African American commission member, warned against performing such tests due to a concern for potential cultural bias against minority students (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). The commission agreed to allow local communities to conduct health screenings for “special problems and special strengths,” but did not advocate for IQ testing (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992, p. 20).

The Head Start planning commission recommended that a pilot group of approximately 2,500 students be included in the initial program. This advice was ignored by Shriver and President Johnson. Both Shriver and President Johnson were committed to offering Head Start on a national level, providing \$18 million to more than 100,000 students in the formation of the first summer program (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). Lady Bird Johnson agreed to serve as the honorary chairperson and was instrumental in rallying public support for the program (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992).

The White House organized a tea to present the recommendations of the commission. The reception was intended to be a news event, but quickly grew into a major social event including over 400 politicians and celebrities (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992). The exciting introduction of Head Start had the effect of encouraging support across political party lines, including acceptance in the southern states where President Johnson had been previously met with resistance to civil rights and War on Poverty initiatives. Community groups volunteered to sponsor Head Start programs, housing programs not only in schools, but also in social halls and in churches (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992).

Public support for Head Start resulted in increased funding for the program. The original amount of \$18 million grew to almost \$100 million by May, 1965 allowing over half a million students to be enrolled in the first summer program. Prior to the opening of the first summer program in 1965, President Johnson announced a commitment of over \$150 million to Head

Start for 1966, allowing the program to operate on a year-round basis (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992).

Once the planning commission made its recommendations and public support was established, Head Start became a political tool of President Johnson's administration (Vinovskis, 2005). The focus of the program became increasing students' IQ scores, rather than on providing a comprehensive child development program. The commission had warned against the temptation of attempting to align poverty with mental disability, but political forces ignored the warning and quickly tied the eradication of poverty to improved cognitive functioning (Vinovskis, 2005). Sergeant Shriver testified to the United States' Congress in 1966 on the progress of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966. Presenting to Congress, Shriver was asked to comment on the greatest success of the Act. Shriver responded by stating that, "Project Head Start is OEO's greatest single measurable success,...[Head Start] has had great impact on students – in terms of raising IQ's, as much as 8 to 10 IQ points in a six-week period" (Shriver, 1966, p. 155). President Johnson advertised himself as the original "education president" (Zigler & Muenchow, 1992, p. 26). Speaking in the Rose Garden on Head Start, President Johnson made the statement that, "this program this year means that 30 million man-years – the combined lifespan of these youngsters – will be spent productively and rewardingly, rather than wasted in tax-supported institutions or in welfare-supported lethargy" (Johnson, 1965d). By making this claim, President Johnson implied that students who participated in Head Start could avoid a life of poverty spent either in institutions for cognitively disabled adults or on welfare.

Head Start and other early childhood intervention programs were challenged in 1969 by the researchers of a study compiled by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, entitled, "The impact of Head Start: An evaluation of the effects of Head Start on students' cognitive and affective development" (Westinghouse Learning Corporation, 1969). The researchers of the study summarized their findings by stating that summer programs were ineffective in producing gains in cognitive development, while full-year programs produced marginal gains in cognitive development. Students attending either summer or full-year programs were still considerably behind in language development and scholastic achievement, although performance on school readiness neared the national norm (Westinghouse Learning Corporation, 1969). The researchers of the Westinghouse study stated that Head Start was unsuccessful in its efforts to remediate

disadvantaged preschool students due to the government's underestimation of its ability to intervene in "complex human affairs" (Calhoun & Collins, 1981, p. 135). A spokesperson for the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Arthur Jensen, publicly announced that, "compensatory education had failed, leaving the clear implication that the poor and minorities may be genetically incapable of learning" (Calhoun & Collins, 1981, p.135).

Despite the initial findings of the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Head Start continued to serve disadvantaged children in the United States. Under the direction of Edward Zigler, the director of the Office of Child Development, Head Start became an 8-12 month program, offering partial and full-day programs, as well as home-based services (Cicirelli, 1970). Program criteria were established along with consistent performance standards for every Head Start program in the United States. Earlier attempts to increase IQ scores during the Johnson administration were abandoned for a more comprehensive approach, providing health, social, and education services (Calhoun & Collins, 1981).

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was first presented at a meeting of Chief State School Officers in Washington, DC on June 23-24, 1965. The draft included regulations and a model application form. In July, 1965, the Division of Compensatory Education was established through the Office of Education's Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education to assume the responsibility for administering Title I programs at the federal level (Bailey & Mosher, 1968). As described in Section 201 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,

Title I services are designed in recognition of the special educational needs of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance...to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of students from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute to meeting the special educational needs of educationally disadvantaged students. (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Sect. 201, 1965)

Through Title I, states could apply for financial assistance to provide economically disadvantaged students supplementary and remedial instruction, guidance and counseling services, and health and welfare services. Federal aid included providing equipment and the construction of school facilities necessary to provide specific programs. Limitations were placed on new construction based upon the availability of either leased or rental facilities (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966a).

State access to federal aid was based on the number of school-age students (5-17) from low-income families within a school district, multiplied by one-half the state average per pupil expenditure. In 1966, *low-income families*, were defined to be those families whose annual income was less than \$3,000 (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a). During 1965-1966, local school districts were required to have at least 100 children from low-income families or three percent of its total enrollment from low-income families to qualify for assistance. Beginning in the 1966-1967 school year, this requirement was altered to ten children from low-income families to qualify for federal assistance through Title I services (United States Department of Health, Education, Welfare, 1969a)

Local school districts were required to apply for Title I assistance through their state department of education. States awarded financial assistance based upon regulations and guidelines established by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. In awarding financial assistance, states determined the scope and quality of the proposed project and the potential for meeting the special needs of educationally disadvantaged students. Once funds were awarded, localities were required to show evidence of developing procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of the program annually, to develop procedures for communicating educational practices to teachers and administrators, and to coordinate its program with any community action program that operated under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a).

The U.S. Commissioner of Education, State education agencies (SEA), and local education agencies (LEA) all had responsibilities in administering Title I programs. The Office of Education was responsible for approving applications submitted by state education agencies, for distributing funds to state education agencies, for developing and for disseminating regulations and guidelines regarding the administration of the program, for providing consultative services to state education agencies, for evaluating the progress of Title I programs

throughout the nation, and for compiling fiscal, and statistical reports to the members of Congress and to the public from reports submitted by the State agencies (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a).

State education agencies (SEA) were responsible for developing and submitting Title I applications to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, for sub-allocating grant funds to local educational agencies (LEA), for assisting LEAs in the development of projects, for approving proposed projects from LEAs, for maintaining fiscal records of all grant funds, and for preparing and submitting fiscal and evaluative reports to the Office of Education (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a).

Local education agencies (LEA) were responsible for identifying economically disadvantaged children in areas with the highest concentrations of children from low-income families, for determining the special needs of children in these areas, and for designing projects to meet the children's needs. LEAs were responsible for submitting to the SEA applications for grants to finance the proposed projects, for documenting use of funds for the intended purposes as proposed in the applications, and for making public the nature of the projects to be included.

In 1969, the National Advisory Council (NAC) published the findings of the American Institutes of Research on a sample of 1,000 Title I programs in the United States (United States, 1970b). The purpose of the research was to determine which Title I programs were successful in assisting students in making measurable gains in language or arithmetic skills as compared to the scores of a similar control group. Of the 1,000 programs researched, only 21 programs or 2 percent were considered successful by the standards established by the council. The council defined successful programs to be those that included, "careful planning of programs with clearly stated objectives and small groups with intensive instruction and teacher training. The study concluded that mere service without planning would not work and the addition of teachers without training would not result in *real compensatory education* (United States House Committee on Education and Labor, 1970, p. 112). The council summarized its findings by stating that "effective compensatory education would be expensive" (United States House Committee on Education and Labor, 1970, p. 131).

Evaluation of Title I Services

The federal government granted local education agencies Title I funding provided:

Effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of economically disadvantaged children. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a, p. 25)

The Commissioner of Education required local educational agencies to submit information on the operation and evaluation of Title I to determine if federal funds were being used for the benefit of students living in low-income areas and to determine if the program was meeting the needs of economically disadvantaged children. Information on the operation of the program was reported in annual statistical reports from local educational agencies and annual financial reports from state educational agencies.

The annual statistical report provided information related to the number of students participating in the program, services offered, and the personnel involved in providing program activities. The annual financial report included the actual expenses incurred by local educational agencies. Statistical and financial reports were submitted by local educational agencies to state departments of education. State departments of education then submitted operational and financial reports to the federal Commissioner of Education (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a).

Statistical and financial reports were not required from local or state departments of education to the Commissioner of Education the first year of implementation (1965-1966) due to the limited time frame with initial implementation of the program. Evaluative reports were submitted the second year of implementation (1966-1967), but collection procedures were inconsistent and unreliable. By 1967-1968 the federal government had established a more comprehensive evaluation tool and provided an analysis of 180,000 students in over 4,000 Title I schools throughout the nation. The evaluation included descriptive information of approximately 33,000 teachers in Title I schools in the United States (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a, p. 33). The federal government required that Title I programs include accountability measures that included reporting, record keeping, and accessibility to information. These measures were intended to be consistent throughout the nation. Funds were restricted to the development of programs for economically disadvantaged students who resided in low-income areas. Title I programs were to supplement, not supplant, local programs (Vanecko, Ames, & Archambault, 1980).

Both Head Start of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 were designed to provide states and their localities with supplementary educational programs for disadvantaged students. Early intervention services were the focus of the programs, targeting preschool and elementary students with remedial and cultural opportunities. States and localities had the option of not accepting federal funding to provide supplementary programs for their students, but an increased population of students, and awareness of the prevalence of poverty and inferior educational opportunities for African American and disadvantaged students prompted the majority of states and their localities to accept federal funding to provide Head Start and Title I services for disadvantaged students.

CHAPTER IV
SETTING THE STAGE: LOCAL CHANGES AFFECTING ROANOKE COUNTY
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Economic, social, and political changes at the national level, including increases in population, racial desegregation, and heightened awareness of economically disadvantaged students permeated localities throughout the United States during the 1960s. The citizens of Roanoke County were not immune to these forces and they experienced the same phenomena of growth and cultural change.

Beginning in the mid-1950s, Roanoke County experienced a boom in population, followed by racial desegregation in the public schools. According to the 1960 census, more than 1,600 students in Roanoke County qualified for federal assistance based upon their socio-economic status (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1961). Consequently, the leaders of Roanoke County Public Schools were challenged with developing facilities that were staffed with qualified educators who met the academic and developmental needs of a booming student population that was racially and economically diverse.

Increased Population in Roanoke County, Virginia

The increase in population in Roanoke County beginning in the mid-1950s and continuing throughout the 1960s was due to industrial growth and the subsequent relocation of employees into the county. In 1955, the General Electric plant relocated from New York to Salem, marking a surge in residential growth in Southwest Roanoke City and Salem areas of Roanoke County. General Electric employed over 2,000 workers, becoming the largest employer in Roanoke County (Kagey, 1988). In 1958, the American Viscose plant, a rayon manufacturer, closed their doors causing 1,750 employees to lose their jobs. Many of these employees were hired by General Electric, contributing to a peak employment by General Electric of almost 3,800 positions (Kagey, 1988). A number of the employees of General Electric lived in Southwest Roanoke County.

Other industries that opened during the 1950s in Roanoke County included Koppers, a wood preserving company, and the Ortho-Vent Shoe Company. Both companies were located in Salem. The Allstate Insurance Company moved its headquarters to Roanoke County in 1956 after having been located in Roanoke City since 1951. Other companies that moved to Roanoke

County during the 1950s and 1960s were the Kroger Company and ITT Components Division in 1959; Double Envelope Corporation in 1960; Grumman Emergency Products, Incorporated, in 1961; and 7-Eleven Food Stores in 1965 (Kagey, 1988).

Between April 1, 1950 and April 1, 1960, the population in Roanoke County grew from 41,486 to 61,693, an increase of 48.7 percent (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1961). As the population in Roanoke County increased, farming communities decreased. People living on farms in Roanoke County in 1950 constituted one-seventh of the total population. By 1960 people living on farms dropped to one-thirtieth of the overall population. Farm land dropped by 21,000 acres between 1950 and 1960 (Kagey, 1988). Between April 1, 1960 and April 1, 1970, the population in Roanoke County grew from 61,693 to 89,321, an increase of 44.8 percent (Robinson et al., 1977). Increases in business and industry in Roanoke County led to increased student enrollment in Roanoke County Public Schools.

Increased Student Enrollment

Industrial growth in the county during the 1950s and 1960s led to residential growth which led to considerable increases in student enrollment in Roanoke County Public Schools. Student enrollment grew from 8,233 students in 1953 to 15,221 in 1963 (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1963). By 1968, Roanoke County Public Schools had an enrollment of 20,325 students and was increasing by approximately 1,000 new students each year (Kagey, 1988). Schools in Roanoke County became so overcrowded that in 1970 the members of the Roanoke County School Board began denying requests from parents in Roanoke City to have their students attend Roanoke County Public Schools (Chamberlain, 1970a). Comparable growth continued through the mid-1970s. In 1975, Roanoke County Public Schools became the largest school system west of Richmond, with over 24,000 students, approximately 1,200 teachers, and 40 schools (Kagey, 1988).

Table 2

Roanoke County Schools, Student Enrollments, 1950 – 1975

Year	White	African American	Enrollment Total
1950	7,606	670	8,276
1955	9,283	747	10,030
1960	13,424	948	14,372
*1965			17,979
*1970			21,091
*1975			24,390

*Figures not separated after desegregation

Note. Adapted from “Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1961-1969,” By N. Peters. & B. Wilson, 1988, p. 18, Table 1-1.

School Construction in Roanoke County

Growth in Roanoke County necessitated expansion of school facilities. In 1952, the Roanoke County Board of Supervisors authorized an eight million dollar school building program (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1961). Funding was made available by a 25-cent levy for school construction purposes. In 1954, the construction levy was raised to 50 cents (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1961). The authorization of the construction levy marked the beginning of a twelve year period of school construction.

In 1952, Roanoke County had four high schools and nineteen elementary schools. One additional school, Hollins Elementary, was owned jointly with Botetourt County (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1961). Between 1952 and 1962, five new schools were built and eight additional schools received additions. The new schools were Northside High School, Glenvar Elementary School, Oak Grove School, Mountain View School, and Craig Avenue School; additions were built at Cave Spring, William Byrd, Carver, and Andrew Lewis high schools, and South Salem, Mt. Pleasant, Clearbrook, and Back Creek elementary schools (Kagey, 1988).

On December 4, 1962, a \$3,500,000 bond referendum passed allowing for the continuation of school construction (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1962). In this phase of construction, five more elementary schools were built including Cave Spring, Masons Cove,

Pinkard Court, East Vinton, and East Salem (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1962). By 1962, Roanoke County had thirty-three schools, with a net gain of 313 classrooms (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1962).

In 1962, the Virginia Superintendent of Public Instruction appointed a committee to conduct a study of the school building needs in Roanoke County through 1975 (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1962). Based upon previous three-year student enrollment averages, if growth in the county continued at the same rate, the student enrollment by 1975 would be 30,000 students. High school enrollments, grades ten through twelve, would be approximately 6,500 students; intermediate enrollments, grades seven through nine, would be approximately 7,500 students; and elementary enrollments, grades one through six, would be approximately 16,000 students (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1962). Building capacity in 1962 was 6,000 students at the high school level, and 12,000 students at the elementary level (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1962).

By 1965, Roanoke County had thirty-seven schools including thirty elementary and seven secondary schools. In 1963, a vocational school was constructed in Salem. Enrollment of the vocational school was three hundred twenty-seven secondary students. Division enrollment in the 1965-1966 school year was 17,955 students (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1965). This enrollment marked an increase of 938 students over the previous school year.

Construction in the 1965-1966 school year included additions to several elementary schools. Glenvar High School was to be completed by January, 1966 and a new Cave Spring High school was to be completed in the 1967 school year. The Roanoke County School Board purchased land for a new Andrew Lewis High School in Salem and a new William Byrd High School in the Vinton area (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1965).

In 1967, Roanoke County launched a three-year \$7,000,000 school building program. The program was financed from three different sources: “(1) \$3,500,000 from the sale of general obligation bonds as approved in a bond referendum May 2, 1967; (2) \$3,000,000 will be borrowed from the Virginia Supplemental Retirement Fund - \$1,000,000 per year over the next three years; and (3) \$500,000 from the State Literacy Fund” (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1967, p. 85). This phase of construction included a new high school in Vinton, an intermediate school in North County, an intermediate or high school in Salem, and the expansion of facilities in several elementary schools (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1967).

As of 1967 there were 1,800 five-year-old students eligible to participate in a preschool program, but facilities were not available for housing a kindergarten program. Seventy-two additional classrooms were needed in Roanoke County to accommodate the kindergarten program (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1967). Consequently, the preschool program in Roanoke County was limited to a summer program until additional facilities could be constructed.

In response to the continued need for additional facilities, a \$15.8 million bond was approved by the voters in Roanoke County in 1969. When the issue was presented to the voters the first time, the date on the bond was accidentally omitted from the document, forcing the referendum to be voted on a second time. The results of each election were favorable, and the bond passed resulting in the construction of William Byrd High School; Cave Spring High School; Hidden Valley Junior High; Northside Junior High; Roanoke County Occupational School; and Glen Cove, Penn Forest, and Hardy Road elementary schools (Peters & Wilson, 1988). In addition, nine elementary schools received gymnasiums, multi-purpose rooms, cafeterias, and space for the implementation of a kindergarten program (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1969).

Racial Desegregation

Racial desegregation of public schools began in Roanoke County during the 1962-1963 school year (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1963). Members of the school board planned to desegregate two grade levels per year concluding the effort in 1967-1968 with the closing of Carver, the only African American school in the county (Peters & Wilson, 1988). Acceptance of federal funding to develop a Head Start program in the County, forced the administration to complete desegregation efforts by 1965 to comply with federal regulations that Head Start would be a desegregated program (Chamberlain, 1970b).

Desegregation efforts in Roanoke County were noted for their lack of controversy as compared to the transition in nearby Roanoke City. The major difference between Roanoke County and Roanoke City was Roanoke County had a small percentage of African American students scattered in the more rural areas compared to Roanoke City, which had a large percentage of African American students concentrated in core city areas (Chamberlain, 1970b). In desegregating schools, African Americans living in Roanoke County were allowed to attend

their neighborhood schools instead of being bused from rural areas like Bent Mountain and Catawba to Carver (Chamberlain, 1970b). As of 1970, Roanoke County had a student population of 20,885 of which only 814, or 3.8 percent, were African American students (Chamberlain, 1970b).

The members of the all-white Virginia Education Association [VEA] assisted in cultivating positive relationships between white and African American educators by merging with the all-Black Virginia Teachers Association [VTA] in July, 1966 (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008). Prior to the merger, the VEA had a membership of approximately 36,000 educators and the VTA had a membership of approximately 8,500 educators (Kagey, 1988, p. 557). In combining the two organizations, not only did the overall membership increase at the state level, but desegregated schools were united by having one teacher organization instead of two organizations.

Fred Eichelman, who served as the president of the Roanoke County Education Association [RCEA] in 1966, shared that the RCEA began efforts to desegregate the local chapters in 1964 by rewriting the RCEA constitution to remove racial restrictions (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008). In 1966, the RCEA merged with the Roanoke County Teachers Association [RCTA], dissolving the previous African American RCTA (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

One noted controversy surrounding desegregation in Roanoke County involved the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) filing a complaint against Roanoke County for changing the name of the African American school, Carver, to Salem Intermediate School. Members of the NAACP argued that the school should retain the name of Carver in honor of George Washington Carver, an African American scientist who became famous for his research on peanuts and sweet potatoes as alternatives to cotton crops (Means & Stein, 1952). The members of the Roanoke County School board refused to comply with the request, citing that it was against current policy to name schools after individuals.

George Washington Carver School opened as Salem Intermediate School in August 1970 with 687 white and 35 African American students. Other African American students attended their neighborhood schools (Chamberlain, 1970b). Once Carver School became Salem Intermediate School, the principal of Carver, Chauncey Harmon, became a visiting teacher for

Roanoke County Public Schools. The assistant principal, Joseph Kyle, became the assistant coordinator of testing for Roanoke County Public Schools (J. Kyle, personal communication, December 12, 2007). The majority of African American teachers who taught at Carver were assigned as itinerant teachers or reading teachers in the county (J. Kyle, personal communication, December 7, 2007).

Although desegregation efforts in Roanoke County were noted for their lack of controversy, there was a sense of loss expressed by African American educators resulting from the desegregation of schools in the county. In an interview with Wayne Tripp, former superintendent of Salem City Schools, Georgia Reeves, a mathematics teacher at Carver prior to desegregation, stated that African American teachers at Carver were resentful of being transferred throughout the county to serve as itinerant or reading teachers. Reeves refused to become a reading teacher, so was assigned as a mathematics teacher at Cave Spring High School. Reeves shared with Tripp her belief that by desegregating schools in the county, African American students lost the sense of family and encouragement that they received at Carver. In desegregating schools, Reeves stated that gifted African American students did receive more scholarship and athletic opportunities, but the average African American student “lost more than they got” (Tripp, 1995, p. 305).

Reeves believed that moving Chauncey Harmon to the administrative office in the county to serve as a visiting teacher was a significant loss for the students and teachers in the county. According to Reeves, Harmon was a model educator and a person who graciously assumed his new position within the county. Reeves stated that many African American teachers were resentful of the positions they assumed in the county after desegregation. She concluded by stating, “We got bitter and mean, but he didn’t” (Tripp, 1995, p. 305). The reassignment of African American principals was common in Virginia at this time. In 1965, there were 105 African American principals in Virginia. By 1971, there were only 16 African American principals serving in public schools in Virginia (Williams, 1994, p. B1).

Disadvantaged Students

President Johnson’s War on Poverty initiatives led the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to provide funding for localities to develop local programs to combat problems associated with poverty. In response, leaders in the Roanoke Valley established Total Action Against

Poverty [TAP] in 1964 to develop programs to support economically disadvantaged families in their endeavor to escape poverty (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967). Organizations such as TAP of the Roanoke Valley represented efforts by government, business, and educational leaders to coordinate community, health, and educational services for economically disadvantaged students.

Total Action Against Poverty in the Roanoke Valley

In January, 1965, the members of the Roanoke Valley Council of Community Services met to discuss human services development in the Roanoke Valley. One of the members of the council requested the passage of a resolution not to participate in anti-poverty federal programs that were being established in localities throughout the United States. Cabell Brand, a businessman and member of the council, stated that he was not knowledgeable of the federal legislation, but decided that if this particular member of the council was opposed to the federal program, then he (Cabell Brand) would probably be supportive of the program (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008; Brand, 2000). Brand requested and received permission from the majority of the members of the board to delay a motion pending further investigation. Brand contacted Congressman Richard Poff to inquire and to receive copies of the federal legislation. A copy of the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 was delivered to each of the members of the board for review.

After reviewing the EOA, Brand flew to Washington, DC to meet with Sergeant Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). For two days, Shriver's staff worked with Brand to instruct him in creating a Community Action Agency (CAA) in the Roanoke Valley. Brand learned that once a CAA was established, the federal government would supply 90 percent of the funding for the program, while the locality would supply 10 percent (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008; Brand, 2000). Brand returned home and shared the details of the program with the members of the Roanoke Valley Council of Community Services. According to Brand, Dave Herbert, the council's executive director, enthusiastically endorsed his efforts. Brand proceeded to take a six month leave of absence from his business to work with local government officials in Roanoke City, Roanoke County, and Botetourt County to assist them in understanding the parameters of the program and to assess their potential interest in participating in the program (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008; Brand, 2000).

The Roanoke City Council and the Roanoke and Botetourt County Boards of Supervisors agreed to appoint a committee of six members to study the legislation.

We didn't have much trouble convincing these three governments to participate. All of us saw the legislation as a way to get federal money to do things for poor people here at home. No one considered the political implications that it would have. Looking back, it was naïve, but that's how we all viewed it. (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008; Brand, 2000, p. 3)

After reviewing the legislation, each of the six committee members unanimously agreed to apply for the funds to form a private, non-profit Community Action Agency for the Roanoke Valley. "There was really very little discussion. Again, we just looked at it as federal money to help us do good things in our community" (Brand, 2000, p. 3).

In considering the name of the newly formed CAA, Brand shared his dislike of the word *poverty*. Brand stated that poverty is defined by an economic means test and should not define a population of people (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008).

To me the disadvantaged are those who don't participate in society, and not having enough money is a symptom. But every part of the Economic Opportunity Act was designed for the low-income or poverty population, so 'poverty' seemed the appropriate word. And since we had a multi-jurisdictional agency, we came up with the idea that it was a program against poverty in the Roanoke Valley. The name of a similar agency in Detroit – 'TAP' appealed to everyone. I liked the name because of the inference that it tapped the resources of the valley and the local community, as well as outside resources, to bring a hand up instead of a hand out. We built on these thoughts and came up with 'Total Action Against Poverty' or TAAP and later, for convenience, we contracted it to TAP. (Brand, 2000, p. 3)

Total Action Against Poverty (TAP) was incorporated on April 28, 1965. Led by Cabell Brand, members of the TAP board of directors included the original 18 committee members representing Botetourt County, Roanoke City, and Roanoke County. Chauncey Harmon, former principal of George Washington Carver School, served as the representative from Roanoke County. Six additional board members from low-income neighborhoods were added to the board of directors.

At first, I wasn't sure about having people living in poverty as directors, but it was a brilliant move. It has kept us honest and our programs on target. Having representatives of the constituency you're serving ensures smart planning. For instance, if we decide to start a program, it's the representatives of the poorer neighborhoods who remind us to think about transportation, child care, shift working hours, literacy levels, and other such things. They keep our programs reality based. They prevent us from the all too common sin of developing middle-class solutions for those in poverty. (Brand, 2000, pp. 6-7)

Having accomplished the goal of establishing TAP, the next challenge was to learn how to create a culturally responsive organization that carried out the intended expectations of a CAA by developing programs to combat the many problems associated with poverty in the Roanoke Valley. "All we knew was that there was clearly a need – nearly a quarter of the Roanoke Valley's families met the federal definition of poor – and federal money was available" (Brand, 2000, p. 3).

To better understand how to organize TAP, Brand returned to Washington to meet with officials from the OEO. Brand learned that money was available specifically for the development of CAA programs, but the proposal showing broad-based community support had to be submitted prior to the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1965 (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008; Brand, 2000). To establish broad-based community support, the members of the TAP board of directors organized a series of public meetings and met with civic groups. They spoke to the

Roanoke City Chamber of Commerce, the Roanoke Area Manufacturers Association, Roanoke Valley Industries, the Junior League, the League of Women Voters, the United Way, and even garden clubs. They spoke to Catholic churches, Baptist churches, Episcopalian churches – all the churches – in black and white and rich and poor communities. (Brand, 2000, p. 4)

On May 11, 1965, Cabell Brand addressed the Roanoke Valley Torch Club, an international discussion group, regarding the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 and its implications for the Roanoke Valley. Brand stated that the EOA was a social legislation for all citizens, not just for those who were poor. He argued that lowering the poverty rate not only increased the nation's prosperity but increased national security (Brand, 2000).

If the Western World, led by the United States, could accelerate its economic activity, make better use of its resources, particularly its major resource of people, could show the rest of the world magnificent progress in raising the standard of living..., we could solve the international political problem (the Cold War) by being so strong economically that the opposition would have to join us instead of fight us. In a democracy, the human being is the most important element. His dignity as a human being, his ability to satisfy his basic needs for health, frugal comfort, and moral living at a decent level is a minimum requirement for collective survival. Most references to poverty have been made in the context of low income or lack of financial resources. But our War on Poverty begins in the mind. We think, we create, we produce, and we prosper – and in that order. (Brand, 2000, p. 4)

On May 19, 1965, TAP board member and Roanoke City Manager Arthur Owens personally delivered TAP's proposal to the OEO in Washington, DC. Included in the proposal was 100 letters of support from the community (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008). On June 25, 1965, Congressman Richard Poff sent a telegram to the TAP board of directors notifying them that they would receive \$65,000 for development purposes (Brand, 2000, p. 12).

By December, 1965, the TAP staff in the Roanoke valley consisted of 350 members including teachers in day care centers and Head Start programs, nurses, social case workers, administrators, lawyers, and support personnel. Cabell Brand served as the director of TAP, Bristow Hardin, Jr., executive director, Osborne Payne, assistant executive director, and C. Samuel Barone, assistant executive director (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967; Brand, 2000).

Between May, 1966 and April, 1967, more than \$1 million dollars of the TAP budget was allocated to early childhood development. This included day care centers that operated during the day to allow working parents care for their children. Day care centers were open eleven-and-a-half-hours per day, five days a week, year round. In 1967, in the Roanoke Valley, 650 students from 410 families were enrolled in the program (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967). Day care centers provided employment for 278 mothers in the valley (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967, pp. 5-6).

Preschool programs were only a portion of the programs that were offered by TAP. Other programs were vocational training for men and women, neighborhood youth camps,

neighborhood development centers, a federal credit union, half-way houses, and legal aid (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967).

The TAP program provided economically disadvantaged citizens with an opportunity to better themselves and the lives of their children through education and employment opportunities. The authors of a brochure advertising TAP in the Roanoke Valley made the following statement:

TAP believes that much of the answer to the problem of poverty can be found in sound research, education and community-wide facing of facts. TAP believes that we should offer a man a helping hand rather than a *handout*. If TAP gives away anything, it is hope and opportunity. (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967, p.1)

TAP's job is to find out what poverty is, to know what it does to the spirits of men and the progress of a community. And if possible, to help find ways for men to help themselves out of poverty and into productivity. (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967, p.2)

Increased student population, racial desegregation, and the acknowledgement by legislators and local officials of the need to provide services for economically disadvantaged students prompted the administration of Roanoke County Public Schools to consider accepting federal funding to support educational programs.

Acceptance of Federal Funds by Roanoke County

On December 21, 1964, Assistant Superintendent of Roanoke County Public Schools, Arnold R. Burton, asked the members of the school board to share their thoughts regarding the use of federal funds to support instructional programs. The members of the board shared their beliefs that Roanoke County should do what was necessary to provide educational opportunities for students. Superintendent Horn stated that he was opposed to the *trend towards socialization* (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1964c). After much debate, the general consensus between Burton and the members of the board was, "The county should get its share when the 'cake is passed around'" (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1964c, p. 136).

Horn's comment of being opposed to the *trend towards socialization* potentially stemmed from a socialization theory that was developed during the 1960s to attempt to explain the reason for increased government spending. The socialization hypothesis stated that government spending grew because government leaders had been socialized into pro-spending beliefs. Government leaders were socialized into believing that it was socially-responsive behavior to

financially support programs they developed, regardless of the cost of implementation (Payne, 1991).

Despite reservations, the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools pursued two federal compensatory programs to support educational initiatives: Head Start of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Head Start was an eight week summer program designed to prepare economically disadvantaged students who were entering first grade for “their first encounter with modern society” (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967, p. 5). Students were provided instruction in reading and mathematics as well as cultural programs. Parents were assisted in securing medical and dental care, given nutritional guidance, and provided support for preparing students for school (TAP, 1967).

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 began in Roanoke County in 1965. The provisions of Title I provided resources, personnel, and remedial instruction to any child who was behind grade level in reading, in targeted Title I schools throughout the county. Schools in Roanoke County with the highest concentration of students with annual family incomes of less than \$3,000 were targeted to receive Title I services.

CHAPTER V
THE LOCAL SCENE: IMPLEMENTATION OF HEAD START IN ROANOKE COUNTY
(VIRGINIA) PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In 1965, the only kindergarten programs in Virginia were private programs which prevented many economically disadvantaged children from attending preschool programs. Children who did not attend a preschool program prior to the first grade were often at a disadvantage in knowing their colors, letters, and numbers, as well as in learning basic etiquette and communication skills. Head Start offered economically disadvantaged parents the opportunity to provide their children with a preschool program designed to prepare them academically and socially for the transition to the public school setting.

On May 21, 1965, two days after Arthur Owens delivered TAPs proposal for development funding, Cabell Brand and Dave Herbert travelled to Washington, DC, to request funding for a summer Head Start program (Brand, 2000). Officials from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) shared with Brand and Herbert that to offer Head Start during the summer of 1965, the proposal had to be submitted to the OEO by June 9, 1965. Brand and Herbert had less than two weeks to prepare a proposal to the federal government to offer Head Start for the Roanoke Valley for the summer of 1965.

Cabell Brand returned to Roanoke and requested a meeting with the superintendents of Botetourt County Schools, Roanoke City Schools, and Roanoke County Schools. Brand explained to the superintendents the opportunity to have Head Start in their school districts for the summer of 1965, depended upon availability of space and staff (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008). The superintendent from Botetourt County, J. W. Obenshain, chose to wait until the following summer to offer the program. The superintendent from Roanoke City, Dorothy Gibboney, agreed to offer Head Start for the summer of 1965, but expressed concern to Brand that the program would be a desegregated program. According to Brand, Gibboney contacted him the following day and told him that parents of white children would never allow their children to attend a preschool program with African American children. Brand told Gibboney that Head Start was exactly what was needed to begin the process of creating a desegregated public school system and the acceptance of federal funds dictated that both white and African American students be included in the program. Gibboney was supportive of Brand

and Herbert's efforts to secure approval to offer a Head Start program in Roanoke City for the summer of 1965 (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008; Brand, 2000).

The superintendent from Roanoke County, Herman L. Horn, shared with Brand that Roanoke County had already applied and received approval to operate Head Start for the summer of 1965 (Brand, 2000). According to Brand, the administration of Roanoke County was receptive to working with TAP and Roanoke City Public Schools to coordinate future Head Start efforts (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008).

Brand and Herbert went forward with submitting a proposal for a summer Head Start program in Roanoke City to the OEO by the deadline. Approval was granted to operate the program the last week of May, 1965. During the summer of 1965, 1,259 preschool students in the Roanoke Valley participated in Head Start (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967, p. 5). The eight week summer program was scheduled to begin in elementary schools throughout Roanoke County on June 23, 1965 (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967a).

Appointment of Fred Eichelman as Head Start Coordinator

Fred Eichelman, an administrative assistant for Roanoke County Schools, assumed the position of Head Start coordinator beginning in the spring of 1965. Eichelman who previously served as the principal of South Salem Elementary School, was appointed by the school board on November 10, 1964, as an administrative assistant in charge of the 1965 census (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008). Eichelman was transferred from being a principal to the administrative position at the county level after suffering a broken leg in an auto-train accident on October 13, 1964. He was replaced by Hugh Tucker, a teacher at William Byrd High School, as the principal at South Salem School. Dr. Horn stated that Eichelman was ready to return to work, but required a walker for mobility which would be difficult in overseeing administrative and discipline issues at a school. The members of the board appointed Eichelman as an administrative assistant responsible for the 1965 census and the coordinator of Head Start for Roanoke County Public Schools (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1964b).

Implementation of Head Start in Roanoke County

On April 13, 1965, Superintendent Horn recommended to the members of the Roanoke County Public School Board that an application be made for federal funds under the Economic

Opportunity Act to assist in financing instructional programs, including a more comprehensive special education program. The members of the board agreed to have Dr. Horn and Mr. Burton proceed with preparing an application for federal funds to operate the programs (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965b).

Fred Eichelman, Head Start coordinator for Roanoke County schools, reported to the board that an application had been submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) for funds to operate a two month Head Start program in 22 elementary schools in the summer of 1965 (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965b). Over 700 students were eligible to participate in the program based on socio-economic qualifications established by the OEO. With a total student population of 17,979, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in Roanoke County was 3.8 percent (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965b). The school board requested \$133,547.00, or 90% of the cost of the program, from the federal government. Roanoke County provided \$44,000.00 in services, rentals, space, etc (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965b). Superintendent Herman L. Horn, shared his hesitation over accepting federal funds for education, but stated that the government was anxious to disperse the funds and the students would benefit from the program (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965b).

Roanoke County received approval from the OEO for implementation of the Head Start program on May 15, 1965, but student enrollment by the first of June was less than a hundred students (Chamberlain, 1965a). Horn reported that “apathy, disinterest, and pride” from the community could be the reasons for lack of enrollment (Chamberlain, 1965a, p. 5). Horn stated, “This is a tremendous opportunity for them [students], for many of them the difference between failure and success in school. It can reduce the first grade failure rate by 25 per cent” (Chamberlain, 1965a, p. 5).

Federal guidelines required that Head Start programs include a curriculum that focused on academic and social development in preschool students. The curriculum in Roanoke County included an introduction to phonemic awareness and mathematics, but also included social awareness such as nutrition, hygiene, fitness, and etiquette (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

Head Start classes were limited to fifteen students in a class with one teacher, two aides, and two volunteers. Lead teachers were responsible for the daily operation of individual Head Start schools, with limited involvement from elementary principals of host schools. The Head

Start staff included a nurse, a social worker, and a cafeteria manager (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008). Federal guidelines required that students who participated were from families with an annual income of less than \$3,000, with the exception of ten percent of the student population that could be above the income restriction (Total Action Against Poverty, 1967, p. 4). According to Eichelman, the ten percent above the income level was to better ensure that the student population was diverse in its composition (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

Head Start: Summer 1965

Educators through the Office of Economic Opportunity provided training for teachers who planned to teach Head Start in Roanoke County in the summer of 1965. Eight teachers in Roanoke County attended training sessions at George Washington University in Washington, DC, for the week of June 14-18, 1965 (Chamberlain, 1965d). After returning from Washington, DC, teachers had two days of planning prior to the first day of Head Start in Roanoke County (Chamberlain, 1965d).

Roanoke County had planned for 22 kindergarten centers for the summer of 1965, but limited enrollment threatened to reduce the offerings to only six kindergarten learning centers. At a minimum, Roanoke County would offer two or three centers in Salem, two or three centers in the Catawba area, one or two in the Vinton area, and one or two centers in the Cave Spring area (Chamberlain, 1965b).

As of June 9, 1965, 130 students had enrolled in the Head Start program. Eichelman projected, “We’ll go over 200, we may still go over the 300 mark” (Chamberlain, 1965b, p. 14). Eichelman stated that in speaking with families of eligible students, it was apparent that parents did not understand that the program was free and that the program would be beneficial in preparing students for the first grade (Chamberlain, 1965b).

In an effort to communicate the formation of the Head Start program, approximately 40 volunteers, including county school officials and members of civic groups, began door-to-door campaigning. Volunteers visited over 150 homes sharing the benefits of the Head Start program and attempting to enroll eligible students (Chamberlain, 1965b). Mrs. Howard J. Wulfken, a civic volunteer, stated that the majority of low income parents did not know about the program. She commented, “A lot of these people don’t get a newspaper, and those that do read the sports pages and the comics...the ones we want to reach are isolated” (Chamberlain, 1965b, p. 14).

The original application for Head Start stated that 690 county students qualified for the program, but later estimates reported the number to be 330 students. One volunteer asked a county official the reason for the discrepancy in counts. The official responded by stating, “It looks like it turned out that Roanoke County is a little more affluent than school officials thought” (Chamberlain, 1965c, p. 15).

Head Start began for the first time in Roanoke County on June 23, 1965. Two hundred and thirty-five pre-school students enrolled in the eight week program. The county offered 11 Head Start centers: Academy Street, Carver, West Salem, Fort Lewis, Back Creek, Pinkard Court, Mount Pleasant, Roland E. Cook, Craig Avenue, Burlington, and Catawba. Each center employed one to two teachers, dependent upon student enrollment and operated for three hours each day. Transportation was provided for every child participating in the program (Chamberlain, 1965e).

Superintendent Arnold R. Burton, shared with the board on September 14, 1965 that the Head Start program, which began the previous summer, would be considered again for the summer of 1966 (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965c). Burton shared his desire to offer the program during the regular school session, but stated the lack of facilities prevented providing this opportunity (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965c).

Head Start: Summer 1966

Fred Eichelman proposed to the board on February 8, 1966 (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1966a), the continuation of the Head Start program for the summer of 1966. He estimated the cost of the program to be \$103,344.30, which included offering the program in 10 elementary schools. The summer program would include kindergarten preparation for 500 students. Classes would last for eight weeks beginning the middle of June for four hours a day. Teacher and aide training would begin in late spring. An evaluation of the previous summer’s program and the upcoming summer program would be conducted (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1966a).

Head Start: Summer 1967

Roanoke County received \$109,256.15 from the federal government to operate Head Start in the summer of 1967 (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967a). According to Eichelman, the county did not require all of the money allotted by the federal government so he

purchased tricycles for the students to use in each of the Head Start centers. Eichelman stated that Charles Jennings, personnel director for Roanoke County Public Schools, was not happy that he had used federal funding to purchase tricycles (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008). Eichelman stated that he believed the Head Start program in the county should include academic preparation as well as cultural opportunities including art, music, dance, and other physical activities. He said that Charles Jennings and other members of the senior administration in Roanoke County Public Schools were more interested in academic preparation than in cultural opportunities (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

According to Eichelman, tension between the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools and the administration of Total Action Against Poverty (TAP) grew as the Head Start program continued to be offered in the county. Eichelman stated that TAP administrators expected administrators in Roanoke County to consult with them regarding questions related to the operation of Head Start, but Eichelman often consulted directly with the Head Start administration in Washington, DC. Eichelman recalled that during the first summer of Head Start, he asked Herman L. Horn whether he could contact Osborne Payne, TAP executive director, regarding a question related to Head Start. Horn consulted with Charles Jennings, director of personnel, and Arnold R. Burton, assistant superintendent, prior to giving Eichelman permission to pose the question to Osborne Payne (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

Eichelman speculated that the tension was due to distrust between the administrators of the Roanoke County Public Schools and the Roanoke City Public Schools resulting from the perception that the administration in Roanoke City wanted to integrate the two school divisions into one system (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

Evaluation of Head Start Services in Roanoke County

According to Eichelman, Roanoke County was required to submit to the federal government an evaluation of Head Start services at the conclusion of each summer, but the evaluation was limited to the number of students, teachers, aides, and volunteers who were involved in the implementation of the program. Dr. Donald W. Rapp, professor of child development at the University of Georgia and an OEO representative, served as the evaluator for the Roanoke Valley Head Start programs. According to Cabell Brand, Rapp was complementary of the Head Start programs but did recommend that the programs in Roanoke City and Roanoke County be combined for greater efficiency. Brand stated the programs did not combine due to the

county pursuing the state supported kindergarten program instead of Head Start beginning in the summer of 1968 (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008). Eichelman recalled Dr. Rapp performed juggling acts for the students when he visited the Head Start centers in the county. Eichelman said that he did not receive feedback on Rapp's observations (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

Transition from Head Start to Kindergarten in Roanoke County

Superintendent Arnold R. Burton, recommended to the members of the school board on November 14, 1967 that Roanoke County transition from Head Start to kindergarten for the 1967-1968 school year. Burton told the school board that Head Start had provided the opportunity to offer a preschool program three years prior to the state-supported public kindergarten, but that it was his desire to provide all students in the county with the opportunity to attend preschool, not just to those students whose families were of a certain income level (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967b).

Transitioning the preschool program in the county from Head Start to kindergarten allowed the administration in the county to assume more autonomy in decision-making processes but required the county to assume responsibility for providing funding to support the continuation of the program. The members of the school board supported the transition to kindergarten and instructed Arnold R. Burton to go forward with implementation of kindergarten beginning in the summer of 1968. In response, Burton instructed Eichelman not to submit an application for Head Start in Roanoke County Public Schools for the summer of 1968. Preparations were made to offer a summer kindergarten program for rising first graders with an emphasis on academic and social acclimation to the school setting (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

After the transition from Head Start to kindergarten, Eichelman served in an administrative capacity for Roanoke County partial days and served as a history teacher at Andrew Lewis Middle School the remainder of the time (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008). The following year (1968-1969), he served as the assistant principal of Glenvar High School before returning to the classroom as a history teacher at Northside High school until his retirement in 1981 (F. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

Kindergarten: 1967-1968

On December 12, 1967, Mr. Oren Counts, director of instruction, reported that a kindergarten curriculum was being designed to prepare students for the first grade with an emphasis on academic readiness (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967b). Members of the Roanoke County School Board unanimously agreed to have Superintendent Arnold R. Burton, submit a proposal for the implementation of kindergarten in Roanoke County to the State Board of Education, but they also expressed reservations about offering a full-year program due to lack of facilities and increased student enrollment (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967c).

Mr. Burton indicated that he had met with Mr. J. G. Blount, State Finance Officer, to discuss the financial obligations involved in implementing the kindergarten program. According to Burton, state and local funds would allow for a kindergarten program to be developed by the summer of 1968, if space was available and qualified teachers could be hired (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967c).

Burton recommended, pending approval from the State Board of Education, the development of an eight week kindergarten program in the summer of 1968 for six year olds who were entering first grade in September, 1968. Burton requested the offering of the same kindergarten program for six year olds in the summer of 1969 with the intention of beginning regular kindergarten for five year olds in the fall of 1969. Members of the board unanimously agreed to support the proposal and requested that Burton submit his plan to the state for approval (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967c).

On April 9, 1968, Hugh Tucker, coordinator of federal programs for Roanoke County Public Schools, told the board that Roanoke County Public Schools qualified for approximately \$72,199 in state funds specifically for the development of kindergarten in Roanoke County. This allotment would be used to provide equipment for schools, to pay for teachers to receive the training necessary to qualify for kindergarten certification, and to hire kindergarten teachers. Tucker stated that the program must operate five hours per day, be taught by teachers with kindergarten certification, and serve students one meal per day to qualify for state funds (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968a). He also stated that the program would be called, "Social and Cultural Experiences for the Pre-School Child" (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968a).

Arnold R. Burton shared with the members of the board his concern over the lack of endorsement by current personnel to teach kindergarten. Mr. Burton shared with the members of the school board that he had written to the State Superintendent of Instruction, Dr. Woodrow Wilkerson, requesting that primary teachers be allowed to teach at the kindergarten level and still retain the \$25 per child reimbursement from the state. State guidelines required that kindergarten teachers have six hours of credit in kindergarten training or hold a collegiate professional certificate at the elementary level with two years of kindergarten teaching experience. Dr. Wilkerson replied by stating that many localities had the same problems in securing qualified kindergarten teachers, but the state department of education would not lower certification standards. Burton stated that members of the Roanoke City School Board had granted approval for teachers in Roanoke City who were certified to teach kindergarten be employed by the county for the summer kindergarten program. Based upon the information shared, the members of the board consented to begin plans for a summer kindergarten program (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968a).

On May 14, 1968, Assistant Superintendent Con Davis reported to the members of the school board that 653 students had registered for the summer kindergarten program. Nine schools throughout the county--Academy Street, Carver, West Salem, Fort Lewis, Back Creek, Mount Pleasant, Roland E. Cook, Burlington, and Catawba--would provide kindergarten instruction in the summer of 1968 (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968b).

Kindergarten: 1968-1970

On August 13, 1968, Superintendent Burton shared with the members of the board that lack of space would prevent the county from offering the kindergarten program during the 1968-1969 school year. Burton stated that space was available in the north, south, and eastern parts of the county, but no space was available in the Salem area. Kindergarten programs would continue to operate during the summer months, but not during the regular school term until adequate space was made available in the Salem area (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968d).

On March 4, 1969, Con Davis reported to the members of the board that a summer kindergarten program was to begin on June 13, 1969. As of March 4, 1969 803 students had enrolled in the program. The projected cost of the summer program was \$93,000 of which \$11,486.65 would be financed from local funds. Teachers who were endorsed in kindergarten instruction were being employed by the county (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1969a).

Davis shared with the members of the board that only 32 of the 76 rooms required to offer the kindergarten program during the school year were available for use. Due to increased enrollment and lack of facilities, the committee concluded that it would be impossible to offer a kindergarten program in the regular 1969-1970 school session (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1969b).

Kindergarten: 1970-1971

On October 13, 1970, Burton reported that with the completion of kindergarten facilities at Mountain View in North County and Glenvar Elementary in Salem, the possibility of offering a regular kindergarten program may be a reality for the 1971-1972 school year. Burton asked the board for its permission to begin developing a kindergarten program in anticipation of the upcoming school session. The members of the board granted permission for the development of a kindergarten program (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1970b).

On December 8, 1970, Burton apprised the members of the board that a voluntary kindergarten program was being developed by the staff for a voluntary program designed to begin in September, 1971 for five-year olds. Brochures advertising the program to families were being distributed throughout the county. Kindergarten registration was scheduled for December 9-11, 1970. Burton discussed hiring additional kindergarten teachers and the need for additional buses to transport students. The board was advised that some students would have to attend summer kindergarten programs in schools different than those they would attend for first grade due to space restrictions. A summer kindergarten program would be held for students entering first grade in the fall of 1971 (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1970c).

On January 12, 1971, Con Davis reported that the estimated cost of offering a full-day kindergarten program was \$337,701.50, and the cost of operating a half-day program was \$288,218.25. Federal funding provided a portion of the expense along with state and local funding (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1971a). Burton shared with the members of the board that the State required a five-hour kindergarten program unless the division could justify a shorter program. No decision was made as to whether the county would offer a full-day or half-day kindergarten program (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1971a).

On February 9, 1971, Burton reported that the kindergarten program had a tentative enrollment of 1,200 students. Some students would have to attend centrally located kindergarten programs in areas with heavy concentrations of five-year olds. Busing was coordinated with

elementary and high school transportation schedules. The members of the board requested that Burton submit an application to the Virginia State Superintendent of Public Instruction requesting a four and one-half hour modified school day. The following resolution was adopted and submitted for approval by the State:

WHEREAS, the County School Board of Roanoke County has duly considered implementing a regular kindergarten program for 1971-1972; and

WHEREAS, in preparing for said program in compliance with the provisions set forth in Regulation 12 of the State Board of Education as amended February, 1967; great difficulty is being encountered in devising a workable transportation schedule which will permit transporting the kindergarten students to their homes; and which will allow sufficient time for the buses to return to their assigned schools for regularly scheduled pick-ups, and

WHEREAS, several central kindergarten centers will be required to accommodate those students in areas heavily populated with kindergarten-aged students, which will not permit the students to attend their home schools; thus, further complicating the transportation schedule;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County School Board of Roanoke County, on motion of S. Wallace Cundiff, seconded by Thomas S. Worrell, hereby requests approval, by the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Virginia; of a modified school day to begin at 8:15 A.M. and dismiss at 12:45 P.M. (four and one-half hours) for the 1971-72 school session based on the above stated difficulties.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that, should said request be granted, the Board shall make every effort to provide the necessary facilities to house kindergarten students in their home schools, thus eliminating the need for established schedules. These facilities are now under construction. (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1971b)

On April 13, 1971, Burton reported to the members of the board that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Woodrow Wilkerson, had granted permission for the operation of a modified four and one-half hour kindergarten program for the 1971-1972 school year. During the 1971-1972 school year, 26,813 of the 74,286 kindergarten-age students (36%) were enrolled in public school kindergarten programs in Virginia (Virginia Board of Education, 1971). Kindergarten enrollment was 1,200 of approximately 1,950 kindergarten-age students

(62%) of eligible students in Roanoke County Public Schools (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1971c).

Kindergarten: 1971-1972

In August of 1971, Roanoke County Public Schools began its first kindergarten program during the school year for 5-year-old students. The projected enrollment was 1,200 students requiring 188 new kindergarten teachers. With the addition of the kindergarten program, the student enrollment in Roanoke County was expected to exceed 23,000 students, making Roanoke County the largest school system west of Richmond (“Full Kindergarten,” 1971).

Summary

Head Start services were provided to economically disadvantaged preschool students in Roanoke County for three summers before the county transitioned to a state-supported kindergarten program. In providing Head Start, educators were afforded the opportunity to determine the organizational and instructional requirements necessary to provide a preschool program in Roanoke County. Head Start provided an opportunity for the first generation of students to learn in a desegregated environment beginning at the preschool level.

In transitioning from Head Start to kindergarten, educators were afforded the opportunity to provide a preschool program for all age-appropriate students without family income restrictions limiting participation in the program. As the student population in the county continued to increase and to become more racially and economically diverse, the formation of kindergarten provided educators an opportunity to offer an inclusive preschool program designed to acclimate students to the learning environment.

CHAPTER VI
THE LOCAL SCENE: IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE I SERVICES IN ROANOKE
COUNTY (VIRGINIA) PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was administered through state departments of education (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a). The Virginia Department of Education established a Title I department in 1965 to organize the distribution of federal funds and to supervise the implementation of services throughout the state. Localities were required to submit applications to the department of education to receive funding to support local programs. Each locality was supervised by a regional supervisor who was appointed by the Virginia Department of Education to work with that locality to understand and implement Title I programs.

Local school districts were granted the autonomy to design programs according to their specific needs, but were required to limit Title I funding to those students attending low-income schools within their school district. Low-income schools were determined through a local funding formula that identified the greatest concentrations of families with annual earnings below the poverty level. Students attending Title I schools were afforded the opportunity to receive Title I services even if their family did not meet the income requirements established through the federal government.

The administration in Roanoke County made application to receive Title I services beginning in 1965, the first year funding was offered. Title I funding provided for increased personnel to support the implementation of remediation, special education, guidance, migrant, and food and health services to students attending Title I schools in the county.

Title I Program in Virginia

The administrative and support personnel of the Title I program in Virginia included a program director who served as the principal administrator for Title I, a coordinator who supervised the analyses of programs throughout the state, four regional supervisors who assisted in the development of projects and programs at the local level and were headquartered in Abingdon, Lynchburg, Warrenton, and Richmond, a grants advisor who analyzed compliance of applications according to the laws, rules, and regulations; an accountant, a key punch operator, and two secretaries (Virginia Board of Education, 1965-1966).

The first program director for Virginia was Robert W. Fox. The first regional director to serve southwestern Virginia, including Roanoke County, was Bob Bales from Abingdon, Virginia. He was followed in the early 1970s by Jim Lewis from Lynchburg, Virginia (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Title I allotments for Virginia between 1966 and 1970, including funding for projects submitted by school divisions, are in Table 3. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act required that programs developed through Title I funding supplement rather supplant current educational services offered by the school divisions (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966a). School divisions submitted applications to participate. A description of how funds were used to enhance current educational programs was required. Remediation, kindergarten, guidance, elective, and health programs were submitted. Funds could be used to increase personnel to support the development of special education programs, to develop remediation programs, to provide support for the care of neglected or delinquent students, and to provide services to students of migrant workers who lived in rural portions of the state for a given period of time each year (Virginia Board of Education, 1969).

Table 3

Virginia: Title I Allotment 1966-1970

Year	Title I allotment	Participating divisions	Project allotment	Number of projects	Handicap allotment	Neglected allotment	Migrant allotment	Adm.
1966-1967	\$23,985,037	112/138=81%	\$23,658,931	172	\$192,796	\$33,310	\$100,000	
1967-1968	\$29,145,963	121/138 =88%	\$28,130,476	196	\$434,333	\$148,154	\$433,000	
1968-1969	\$26,959,114	125/138 =91%	\$25,880,038	228	\$473,671	\$253,494	\$351,911	
1969-1970	\$31,760,513	136/138 =99%	\$30,013,222	245	\$564,400	\$359,832	508,533	\$314,526

Note. Adapted from “Superintendent of Public Instruction: Annual Report” by Virginia Board of Education, 1966-1970, Vols. 50-54, Richmond, VA: Author.

Title I Program in Roanoke County

On March 3, 1965, two patrons of Roanoke County presented to the members of the school board their concerns regarding instructional and special education programs in Roanoke County. Mrs. Norman Strickland, a concerned parent, shared with the members of the board the need for increased curriculum opportunities in the county. Mrs. Strickland stated that she believed the county needed more subject area supervisors; more libraries, books, and instructional materials; improved opportunities for exceptional students; elective classes in art, language, and music; and an expanded guidance program. She stated that she believed that the majority of county residents had not been made aware of these needs. The chairman of the school board shared with Mrs. Strickland that the administration in Roanoke County was aware of the need for additional instructional programs and would work with the current administration to develop additional instructional programs as funds became available (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965a).

Mrs. Conrad Stone, representing the Roanoke Council for Retarded Students, reported to the members of the board that the Council recommended an improvement to facilities and instructional programs for retarded students in Roanoke County. Mrs. Stone stated that, “through scientific research it is estimated that at least 3% of any school population is mentally retarded, having an I.Q. of less than 80” (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965a). Mrs. Stone noted that since the population in Roanoke County had grown rapidly, the number of mentally retarded students had grown proportionately, necessitating additional facilities.

Mrs. Stone pointed out that federal funds were available for transporting mentally retarded students, providing training for teachers, and for providing school psychologists. Assistant Superintendent Arnold R. Burton, shared with the members of the board that the State required a maximum enrollment of 12 in trainable classes and 16 in educable classes. The State provided \$1,600 towards the salaries of teachers of mentally retarded students. Burton stated that it was anticipated that the program would grow in the county in the coming year, but the number of students to be included was uncertain. Burton shared with the board his intentions to visit a special education school in Fishersville, Virginia to learn more about their program. The chairman of the school board, Arthur Trout, requested that Mrs. Stone select a small committee from the Roanoke Council for Retarded Students to work with Mr. Burton to develop a list of needs and possible solutions (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965a).

On September 14, 1965, Arnold R. Burton, who assumed the position of superintendent of Roanoke County Public Schools on July 1, 1965, following the retirement of Herman L. Horn, shared with the members of the board that an application had been submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to offer Title I services through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Burton stated that Roanoke County was eligible for federal funds under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for creating educational programs benefiting culturally disadvantaged students. “This could include kindergarten, reading and guidance programs, education classes, new teachers, certain construction,...any type of program which would be for the good of the schools that will go above and beyond what is now being offered” (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965c, p. 303). Burton stated that he believed the program, “will be a fine and large program which will cover a period of at least three years” (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965c, p. 304).

Burton shared with the members of the board that individual schools would qualify for federal assistance through Title I if more than ten students in each school were from families with less than \$3,000 annual income. He reported that if every county school qualified, then Roanoke County would receive \$1,740,000. A preliminary survey of the population indicated that 1,620 students in 16 schools qualified, making the county eligible for \$283,500.00 (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965c). He shared with the members of the board his intention to continue to investigate the most effective use of federal funds.

Appointment of Hugh Tucker as Coordinator of Federal Programs

On November 9, 1965, Superintendent Burton recommended to the members of the school board that Hugh Tucker, a teacher at William Byrd High School, assume the position of coordinator of federal school programs. Tucker had previously served as the principal at Back Creek Elementary School, Mountain View Elementary School, and South Salem Elementary School prior to returning to teaching at William Byrd High School. According to Tucker, Superintendent Burton phoned and asked him to work with federal programs that were beginning in the county (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007). Tucker agreed to serve as the coordinator of federal school programs, pending board approval. The members of the board unanimously agreed to proceed with the appointment of Hugh Tucker as the coordinator of

federal programs and to proceed with the implementation of Title I services in Roanoke County Public Schools (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965d).

Title I Services in Roanoke County Public Schools: 1967-1971

In Roanoke County Public Schools, early intervention services were the focus of Title I including services for elementary, special education, disadvantaged, and migrant students as the recipients of the funding. Roanoke County made individual achievement in reading a priority, but included special education services, preschool programs, guidance services, food and health services, migrant services, and enrichment through the arts. Title I funding was used to purchase instructional materials and equipment in Title I schools throughout the county (J. Kyle, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

The initial application for Title I funding included a proposal for programs designed specifically for targeted Title I schools in Roanoke County. Hugh Tucker, coordinator of federal programs, worked with individual principals to design Title I programs that provided the financial means to help students in Title I schools meet grade level expectations. Initially, programs were designed specifically for individual schools, but, beginning in 1968, only one program was written for all Title I schools in Roanoke County. The emphasis of the program was remediation services in targeted Title I schools (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Between 1965 and 1971, Title I schools in Roanoke County were Academy Street, Back Creek, Bent Mountain, Broad Street, Catawba, Clearbrook, Glenvar, Mount Pleasant, Roland E. Cook, South Salem, West Salem, and Mason's Cove. Secondary schools were Roanoke County Occupational School, Salem Intermediate, and William Byrd Intermediate (Chamberlain, 1973a).

Title I Services: 1966-1967

Title I services were first offered in Roanoke County Public Schools during the 1966-1967 school year. Hugh Tucker presented to the members of the board on November 9, 1965, that \$231,739.20 had been allocated to Roanoke County Schools for the 1966-1967 school year (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965d). The money had to be encumbered by June 30, 1966 and spent by August 30, 1966. Questionnaires were sent to schools to determine the number of students eligible to receive services. The board voted unanimously to approve the

application for federal funds under Title I in the amount of \$231,739.20 (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965d).

On February 8, 1966, Tucker shared with the members of the board that a proposal had been submitted to the Virginia Department of Education for \$61,000.00 for increased staff and materials at the Special Education School through Title I funding. Additional projects would be submitted prior to the June 30, 1966, deadline for approval (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1966a). On March 24, 1966, Hugh Tucker requested approval for federal funding for a mobile reading laboratory allowing the reading remediation program to operate during the summer months. The request was approved by the members of the board (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1966b).

Personnel to Support Title I Services

During the 1966-1967 school year, the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools used Title I funds to hire a school psychologist, one teacher, four teacher aides, and a secretary at the Special Education School. Teacher aides, who were employed by Roanoke County Public Schools for the first time in the 1966-1967 school year, were hired to assist teachers in meeting both instructional and developmental needs of students. A school psychologist was hired to conduct regular testing to determine the most appropriate placement for special education students. Remediation teachers were hired to offer summer instruction to students reading below grade level. A coordinator, Hugh Tucker, and an assistant coordinator, Joseph Kyle, were hired to administer the program (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1966b).

Special Education Services

As the population grew in Roanoke County, enrollment at the Special Education School increased, forcing the county to hire additional staff members and to consider alternative facility arrangements to accommodate the increased enrollment. Arnold R. Burton reported that the Special Education School, located at old South Salem Elementary school, could expect 80 additional students for the 1966-1967 school year (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1966b). Title I funds were used to hire special education personnel, but were not used to develop special education instructional programs. Special education instructional programs were financially supported through Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969c).

Remedial Services

During the summer of 1966, Title I services provided funding to support reading programs at the Baptist and Lutheran Students' Homes. Title I funds were also used to purchase a bus to serve as a mobile reading laboratory. A reading teacher circulated throughout the county providing remedial reading instruction to elementary students (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1966b).

The mobile reading laboratory operated five days a week. Betty Waldron, a reading teacher from Fort Lewis Elementary School, served as the reading teacher. Holbert Taylor drove the bus from one location to the next throughout the county (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007). The bus pulled-up to a central location such as a church parking lot on advertised days of the week to provide reading remediation to students. Parents were notified of the location by hand-outs that were sent home with the students at the end of the school year (J. Kyle, personal communication, December 12, 2007). Any child who was behind grade level in reading could receive remediation services from Mrs. Waldron (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007). Participating students were rewarded at the end of the week with ice cream or a drink (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Title I Services: 1967-1968

During the 1967-1968 school year, the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools received \$243,000 from the federal government to operate Title I programs (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967b). Funds were used to support increases in special education personnel, including the employment of elective teachers and secondary counselors at the Special Education School, to feed and clothe some students, and to purchase an additional bus to serve as a mobile reading laboratory. With the new bus, two reading teachers circulated throughout the county providing remedial reading instruction to elementary students who were reading below grade level (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967b).

Personnel to Support Title I Services

Title I funding provided the means for Roanoke County to hire additional art, music, and physical education teachers at the Special Education School. These teachers were employed to assist mentally retarded and physically handicapped students in the development of vocabulary and physical coordination skills (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1967b). Secondary

counselors were employed at the Special Education School to support high school age students who participated in an employment program created by the Virginia Vocational Rehabilitation Department (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968e).

Special Education Services

During the 1967-1968 school year, the administration in Roanoke County chose to use Title I funds to partially finance a program developed in coordination with the Virginia Vocational Rehabilitation Department. Staff from the rehabilitation department worked with the administration, teachers, and counselors at the Special Education School to develop a program that prepared mentally retarded and physically handicapped students to secure employment in the community. The rehabilitation program was a nation-wide program that permitted students who participated in the program to move from one place to another in the nation and continue to receive educational services (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968e).

Remedial Services

During the summer of 1968, remediation continued to include mobile reading laboratories. With Title I funds, the county purchased a third bus to circulate throughout the county to provide reading remediation to elementary students (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968c). Reading programs continued to operate at the Baptist and Lutheran Children's Home, providing instruction to students in an attempt to minimize loss of learning during the summer months (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007). Teacher aides were employed to operate school libraries during the summer months for two days per week in each of the Title I targeted areas of Roanoke County (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968c).

Reading remediation continued to be offered during the school year to elementary age students who were performing below grade level (J. Kyle, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Food & Health Services

Beginning in the 1967-1968 school year, a portion of Title I money was used to feed and clothe needy students (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968d). County health nurses worked with principals to identify students with specific needs. Title I funds provided for medical and dental services. According to Hugh Tucker, requests for food and health services

were minimal. He said that most schools took care of individual requests without requesting federal funding (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Title I Services: 1968-1969

Roanoke County received \$237,283.08 in Title I funds for the 1968-1969 school year. Funds were used to finance the continuing contracts of personnel previously hired through Title I services. Additional staff were hired to provide reading remediation services at the elementary level. Teacher aides were hired to support reading teachers in providing remedial reading instruction. Overhead projectors and other classroom equipment were purchased to be used in Title I schools (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1968c).

Title I Services: 1969-1970

On August 14, 1969, Tucker shared with the members of the board that Roanoke County could expect \$203,654.00 in Title I funds, of which \$189,000.00 would be used to support previously hired personnel. Title I funds supported the addition of personnel to the Special Education School, teacher aides, remediation, and elective teachers in Title I schools. Elementary guidance counselors were introduced in the county during the 1969-1970 school year. Employment of elementary guidance counselors was financed with Title I funds (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1969c). Remaining Title I funds were used to support the students of migrant workers who lived in the county during the months of September through November, picking apples for resident farmers; health and food services; clothing for needy students; and equipment for classrooms in Title I schools (M. Robison, personal communication, January 10, 2008).

Personnel to Support Title I Services

Title I funds provided additional staff for the Special Education School, including a music teacher for handicapped students, one intermediate teacher for mentally retarded students, and five elementary teachers for mentally retarded students. Title I elementary schools received 66 teacher aides for 160 days, one remedial reading teacher, two remedial math teachers, one elementary art teacher, a music teacher, and a physical education teacher. The Baptist and Lutheran Children's Homes received four tutors for students during the school year (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1969c).

Elementary Guidance Services

Burton recommended to the members of the board on February 11, 1969 the formation of an elementary guidance program for the 1969-1970 school year. Burton shared with the members of the board his desire to offer a pilot guidance program at the elementary level. Federal funding supported the implementation of the program for approximately two to three years, allowing the administration time to determine if the program would continue (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1969b; G. Kelly, personal communication, August 5, 2008).

On August 14, 1969, Tucker shared with the members of the board that a pilot program of elementary counselors was scheduled to be introduced in the county. The program included one elementary counselor in a rural area and one elementary counselor in an urban area. Margaret Brammer served as the guidance counselor at Clearbrook Elementary School and Ralph Shupe served as the guidance counselor at Conehurst Elementary School. Title I funds provided for the salaries of the two guidance counselors in each of these schools (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1969c; G. Kelly, personal communication, August 5, 2008).

At the end of the 1971-1972 school year, a survey was conducted by the administration in Roanoke County to determine if the principals, teachers, students, and parents at Clearbrook and South Salem Elementary Schools felt that the counseling program had benefited the students. According to Gary Kelly, director of guidance services, the overwhelming majority of those surveyed believed the program had benefited the students (G. Kelly, personal communication, August 5, 2008). After the 1971-1972 school year, Title I funding would no longer support the implementation of the program so the members of the school board had to decide if the program would continue after the current school year (G. Kelly, personal communication, August 5, 2008).

The reported success of the pilot elementary guidance program at Clearbrook and South Salem Elementary Schools, prompted the members of the school board to finance an elementary guidance program beginning in the 1972-1973 school year. In 1972, Roanoke County Public Schools became the first public school system in Virginia to provide an elementary guidance program (G. Kelly, personal communication, August 5, 2008).

Migrant Services

Beginning in 1967, Title I allotments included funding to states for “migratory children of migratory agricultural workers” (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a, p. 8). Funding was determined by an estimate of the number of children of migratory farmers working within a given state. States received “one-half the national average per pupil cost of education” for every migratory child. States distributed funds to local educational agencies dependent upon the number of migratory children living within their school division (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969a, p. 8).

Migrant workers and their families lived in Roanoke County during the months of September through November of each year picking apples and peaches for farmers in the county. According to Hugh Tucker, migrant workers arrived in the county in groups and were supervised by men who were referred to as *gang bosses*. Each gang boss supervised approximately twenty to thirty migrant workers. Each group of migrant workers had children who attended neighborhood schools. Title I funds provided clothing, meals, and the cost of textbooks for students of the migrant workers. Hugh Tucker and Joe Kyle worked to provide students of migrant workers with recreational opportunities through the department of parks and recreation. Students of migrant workers lived primarily in the Bent Mountain and Mason’s Cove areas of the county (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1969b).

Title I Services: 1970-1971

Hugh Tucker reported to the members of the board on August 11, 1970, that Roanoke County Public Schools was eligible for \$206,930.50 in federal funds specific for Title I services. The majority of funding was used to finance the continued employment of previously hired personnel. The Special Education School received funds to continue to employ special education teachers, counselors, a psychologist, elective teachers, and teacher aides. Title I elementary schools received funding to continue to employ remediation teachers, teacher aides, and guidance counselors (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1970a).

Title I programs included partial funding of the elementary guidance program, migrant program, and summer remediation program (Roanoke County Public School Board, 1970a). Reading teachers circulated in mobile reading laboratories providing remediation services to students who were reading below grade level. Remediation services were provided to students at

the Baptist and Lutheran Children's home. Funds were used to purchase classroom equipment for Title I schools (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

According to Hugh Tucker, Title I services became more restricted as salaries continued to rise. By the mid-1970s, Title I funds were limited to providing remediation services and instructional materials for students who attended Title I schools in Roanoke County. Title I funds were available to support the continuation of remediation services for students who attended summer school (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Evaluation of Title I Services

Hugh Tucker, coordinator of federal programs and Joseph Kyle, assistant coordinator of federal programs, were responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of Title I programs in Roanoke County. The county used comprehension products designed by Science Research Associates (SRA) as their evaluation tool. Science Research Associates (SRA), a producer of reading, mathematics, science, and social studies comprehension kits, was founded in 1938 in Chicago, Illinois. SRA kits included guided activities followed by multiple choice assessments (Webster/McGraw Hill, 1970). During the 1960s the federal government spent approximately \$500 million dollars over nine years to assess the effectiveness of the SRA assessment in accurately diagnosing cognitive gains. The SRA assessment was supported by the federal government as a means of indicating overall gains in basic skills in cognitive areas (Webster/McGraw Hill, 1970).

In the beginning of each school year, Roanoke County used SRA materials as a diagnostic tool to assess students level of performance in reading and math. Students who were performing below grade level received remedial instruction during the school year. At the end of the year students were tested again with the SRA assessment to determine progress made. Results were submitted to the Virginia Department of Education by July 1 of each year. Students who participated in the summer remediation programs were assessed using the same format. The results of summer remediation were submitted to the Virginia Department of Education at the end of each summer (J. Kyle, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Roanoke County used the SRA assessment to diagnose student mastery of reading comprehension and mathematic skills in every elementary school in the county. Students who were performing below grade level in reading or mathematics received remediation services

during the school year, regardless of whether they attended a Title I school. Remediation services were funded by Roanoke County Public Schools for students who did not attend Title I schools. Students who were performing below grade level in reading or mathematics in Title I schools received remediation services funded by the Title I program. Students who received remediation services were exited from the program once they demonstrated grade level performance (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Evaluation of Title I services was limited to documentation of progress made in reading and mathematics. Other programs offered through Title I funding did not require an evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs (J. Kyle, personal communication, December 12, 2007). When asked how Roanoke County fared in the evaluation of remediation services, Hugh Tucker responded,

I think Title I did a pretty good job helping these students improve....If a child was in the remediation program, but showed evidence of making gains in their reading or math, then they were exited from the program. A child in a Title I school didn't have to be poor to receive help; they just had to be behind grade level. Roanoke County's got a pretty good school system. We're strong. (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Summary

Beginning in 1965 Title I services were provided to students attending low-income schools in Roanoke County as a means of providing supplementary educational programs to disadvantaged students. Title I funding provided for the development of remedial, guidance, special education, migrant, and health services for students attending Title I schools. As federal guidelines became more refined and salaries grew, Title I programs in Roanoke County were limited to remedial services and for the purchasing of instructional materials. Without Title I funding to support the continuation of guidance, special education, migrant and health services, the administration in Roanoke County absorbed the financial responsibility to continue to provide these services to students attending Title I schools. The combination of Title I funding and local funding afforded students the academic and support services necessary to provide a more equitable education.

CHAPTER VII

FEDERAL COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS OF THE 1960S: ROANOKE COUNTY (VIRGINIA) RESPONDS TO FEDERAL FUNDING OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The purpose of this study was to provide an historical account of the development of Head Start and Title I programs in Roanoke County Public Schools within the national context of Head Start and Title I programs. Understanding the conditions at the national and local levels that prompted educators in Roanoke County to accept federal funding for the development of supplementary educational programs has contributed to a more comprehensive understanding of the implementation of these programs.

Summary

Increased student population, racial segregation, and inferior educational opportunities for African American and economically disadvantaged students were catalysts for increased involvement by the federal government in public education during the 1960s. Beginning in the 1950s, school districts faced the challenge of providing appropriate educational facilities for a booming population of students. By the 1960s, the challenge had grown to include providing an equitable education for students who had been previously denied an appropriate education because of race, economic conditions, or ability. This study focused on the federal response to the needs of the identified students as implemented through Roanoke County Public Schools.

During the 1960s, federal aid to public schools grew from a half a billion dollars in 1960 to 3.5 billion in 1970 (Kantor & Lowe, 1995). Increases in federal aid provided support for educational facilities to accommodate the increased student population, for early intervention preschool programs through Head Start of the Economic Opportunity Act, and for educational programs for economically disadvantaged students through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Socially, the federal government took an active role in addressing educational opportunities for African American students and economically disadvantaged students in the 1960s. Public schools were ordered to begin the process of desegregating schools with the ruling of *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954. By 1964, most public schools had not begun the process of desegregating the student population, but were still in the planning stages of the process. Working with the members of Congress, President Kennedy's administration developed

the Civil Rights Act of 1964, making it illegal to segregate public schools and public facilities based upon race. To better ensure that the provisions of the Civil Rights Act were enforced, Title IV of the Act allowed the federal government to sue state governments if segregated schools continued to exist.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was followed by President Johnson's declaration of a War on Poverty to combat problems associated with poverty in the United States. Johnson's War on Poverty led to the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The EOA included employment services for economically disadvantaged adults, community action initiatives, and volunteer opportunities. The most public of the EOAs initiatives was Head Start, a preschool program that provided economically disadvantaged students with academic and cultural opportunities prior to entering first grade.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, was created in response to the realization that many economically disadvantaged citizens in the United States were children. To effectively combat problems associated with poverty, efforts needed to begin with providing an equitable education for children living in poverty. The eight titles of ESEA were designed to provide better educational opportunities for economically disadvantaged students. Title I of the Act received approximately eighty percent of the total funding and provided economically disadvantaged students with remediation, special education, guidance, migrant, health, and food services.

Politically, President Johnson and the members of Congress used the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to encourage school divisions throughout the nation to desegregate public schools and to create culturally responsive educational programs designed to ameliorate poverty for future generations. President Johnson believed that education was the cure to poverty. He argued that federal financial assistance was necessary to correct injustices associated with historically inferior educational opportunities for African American and economically disadvantaged students.

The provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 allowed President Johnson and the members of Congress to align the development of academically and culturally responsive educational programs with the eradication of racial segregation in public schools. If school divisions did not

desegregate public schools, then the division did not receive federal funding to support the development of increased educational programs.

Economically, the attractiveness of the financial assistance associated with these programs prompted the majority of school divisions to comply with federal regulations to receive the funding (Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970). The administration in Roanoke County made application for federal funds to offer Head Start in the summers of 1965 through 1967, but transitioned to a kindergarten program beginning in the summer of 1968. Head Start in the Roanoke Valley was an operation of Total Action Against Poverty (TAP). Speculation included the belief that the administration in Roanoke County did not want to be dependent upon TAP, which was operated in Roanoke City. By transitioning from Head Start to kindergarten, the administration in Roanoke County had to assume responsibility for a portion of the funding of the program, but gained greater autonomy in its operation. Transitioning from Head Start to kindergarten afforded more preschool children the opportunity to participate in the program, as compared to Head Start, which restricted participation based upon family income.

In Virginia, eighty-five percent of school divisions within the state made application for Title I funds for the 1966-1967 school year, the first year that assistance was offered. This percentage increased to ninety-two percent by the 1967-1968 school year and reached ninety-nine percent by the 1969-1970 school year (Virginia Board of Education, 1970).

The administration in Roanoke County made application for Title I funds beginning in 1966, the first year funds were made available, and in each subsequent year since its inception, continuing through 2008. Although, Herman L. Horn shared with the members of the school board that he was opposed to the *trend towards socialization*, he did recommend to the members of the board that Roanoke County go forward with an application to receive federal funds to support the development of Title I services. Horn stated that other localities were applying for federal funding and that it would not be well received by the community if the county didn't offer the same opportunities to its students. Concerned citizens had shared the perceived need for increased educational programs, including more comprehensive special education programs, cultural programs, and guidance services. Members of the board agreed with Horn that by accepting federal funds, the county could provide increased educational opportunities for disadvantaged students and respond to the requests of the citizens.

The response by the administration to accept federal funding afforded educators in the county the opportunity to develop programs to better meet the needs of the minority, disadvantaged, and special education populations. The availability of federal funding allowed the administration to expand educational programs, while local funding sources supported the construction of new facilities. The combination of federal and local funding led to increased educational opportunities for all students attending Roanoke County Public Schools.

Conclusion

During the 1960s, legislators in the United States operated with a sense of urgency to provide a booming student population that was racially and economically diverse with equitable educational opportunities. The learning community of Roanoke County experienced the same social phenomena of growth, racial desegregation, and awareness of the need to provide economically disadvantaged students with equitable educational opportunities that was being experienced across the United States. The administration in Roanoke County operated with a sense of urgency to construct facilities to accommodate the growing student population, but did not experience the same problems with desegregation efforts or meeting the needs of economically disadvantaged students as other school divisions.

Roanoke County Public Schools experienced tremendous growth in student population between the 1950s and the 1970s. The student population in the county increased from 8,276 students in 1950 to 24,390 students in 1975 (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1961-1969, 1975). Increased student enrollments resulted in a need for additional school facilities. Between 1952 and 1967, fourteen schools were constructed in Roanoke County. According to Hugh Tucker, former coordinator of federal programs, school construction dominated discussions among school leaders during the 1960s (H. Tucker, personal communication, December 12, 2007).

Racial desegregation efforts were noted for their lack of controversy in the county. Limited conflict was primarily the result of only three percent African American students enrolled in the county schools, even distribution of African Americans throughout the county, and compliance by administrators in the county to adhere to the federal desegregation timeline. Providing economically disadvantaged students with equitable educational opportunities resulted in the formation of Head Start for preschool children, reading and mathematics remediation,

nutrition and health services, migrant services and guidance services. According to Hugh Tucker, teachers and principals provided remediation and health services prior to the acceptance of federal funding, but additional resources afforded the opportunity to expand previous services and to create new programs designed to provide economically disadvantaged students with equitable educational opportunities.

Through federal funding, Roanoke County offered Head Start for preschool students for three years, but transitioned to a state-supported kindergarten program once it became available in 1968. Federal funding provided the opportunity for Roanoke County to offer an elementary guidance program for several years prior to the county assuming the cost to continue the program. Federal funding provided for the salaries of teachers, psychologists, instructional assistants, and administrative assistants at the Special Education School. Federal funding provided health and nutrition services for students and accommodated for students of migrant workers who lived in the county for several months each year. As salaries continued to rise in the county, federal funds became more restricted to support the continuation of previously hired personnel and to provide remediation services.

According to Hugh Tucker and Cabell Brand, former director of TAP, federal funds were naively accepted by most school systems during the 1960s. In general, the federal government was anxious to disperse the funds and school administrators were eager to accept the money. Evaluation procedures and guidelines were loosely managed during the first several years of implementation, allowing school divisions the opportunity to design educational services they deemed important. By the time the federal government established a more stringent accountability system, school divisions had become dependent upon the money and worked to follow guidelines to ensure the continuance of funding.

The response by the administration in Roanoke County to accept federal funding to support educational programs during the 1960s was cautiously agreed upon by Superintendent Herman L. Horn, and the members of the school board. After Horn retired in June, 1965, the new superintendent, Arnold R. Burton, was more enthusiastic about the opportunities that federal funding could provide to the students attending Roanoke County Schools. Burton believed the federal program to be an effective program that allowed students to receive services they otherwise might not be afforded through local funding.

In sharing with the members of the school board that Roanoke County should accept federal funds to support the development of educational programs for disadvantaged students, Arnold R. Burton commented that he believed the program to be a “fine program that would last for at least three years”(Roanoke County Public School Board, 1965c, p. 304). Based upon his comment, Burton believed federal funding to be a potentially temporary investment by the federal government in public education and Roanoke County should pursue the money while the funds were available.

The federal government was anxious to disperse the funds, Roanoke County wanted to provide additional educational programs, resulting in the acceptance of federal funds by the county. In using federal funds to provide educational programs for economically disadvantaged students, the county was able to accomplish the goal of continuing to construct facilities to accommodate the growing population of students through the use of local funding sources, while providing for disadvantaged students through the use of federal funding.

The targeted populations of racially diverse and economically disadvantaged students were served through Head Start and Title I services in the county, but with less than four percent of the population constituting either one of these populations, the county discontinued Head Start services in favor of a state and locally funded kindergarten program. The provisions of Title I provided funding for students attending low-income schools to receive services, but allowed school districts to design remediation and support services specific to the needs of the individual schools and students. The autonomy to design programs specific to the needs established in Roanoke County was desirable to educators, resulting in the continuation of Title I services in Roanoke County since the initial application was filed in 1965.

The federal investment in public education that began in 1964 was intended to better ensure that disadvantaged students received equitable educational opportunities. It was the belief by some federal policy makers that through equitable educational opportunities poverty would be eradicated for future generations. Acceptance of federal funds to provide increased educational opportunities for disadvantaged students in Roanoke County was made to satisfy public perception that increased educational opportunities were needed in Roanoke County and to avoid using local funding to provide these services. Through federal funding, Roanoke County was able to provide enhanced educational programs and continue to use local funding sources to construct school facilities. As educational programs, including preschool, remediation, migrant,

and guidance services became established in Roanoke County, educators realized the benefit of these programs to the learning community and worked to continue the programs after federal funding could no longer support the continuation of services. Federal funding provided the opportunity for the administration to introduce these programs, to determine their effectiveness, and ultimately to decide whether the programs would continue in Roanoke County. Acceptance of federal funding to support educational programs led to a more comprehensive educational system in Roanoke County Public Schools.

EPILOGUE

President Johnson's administration authorized the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964, which included Head Start, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, which included Title I, for the purpose of providing minority, economically disadvantaged, and special education students with an equitable education. ESEA was originally authorized through 1970, but the federal government has reauthorized the Act every five years since its enactment, continuing through 2008. With each reauthorization, ESEA has continued to "provide targeted resources to help ensure that disadvantaged students have access to a quality public education" (United States Department of Education, 2007, p. 7).

President George W. Bush's administration reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, for the purpose of providing every public school student with an accountable education. Provisions of NCLB include the expectation that all public schools students, including minority, economically disadvantaged, special education, and English Language Learners (ELL), demonstrate grade level achievement in reading and mathematics by 2014 (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002).

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

In 2001, the federal government established the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), a reauthorization of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The NCLB Act required states to establish annual measurable goals of proficiency in reading and mathematics. Public schools and school divisions that meet annual goals established by federal guidelines are considered to have made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Through the NCLB, the federal government has established that all public school students, including minority, disadvantaged, special education, and English Language Learners (ELL), achieve annual AYP benchmarks, leading to 100 percent grade level achievement in reading and mathematics by 2014 (Virginia Department of Education, 2001).

Public schools that receive Title I funding must achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) or face sanctions imposed by the federal government. Title I schools that do not achieve AYP for two consecutive years are required to offer parents the option of transferring their child to a higher performing school or to receive free tutoring. Title I schools that are successful in meeting

AYP for two consecutive years receive financial awards to be used for instructional programs and for staff development opportunities (Virginia Department of Education, 2001).

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 in Virginia

In Virginia, the Standards of Learning (SOL) represent expectations for student learning and achievement in English, mathematics, science, and history. SOL achievement tests are administered to students on an annual basis in grades three through twelve. The results of these tests determine whether schools and school divisions are achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as established by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001.

As an additional measure of accountability, educators in Virginia have developed the Virginia Index of Performance (VIP) program. This incentive program, implemented in 2007, has been designed to recognize outstanding achievement by public school divisions and schools, as determined by the provisions of the program. School divisions and schools are awarded points based upon the number of students achieving advanced levels of performance on the Standards of Learning (SOL). School divisions and schools may earn additional points by enrolling at-risk four-year-olds in preschool programs, increasing the number of students reading at grade level by the third grade, increasing the number of students participating in Algebra I by the eighth grade, increasing the number of high school students participating in college-level courses, increasing high school graduation rates, and increasing the number of graduates with advanced diplomas and industry certifications. The VIP program awards additional points to schools for demonstrating evidence of promoting physical activity and healthy nutritional opportunities to students. To qualify for the VIP distinction, school divisions and schools must earn at least 80 out of a possible 100 points and meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years. Schools that achieve the VIP distinction may receive banners, plaques, and monetary awards (Virginia Department of Education, 2007a).

Since the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the Virginia Department of Education has recognized Roanoke County Public Schools on an annual basis for achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). In 2007, the VIP distinction was awarded to eight schools in Roanoke County Public Schools: Burlington Elementary, Glenvar Elementary, Herman L. Horn Elementary, W.E. Cundiff Elementary, William Byrd Middle, Hidden Valley

Middle, Cave Spring Middle, and William Byrd High School (Virginia Department of Education, 2007b).

Federal Compensatory Educational Programs in Roanoke County in 2008

Beginning in 1965, the administration of Roanoke County Public Schools accepted federal funds to provide supplementary educational services for its students. In 2008, the administration of Roanoke County Public Schools continues to accept federal funds to provide supplementary educational services for its students. Although Head Start of the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 is no longer available to students attending Roanoke County Public Schools, Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, continues to be implemented in low-income schools in the county.

Head Start/Kindergarten

Roanoke County Public Schools only offered Head Start for the summers of 1965-1967, but the program allowed the administration in the County to learn how to develop a preschool program, to determine the curriculum to be included, and to determine the staffing and facility requirements. Funding provided through the Head Start program allowed the administration to create a *pilot* preschool program in advance of the introduction of kindergarten in the summer of 1968. The concept of providing a preschool program designed to prepare students academically and socially for future educational opportunities was embraced by the citizens of Roanoke County, prompting the administration to create a kindergarten program for all preschool children.

Due to family income-level restrictions imposed by the Head Start program, the administration in Roanoke County transitioned to a kindergarten program in the summer of 1968. According to federal guidelines, only ten percent of the population of the students enrolled in the Head Start program could be above the poverty level. The administration in Roanoke County desired to offer a preschool program to all children in the county, not just to those children who were of a certain socio-economic status. Less than four percent of the population in Roanoke County, during the mid-1960s, was reported as being below the poverty level (Roanoke County Board of Supervisors, 1965). By choosing to offer kindergarten instead of Head Start, the administration in the county provided early educational opportunities to all of its preschool children, not just to three percent of the population.

In transitioning from Head Start to kindergarten, the administration in the county took greater ownership in the development of the curriculum and daily operation of the preschool program. Summer programs were led by building level administrators, not by lead teachers. The curriculum was created through a joint effort between the preschool teachers and the administration. According to Carolyn Eichelman, a Head Start teacher in the Roanoke Valley, portions of the Head Start curriculum implemented in Roanoke City were adopted by the administration in Roanoke County for the kindergarten curriculum the first year kindergarten was offered in the county (C. Eichelman, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

In transitioning from Head Start to kindergarten, the administration in Roanoke County was given greater autonomy in the operation of the preschool program. By offering a locally run and locally financed kindergarten program, the division was not beholding to the federal government for its implementation, operation, or evaluation of the program.

During the 2007-2008 school year, kindergarten is a full-day program, offered in every elementary school in Roanoke County Public Schools. Children who are five years of age by September 30th of the given year are provided the opportunity to attend kindergarten. Each child is screened by the administration to determine the appropriateness of the child participating in kindergarten at the age of five. Administrators and parents are granted flexibility in determining the appropriate placement of the child. If a parent chooses to hold a child back when he or she is five years of age, the child must attend kindergarten the following year. If the parent then wishes to enroll the child in first grade the following year, the child must be assessed with *end of course* kindergarten materials (L. Lange, personal communication, February 10, 2008). During the 2007-2008 school year, ninety-nine percent of eligible children participated in the kindergarten program (C. Snead, personal communication, February 7, 2008).

Title I Services

Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 does not provide financial assistance to support special education, guidance, kindergarten, art, music and physical education, health and migrant programs in Roanoke County, but the opportunities provided through the initial funding in 1965 have afforded the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools the opportunity to develop programs that continue in 2008.

During the 2007-2008 school year, the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools received \$1,058,000 in Title I funds, specifically for students attending Title I schools in the

county. Eighty-eight percent of those funds are allotted for personnel purposes (B. Brewer, personal communication, February 6, 2008). Title I remediation programs benefit all students attending Title I schools who are performing below grade level. Title I funding does not allow for the implementation of school-wide Title I programs unless more than forty percent of the student population qualifies as economically disadvantaged (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 2002). Title I services include reading remediation, professional development, instructional materials, and parental involvement opportunities. Title I programs are offered during the school year and during the summer months. A home intervention specialist is available to work with families in need of additional support. Title I funding is provided for homeless students on an individual basis. Principals in Title I schools submit to the associate director of instruction an annual proposal for services including requests for remediation services, professional development, and instructional materials. Principals work with the associate director of instruction to develop parental involvement opportunities which may include a parent advisory board, parent fairs, and instructional materials to be used in the home.

Reflections on the Outcomes of Federal Compensatory Programs in Roanoke County Public Schools

This study focused on the federal response to the needs of identified students as implemented through Roanoke County Public Schools. During the 1960s, the federal government developed federal compensatory programs to address the needs of a booming student population, with a heightened awareness of inferior educational opportunities for African Americans and economically disadvantaged students. Federal compensatory programs were designed to assist states and local districts in providing equitable educational opportunities for minority, economically disadvantaged, and special education students.

In 1965, the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools accepted the offer made by the federal government to receive federal funds to support the development of educational programs targeted towards minority, economically disadvantaged, and special education students. By accepting federal funds, the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools entered into an accountability driven economic, social, and political relationship with the federal government.

Economically, acceptance of federal funding provided through the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, allowed the

administration in Roanoke County Public Schools the opportunity to respond to the educational needs of an increasing student population. During the 1960s, the citizens of Roanoke County devoted the majority of their resources to the construction of new facilities and to the hiring of additional personnel to accommodate increased student enrollments. Federal funding provided the means to develop increased educational programs for students in Roanoke County Public Schools.

Socially, acceptance of federal funding provided through the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 encouraged the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools to coordinate their efforts with local community agencies and to complete desegregation efforts in its public schools. The EOA led to the development of Head Start, an operation of Total Action Against Poverty (TAP). As a member of the TAP board, the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools coordinated community-based social and health services for disadvantaged students in Roanoke County. Acceptance of federal funding forced the administration to complete desegregation efforts by 1965, two years earlier than the projected date established by the members of the school board. Despite the accelerated time frame, desegregation efforts were acknowledged for their limited controversy in Roanoke County. Limited controversy afforded leaders of Roanoke County Public Schools the opportunity to focus their efforts on providing appropriate educational facilities and comprehensive educational programs for all of its students.

Politically, acceptance of federal funding by the administration in Roanoke County Public Schools avoided potential criticism by the community and surrounding school divisions for not offering educational programs targeted towards disadvantaged students. The administration in Roanoke County Public Schools used federal funding to develop socially and educationally responsive educational programs including preschool, special education, guidance, remediation, migrant, health and nutritional programs.

The investment made by the federal government in Roanoke County Public Schools and other school districts, was not made without a level of expected accountability. Beginning in the 1960s, the federal government used the appeal of financial assistance to complete desegregation efforts in public schools. By desegregating public schools, school districts received funding to provide the resources to offer additional educational programs. By accepting federal funds, states and school divisions were expected to develop programs to meet the needs of minority,

economically disadvantaged, and special education students, with the expectation that through culturally responsive educational opportunities, students would work their way out of poverty.

With each reauthorization of the ESEA, the federal government has expanded its investment and level of accountability in public education. The provisions included in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), requires not only equitable opportunities for public school students, but requires more equitable student achievement. All public school students, including minority, economically disadvantaged, special education and English Language Learners (ELL), are required to demonstrate grade level achievement in reading and mathematics. This expectation by the federal government includes a punitive measure for Title I schools unsuccessful in assisting students in achieving grade level expectations on an annual basis.

The implementation of federal compensatory education programs in Roanoke County Public Schools has led to a permanent relationship between the federal government and Roanoke County Public Schools. The administration in the county continues to rely on federal funding to provide resources to support the development of socially and educationally responsive educational programs for economically disadvantaged students. In turn, federal mandates require that all students demonstrate annual grade level achievement in reading and mathematics. As Cabell Brand shared, “all of us saw the legislation as a way to get federal money to do things for poor people here at home. No one considered the political implications. Looking back, it was naïve, but that’s how we all viewed it.” (C. Brand, personal communication, June 23, 2008).

REFERENCES

- Arrington, K. M. (1981). *With all deliberate speed, 1954-19??* Clearinghouse publication, 69. Washington, DC: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, p. 14.
- Bailey, S. K., Mosher, E. K., & United States. (1968). *ESEA: The office of education administers a law* (1st ed.). Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Billington, M. (1977). Lyndon B. Johnson and blacks: The early years. *Journal of Negro History*, 62(1), pp. 26-42.
- Brand, E. (2000). *Community action at work: TAPs thirty-year war on poverty*. Blacksburg: Pocahontas Press, pp. 3, 4, 6, 7, 12.
- Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, 349 U.S. 299, 301 (1955).
- Calhoun, J. A., & Collins, R. C. (1981). From one decade to another: A positive view of early childhood programs. *Theory into Practice*, 20(2), pp. 135-140.
- Chamberlain, J. (1965a, June 5). U. S. approves city's 'head start' plans. *The Roanoke Times*, p. 5.
- Chamberlain, J. (1965b, June 9). County begins intensive drive to boost 'head start' enrollment. *The Roanoke Times*, p. 14.
- Chamberlain, J. (1965c, June 11). 500 are enrolled for 'head start'. *The Roanoke Times*, p. 15.
- Chamberlain, J. (1965d, June 12). 225 signed for county 'head start'. *The Roanoke Times*, p. 37.
- Chamberlain, J. (1965e, June 23). Head start opens today in county. *The Roanoke Times*, p.11.
- Chamberlain, J. (1970a, August 27). Teacher reassignment smooth. *The Roanoke Times*, p. 25.
- Chamberlain, J. (1970b, July 20). Integration problems few in county. *The Roanoke Times*, p. 13.
- Chamberlain, J. (1973a, August 31). Elementary and secondary education act title I. *The Roanoke Times*, p. 14.
- Chamberlin, H. (1971). *History of the office of economic opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.
- Cicirelli, V. G. (1970, February). The impact of head start: A reply to the report analysis. *Harvard Education Review*, 40(1), pp. 105-129.
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. No. 88-352, 78 Stat. 252 (1964).
- Clark, R. F. (2002). *The war on poverty: History, selected programs and ongoing impact*. Lanham: University Press.

- Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity [summary report]*. [Washington]: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education; [for sale by the Superintendent of Documents], U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. iii-iv, 1, 3, 8, 9, 14, 20, 22.
- Commission on Civil Rights. (1979). *Twenty years after Brown; A report of the United States commission on civil rights*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 112.
- Conference on Economic Progress. (1962). *Poverty and deprivation in the United States: The plight of two-fifths of a nation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Congressional Quarterly. (1969). Significant federal aid-to-education laws. *Congress and the nation* (Vol. II, pp. 1210-1211), 1965-1968. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Service.
- Cray, E. (1997). *Chief justice: A biography of Earl Warren*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (1966a). *Annual report, title I, elementary and secondary education act of 1965*. Office of Education, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (1966b). *Profile of ESEA: The elementary and secondary education act of 1965*. Office of Education, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (1969a). *Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Sect. 105 (a)(6)*. Office of Education, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 8, 25, 33.
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (1969b). *Better education for handicapped children: Annual fiscal report*. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (1970). *Digest of educational statistics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 112.
- Divine, R. A. (1993). *The sputnik challenge*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. xv-xvi.
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-10, S. 201, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965).

- Examination of the war on poverty program: Hearings before the Subcommittee on the War on Poverty Program, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., Committee on Education and Labor (1965).
Full kindergarten is scheduled for county. (1971, August 18). *Vinton Messenger*.
- Graham, H. D. (1984). *The uncertain triumph: Federal education policy in the Kennedy and Johnson years*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, p. 5.
- Gray, S. W., & Klaus, R. A. (1969). *The early training project: A seventh year report: National Inst. of Mental Health* (DHEW), Bethesda, MD.
- Hannah, J. A. (1967). *Racial isolation in the public schools*. Commission on Civil Rights. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, Vol. 1, p. 12.
- Heller, W. W. (1962, December 26). Notes on meeting with President Kennedy. *Heller papers*, box 34. Retrieved on May 3, 2008 from http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives+and+Manuscripts/fa_gordon.htm
- Heller, W. W. (1963a, April 11). Notes on meeting with President Kennedy, *Heller papers*, box 34. Retrieved on May 3, 2008 from http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives+and+Manuscripts/fa_gordon.htm
- Jeffrey, J. R. (1978). *Education for children of the poor: A study of the origins and implementation of the elementary and secondary education act of 1965*. Columbus: State University Press.
- Johnson, L. B. (1964a, January 8). Annual message to congress on the state of the union. *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1964*. Retrieved on November 15, 2007 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26787&st=&st1=>
- Johnson, L. B. (1964b, August 20). Remarks upon signing the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1964*. Retrieved on November 15, 2007 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26452&st=&st1=>
- Johnson, L. B. (1965a, January 4). Annual message to the Congress of the state of the union. *Public papers of the presidents of the United States: Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965*. Retrieved on November 15, 2007 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26907&st=&st1=>

- Johnson, L. B. (1965b). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States: Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963-1964*. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965, entry 357, pp. 704-707.
- Johnson, L. B. (1965c, January 12). Recorded remarks on the message on education. *Public papers of the president: Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965*. Retrieved on November 15, 2007 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26797&st=&st1=>
- Johnson, L. B. (1965d, May 18). Remarks on head start. *Public papers of the president: Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965*. Retrieved on November 15, 2007 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=26973&st=&st1=>
- Johnson, L. B. (1971). *The vantage point: Perspectives of the presidency, 1963-1969*. New York, pp. 70-71.
- Kaestle, C. (1995). *The encyclopedia of the United States Congress* (D. C. Bacon, R. H. Davidson & M. Keller, Trans.). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kagey, D. D. (1988). *When past is prologue: A history of Roanoke county*. Roanoke, VA: Roanoke County Sesquicentennial Committee, p. 557.
- Kantor, H., & Lowe, R. (1995). Class, race, and the emergence of federal education policy: From the new deal to the great society. *Educational Researcher*, 24(3), pp. 4-11, 21.
- Keenan, J. T. (1988). *The constitution of the United States: An unfolding story*. Chicago: Dorsey Press.
- Kennedy, J. F. (1961a, January 30). Annual message to the Congress of the state of the union. *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, John F. Kennedy, 1961*. Retrieved on November 2, 2007 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=8045&st=&st1=>
- Kennedy, J. F. (1961b, February 20). Special message to the Congress on education. *Public papers of the Presidents of the United States, John F. Kennedy, 1961*. Retrieved on November 2, 2007 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=8433&st=&st1=>
- Kennedy, J. F. (1963, June 11). *Radio and television report to the American people on civil rights*. Retrieved on November 7, 2007 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=9271&st=&st1=>

- Keppel, F. (1966). *The necessary revolution in American education*. New York: Harper and Row, p. 78.
- Kurian, G. T. (Ed.). (1997). *The encyclopedia of the democratic party: The democratic party platform of 1916*, 4(503). New York: Armonk.
- Kurian, G. T. (Ed.). (1997). *The encyclopedia of the republican party: The republican party platform of 1916*, 2(478). New York: Armonk.
- Lampman, R. J. (1959, December). *The low income population and economic growth*. Study paper no. 12., 86st Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 6-9.
- Lampman, R. J. (1963, June 10). Lampman interview to Heller. *Heller Papers*, microfilm roll 37.
- Major, C. (1994). *Juba to jive: A dictionary of African American slang*. New York: Penguin.
- McCluskey, N. P. (2007). *Feds in the classroom: How big government corrupts, cripples, and compromises American education*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 339 U.S. 637 (1950).
- Means, F. C., & Stein, H. (1952). *Carver's George, a biography of George Washington Carver*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Missouri ex. rel. Gaines v. Canada, 305 U.S. 337 (1938).
- Munger, F., & Fenno, R. (1962). *National politics and federal aid to education*. pp. 195-196.
- National Center for Health Statistics (U.S.), & United States. (1965). *Vital and health statistics. Series 22, Data from the national vital statistics system*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Table 1-1.
- National Education Association. (1962). *Education and the disadvantaged American*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 15-16, 18-19, 23.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Paige, J. C. (1985). *The civilian conservation corps and the national park service, 1933-1942: An administrative history*, 249(ix). Washington, DC: National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Payne, J. L. (1991). *The culture of spending: Why congress lives beyond our means*. San Francisco: ICS Press.
- Peters, N., & Wilson, B. (1988). *Educational legacy of Roanoke county's public schools*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Plessy v. Ferguson, 45 La. 80, 11 South 948, (1896).

Plessy v. Ferguson, appeal to the United States Supreme Court, 163 U.S. 537, 564 (1896).

Pomfrets, J. (1964, January 9). Program offered to fight poverty: Johnson stresses education – more funds asked. *New York Times*, p. 17.

Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. (1961). *First Annual Report, Roanoke County, Virginia*. Roanoke, VA.

Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. (1962). *Second Annual Report, Roanoke County, Virginia*. Roanoke, VA.

Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. (1963). *Third Annual Report, Roanoke County, Virginia*. Roanoke, VA.

Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. (1965). *Fifth Annual Report, Roanoke County, Virginia*. Roanoke, VA.

Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. (1967). *Seventh Annual Report, Roanoke County, Virginia*. Roanoke, VA, p. 85.

Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. (1969). *Ninth Annual Report, Roanoke County, Virginia*. Roanoke, VA, Table 1-1.

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1964b, November 10). School board minutes (Vol. 13, p. 200).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1964c, December 21). School board minutes (Vol. 13, p. 136).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1965a, March 3). School board minutes (Vol. 13, pp. 233, 242).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1965b, April 13). School board minutes (Vol. 13, pp. 249-250).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1965c, September 14). School board minutes (Vol. 13, pp. 303-304).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1965d, November 9). School board minutes (Vol. 13, pp. 320, 333).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1966a, February 8). School board minutes (Vol. 13, p. 350).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1966b, March 24). School board minutes (Vol. 13, pp. 370-371,410).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1967a, April 12). School board minutes (Vol. 13, p. 389).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1967b, December 12). School board minutes (Vol. 14, pp. 22-23).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1967c, December 12). School board minutes (Vol. 14, pp. 73-74).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1968a, April 8). School board minutes (Vol. 14, pp.108-109).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1968b, May 14). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p. 135).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1968c, June 11). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p. 166).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1968d, August 13). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p. 177).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1968e, December 10). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p.228).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1969a, February 11). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p.253).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1969b, March 4). School board minutes (Vol. 14, pp. 253, 270).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1969c, August 14). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p. 340).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1970a, August 11). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p. 441).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1970b, October 13). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p.455).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1970c, December 8). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p.476).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1971a, January 12). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p.478).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1971b, February 9). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p.491).

Roanoke County Public School Board. (1971c, April 13). School board minutes (Vol. 14, p.499).

Roberts v. City of Boston, 59 Ma. 5 Cush 201, (1850).

- Robinson, L. E., & Virginia. Dept. of Planning and Budget. Economic Research Section. (1977). *Projections and economic base analysis, commonwealth of Virginia*. Richmond: Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Planning and Budget, Economic Research Section.
- Sarratt, R. (1966). *The ordeal of desegregation: The first decade*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Shriver, S. (1966, March 8). *Testimony during hearings before the subcommittee on the War on Poverty program of the committee of education and labor, house of representatives* (Washington, DC: March 8-10 and 15-16, 1966), p. 155; 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.
- Simon, K. A., & Fullam, M. G. (1968). *Projections of educational statistics to 1976-77*. 1967 edition (No. OE-10030-67), pp. 21, 27, 35.
- Sipuel v. Board of Regents of University of Oklahoma, 332 U.S. 631 (1948).
- Sweatt v. Painter, 339 U.S. 629 (1948).
- Total Action Against Poverty in the Roanoke Valley, Inc. (1967). *A progress report on a community action program* [Brochure]. Roanoke, VA: Author, pp. 1-2, 4-6.
- Tripp, N. W. (1995). *Chauncey Depew Harmon, Senior: A case study in leadership for educational opportunity and equality in Pulaski, Virginia*. Portions of an interview conducted on November 4, 1995 with Georgia Reeves. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, p. 305.
- Unger, I. (1996). *The best of intentions: The triumphs and failures of the great society under Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon*. Doubleday. p. 104.
- United States. (1791). Const., amend. X. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2007, p. 14.
- United States. (1791). Const., art. I, § 8. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2007, p. 5.
- United States. (1868). Const., amend. XIV. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2007.
- United States House Committee on Education and Labor. (1970, September 23). *Extract of hearings before the general subcommittee on education of the committee on education and labor*. House of Representatives, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess. on H.R. 17846 and other related bills. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 112, 131.

- United States Department of Education. (2007). *No child left behind act of 2001: Help for students and families*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 7.
- Vanecko, J. J., Ames, N. L., & Archambault, F. X. (1980). *Who benefits from federal education dollars?: The development of ESEA Title I allocation policy*. Cambridge, MA: ABT Books.
- Vinovskis, M. (2005). *The birth of head start: Preschool education policies in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Virginia Board of Education. (1969). *Superintendent of public instruction: Annual report* (Vol. 53, No. 4). Richmond, VA: Author.
- Virginia Board of Education. (1970). *Superintendent of public instruction: Annual report* (Vol. 54, No. 3). Richmond, VA: Author.
- Virginia Dept. of Education. (2001). *Standards of learning currently in effect for Virginia public schools*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008 from <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Instruction/sol.html>
- Virginia Dept. of Education. (2007a). *Board of education approves performance incentives*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008 from <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/NewHome/pressreleases/2007/jul25.html>
- Virginia Dept. of Education. (2007b). *Board of education's VIP competence to excellence award*. Retrieved on January 23, 2008 from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/information_centers/newsroom/news_releases/2008/jan10b.shtml
- Webster/McGraw Hill. (1970). Research report: Programmed reading, an exemplary project. Retrieved on September 19, 2008 from https://www.sraonline.com/about_history.html
- Westinghouse Learning Corporation. (1969, July 12). *The impact of head start: An evaluation of the effects of Head Start on children's cognitive and affective development*. Ohio University.
- Williams, M. P. (1994, May 16). Black educators paid steep price for integration. *The Richmond Times-Dispatch*, p. B1.
- Wilson, W. (1915, December 7). Annual message to congress on the state of the union. *Public papers of the presidents of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, 1915* (Vol. 35, p. 308). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Wilson, W. (1916, January 27). An address in New York on preparedness. *Public papers of the president, Woodrow Wilson, 1916* (Vol. 36, p. 13). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Woolley, J. T., Peters, G., & University of California Santa Barbara. (1999). *The American presidency project*. Retrieved on December 12, 2007 from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/index.php>
- Zigler, E., & Valentine, J. (1979). *Project head start: A legacy of the War on Poverty*. New York: Free Press.
- Zigler, E., & Muenchow, S. (1992). *Head start: The inside story of America's most successful educational experiment*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 6, 8, 19-20, 26.

APPENDIX A LIMITATIONS

By conducting interviews, and document analyses at the federal, state, and local levels, sources of data have been triangulated to strengthen the validity of the sources, but limitations still exist within the research. Limitations from the interviews conducted include the memories of those interviewed; e.g., in one case a respondent recalled that the county had one reading mobile laboratory that circulated throughout the county during the summer months, but the school board minutes indicate on several occasions the use of multiple reading laboratories.

Other areas of weakness from the interviews include the potential embellishing of stories or suppressed information based upon personal experiences; e.g., one respondent believed that Roanoke County transitioned from Head Start to kindergarten partially due to strained relationships with the administration in Roanoke City. This evidence could not be validated. The school board minutes do not reflect the desire by county officials to distance themselves from Roanoke City officials. The remaining members of the administration during this time in Roanoke County, Herman L. Horn, superintendent; Arnold R. Burton, assistant superintendent; and Charles Jennings, director of personnel are no longer living.

Information included in school board minutes is fragmented and an incomplete record of the proceedings. School board minutes reflect a running dialogue between members of the board, educators, and members of the community. They do not provide a comprehensive overview of any one topic of interest. It was my responsibility to take fragments of information provided in the minutes and to develop a logical order of events.

Other inconsistencies include information provided specific to a topic from one year to the next; e.g., the allotment of Title I funding specific to the hiring of personnel may be detailed in its description one year and not mentioned the next year. Once a program is established, the topic may not be described again in further detail until there's a change.

The original applications related to the development of Head Start and Title I services in Roanoke County no longer exists. Lack of evidence from original documents prevented triangulation of evidence between applications made by the administration in Roanoke County, school board minutes, newspapers articles, and books written by local authors.

There were other events that contributed to the social, economic, and political climate of the 1960s. Included was the National Defense Act of 1958 that resulted from the Russian

launching of Sputnik. This event contributed to the social conditions of the time and the funding of science and mathematics initiatives in public schools, but it did not lead to the development of Head Start and Title I services. For this reason the National Defense Act of 1958 was not included in the study.

This study did not explore the full context of the development of Head Start and Title I services. The development of Title I and Head Start happened within the full context of all federal programs; they are beyond this study.

APPENDIX B

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research opportunities may include the following research topics. These suggestions are partially based upon limitations in this study.

- There were other events that contributed to the social, economic, and political climate of the 1960s. Included was the National Defense Act of 1958 that resulted from the Russian launching of Sputnik. A potential study may include the influences leading to the development of the National Defense Act of 1958;
- Special education services continued to develop during the 1960s and 1970s. Future research topics may include the influence of Title I and Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 on the development of special education services in Roanoke County Public Schools;
- Total Action Against Poverty (TAP) was established through the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) in the Roanoke Valley in 1964. Future research topics may include the influence of TAP in the coordination of community-based efforts in the Roanoke Valley.
- Head Start became an operation of Roanoke County Public Schools during the summer of 1965. Head Start programs were located in learning centers in Roanoke City during this time. A potential study may include a comparison of success rates of Head Start programs operated as a function of a school system as compared to Head Start programs located in learning centers.
- Desegregation efforts prompted White families to move to the suburbs and Black families to move to the cities. A potential study may include the phenomena of *White flight* in the Roanoke Valley as compared to *White flight* in other localities the United States.
- During the time of desegregation efforts, administrators in Roanoke City voiced a desire to merge Roanoke City schools with Roanoke County Schools. A potential study may include the merging of urban and suburban school divisions in the United States.
- Federal compensatory education programs were implemented in school districts throughout the United States during the 1960s. A potential study may include the implementation of Head Start and Title I services in Roanoke City Schools during the 1960s.

APPENDIX C

FEDERAL COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF THE 1960S: THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HEAD START AND TITLE I SERVICES IN ROANOKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS CONSENT DOCUMENT

Thank you for participating in the interview today. The purpose of this study is to investigate federal compensatory education programs of the 1960s and the implementation of Head Start and Title I services in Roanoke County Public Schools. The anticipated value of conducting a study of this nature is to provide a historical perspective on the influence of federal compensatory programs on the formation of educational programs at the local school district level.

As a participant in the interview process, you may refuse to answer any question you choose. You may terminate the interview at any time. Please indicate your willingness to allow me to audio-tape the interview by providing your initials below. Direct quotes may be used in the final document. Please indicate your willingness to allow me to use direct quotes by providing your initials below. You may request a copy of the transcript from this interview at any time during the course of the study. You may retract any statements you make during the interview prior to submission of the dissertation to the Graduate School at Virginia Tech. Audio tapes will be stored in a secure location during the course of the study. Audio tapes will not be destroyed after the study has been completed, and they will be made available to the archives of Roanoke County.

_____ I grant permission for the interview to be audio-taped.

_____ I grant permission for direct quotes from me to be used in the final document.

Juliette B. Myers
PhD Candidate
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Interview Protocol

Topics of Interest:

- I. Responsibilities of the administrative assistant in charge of Head Start
 - A. Tell me about your career in Roanoke County.
 - B. What years did you coordinate Head Start?
 - C. What were your duties as the coordinator of Head Start?

- II. Verification of information

I would like to verify information included in the school board minutes regarding the development of educational programs in Roanoke County resulting from federal funding of Head Start.

According to the school board minutes, Head Start was introduced in Roanoke County prior to Title I. Head Start was a preschool summer program in the summers of 1965-66.

After 1966 (when Title I was introduced), the school minutes do not include further information about Head Start, other than to state that you continued to serve as an administrative assistant in charge of Head Start.

Is this information correct?

- III. Head Start in Roanoke County
 - A. When did Head Start begin in Roanoke County? (The approximate year)
 - B. How did Head Start begin in Roanoke County?
 - C. Who was involved in getting Head Start going in the county?
 - D. Why was the county interested in Head Start?
 - E. What role did you play in the development of Head Start?
 - F. What was the working relationship between yourself and Hugh Tucker?
 - G. How was Head Start supported?
 - i. Money resources? Personnel? Other?

- ii. How long did this support last?
 - iii. If it ended, do you recall when? Why?
 - H. What do you recall as the major events in the initiation and implementation of Head Start in Roanoke County?
 - I. How was Roanoke City involved in the development of Head Start in the county?
 - J. What role did TAP play in the development of Head Start?
 - K. What instructional programs were included in Head Start?
 - L. How did Head Start change in the county once Title I was introduced?
 - M. After Title I was introduced in the county, the school board minutes do not include further information about Head Start.
 - What happened to Head Start?
 - Did the program continue in Roanoke County?
 - If not, why?
 - N. Further information that I haven't thought to ask that you can share with me regarding Head Start?
- IV. Title I in Roanoke County
- A. When did Title I begin in Roanoke County?
 - B. What role did you play in the development of Title I?
 - C. What types of programs did the county decide to make application?
 - D. Who was involved in deciding the types of programs to be included with Title I funds?
 - E. Were these programs that were in critical need or were they developed as a result of the availability of funds?
 - F. Which Title I programs continued and which programs were eliminated over time in Roanoke County?
 - G. Does the Actual application for Title I funds still exist?
 - H. What do you recall as the major events in the initiation and implementation of Title I in Roanoke County?

V. Programs initially included under Title I

The school board minutes reflect that the county used Title I funds to implement kindergarten, reading remediation, special education, elementary guidance counselors, elementary elective teachers, and food/health services in Roanoke County.

Kindergarten:

- A. How was Title I funding used to develop the kindergarten program in the county?
- B. Who was responsible for developing the kindergarten program?
- C. Who attended kindergarten? What ages?
- D. What were some of the issues involving the kindergarten program?

Special Education:

- E. How was Title I funding used to support special education programs?
- F. Who supervised special education programs?
- G. What programs were supported by special education? At the elementary level? At the junior high level? At the high school level?
- H. The school board minutes reflect that there was a special education school.
 - i. Where was the school located?
 - ii. What grades did it serve?
 - iii. Who was in charge of the special education school?

Remedial Reading Instruction (Mobile Reading Labs):

- I. How was reading remediation implemented?
- J. Who was responsible for organizing the reading programs?
- K. Who was eligible for reading remediation?
- L. What was included in the reading remediation program?
- M. How were mobile reading labs implemented in the county?
- N. How were the mobile reading labs organized? Issues involved in coordinating efforts.

Elementary Guidance Counselors:

- O. How was the elementary guidance program organized?

P. Who was responsible for developing the elementary guidance program?

Q. What did the counselors do?

R. Who was eligible to receive services through the guidance program?

Elementary Elective Programs (Art, Music, PE):

S. Who was responsible for organizing the elementary elective program?

T. How was it implemented?

U. How did it work?

V. Who was eligible?

W. What were some of the issues involved in implementing the elective program?

Food, Clothing, and Health Services

X. How were these services implemented in the county?

Y. Were there volunteers involved in providing these services?

Z. Who was responsible for the development of the program?

AA. Who was eligible?

BB. What were some of the issues involved in implementing the services?

Are these all of the programs under Title I or were there others included?

VI. Role of the federal and state governments in supporting the development of Title I programs.

Federal

A. What were the requirements that the county had to meet to receive Title I funds?

B. Did the federal government prescribe the types of programs to be developed with Title I funds?

C. What were the federal requirements for the evaluation of the programs?

i. If so, how often were evaluations conducted?

ii. Who was responsible for conducting the evaluations at the county level?

iii. How were the evaluations used by the county?

iv. Are there copies of evaluations still available in the county?

v. What's your opinion of the effectiveness of these evaluations?

Virginia Department of Education

- D. What role did the Virginia Department of Education play in assisting the county in securing Title I funds?
 - E. Did the Virginia Department of Education recommend the development of certain types of programs with Title I funds?
 - F. Did the Virginia Department of Education require an evaluation of Title I programs?
 - i. If so, how often were evaluations conducted?
 - ii. Who was responsible for conducting the evaluations at the county level?
 - iii. How were the evaluations used by the county?
 - iv. Are there copies of the evaluations still available in the county?
- VII. Role of the principal in implementing Title I programs.
- A. How were principals involved in deciding the use of Title I funds?
 - B. How did Title I programs differ from school to school?
- VIII. Attitude of administration regarding acceptance of federal funds.
- A. What was the mindset of the administrators regarding the acceptance of federal funds?
 - B. What was the mindset of the school board members regarding the acceptance of federal funds?
 - C. What was the mindset of the board of supervisors regarding the acceptance of federal funds?
 - D. How were Head Start and Title I services viewed by the administration and the teachers in Roanoke County?
 - E. How were Head Start and Title I services received by the community?
- IX. What do you see as the impact of Head Start and Title I funding on education in Roanoke County?

APPENDIX D
IRB AMENDMENT APPROVAL



Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board
2000 Kraft Drive, Suite 2000 (0497)
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
540/231-4991 Fax 540/231-0959
e-mail moored@vt.edu
www.irb.vt.edu
FWA00000572 (expires 1/20/2010)
IRB # is IRB00000667

DATE: October 15, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: David J. Parks
Juliette Myers

FROM: David M. Moore 

Approval date: 11/27/2007
Continuing Review Due Date: 11/12/2008
Expiration Date: 11/26/2008

SUBJECT: **IRB Amendment Approval:** "Federal Compensatory Education Programs of the 1960s: The Implementation of Head Start and Title I Services in Roanoke County Public Schools", IRB # 06-691

This memo is regarding the above referenced protocol which was previously granted approval by the IRB on November 27, 2007. You subsequently requested permission to amend your IRB application. Since the requested amendment is nonsubstantive in nature, I, as Chair of the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board, have granted approval for requested protocol amendment, effective as of October 15, 2008. The anniversary date will remain the same as the original approval date.

As an investigator of human subjects, your responsibilities include the following:

1. Report promptly proposed changes in previously approved human subject research activities to the IRB, including changes to your study forms, procedures and investigators, regardless of how minor. The proposed changes must not be initiated without IRB review and approval, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects.
2. Report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated or adverse events involving risks or harms to human research subjects or others.
3. Report promptly to the IRB of the study's closing (i.e., data collecting and data analysis complete at Virginia Tech). If the study is to continue past the expiration date (listed above), investigators must submit a request for continuing review prior to the continuing review due date (listed above). It is the researcher's responsibility to obtain re-approval from the IRB before the study's expiration date.
4. If re-approval is not obtained (unless the study has been reported to the IRB as closed) prior to the expiration date, all activities involving human subjects and data analysis must cease immediately, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects.

cc: File

Invent the Future

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE UNIVERSITY AND STATE UNIVERSITY
An equal opportunity, affirmative action institution