

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection:** Duggin, Thelma P.: Files, 1981-1983

**Folder Title:** Executive Order 12320 (1 of 5)

**Box:** 7

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

*Last Updated: 08/18/2023*

# MEMORANDUM

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

TO : The Secretary  
Through: U \_\_\_\_\_  
ES \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 31 JUL 1981

FROM : Thomas Melady  
Assistant Secretary-designate for  
Postsecondary Education

SUBJECT: Request for President Reagan to Reissue/Revise Executive Order 12232 on Historically Black Colleges and Universities Now

Last week I attended an all-day conference, sponsored by the staff of the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and universities, for Initiative liaisons from 85 Federal agencies. I was very pleased to see the leadership role that certain agencies have taken in promoting their interaction with Historically Black Institutions. All agency liaisons agreed that their efforts on behalf of Historically Black institutions would be dramatically strengthened if President Reagan would reissue/revise Executive Order 12232.

On December 15, 1980, the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities staff held its annual conference with historically Black institution Presidents. The purpose of that meeting was to enable historically Black institutions Presidents to comment on the Executive Order. At that time, the Presidents expressed a unanimous desire to have the Executive Order reissued or revised.

Reissuing/revising the Executive Order would accomplish several major goals:

1. It would enable Cabinet members and other agency policymakers to be certain that President Reagan fully supports historically Black institutions.
  - a. Lower level agency liaisons would receive greater administrative and economic support for their activities.
  - b. The goal of the Executive Order would not be eliminated in agencies where funds and manpower are now being reduced.
2. President Reagan's campaign promises and Vice President Bush's statements about the value of historically Black institutions would be translated in a direct mandate for action.
  - a. Members of the Black community would regard this action as a direct commitment from this Administration to help all Americans.
  - b. There would be a counter-balance to the difficulties currently experienced by historically Black institutions because of reduced student aid and rising operating cost.

3. It would continue the important progress toward educational equity as exemplified by the recent decisions on the North Carolina and South Carolina desegregation plans.

It is urgent that President Reagan reissue/revise Executive Order 12232 now. Our Administration has taken action on the budget and taxes; we must turn our attention to assisting our government employees in accomplishing our objectives. This timing is perfect because our new agency personnel have begun their jobs; they are planning the budget for the new fiscal year. In addition, the historically Black institutions campuses are preparing to open this Fall. We want them to be able to help their students attain the education and skills that will enable them to be productive citizens; we want the historically Black institutions to become more self-reliant. It is important that we now reissue/revise Executive Order 12232 so that Federal officials, historically Black institutions, and members of the Black community can be certain that this Administration supports the strengthening of historically Black Institutions.

DECISION

Approve: \_\_\_\_\_

Disapprove: \_\_\_\_\_

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

cc: Elam Hertzler  
Clarence Thomas  
Vincent Reed  
William Young

THE WHITE HOUSE  
Washington, D.C.  
July 28, 1981

The Honorable

Throughout my election campaign and in these early months of our Administration, I have expressed a strong commitment to strengthening historically Black colleges and universities. During my campaign I stated that "These colleges exemplify the truly American concept of self-help for those who choose to work and study in them." At that time, I pledged to work to increase the Black colleges' share of the Title III budget and to encourage the private sector, corporations, foundations, and private philanthropists to continue their aid to Black colleges. Vice President Bush has also acclaimed the historically Black institutions in his speeches at Tuskegee Institute and Howard University.

This Administration recognizes that historically Black colleges and universities represent a resource of cultural treasure that grows more valuable each year. Contrary to some mistaken voices, the role of the Black college in America is more important today than ever before. We cannot allow that resource to be squandered or the tradition of historically Black colleges to wither away.

In order to affirm our government-wide commitment toward preserving, strengthening, and expanding historically Black institutions, I am reissuing Executive Order 12232. I would like you to increase the participation of historically Black colleges and universities in your agency programs. With your cooperation and initiative, we can promote the strength of these vital institutions that serve and must continue to serve their constituents, your agencies, and our nation.

THE WHITE HOUSE

EXECUTIVE ORDER

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution of the United States of America, and in order to maximize the development of human resources, and to strengthen and expand the capacity of historically Black colleges and universities, it is hereby ordered as follows:

- 1-101 The Vice President shall provide leadership of and give direction to the implementation of this Federal initiative to increase the participation of historically Black colleges and universities in Federally sponsored programs.
- 1-102 Federal agencies shall encourage the cooperation and participation of the private sector in enhancing historically Black institutions.
- 1-103 The Secretary of Education shall implement a Federal initiative designed to achieve a significant increase in the participation by historically Black colleges and universities in Federally sponsored programs. To implement this Order the following is required:
  - (a) The Secretary of Education shall ensure that an immediate subordinate is responsible for implementing the provisions of this Order.
  - (b) The Secretary shall ensure that each President of a historically Black college or university is given the opportunity to comment on the implementation of the initiative established by this Order.
- 1-104 The Secretary of Education shall establish a National Center for the Study of Black Higher Education. The purpose is to improve higher education for Black Americans.
- 1-105 The head of each Executive agency shall designate an immediate subordinate who will be responsible for implementing the agency responsibilities set forth in this Order. In each Executive agency there shall be an agency liaison to the Secretary of Education implementing this Order.
- 1-106 The heads of Executive agencies shall establish annual goals for their agencies. These goals shall be reviewed by the Secretary of Education in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget. The review process shall determine the adequacy of the goals in relationship to previous levels of participation. Upon completion of the review process the goals will be submitted to the Vice President.

- 1-107 Executive agencies shall identify and utilize the statutory authorities, regulations and policies which can provide greater utilization of historically Black institutions in Federal programs.
- 1-108 Executive agencies shall review their programs and priorities for the purpose of promoting and maximizing the capabilities of historically Black colleges and universities. They will promote greater utilization of historically Black institutions to meet agency identified needs.
- 1-109 Each Executive agency shall review its current programs and practices and initiate new efforts to increase the participation of historically Black colleges and universities in the programs of the agency. Particular attention should be given to identifying and eliminating unintended regulatory and procedural barriers.
- 1-110 The Executive agencies shall utilize the historically Black institutions as resources in promoting the economic recovery of the nation.
- 1-111 The Executive agencies shall encourage the involvement of corporations, foundations, philanthropists, and community-based organizations in ways to improve self-reliance of historically Black colleges and universities.

WHITE HOUSE

EXECUTIVE ORDER

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Preamble: Directing Federal resources toward preserving, strengthening and expanding the capacity of historically Black colleges and universities has been supported by our national leaders for more than a decade.

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution of the United States of America, the context of Executive Order 12232 is revised as follows:

Section #1-101 is revised as follows:

The Vice President shall provide leadership of and give direction to a Federal initiative to increase the participation of historically Black colleges and universities in Federally sponsored programs. The Secretary of Education shall implement a Federal initiative designed to achieve a significant increase in the participation by historically Black colleges and universities in Federally sponsored programs.

Section #1-102 is revised as follows:

The heads of Executive agencies shall establish annual goals for their agencies. These goals shall be reviewed by the Secretary of Education in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget. The review process shall determine the adequacy of the goals in relation to previous levels of participation of historically Black institutions in Federally sponsored programs. Upon completion of the review process the goals will be submitted to the Vice President.

Change Section #1-108 to now be #1-111

The New Section #1-108 is as follows:

The Secretary of Education shall establish a National Center for the Study of Black Higher Education. The purpose is to improve the quality of higher education for Black Americans.

The New Section #1-109 is as follows:

The Executive agencies shall utilize the historically Black institutions as resources in promoting the economic recovery of the nation.

The New Section #1-110 is as follows:

The Executive agencies shall encourage the involvement of corporations, foundations, philanthropists, and community-based organizations in ways to improve the self-reliance of historically Black colleges and universities.





# MONITOR

Vol. 5, No. 3, September 1981

**Through Pell's crucial work on the Higher Education Act of 1972, the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) was created to provide low income students with access to higher education. With this legislation, Congress declared as public policy that no student should be denied an opportunity to higher education because of his financial condition.**

## Senator Pell Receives Award



Rhode Island State Senator Edward Marth, Representing the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Presents a Distinguished Service Award to U.S. Senator Claiborne Pell for his Outstanding Leadership in Support of Higher Education. Mortin Tenzer, Chairman of AAUP Committee "R" (Left) and Dr. Kenneth S. Tollett, Director of The Institute for the Study of Educational Policy and Committee "R" Member (Right), Look on. (Story on Inside Cover).

### Editor's Note

This issue of the *ISEP Monitor* examines several aspects related to the current status of elementary and secondary education, in addition to a reception honoring Senator Claiborne Pell and to greet members of the American Association of University Professors.

In the first article, Dr. Sarah E. Moten, ISEP Senior Fellow, and Ms. Floretta McKenzie, Superintendent of Washington, D.C. Public Schools, discuss the administrative aspect of public elementary and secondary schools.

Next, Dr. Stephen Wright, an educational consultant and former Fisk University President, analyzes the problems in current Black teacher education. Also featured is a critique of James Coleman's recent *What Do We Know About Private Schools* seminar by Senior Fellow Dr. Lorenzo Morris.

Anna Ellenbogen, an ISEP Research Assistant,

assesses the effect of Reaganomics in *The Impact of Budgetary Policy Changes on Education*. Also included is an article on a special summer elementary tutorial program in Washington, D.C., by Research Assistant/Special Editor, Vicki J. Ballou.

Luther Brown's *Youth in the Black Community: Strategies for Progress* is a commentary on the crises of Black youth in America. Included is a report on the reception for ISEP's latest publication, *A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence: Dunbar High School of Little Rock, Arkansas*, by Dr. Faustine Childress Jones. Also featured is an ISEP National Advisory Board Luncheon featuring remarks by Dr. Faustine Jones about her most recent study. Finally, the back cover contains President Reagan's Executive Order concerning Historically Black Colleges and Universities.



## Pell Honored



**Senator Claiborne Pell addresses reception while State Senator Edward Marth and Dr. Kenneth S. Tollett look on.**

The Institute for the Study of Educational Policy (ISEP) sponsored a reception on June 10, 1981 to honor Senator Claiborne Pell (D-RI) for his distinguished efforts in the struggle to provide equal opportunity in higher education and to greet delegates to the 67th annual meeting of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

Through Pell's crucial work on the Higher Education Act of 1972, the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) was created to provide low-income students with access to higher education. With this legislation, Congress declared as public policy that no student should be denied an opportunity to higher education because of his financial condition.

Pell also sponsored legislation creating the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. In recognition of his continued commitment to equal educational opportunity, the 96th Congress changed the BEOG to Pell Grants in 1980.

At the Capitol Hill reception, Rhode Island Senator Edward Marth presented an award to Pell on behalf of the AAUP.

"We were delighted to honor him for his strong, singular commitment to the principle of equal educa-



**Barbara Lett Simmons, D.C. School Board Member, and Luther Brown are joined by an AAUP conference attendee.**



**Dr. Kenneth S. Tollett and the Honorable Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island.**



**Dr. Kenneth S. Tollett, Director of ISEP, Dr. Edwin Dorn, PUSH Excel Director and Luther Brown, Research Information Officer, ISEP, exchange ideas during Pell Reception.**

tional opportunity," said Al Sumberg, AAUP Associate Secretary and Director of Governmental Relations. AAUP was among the first major higher education associations to support the position or policy of race specificity in Title III, a position long advocated by Kenneth S. Tollett, ISEP Director.

Special guests included Strom Thurmond, U.S. Senator; Roger Estep, Howard University Vice President for Development; Willie T. Howard, Dean of the Howard University School of Education; Barbara Lett-Simmons, D.C. School Board member; and Frank Shaffer-Corona, also of the D.C. School Board.

Representatives from the offices of Senators Howard Baker, David Boren, Bill Bradley, Ernest Hollings, Mack Mattingly, Howard Metzenbaum, Donald Nickles, Sam Nunn, Don Reigle and Harrison Schmitt attended the reception.

The offices of Congressmen Ike Andrews, Silvio Conte, Brian Donnelly, Millicent Fenwick, Wyche Fowler, Bill Frenzell, Elliot Levitas, Carlos Moorhead, and Paul Trible were also represented.

# An Interview with Floretta D. McKenzie, Superintendent D.C. Public Schools

By Sarah E. Moten  
Senior Fellow and Assistant to the Director for Research



**Ms. Floretta McKenzie, Superintendent of D.C. Schools (left) and Dr. Sarah Moten, ISEP Senior Fellow (right), discuss the administrator's role in public elementary and secondary education.**

"Education is our passport to the future; for tomorrow belongs to the people who prepare for it today."—Malcolm X

On July 1, 1981, the D.C. Public School System hired as its ninth Superintendent since 1967, an outstanding educator, Mrs. Floretta Dukes McKenzie. Born in Lakeland, Florida, McKenzie was the second oldest girl in a family of six children.

When Mrs. McKenzie was 15, her family moved to Washington, D.C., where she later graduated from Dunbar High School. She earned a bachelor's degree and master's degree in history from D.C. Teacher's College and Howard University, respectively. The Superintendent is married with two teenage children who are recent graduates of D.C. Public Schools.

**ISEP:** Why did you choose the field of education as a career?

**McKenzie:** I remember quite clearly, I was daydreaming in the ninth grade and I decided I was going to be a history teacher. And somehow or the other, I never came up with an idea better than that, although the career choices in my hometown were very limited. We either saw people working as domestics or in education. There were very few business people and no *Black lawyers* in my little hometown, although there were a couple of doctors. One's view of what you can do with your life becomes very narrow. I knew I didn't want to be a domestic. So, I thought I'd be a teacher. It was very simple.

**ISEP:** Did you have a role model?

**McKenzie:** No, not particularly a role model but I came from a family that believed in education. My grandparents on my father's side were both doctors. And so

it was expected of you to go to school and to go to college and to achieve. So, you just did it. That was the expectation. I had a lot of good teachers and people who were interested in me as a person. My parents set goals for us very early.

**ISEP:** What have been some of your most rewarding experiences?

**McKenzie:** Well, I think one was directing Project Open, which is a talent search project for disadvantaged youngsters to get them into college and help them get financial aid. I started that off-year in the District and I don't think there's anything more rewarding than helping young people break through barriers of poverty. You know that sometimes some of them are the first in the family to go to college. And I mean that's a good feeling to see them coming back after they've achieved. It's just great.

**ISEP:** Was it a federally-funded program?

**McKenzie:** Right. It was funded by the Office of Education. Then, I guess the other most rewarding position was being a counselor in a high school. You can see the results of your work very quickly. And, it was just fun.

**ISEP:** What have been some of your most memorable accomplishments?

**McKenzie:** Oh, I think one that I'm pleased about and proud of is the development of a competency assessment plan for the state of Maryland that is now presently being implemented. I think that we thought about almost everything that one should consider in developing assessment plans. We considered phasing in, making sure that youngsters are not put at a disadvantage, not having more regulations than necessary either by the state legislature or by the state board of education. We also looked at involving the community as a whole in the development. So that was a very exciting, and I think, a comprehensive piece of work. It was complex, but it was developed very comprehensively.

**ISEP:** During your career, you have moved from the D.C. School System to the State Government and Federal Government, respectively, and then back to the D.C. School System. What adjustments have you had to make in order to be flexible?

**McKenzie:** I was only with the federal government for about two years. The other time was spent in another school system and with the Maryland State Department of Education. When I taught with young, aspiring or just aspiring administrators, I'd try to indicate to them that administrative skills are transferrable. I tried to show them that the skills you need in develop-

ing a team or in working through a problem are generally the same. And whether it's a problem of managing curriculum, managing the development of a proposal, managing a whole concept or developing a concept at the federal level, the skills needed are still pretty much the same. You need the same complex of skills. As you work through different organizations, you sharpen your skills and then you also have an opportunity to broaden your vision. You have no concept of the total availability of resources and people in different areas, but your wealth of ideas expands almost geometrically from interaction with folks nationally, statewide or internationally. For example, when I was with the federal government, I participated in three European conferences and I think the most important one was the general conference of UNESCO in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. You talk about folks! It's a broadening experience. And, when you've gone through one that's really broadening, you know it. I have been broadened. But Sarah, I think the fascinating thing about it is, if you open yourself up to learn and realize that you are always learning, then you develop new skills and change attitudes and even change your behavior about certain things. Because I know very distinctly, I've picked up certain skills at the federal level, skills that I did not have before.

**ISEP:** Let me ask you a little about your career goals. You are now Superintendent of D.C. Schools and I guess your immediate goal is to learn the system.

**McKenzie:** I wish I could say it was just learning. This one is learning and doing at the same time.

**ISEP:** What do you see as your immediate goal(s) in this new role and what do you see as your long-range goal(s)?

**McKenzie:** I'll tell you, my goals for this particular position have to do with developing a smooth running organization that is not affected by the change of a person in the Superintendent's chair. I would hope to be able to put into place the kinds of structures and systems that will allow the system to function in an orderly and effective manner, even after Flo McKenzie is gone. My second goal is to raise the morale of the staff and that is a very difficult one in light of the present budgetary problems. The third one... it might even be first, is to try to make sure that gains are maintained and accelerated and that all of them are kind of hooked together.

**ISEP:** If given the opportunity, what would you do to change the total educational process of public schools? This opportunity would include all the necessary money, personnel and leeway.

**McKenzie:** Frankly, I would use the money to re-educate staff. I think in public education we are still doing things too much like we have always done them. In particular, our secondary schools probably haven't changed since the time you and I were in them and even long before then. I am not saying change for change's sake, but we must learn something different and we must also learn some better ways of doing some things, too. I would launch a massive staff de-

velopment program that had to do with classes, job classes and people as individuals. I would support the development of improved skills and the teaching of reading, mathematics and diagnostic prescriptives. But, I think, a system has to respond to the needs of individuals as well as to the requirements of the system. Then, I would apply the best in technology to every facet of school operations, including instruction. There are some things within our school system on the management line that are not on line, that is, on computer. This change could save us many person-hours and it would provide us with information for decision-making. Given the tight budget, we don't even know when we can get in some. But we've made some moves to get into some already. And then, if we are truly going to individualize instruction, we have to use technology.

**ISEP:** How does your current role differ from previous experiences?

**McKenzie:** Well, in a number of spots, I was generally backing up somebody although I was Acting Superintendent here for three months in 1973. But when you're out there and you know that the buck stops here, that's a different feeling. To be exact, if you've got a buffer or somebody to tell you, "Hey, you didn't do it right", you know you've still got another chance. But here, sometimes you only have one chance to get it right. I like to reflect on things, and one of the other things you have to be able to do is conceptualize the total operation of the school system. And while you can conceptualize the whole, you have to know something about each individual part. Because then, if you don't, you can't direct the operation or you don't have a sense of the quality of the operation when somebody presents you with a plan or tells you how they are managing it.

**ISEP:** Yes, you really have to understand the total picture.

**McKenzie:** It's a little frightening in a way.

**ISEP:** They say it's lonely at the top. I imagine it becomes lonelier because you know that the buck stops here.

**McKenzie:** That's right. Then you start fighting for time to be by yourself because you're giving so much of yourself until you get very little time to gather yourself back together. So, I find that I'm just fighting for a little time to myself sometimes.

**ISEP:** I know you probably work extremely long hours.

**McKenzie:** Yes.

**ISEP:** Your children are 18 and 19, and they're growing up a little, but they still need some of your time. How do they fit into your total outlook on public education?

**McKenzie:** My commitment to public education is longstanding in that I continued to keep my children enrolled until they graduated. I think that young people in public schools are able to engage in kinds of social relationships that they can't possibly get in a private school. That is, they develop certain kinds of social survival skills that you can't get otherwise. On the other hand, parents who have the ability to go outside and who are not satisfied totally with everything



the school is offering can augment that with different kinds of experiences. But of course, my concern always has to be with those parents who are not able to augment it through various experiences.

**ISEP:** What is the major contribution that the federal government could make to public education?

---

***“Public education in this country is under siege and we will see a decline, almost a breakdown in public education over the next decade, unless we reaffirm our commitment to public education and reassess the value of education to the perpetuation of our democratic ideals.”***

---

**McKenzie:** The major contribution the federal government could make to public education, one they've tried to make in prior years, is to support efforts to assure equal educational opportunity and equal access through programs like those for elementary and secondary education. It could also provide monies to school systems to do some development demonstration work. And these are monies that school systems are finding in very short supply now, yet they provide for improvements in the quality of education. I'm very concerned that the federal government is retreating from its major role of assisting and monitoring the school system's efforts toward equality of educational opportunity and equal access. I think they're blurring the identification of the programs through the block grant process. And when a program doesn't have a constituency, then it's easy to pick it off.

**ISEP:** What do you think would be the greatest impact of tuition tax credits on D.C. schools?

**McKenzie:** I think that it will have a devastating impact. While the schools haven't been getting as much financial support as they need and require, they'll get even less. I think it will undermine public education in this city and it will have an impact on public education throughout the country.

**ISEP:** Is there other information you would like to share with our readers?

**McKenzie:** The only other thing that I would like to add is that I think it is very important that the city rallies around its public school system. Public education in this country is under siege and we will see a decline, almost a breakdown in public education over the next decade unless we reaffirm our commitment to public education and reassess the value of education to the perpetuation of our democratic ideals. I think that we've taken public education for granted while it serves as the very foundation of our society and culture.

**ISEP:** Let me ask you one last question. What do you see as the relationship between the Superintendent and the local school board? I know that D.C. is unique in that not only are you the local Superintendent, but you are the state Superintendent. So consequently, there is a local board and state board, which are all in one, not different. What do you see as the local Superintendent's relationship with the local board?

**McKenzie:** Well, the local board provides first hand information to the administration on how the community feels about programs and services and what the community perceives that it needs. It's a kind of barometer. And I would adopt policies that speak to those concerns. But by all means, it has to be a cooperative partnership. It would not suffice for the Superintendent to have a good image in the community and a bad image with the board. I think the young people in this city need to see the Board, the Superintendent, and our employees. It would be a plus for morale if the people in this city could see the Board and its Superintendent working together in their best interest.

**ISEP:** Do you care to share with me any of those ideas you have in terms of building morale?

**McKenzie:** First of all, I'm going to develop a school system newsletter that highlights some of the good things happening in the city. Second, I'm going to provide opportunities for teachers to interact in decision-making capacities on task groups or whatever else we are working on. I think it's important to involve people and to keep the staff involved in all the processes that would impact on their sphere of influence. We had textbook committees, and while some people didn't want to work on them, they made sense. They give a kind of involvement. Whenever somebody develops innovations in the school system or in a classroom, they're not done in the curriculum labs, they're done right in the classroom. If somehow we can capture these innovations or instructional improvements and provide some recognition and incentive, then that will be helpful. I think another thing that will help the system is to know that there is somebody at the helm who doesn't double speak—who can be wrong because the information is sometimes clouded, but who can still tell one story. Then the senior staff can support it and give one message rather than mix messages about whether you care about teachers, whether you care about kids, what programs are supported, which ones are not supported, what's important and what's not. I think that will help clear away some of the stuff, too. I'm going to do my best and give it all I have.

“Whether we have a viable PTA, a viable extra-curricular program—all of these are really indicators of a good school system.

... Now, General Motors makes cars. School systems teach kids to read, write, compute. So make no mistake, I'm not in the social work business or any other business. I don't make cars. I'm here to see that kids learn. ... I know what the mission of a school system is.”—Floretta McKenzie

# The Survival of Black Public School Teachers: for Black Colleges and Universities

By Stephen J. Wright  
Educational Consultant

Dr. Stephen J. Wright, educational consultant and former Fisk University president, delivered the following address during the "Problems, Issues and Strategies Related to the Preparation of Black Public School Teachers" conference at Norfolk State University on June 26, 1980.



Those who planned this conference deserve, I think, the highest commendation for seeking to address a very urgent problem—the survival of black public school teachers. This is an especially urgent problem for the predominantly Black colleges and universities—training, as they do, nearly 50 percent of them. As I analyze the problem, the urgency is a product of three major developments, each of which is playing a significant role in reducing the number of Blacks who become teachers in the public schools and taken together, they constitute a very serious threat to the survival of Black public school teachers:

- The desegregation of the public schools which has opened up teaching positions, at least theoretically, without regard to race. In the pre-desegregation days, the teaching positions in Black schools were reserved for Black teachers. This, obviously, is no longer the case. The competition for these positions has become tough.
- The opening up of new job opportunities in many fields hither-to closed to Blacks. This is the result of

the desegregation in the larger society and the reduction in job discrimination. As all of us know, teaching was once the "Rock of Ages," the "Shelter in a Time of Storm" for Blacks. It was the refuge for the "Best and the Brightest" as well as for the worst and the dullest. Such a refuge is obviously no longer a necessity for the best and brightest. They can now aspire realistically to hundreds of other careers.

- The introduction of the National Teacher Examination (NTE) as a screening instrument for admission to the profession—an instrument on which too many young men and women trained in Black institutions have scored significantly lower than whites—disastrously lower in far too many instances.

In developing this presentation, I have made five important assumptions which I am persuaded are sound:

- That the three developments which I have just described are not only here to stay but will continue as developments—indefinitely;
- That the survival of Black public school teachers is vitally important for the public schools in general and for Black children and youth in particular;
- That the survival of Black public school teachers is contingent, to a substantial degree, upon significant improvement in the performance of Blacks on the National Teacher Examination;
- That the soundest approach to improve the performance of Blacks on the National Teacher Examination is the serious upgrading of the educational program in the Black colleges and universities, given the special mission of these institutions;
- That Blacks, like other people, can learn anything they are taught.

The fourth assumption, with the clause "given the special mission of these institutions," requires further explanation, I suspect. The great majority of the black colleges and universities, for all practical purposes, are open admissions institutions and given the demographic prediction of fewer college age youth for the 1980's, they are likely to continue to be open admissions institutions. This means that we are not likely to raise admissions standards, nor do I think we should; however, this means that the majority of the students admitted will, for a variety of reasons, bring serious academic deficiencies to the colleges and universities, especially in reading, vocabulary and command of language. It is also unrealistic, I think, to believe that we will be able to set



---

***... the soundest approach to improve the performance of Blacks on the National Teacher Examination is the serious upgrading of the educational program in the Black colleges and universities, given the special mission of these institutions ...***

---

the grade point averages for those entering the professional phase of the training high enough to eliminate the performance problem on the N.T.E. As open admissions institutions, our obligation is to remove the academic deficiencies by special developmental programs and superior teaching. Moreover, we then have the additional responsibility of being responsive to the educational implications of the performance of our students on the N.T.E. and the burden of what I wish to say relates to this latter point.

### **The Nature of the N.T.E.**

One reason that students in too many of our black colleges and universities continue to perform poorly on the N.T.E. is that the institutions have not been sufficiently aroused by the poor performance to diagnose the problem and to develop programs for its solution. Such an approach will, inevitably, involve the chief academic officer, the Education Policy Committees of the institutions, the faculty and especially the departments and schools of education. Charging test bias will accomplish nothing, for the courts have spoken decisively on this point. But a thorough examination of the content of the examination may suggest some fruitful approaches.

The National Teacher Examination consists of two major types:

- The Common Examinations—three hours and 15 minutes in length
- The area of major field examinations—some 26 in all—each two hours in length

Let us take a look at the Common Examination where the critical problem lies. This section of the N.T.E. has six parts:

Professional Education with	109 items
Written English Expression with	45 items
Social Studies with	30 items
Literature and the Fine Arts with	35 items
Science with	30 items
Mathematics with	20 items

You can see immediately that 160 items, roughly 60 percent of the items on these common examinations, are concerned with general education: English, Social Studies, Literature and the Fine Arts, Science and Mathematics. The remainder of the items, roughly 40 percent, are devoted to professional education.

Betty J. Humphry of the Educational Testing Service has done a very useful comparative analysis of black and national (mainly white) performance on these common examinations.<sup>1</sup> Let me summarize just enough of her findings to make four points:

1. Comparatively, the poorest performance of Blacks was in mathematics and within this area, their poorest performance was on the items relating to geometry.
2. The second poorest performance by Blacks was in literature and fine arts and within this area, their poorest performance was on the items relating to music, dance and theatre and general knowledge of the field.
3. The third poorest performance was in the science area and within this area, their poorest performance was in the area of physics and general knowledge.
4. The poorest performance in the professional education area was in three areas:
  - A. Pupil backgrounds, needs and characteristics—items on which one would think Blacks would score well.
  - B. Evaluation, measurement and statistical concepts.
  - C. Instructional theory and practice.

It should be emphasized, however, that Blacks did poorly, as a group, on all six parts of the Common Examinations.

Humphry makes three observations that warrant inclusion in the analysis:

1. Black students may need to develop their analytical and decision-making skills in arriving at answers to test items.
2. Black students need to attempt to answer more of the test questions, as indicated by the number of questions they omitted or failed to attempt. She goes on to say that “the failure to attempt some questions may have to do with reading skills, and the improvement of both reading rate and reading comprehension could be helpful!”
3. Black students may need to increase their test-taking skills.

There is, of course, a great deal more to Humphry's Comparative Analysis than I have summarized here but what I have summarized has definite implications for improving the teacher education programs in the majority of Black colleges and universities.

### **Educational Implications**

The Humphry Analysis, I believe, tells us a number of things that we need to do—things that can make the critical difference in the performance of our students on the N.T.E. Let me summarize what I think this analysis reveals:

- This analysis tells us that we need to take a hard look at the general education program we provide for students entering our teacher education program, for it is abundantly clear that their perfor-

---

***“...we must emphasize competence almost as a creed. In the process, we must have the courage to eliminate those students who will not really try hard enough to overcome their serious deficiencies.”***

---

mance indicates a need to strengthen their knowledge of what amounts to 60 percent of the test items. For some institutions this may mean fewer electives and more prescribed courses; for some, it may mean more courses in general education; for some it may mean simply a higher quality of teaching. In taking this hard look, we need to pay special attention to mathematics, to literature and the arts and to the amount and quality of science which the various programs in general education include.

- This analysis tells us we need to take a hard look at the professional aspect of the teacher education program—at the courses required and the content of those courses, the supplementary reading that is required and the rigor with which the courses are taught. In taking this hard look, we need to pay special attention to such areas as measurement and evaluation, instructional theory and practice and pupil backgrounds, needs, and characteristics.
- This analysis tells us that we need to take a hard look at the reading speed and comprehension of the students. For if either is substantially below standard, they simply cannot handle long sophisticatedly worded tests. John Monroe at Tougaloo College holds that too many students enter college with a vocabulary that is much too limited to handle college work. In freshman English, first at Miles College and now at Tougaloo, he devotes a significant amount of time to vocabulary building, and it pays off. In any event, knowledge of the reading level of the students, with a program for removing deficiencies, may be imperative in some institutions.
- This analysis tells us that our students need to bring more sophistication to the taking of standardized tests—to be taught to bring more analytical reasoning to the task, to try more of the items and not get “hung up” on any one item, to read test items with far more suspicion that there is more than meets the eye at first glance. Dr. J. W. Carmichael at Xavier University, for example, conducts a program for high school graduates who are headed for Xavier called SOAR—an acronym for Stress on Analytical Reasoning. It is a five-week, pre-college program which is proving that scores on standardized tests can be raised and raised significantly. As an example of how successful it is, Xavier has 17 members of its class of 1980 who have been admitted to Medical School—Tulane, Harvard, Cornell, Howard, Meharry, the University of Wisconsin, Stanford, Tufts. Show me another small institution with a better record! The present record

represents an 87 percent acceptance in medical schools. The “secret”? Some Piaget-inspired laboratory exercises—emphasizing explanation, inventions and application; critical reading-analytical reasoning, and vocabulary building with some “quiz bowl” type sessions.

- This analysis tells us, I think, that we need to involve the students in the effort to improve their performance on the N.T.E. and other standardized tests, for it is clear that these instruments—like it or not—will be with us for the foreseeable future. And our students need to become a part of the answer to our search for solutions to their present levels of performance—not merely a continuing part of the problem.

As much as this analysis tells us, there is a great deal more. You can have a “custom-tailored” analysis of the performance of your own students and an expert from Educational Testing Service to help interpret that performance for you and your colleagues. What is more, the most it can cost your institution, at the present time, is the actual expense involved. And if you really cannot afford this, you can get the service free. In fact, you may be able to get this service free without having to prove your poverty.

At Educational Testing Service, the N.T.E. is managed by Dr. William U. Harris, who happens to be Black. He is a former principal in North Carolina and is knowledgeable about and highly sensitive to the special problems of Black colleges and universities. In addition, he is an exceptionally able man.

In all that we do in training public school teachers in open admission institutions, it is imperative that we make it our business to know our students far better than ever before—to know their strengths and especially their weaknesses and to devise hurdles, training and exercises addressed to those weaknesses. Moreover, we must emphasize competence almost as a creed. In the process, we must have the courage to eliminate those students who will not really try hard enough to overcome their serious deficiencies.

The survival of Black public school teachers has to be a part of the very reason for being of departments and schools of education in our Black colleges and universities. And the N. T. E., viewed in proper perspective, is a relatively minor challenge that can and must be overcome, even though it may take more than the usual, traditional four years. The far greater challenge, it seems to me, is to prepare teachers who can lift the horizons of inner city Black children, who can help to build their self-images, who can teach them to see the relationship between success in school and larger life opportunity, and who can motivate them to realize their potential and to take pride in achieving it.

---

<sup>1</sup>Betty J. Humphry. “A Review of Data Based Performance of a Sample of Black Students From Southern Colleges on the N. T. E. Common Examination.” Unpublished and no date. Princeton, New Jersey, Educational Testing Service.

# “What Do We Know About Private Schools”: A Critical Analysis of the NCES Seminar on the Coleman Report

By Lorenzo Morris, Senior Fellow



James Coleman, social scientist and educational consultant, presented “What Do We Know About Private Schools” at a National Center for Education Statistics seminar in April. The following is a critique of that presentation.

The leading social scientist of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) has emerged from a long public silence, following his last attack on busing in 1977, to declare that the nearly unanimous hopes of the poor, minorities and sympathetic educators for progress through public schooling are misguided. In a resounding blitz of media management, he and his associates reveal the prophecy of their inspired contemplation of the computer tapes. We are told that retreat from a public policy concentrated on the priority of public schooling is dictated by a constellation of findings anchored in simple correlations. Capping off this constellation of findings and inspiration, Coleman *et al* sent out a call for tuition tax-credits which reverberated like an oracle, albeit suspect, throughout the news media. The premises and formal analysis are disconcerting and unconvincing, but more important, the conclusions are both disappointing and contrary to the refined and common sense of many in their audience.

More like an authoritative message than an oracle, Coleman’s conclusions are precise although the methods and logic behind them are shrouded in ambiguity. The report enumerates fifteen basic “premises underlying policies that would increase or decrease the role of

private schools.” Ironically, there is no category of premises supporting current policies. Of the eight premises that would justify a public policy of increasing support for private schools, he says there is positive evidence for four, no meaningful data for three, and uncertainty about one. The four strongest premises involve a claim of superiority of private school over public school students in terms of: “cognitive outcomes”; “discipline”; greater extracurricular participation; and greater teacher/student “contact.” Of the seven premises that would justify decreasing support for private schools, he says the evidence contradicts all but two. Three of the five eliminated relate to race and class inequality and segregation. By considering and eliminating these three premises, he gives the weight of his basic conclusion to the idea that private schools serve the interest of Black students and desegregation better than public ones. This idea undergirds his summary of his conclusions when he says:

It is hard . . . to avoid the overall conclusion that the factual premises underlying policies that would facilitate use of private schools are much better supported on the whole than those underlying policies that would constrain their use. Or, to put it another way, the constraints imposed on schools in the public sector (and there is no evidence that those constraints are financial, compared with the private sector) seem to impair their functioning as educational institutions, without providing the more egalitarian outcomes that are one of the goals of public schooling. (p. xxix).

The responses from educators, researchers and policy analysts have been equally intense and critical of the Coleman report. All but the most mundane aspects

---

***Tarnished but still effective, the report is expected to effectively undergird tax credit promoters on Capitol Hill and in the state legislatures for years to come. Ironically, the substance of the Coleman message has been roughly rejected and yet, like the message of a conquering power, it remains influential.***

---

of the report have been attacked and seriously wounded by a diverse group of scholarly and policy oriented critics. Tarnished but still effective, the report is expected to effectively undergird tax credit promoters on Capitol Hill and in the state legislatures for years to come. Ironically, the substance of the Coleman message has been roundly rejected and yet, like the message of a conquering power, it remains influential.

The irony emerges from the overestimation of the role of the message itself and the virtual failure of the concerned public to focus attention on the ultimate source of the message. More recently, Coleman has directed criticism toward the original source of authority which nevertheless remains in the shadow of his social-scientific creation. In attempting to moderate, if not to recant, his conclusion about private/public school differences in test results, Coleman admitted to a *New York Times* reporter that at least one important methodological decision did not flow primarily from the dictates of the scientific method:

The University of Chicago sociologist conceded that in order to make judgments about high school teaching "it would have been better to have measured subjects that are taught in high schools."

Mr. Coleman added that he would have preferred to test high school subjects but explained that in 1972 the National Center for Education Statistics conducted a similar test of high school seniors' basic skills. "They wanted to give the same test again, so that's what we did," he said. (Fiske, 1981)

On April 7th the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) held a large seminar to introduce its major new data file on public schooling from which the Coleman report emerged. Since NCES has consigned the file and its development to the guiding hands of Coleman and associates at the National Opinion Research Center at Chicago (NORC), the seminar had to appear to focus on the Coleman study and, to a lesser extent, on the Andrew Greeley study of parochial schooling produced concurrently. Beyond mere appearance, however, the seminar's title, publicity and mode of organization left the news media and seminar participants with the singular impression that NCES was promoting the Coleman conclusions as appropriate for public policy. Accordingly, NCES entitled the seminar, "What Do We Know About Private Schools," and attached their announcement to the summary of findings of Coleman's report, *Public and Private Schools* (a draft). On the surface at least, NCES thus gave the unavoidable impression that both the question and the Coleman answer were of national import. The fact that the report was stamped draft may well have encouraged seminar participants to believe that the conclusions required the expression of informed public sentiment rather than basic analysis.

The more political, as opposed to scholarly, character of the seminar is exhibited by the manner in which invitations were distributed and not distributed. Ten researchers/policy analysts were invited to critique the Coleman and Greeley studies following short presenta-

tions by the authors. After all the panelists had spoken, microphones were passed among the approximately 400 invited people in the audience. In this regard, the form would perhaps have been typical for an academic seminar had the number of participants, both on and off stage, not been gigantic by normal academic standards. Beyond the hundreds of academic participants, however, the presence of two dozen or more news reporters served to contradict the remaining pretensions of a reflective intellectual exchange.

Still without size and publicity to deform the gathering's academic legitimacy, the social-political character of the invited audience was sufficient distortion. Unfortunately for the organizers of the seminar, namely NCES, the distortion resulting from the selection of the invited audience became most apparent once the Coleman and Greeley messages had been presented. The audience consisted of people attuned to the subject of education policy—representatives of public schools and teacher associations, nuns and brothers representing parochial schools, advocates of private schooling, and a range of higher education analysts. The subject matter, however, quickly narrowed from the broad domain of all these groups to specific interests of the poor, minorities, and, particularly, the interests of Blacks. The conclusions of both the Greeley study and the Coleman study emphasized the special benefits which private schooling would offer the disadvantaged. Greeley's conclusions insisted on the non-sectarian benefits that Catholic schools have presumably offered Blacks and Hispanics along with moral enlightenment. Yet, Coleman's conclusions were most striking because they raised the claimed virtues of private schooling to the level of immediate public action via the promotion of tuition tax credits as the solution to the malaise of public schools.

The conclusion should have only surprised those who were unaware of the time and context in which Coleman and NORC received the multi-million dollar funding from NCES. On the heels of the 1978 Congressional debate over tuition tax credits, which the Carter administration was barely able to quell, NCES conceived the project. Then Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education Mary Bery objected to the selection by NCES of a figure who had been repeatedly immersed in political controversy over the quality of his research. In spite of Coleman's controversial involvement in the busing issue, NCES gave him its blessing. Subsequently, and by

---

***Yet, Coleman's conclusions were most striking because they raised the claimed virtues of private schooling to the level of immediate public action via the promotion of tuition tax credits as the solution to the malaise of public schools.***

---



intervention of a respectable internal, his findings in support of tax credits appeared. His study's support for tuition tax credits was further legitimated by a more standard and broader critique of education. In addition to the problem of tax credits, the Coleman report claimed to find a big educational benefit from increased discipline in schools—a discipline presumably abandoned in public schools.

When the short period for audience response finally came near the end of the seminar, most aspects of Coleman's analysis came under broad criticism. The methods of economic analysis, or lack of them, used to speculate on future educational spending; the rather unconvincing index of segregation in public and private schools; the use of elementary school tests to measure high school achievement—all these and more were shown to be unacceptably weak. Yet, on the major conclusions involving minority group interests and school discipline there was relative acquiescence. No one seemed to doubt that greater discipline would be an advantage although few argued that the analysis supporting the conclusion was more incontrovertible than the rest of the study. Nor did anyone openly question the benefits to minorities claimed for private schools, except for the validity of the segregation measure.

Yet, the question of equity among recipients should have been paramount in any discussion of a major federal financial commitment. In the case of tax credits this commitment is expected to cost a minimum of \$5 billion to start, and could easily reach the current level of the entire federal education budget of \$13 billion. With such a potentially consuming federal obligation any federal commitment to desegregation would inevitably be diminished. To Coleman's credit, in an ironic sense, he failed to consider the public cost and thus had an excuse for not discussing the public policy trade-offs. But what about NCES and the rest of the seminar participants? Was the exercise a legitimate no-fault reflection on whatever policy questions happened to emerge?

Some of the participants were obviously concerned about these questions but their concern surfaced before and after the seminar rather than during it (as if the seminar forbade it). Expressing these concerns, sociologist Robert Crain suggests in a group of papers critical of the report that the "segregation index" unjustifiably ignored both technical and common-sense methods of analysis. Crain observes:

The report cites Becker's work on segregation indices, but not his even more relevant paper showing disproportionately high white private school enrollment in areas of black concentration. The key sentence is on page 50. "We assume that (whites in private schools) would be (if they came back to public school) distributed among schools within the public sector in exactly the same way whites and blacks are currently distributed in the public sector." . . . The report's reasoning here is circular; by assuming that white flight to private schools does exist, it concludes that private schools do not segregate students. (Crain, 1981)

---

***Order and discipline in education are probably important assets to public education without regard to race, but when left in the unrefined context of public/private school differences, they bear the familiar racial implications of the 1960's refrain of "law and order."***

---

The Crain critique, along with those of five other respected scholars, was available before the seminar to many participants and to NCES representatives. But, the racial issues were scarcely mentioned outside the context of the clearly deficient index. Sociologist Gail Thomas, the only Black on the panel of ten, raised the issue when she opened her remarks. Others, such as David Breneman of the Brookings Institution and Douglas Page, a consultant with NCES, hit hard at the deficiencies of the segregation index, but they did not move to the major racial policy questions. In a broader context, Michael Olivas, the only Hispanic panelist, alluded to the understated issues when he concluded that "Coleman is dealing not just with research questions but with political questions."

The limits of the discussion apparently correspond to the restriction on participation imposed by NCES. While some of the panelists and some in the audience had seen the Coleman study a month before the seminar, the two minority panelists had only received it a few days before. In fact, they had only been invited to participate a week before the seminar. Moreover, NCES only saw fit to exercise that minimal element of egalitarian social grace after protests were raised from academic and political circles over minority exclusion. The NCES concession, however, did not extend far beyond panel participation. In the packed auditorium there were only a handful of Blacks, several of whom had had to work at being invited. Among the hundreds of researchers present there were probably only three or four Black researchers. Of course, an adequate representation of Blacks and other minorities might not have changed the discussion. In this regard, some participants may have felt the brief criticisms were sufficient to unmask the policy weaknesses of the analysis. But if that were the case, the widespread endorsement of the report's call for "more order and discipline" in schools as the solution to a host of pedagogical inadequacies would have been moderated by a recognition of the racial implication.

Order and discipline in education are probably important assets to public education without regard to race, but when left in the unrefined context of public/private school differences, they bear the familiar racial



implications of the 1960's refrain of "law and order." Again, this nuance emerges more from the way in which the report was presented to the public than from Coleman's work itself. Drawing on the only conclusion in which he seemed to have more confidence than in the segregation analysis, Coleman observes:

The greatest difference found in any aspect of school functioning between public and private schools was in the degree of discipline and order in the schools.

Pedantic as it may sound, the terms "discipline and order" were never given any substantive definition in the course of the seminar. As a consequence, meaningful definition grew more out of the context of the event and the character of participation rather than out of any analytical insight. Given the racial/ethnic confines of the participants, egalitarian innuendo is hardly justified.

Of course, the report provided a frame of reference for discussion of the terms. In the section on discipline (there is no separate discussion of "order"), Coleman reports that several questions were asked of administrators and students about "rules and enforcement of rules" (p. 114-125). He refers to holding "students responsible to the school for property damage" and to "student dress" codes as representative measures of discipline. Dividing discipline into separate measures of "effectiveness" and "fairness," it is not surprising that he finds Catholic schools to be the most effective and fair, given the dress code item. Similarly, the probable economic bias in the property responsibility item would lead one to expect other private schools to excel, as they do in his findings. Neither of these findings, however, would cause much consternation or rejoicing if they were not associated with other unspecified characteristics of discipline. Some of these characteristics are discussed in subsequent sections under categories like "student behavior." Under this category, "time spent on homework," "involvement in school" and "attendance" are treated as if they were primarily functions of student choice and/or school "climate" and not also dependent on student socioeconomic status and community-school relationships.

These latter items would appear to be involved in what Coleman refers to as growing public concern over discipline, but they are not systematically tied into his conclusion. For example, he discounts the finding that "high-performance public schools have the poorest attendance records" while implying that "good attendance is a basis for better performance in private schools" (p. 131).

A more significant oversight involves the failure to deal with his own findings on the most serious disciplinary problems—drug and alcohol abuse. He explains:

In one area of behavior, however, administrators in both sets of high-performance (public and private) schools more often report a behavior problem than do administrators in any other sector: use of alcohol and drugs. Administrators in three-fifths of the high-performance schools report a "serious" or "moderate" problem. In the absence of further in-

---

### ***The clearest instance of the difference between public and private schools emerges from the dissimilar availability of courses.***

---

formation (students were not asked about alcohol or drug abuse), we merely note this. (p. 137)

The explanation or lack of information on such clearly important issues is evidence that many issues normally associated with disciplinary problems may not be addressed in the comparison of public and private schools. Expressing confidence in the conclusion on discipline while lacking information, the seminar supporters of Coleman left considerable room for innuendo.

Correspondingly, Coleman refers to "verbal abuse," "not obeying, getting in fights, and threatening or harming teachers" as evidence of public/private school differences in discipline. Given the clear socioeconomic differences between students and schools in the public versus private sectors, the causal relationship which he assumes exists between the performance levels in types of schools and discipline is, at best, speculative. Second, the simple correlations between economic deprivation and things like school fights should surprise no one. More important, praise for such findings is much less of an academic evaluation than a normative expression of popular sentiment. The prominent panelists and large audience could not have been assembled, at federal expense, to comment on fragments of a conventional wisdom which is older than ghetto students and graffiti in corridors. Next to Coleman's claims that private schools are less segregated than public ones, his redundant observations about discipline seem trivial.

In fact, they would be trivial if they were not complemented by the conclusions about test performance, however shallow they may be, and about social and racial equity in private schools. These claims together lead to the conclusion that the public school provisions for greater freedom for students, to the extent they differ from private schools, are destructive of discipline and thereby impediments to the advancement of social equity and racial justice.

In other words, what is relatively new, though not very surprising, in the data concerns greater private school restrictions on student freedoms resulting from the civil rights movement and the programs created in the late sixties. The clearest instance of the difference between public and private schools emerges from the dissimilar availability of courses. In particular, "ethnic and black studies" were found more frequently in public than in private schools. "The greatest accessibility is found in the public sector," according to the report, "where 29 percent of the students in public schools as a whole and 45 percent in the high-performance schools attend a school where such a course is offered. Lowest accessibility to such courses is found in the other non-Catholic private schools" (p. 83). The fact that the semi-

nar participants did not discuss this or related issues indicates that the established Black and minority interests in public policy were not well represented.

Nevertheless, the issue itself was not remote or unrelated to the main focus of discipline and segregation. It was raised in Coleman's analysis of "fairness of discipline." Not too surprisingly, he finds that public school students rate their schools lower on fairness than private school students.

The lower rating of public schools by their students in fairness of discipline is somewhat ironic. In the past decade and a half, legal strictures to insure fairness of discipline, such as requirements for due process before suspension, elaborate review processes, and statistical comparisons of disciplinary actions by race to insure racial fairness, have been imposed by the courts or the Federal government on public schools. These strictures are much less fully imposed on private schools (in part, of course, simply because attendance at these schools is by choice rather than assignment). (p. 120)

The difference in ratings can probably be explained by the racial and socioeconomic differences in the student populations. Unfortunately, Coleman does not allow for the possibility of testing such an explanation before rushing to the speculative conclusion that regulations born out of the civil rights period are counter productive. Given the limits of data, it would have been more reasonable to conclude that the groups of students most often subject to discrimination are found in public, rather than private schools. Moreover, students who decide that a private school is seriously unfair would probably refuse to attend or perhaps be expelled—options much less available in public schools.

Related to the limits on ethnic and black studies courses is the very small number of private schools offering vocational education (p. 96) and the low availability of remedial specialists (p. 87). In both cases, private schools are comparatively unconcerned about education programs in which Blacks are highly represented. The absence of these programs might be justified on the grounds that such students would benefit more from a traditional sequence and/or "mainstreaming". This justification, however, should not apply to private

---

***Responsibility for public funds is an important part of the larger governmental responsibility involving desegregation. The failure to recognize governmental involvement in the development of segregation leads to the distorted concepts of segregation with which Coleman amazed most of his audience.***

---

schools because they have selective admissions policies requiring prior preparation and competition for admission to the schools. In another light, the narrow concentration of private schools on college-oriented programs may well be based on their inability and/or unwillingness to educate efficiently in other programs. Special programs are particularly linked with the policy question of public support for private schools in that the mutual conformity of public and private goals must be decided. However well private schools may educate their students, the government is responsible for assuring that they serve a publicly defined educational purpose and that they do so equitably. Otherwise, public funds should not be used to serve private purposes.

The issue of public funding responsibility emerged in the seminar around the availability of specific program offerings. Yet, this issue was not brought into focus around the major issues of segregation and discipline. Responsibility for public funds is an important part of the larger governmental responsibility involving desegregation. The failure to recognize governmental involvement in the development of segregation leads to the distorted concepts of segregation with which Coleman amazed most of his audience. He focused on what he calls "internal" segregation in the sector:

The Catholic schools enroll about half as high a proportion of blacks as the public schools, and other private schools only about a quarter as high a proportion. Internally, however, the other private sector is least racially segregated and the public sector by far the most segregated. (p. 229)

If segregation were simply a matter of haphazardly created statistical headcounts of Blacks and whites, then one could legitimately divide institutions of similar purposes into mutually exclusive categories. If desegregation were simply a matter of racial balance, then one could assume, as Coleman does, that the minority of black students in the private sector make that sector more desegregated simply because they are more evenly distributed among schools. Moreover, the report assumes that desegregating great numbers of poor students will be no more difficult than the sparse desegregation of a few better-off students. His interpretation of desegregation as racial balance is like saying that one Black each in ten prep schools is evidence that these schools are less segregated than public schools. Convuluted as this may sound, the argument makes sense if the authoritative, exclusionary and governmental character of segregation is overlooked. Although it is frequently recognized, the aspects of power and domination determining racial history are often overlooked in the segregation measurement. "Both segregation and separation are facts of life in this society, and they should not be ignored by those who seek social equality. Progress towards desegregation begins with a recognition that oppression, and thereby segregation, is facilitated through the enforced, discriminatory separation of racial groups. However, progress towards desegregation comes to an end when one can no longer recognize discrimination for an obsession with separation." (Morris, 1979)



To minimize segregation through a historically insensitive focus on virtually arbitrary categories of racial separation is to make its recurrence more likely. Certainly, government funding of private schools poses such a threat. It is unlikely that with seminar participants more representative of those people most immediately concerned with segregation that this threat would have been overlooked.

Apparently, a fuller recognition of dangers of segregation was behind the few words allowed the few Blacks and concerned whites in the seminar, but the focus was missing. If there is any explanation beyond the composition of the seminar, it too goes back to the authoritative and political aspects of its organization. The seminar and the report were federally sponsored. It is least in the interest of those who pay for a service to look at their own faults. Fortunately, the federal government has previously sponsored unbiased research. But, the objectivity of research with regard to public responsibility has been assured in direct relationship to the independence of the researchers given access to the data and funding. Unfortunately, neither independence nor representativeness were visible at the seminar.

In other times and places, where moral responsibility held sway over scientific enterprise and where pronouncement on the public interests and the role of public policy were hallmarks of governmental authority, the bearer of so unwelcome words would have been subjected to as much criticism as the sender. In the present technocratic society, however, policy statements whether good, bad or erroneous, ensue as often from the oracles of academic analysis as from the trumpets of legislative

or administrative decree. So it is with the latest declaration *a la* findings on the benefits of tuition tax credits for private schooling. The findings appear like a declaration of the public interest thus protecting criticism of political message from the frailties of the social scientific messenger and the deficiency of his methods.

#### References

- Coleman, James, Thomas Hoffer and Sally Kilgore, *Public and Private Schools: Report to the National Center for Education Statistics, Contract No. 300-78-0208* by the National Opinion Research Center. Draft prepared for April 7, 1981 Seminar, "What Do We Know About Private Schools," Washington, D.C., March 1981.
- James, Coleman and Sally Kilgore, "NCES Review of Greeley Report and Coleman-Hoffer-Kilgore Report," Memorandum to Recipients of that Review. Washington, D.C., April 1, 1981.
- Robert Crain, "Seven Scholarly Reviews of Public and Private Schools," Unpublished, (April 1981).
- Edward Fiske, "School Study Said to Fail to Emphasize Main Point," *The New York Times*. (April 26, 1981) p. 40.
- Andrew Greeley, "Minority Students in Catholic Secondary Schools," (Work in Progress) National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C. (April 1981).
- Lorenzo Morris, "The Future of Black Colleges," Blacks, Presidential Politics and Public Policy Conference, Howard University, Washington, D.C. (unpublished) October 1979.

## THE IMPACT OF BUDGETARY POLICY CHANGES ON EDUCATION

By Anna Ellenbogen  
Research Assistant

The budget cuts already imposed by the Reagan Administration and those that are proposed will seriously hamper the much heralded march to economic recovery by undermining the capacity of public schools to deliver needed services. School districts will be significantly weakened in their capacity to develop the human capital that is needed for a productive society. They will also be weakened in their role of structuring a society characterized by opportunity for all. Higher education institutions and programs will also be affected.

This paper is a discussion of the Reagan proposals and their impact upon education, particularly elementary and secondary education. The proposals include certain policies which will have a negative impact upon the funding of education. One of these proposals, namely tuition tax credits, will further erode financial and com-



munity support for elementary and secondary education. Education is not a narrow or special interest whose funding benefits only a select group. The educational process that is generated and enhanced through federal dollars serves broad economic and social interests. Following, then, is a summary of the Reagan proposals with particular attention to public school financing, tuition tax credits and financial aid programs for higher education as examples of the administration's impact on education.

### **The Reagan Proposal**

In education, the administration's proposed two big blocks consolidating more than 40 school-aid programs ended up as one block covering about 33 programs. The President proposed uniting more than 40 educational programs into two huge block grants, cut by about a quarter to \$4.3 billion. However, Congress reauthorized as separate categorical programs Title I grants to school districts to help educationally disadvantaged children (\$3.48 billion a year for the next three years); the program of aid to the handicapped (\$1.14 billion in 1982, rising slightly thereafter); adult education (\$100 million a year); and the Women's Educational Equity Act (\$6 million). Three other major programs the President had not tried to include in the block also were reauthorized separately: vocational and bilingual education and impact aid.

Congress did put into a block, although in some cases with strings attached as to how the money would be spent, some 33 programs, including Follow Through, the Teacher Corps, the School Library Program and Emergency School Aid. Authorization would equal \$589 million a year in fiscal 1982-4. Six percent of the money is reserved for the Secretary of Education for special discretionary grants (*Washington Post*, August 6, 1981).

The Federal Government has not formally announced the abandonment of equality of opportunity in education—you just don't hear about it anymore. At one time, the Federal government was a towering beacon of hope to poor Americans, who found little encouragement from state and local governments. Now the beacon is dim (Howe, 1981).

Federal social welfare programs are also under heavy attack. They are widely believed to have failed in their objectives, designed to help only Blacks, and to cost more than the economy can afford.

The Reagan Administration's decision to re-examine federal affirmative action regulations is one example. The program is being reviewed as part of an attempt to cut government requirements. Under these regulations, colleges and universities have been investigated and

---

***The federal government has not formally announced the abandonment of equal opportunity in education—you just don't hear about it anymore.***

---

---

***School districts are not just being asked to tighten their belts; the depth of the federal cuts makes it more accurate to believe that school districts are being punished for belonging to the human service portion of the federal budget.***

---

ordered to draw up detailed affirmative action plans to hire and promote more women and members of minority groups. The Administration's review suggests an almost cost/benefits analysis approach to civil rights.

An equally severe example is the Administration's proposal to cut federal elementary and secondary education programs. These cuts, once fully implemented by Congress, will affect school district programs in the upcoming school year. The outlook is grim. Teacher layoffs, staff layoffs, increased unemployment compensation payments and a marked inability to keep pace with inflation will result. School districts are not just being asked to tighten their belts; the depth of the federal cuts makes it more accurate to believe that school districts are being punished for belonging to the human service portion of the federal budget.

The cutbacks affect all school districts. School districts at all points on the range of federal contributions (from less than 3 percent to more than 15 percent of the total operating budget) report that funding reductions will necessitate staff layoffs. Throughout the country school districts report that funding reductions will force personnel layoffs and service cutbacks (NSBA, 1981).

Clearly, school districts will be unable to compensate for a loss in federal support. When federal funds are reduced, local and state sources will find it difficult to rescue school districts already unable to keep pace with inflation. It will be difficult for school districts to stop the erosion of their budget intended for instruction. The Administration's cutbacks in federal support of the public schools will affect programs across the board.

The Reagan Administration is threatening to undermine the integrity of financial aid programs for higher education, too. College enrollments, especially at historically Black institutions, could be drastically reduced with equal educational opportunity remaining an unfulfilled promise. Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (now known as Pell Grants) have been the chief sources of financial aid for Black college students. Cuts in this program will most heavily affect low-income Black students.

Reagan has made a commitment to protect and enhance traditionally Black colleges. Given the apparent deficits that will result from the implementation of the budget, more severe programmatic cuts probably will have to be made in federal programs that support



needy college students. One has to wonder how the Administration plans to enhance these colleges, while severely cutting essential financial resources. Although concrete evidence is needed, there is some hope Vice President Bush's promises will be followed up. Bush said: "President Reagan and this administration are determined to do *what is necessary* to assure that the cultural and educational heritage represented by Tuskegee and America's Black institutions of higher learning will be preserved and strengthened in the years ahead."

Pell Grants, Guaranteed Student Loans, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants and College Work-Study Programs are essential to youths from low-income families seeking to complete their post-secondary education. These programs help to meet the goal of providing equal educational opportunities to the poor and disadvantaged.

The special needs of the poor will be left to the discretion of thousands of state and local officials, whose decisions about the block grants will respond to the political pressures in their jurisdictions. Seldom do these pressures reflect the interests of America's have-nots (Howe, 1981).

Budget Director David Stockman and others have formulated a Reagan plan to cut federal spending for food stamps, welfare and other social programs. The fundamental stance of both Democratic and Republican Administrations on education since the mid 1960s has been to put the leverage of the federal government behind equal opportunity for those most frequently denied it—the children of poor people, racial and cultural minorities and the handicapped. The stance is weakening fast under a leadership that would rather save a buck than save a child and that prefers an easy flow of unrestricted and reduced federal funds to states and school districts to the inherent difficulty of focusing money on national problems (Howe, 1981).

The belief that federal social programs have failed in their objectives is false. Federal social programs have worked. Some social programs are among the government's most successful endeavors. The examples are abundant:

- compensatory school aid for underprivileged students;
- fuel assistance for poor households;
- food stamps for the poor;
- free lunch programs; and
- Medicaid.

These are not programs for Black people alone. The most serious problems confronting this nation, however, are acutely reflected in the Black experience. Programs are needed for all Americans: the elderly on limited income, most of whom are white; the struggling young all over the nation who are unable to find affordable housing, most of whom are white; the coal miners whose black lung benefits are threatened, most of whom are white; the sick, the cold, the hungry, the handicapped, most of whom are white; and all of those whose

burdens would be made heavier by the Administration's proposal (Fauntroy, 1981).

The President's plan to slash social and education programs has not gone unchallenged. Constructive alternatives were introduced to reduce inflation, increase jobs and productivity, improve our national security and relieve the American people of a growing federal tax burden. In initiating options for renewed economic viability, Walter Fauntroy, Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, has stated, "unlike the Reagan Administration's cold and uneven solution to these problems, our proposal moves us towards the goal of reduced inflation and full employment with a compassion for people, and a sharing of the burdens of these difficult times by the rich as well as the poor."

Recessions always hurt Black Americans more severely than the rest of the population. The research literature (see Morris, 1979, Gill, 1980) convincingly shows that Black economic progress has never established a firm footing in the American economy. Traditionally, Black Americans have constituted a 'reserve army of labor', available in time of need but expendable during periods of fiscal crisis.

As stated earlier, a manifestation of the severity of budget cuts is in the area of public school financing. To fully understand the effect of budget changes, the financing of public schools must be examined in a historical context.

### **School Financing**

Prior to World War II, public schools were financed mostly from local revenue. In 1942, for example, 67 percent of public school revenues came from local sources, 32 percent from the state government, and one percent from the federal government. In most school districts, the primary source of local revenue was the property tax. After the war, the state and federal government shares started to grow, roughly in proportion to their increasing influence and involvement in local schools. By 1950, the local contribution was down to 57 percent, and by 1974 it was below 50 percent for the first time. In contrast, state government contributions had increased to 42 percent by 1974 with the federal government contributing more than eight percent.

States have ruled that the local property tax cannot be relied upon as the major source of revenue for financing public schools if it results in unequal funding and, by inference, unequal educational opportunity among school districts. One state court after another has stated that students in a property-poor district are penalized if the property tax is the main source of support for local schools.

As a result of the trend toward increased state financing of local schools and court decisions that decreed greater equalization of state aid, 25 states have revised their methods of financing local public schools. The state plans established a minimum level of financing for public schools and provide the most state aid to those districts, which despite their best local tax effort, are the farthest below the minimum level. The passage of Proposition 13 in California in 1978 has, in two years,



skyrocketed the state's share of public school financing by more than 30 percent. Local districts in California are now responsible for raising only 30 percent or less of the needed revenue.

The trend toward increased financing by state governments will continue. By the early 1980s, as many as a third of the states may be responsible for providing 60 to 70 percent of the public school financing. If the movement against the local property tax begun by California's Proposition 13 continues to gain momentum, the shift could be even more dramatic. However, another movement in the country—to put a lid on government spending at all levels—may force states to limit actual dollars spent on public schools even as they assume a larger share of the financial burden. Dramatic increases in state funding, as in California, may not be possible without major increases in state tax. Taxpayers' resentment, however, could slow down the trend (NSBA, 1981).

The financing of elementary and secondary education could be further threatened by tuition tax credits.

### Tuition Tax Credits

It is ironic that the Reagan Administration seeks budget cuts in public education, while it supports tuition tax credits for private schools. Since last fall, when Reagan asked Congress to pass the tuition tax credit legislation, the prospect of tuition tax credits is more ominous than ever before. The end result would be lowering the quality of education by eroding the public school system. Tuition tax credit legislation threatens the universal right to equal educational opportunity which ostensibly is an integral part of education in this country; it undermines the principles of free education for elementary and secondary years. Equal educational opportunities are fundamental for providing social and economic mobility, a right always considered crucial in our society.

The argument against tuition tax credits is not an argument against the existence of private schools. It is an argument against providing private schools with an unfair competitive edge over public schools. Private schools have traditionally had the advantage of specific criteria for acceptance and enrollment. Private schools are often immune to federal mandates (services public schools must provide) and are not confronted by problems of discipline, violence, language barriers and children from socio-economic environments who have had little or no academic training in their homes.

Tuition tax credit proposals in the form of initiatives will be appearing on voting ballots. They would permit parents to write off as much as \$1200 dollars for each child enrolled in either private or public schools and would cost cities millions of dollars in tax revenues. Initiatives are being proposed in many cities, an example of the conservative trend rampant in the United States.

### Conclusion

The list of proposed changes goes on and on. Once again, the "truly needy" are ignored by those more educated and economically advantaged. Poor people and

---

## **Tuition tax credit legislation threatens the universal right to equal educational opportunity which ostensibly is an integral part of education in this country. . . .**

---

members of historically-persecuted minority groups are stuck—they have no options.

The proposed changes show a lack of responsibility and obligation to help those less fortunate. Contrary to David Stockman's statements, it is the responsibility of government at all levels to help those less fortunate. To both ourselves and to those around the world, we are judged by our actions and what we try to do with our resources.

The impact of the budget cuts raises a serious question of whether economic recovery is the true objective. The ability to develop the human capital needed for a productive society is being significantly weakened. It is education that forms the base of a true program of economic recovery and equal educational opportunity.

We owe our children many things and we teach in many ways. We teach them by our examples, by showing them what we deeply care about. In our reaction to the Administration's proposed funding and policy changes, we will show our children our commitment to them and our commitment to those who have no options. The strength and endurance of our commitment to a just society is what matters, not our commitment to a balanced budget or a reduced tax rate. John Mitchell was right when he said: "Watch what we do, not what we say."

We know what the Administration has done. Now, we must act and we must do.

- Fauntroy, Walter E. "A Constructive Alternative Budget." Speech presented at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C. March 18, 1981.
- Fields, Cheryl, "Reagan Administration to Re-Examine Federal Affirmative-Action Regulations," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 6, 1981.
- Gill, Gerald R. *Meanness Mania: The Changed Mood*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1980.
- Howe, Harold, "The Case Against Reagan's Cutbacks," *New York Times*, April 26, 1981.
- Jordan, Vernon, "Exploring Some Myths About Social Programs," *Los Angeles Times*, February 16, 1981.
- Morris, Lorenzo, *Elusive Equality: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979.
- National School Boards Association. *Impact of Administration Proposed Federal Funding Cutbacks*. Washington, D.C. 1981.
- National Urban League. *The State of Black America 1981*. New York, 1981.
- Raspberry, William, "The Least Awful Budget Cuts," *Washington Post*, April 6, 1981.
- Rich, Spence, "The Block Grant Story," *Washington Post*, August 6, 1981.
- Watson, Bernard C., "Educational Priorities for the '80's: Can Schooling Survive a Limited Growth Economy?" *Adherent*, December, 1980.

# Youth Tutoring Youth: An Educational Alternative

By Vicki J. Ballou  
Research Assistant/Special Editor



The Department of Labor, District of Columbia Schools and the Association for Renewal of Education (ARE) have together established an innovative tutorial program that may revolutionize academic reinforcement in elementary education.

The District of Columbia's summer Elementary Tutorial Program pairs high school students with first, second and third graders who failed to master reading and math skills during the regular school year. The eight week program, under the supervision of staff coordinators, teacher-supervisors and Title I Aides, is designed to improve the academic skills of both elementary students and parateachers (tutors). As an additional feature, parateachers also receive on-the-job career development training.

Before classes begin, site coordinator Mildred Lockridge and her staff put parateachers through an intensive one week training program focusing on tutorial techniques and principles. During this preliminary period, the administrative staff also tests the elementary students or "little people" to determine specific weaknesses and strengths.

For the first half-hour each morning, the administrative staff meets with parateachers to discuss plans for the day. Then, teachers and aides present the day's concepts to parateachers who in turn drill their assigned pupils.

To improve reading skills, students are responsible for mastering five words per day. Once the student learns a word, new ones are added to the list. Students must also submit two language experience stories each week. Then, parateachers check these stories for spelling and grammatical mistakes. Weekly spelling assignments and letter formation drills are also used to sharpen skills.

During the math segment, parateachers drill students on addition, subtraction, multiplication and division principles. Students must also solve written and oral word problems, identify geometric shapes and practice measuring skills.

"Problem solving, measurement and geometry are things that people across the country have problems with so we focus on this daily," said staff math specialist Larry Williams.

---

***To promote positive role models, each student is paired with a parateacher of the same sex. This arrangement is a major reason for the program's success because it also provides students with individualized attention unavailable to most during the regular school year...***

---

well as the little people," said Woods. "They seem to have a more positive attitude toward learning."

When asked how he felt about the summer program seven year-old Kaleb Baker simply responded, "I like it."

But the elementary students are not the only ones who receive academic reinforcement. Like the little people, parateachers took tests to assess their own academic deficiencies. Once the little people leave for the day, teacher-supervisors provide tutoring to parateachers on a voluntary basis.

At first, parateachers were afraid to ask for extra help but now, according to Lockridge, "we have no problem."

"I think I've benefitted," said 15 year-old parateacher Margaret Washington. "While we're teaching the little



To promote positive role models, each student is paired with a parateacher of the same sex. This arrangement is a major reason for the program's success because it also provides students with individualized attention unavailable to most during the regular school year, according to Lockridge.

Reading teacher Cynthia Woods agrees, adding that parateachers also benefit from the one-to-one relationship.

"I've seen growth in many of the older children as

---

***"I've seen growth in many of the older children as well as the little people... They all seem to have a more positive attitude toward learning."***

---







kids, we're getting something out of it, too."

Before the program ends, the elementary students will be tested again to measure each child's improvement. The students are not promoted through the summer program but the administrative staff will send test results, progress reports and recommendations to each child's elementary school. The school has the option of administering a retest for promotion. Parents also have access to the results.

Another major feature of the program is the career development workshop coordinated by ARE director Walter Fontaine and his staff. Through role-playing, skits and lots of interaction, parateachers learn the do's and don'ts of grooming, speech, attitude and job interviewing.

"We send them through these really intense segments so that they will focus on the importance of a career," said Fontaine.

For many parateachers, the summer program represents their first work experience. Through the tutoring and career development workshop, they are encouraged to take work seriously and to explore future career opportunities. They also receive information on college admissions.

"Here they're getting \$3.35 (per hour) plus something extra," coordinator Mark Arenas commented. "And, we also keep data on them so we can write a letter of recommendation if they do a good job."

The D.C. Elementary Tutorial Program is only the second of its kind in the country. Although similar to an earlier Flint, Michigan project, executive director Brenda Nixon quickly explained the differences.

"The original program (Flint) was designed for

enrichment but we're the first remedial program," she said.

Nixon also noted that the District's program, with its 221 parateachers and 197 students, is much larger than the earlier project.

The summer program was the brainchild of Dr. James Guines, former acting superintendent of D.C. schools and Ivanhoe Donaldson, Acting Director of the D.C. Department of Employment Services. Guines began searching for traditional academic reinforcement alternatives after receiving disappointing student progress plan results.

Donaldson, concerned with youth employment, sought a program that would offer 14 and 15 year-olds an educational work experience. After looking at the Flint program, Donaldson chose Nixon to organize the D.C. program. She began pooling the Labor Department, D.C. school system and community and corporate people to create a master plan which became the Elementary Tutorial Program. ARE, D.C. Public Schools and the Department of Labor provide the program's major funding while local businesses supply additional monetary support.

Once the program was organized, Nixon sent information to area junior and senior high schools to recruit parateachers. These tutors were registered through Donaldson's department and the elementary students entered the program on a voluntary basis through their parents.

With the end of social promotion in many public school systems, the Elementary Tutorial Program offers an attractive alternative to other failing academic reinforcement concepts.



# Youth In The Black Community: Strategies for Progress

By Luther Brown  
ISEP, Research Information Officer



*Bondage does not simply mean slavery with physical chains and shackles. It also can and does suggest—especially in a social sense—systematic restriction of growth and freedom of choice. In this social sense, bondage is the structured denial of movement, meaningful participation and social advancement, even though ability and human justice demand it.—M. Ron Karenga*

Black youth in the United States face an escalating crisis in this last quarter of the 20th Century. The public education system, which handles more than ninety percent of our Black youth, faces both declining public confidence and shrinking resources. The Reagan Administration has signaled a wholesale retreat from the goals of equal opportunity and a retreat from the goals set forth during Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" as well. The Administration has yet to provide any clear indication of how it will respond to the needs of Black youth in particular and the Black community in general. America continues to treat Black teenagers as expendable members of the work force. In some of our major cities Black teenage unemployment exceeds 60% and the number of Black teenagers who will reach adulthood without ever having held a job increases at an alarming rate. Thus, all too many Black families have been placed in an economically precarious position.

Clearly, Black youth and Black families are the infrastructure of the Black community; as they go so goes the race. The status of Black youth has reached such a

point that a fundamental question must be raised regarding the societal perception of the very humanity of Black people, given its toleration of Black people's condition, particularly their youth.

The time has come for both Black and white Americans to address these issues and to also address the political mandate of constructing a more just and humane society. If we as a nation are to face this challenge, we must begin with our youth, especially Black and other minority youths who are on the margin of society.

What is the status of Black youth? What are the implications of their status especially for educational and community development policy? What is the policy agenda for progress as it relates to youth in the Black community? What is the role and responsibility of government on all levels to address the problems of our youth? What are the consequences of allowing the current conditions to persist? Who must take the lead in resolving this dilemma? These questions must be addressed now.

This article is divided into two parts, the first section seeks to establish just what the condition of Black youth

---

***Clearly, Black youth and Black families are the infrastructure of the Black community; as they go so goes the race.***

---

is today as determined by the status of the Black family, education, unemployment and health. Part two will attempt to determine what must be done to meet the challenge facing Black Youth. Four agenda items are presented. They are enhanced consciousness; organizational development; greater socio-political action; and educational reformation.

### **The Status of Black Youth: Tragedy And Potential**

*Over the past fifteen years, the nation's inner cities have witnessed the growth and consolidation of a population of poor and unused Black youth, confined in economic poverty and social decay. A significantly younger population than the poor of previous generations, these young Blacks, some as young as thirteen or fourteen, are already earmarked for failure—they are undereducated, jobless, without salable skills or the social credentials to gain access to mainstream life. They are rendered obsolete before they can even begin to pursue a meaningful role in society.—Douglas G. Glasgow*

No analysis of status of Black youth can be made without examining the overall condition of the Black community. Knowledge of the current economic, political and social conditions facing the Black community is necessary before one can fully perceive the condition of Black youth, especially that segment which makes up what is called the "Black underclass". The four categories focused on are the *Black family, educational status, unemployment and health.*

### **Family Status**

Black economic progress stagnated in the 1970's. Rather than shrinking, the gap between Black and white family income is widening. Between 1969 and the present, the income gap between Black and whites widened by more than 14 percent (Edelman 1980).

The condition of many Black families is best understood by examining the percentage of Black children living with one or both parents. In 1979, only 43.4% of Black children lived with both parents as compared to 83.5% of white children. It is interesting to note that during the same year, 12.5% of white children lived with their mother only, whereas 41.9% of Black children lived under such circumstances.

The condition of Black families is compounded when one realizes that the 1977 per capita income of Black families, both intact and single parent, was about half that of white families. Much of the above condition results from income differentials between Black and white husbands. In 1977 the median income for Black husbands was \$9,035; for White husbands it was \$13,482 (Edelman, 1980). In 1978, the median income of households headed by Black females was \$5,082; 41.9% of all Black children live in such households.

Income inequality, the drastic growth in the number of single parent households, and poverty status coupled with stag-flation all contribute to the crisis facing the Black family. Though there are many middle income Black families, the number of poor Black families is growing at a faster rate.

### **Education**

*God knows how Black children in this country have survived when so many of them have been cast aside on the educational trash heap.—Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm*

Educational achievement for Black youth reflects uneven progress and the future is in doubt. Ominous trends are developing, especially in lieu of the following developments:

- the erosion of affirmative action as concept and policy
- declining or stagnant graduate and professional enrollment
- the assault on public education
- the competency based testing movement
- declining financial aid
- the assault on and non-support of historically Black colleges and universities
- the increasingly high enrollment of Black students in Educable Mentally Retard (EMR) programs (note in 1978-79 Blacks comprised 41% of all EMR students although they constituted only 17% of the entire student population)
- persistently high drop-out rates (31% in 1970 and 25% in 1978)
- the urban fiscal crisis (note cities already can afford to allocate only 35% of their budget to education while suburbs allocate 55%) (Bin and Townsel, 1978) and,
- 60% of all Black high school students rank in the bottom quarter of their classes (Congressional Budget Office, 1977).

### **Youth Unemployment**

*If ever a problem has earned the adjective "intractable" it is the chronic unemployment of teenage blacks... No society can call itself civilized when so many of its young are maimed and destroyed so early in life.*

—New York Times Editorial  
March 1979

Conservative estimations of Black teenage unemployment are between 40 and 45%. The National Urban League sets the level at 60%. At minimum, a Black youth is almost three times as likely to be unemployed as his white counterpart. Within the last decade, Black teenage unemployment has escalated to a disastrous level. According to *The Status Of Black Youth 1980*, Black teenage women are usually the most likely group to be unemployed. More surprisingly, a Black youth who has attended college will still have the identical unemployment rate as a white high school dropout. (Hill, 1980). According to Robert Lerman, 23% of all minority men between the ages of 20 and 24 and 36% of similarly aged minority women, did not work a single day in 1977 (Lerman, 1980).

The consequences of Black teenage unemployment are severe and cannot continue without serious social and cultural disruption. Crime and alienation are by



products of the oppression of Black youth. According to an estimate by Walter J. Green, 48% of the "hardcore" unemployed population (500,000 minority youth) must resort to crime for the sake of survival (Green, 1980).

## Health

*From before birth through childhood and adolescence; Black Children suffer from more health problems, yet receive fewer health services, than White children.—Marian Edelman*

The health of Black youth continues to lag substantially behind that of white youth. The Black infant mortality rate (24.5 deaths per 1000 infants born) is about what the white rate was in 1950. This translates today into about 13,000 Black families who needlessly lose a baby each year.

This pattern of poor health follows Black children throughout their young lives. "Non-White children and teenagers die from illnesses at rate's at least 25% higher than those for white children." (Edelman, 1980). The probability of Black children dying by their 14th birthday is 30% greater than a white child. (Public Health Services, 1979) This overall health situation is compounded by the fact that 17% of all Black children have no regular place of health care. (National Center for Health Statistics, 1979)

I have previously stated that Black youth are on the margins of society. If the above statistics do not underscore this point, consider: in 1979 less than half of all Black children had received three polio dosages as recommended and only 58% had ever received inoculation against measles (Black children are 25% more prone to measles infection than their white counterparts) (Center for Disease Control, 1979).

## Meeting The Challenge

*Instead of compassion, one witnesses hostility toward efforts to reduce economic inequities and to overcome the effects of past and present discrimination. Instead of appeals to achieve equal educational and economic opportunities, one hears code words like "forced busing", "white flight" and "reverse discrimination." These code words are manifestations of a spreading mania within American society, a mania increasingly adamant against governmental and societal efforts to help blacks, other minorities and the poor. It is not too much to suggest that behind this mania is a growing feeling of meanness.—Gerald Gill, Meanness Mania*

The conditions chronicled herein must be changed. The threat to the future of Black people is too great and the excuses are inadequate. The mood or disposition of Americans toward social justice, equality and just reparations for Blacks is clear (Gill, 1980) but the question remains: What is to be done?

The task of determining which course the Black community must follow is large and complex. The agenda for Black progress must be determined through the efforts of conscious individuals and through the interaction of Black groups, organizations and the masses of

---

## ***The agenda for Black progress must be determined through the efforts of conscious individuals and through the interaction of Black groups, organizations and the masses of Black people.***

---

Black people. I shall address four agenda items which seem central to Black progress. They are enhanced consciousness; organizational development; greater socio-political action; and education reformation.

### Consciousness

Floyd Hayes, an ISEP researcher, has posited a central notion in Black or African-American consciousness building. He states:

*Each generation of African-American thinkers and scholars must grasp the character and dynamics of social development of earlier epochs in order to contribute to the foundation and creation of body of knowledge, theory and practice that will aid in the struggle to overturn the political, economic and cultural/ideological domination of African peoples.*

Clearly, we must intensify the effort (both collective and individual) to build the knowledge base and awareness level sufficient to overcome ignorance and misinformation which seem inherent in the current system. The knowledge that we are responsible and able to develop new approaches and strategies for understanding and changing reality, must become the motivating and sustaining energy for consciousness and socio-political change.

### Organization

The effort to build strong, viable and accountable organizations within the Black community must be intensified. The present groups or organizations representing the Black community must ground themselves thoroughly in the values of those whom they represent. If the masses of Blacks and poor are the prime constituency of these organizations, then the effort to mobilize, involve and project their interest should be highly visible. Conservatism and the politics of retrenchment can be reshaped under the heat of the organized masses. Justice is on the side of the excluded and long denied in their pursuit of meaningful opportunity. America was built on the backs of these people. The organizations committed to the achievement of equity and equal opportunity should not mirror the organizations whose commitment to these goals is questionable. New forms of organization will give way to new approaches which are certainly required. Our organizations must reflect our constituency, philosophy, and values.

It will be necessary to reunite many of the well educated and highly skilled members of the Black com-



munity who are currently caught up in what they mistakenly believe is the "mainstream" of this society. The major goal of Black organizations must be to build a viable political and economic infra-structure within our communities. Therefore, emphasis must be placed on institutionalization.

### Socio-Political Action

Interaction and cooperation with other groups who share our agenda is a must. Efforts must be launched to make the public sector directly responsible and accountable.

The agenda for social and economic equality cannot be forgotten nor can it be buried under the current neo-conservative and reactionary movements. As a community, Black people must become more politically conscious, disciplined and involved. This is a prerequisite for effective socio-political action. This can be accomplished through educational campaigns and activities aimed at consciousness building. The burden of Black progress rests with Black people.

The progress which resulted from the organized efforts of Blacks during the 1960s flowed from consciousness, consensus and confrontation with the status quo. Participants in the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements knew what was needed; they utilized the broad based support within the Black community to pressure and persuade the legislative and executive branches of government to respond with sensitive legislation and appropriate policy decisions.

Direct action to educate, organize and inspire a semi-conscious nation is essential. In *Meanness Mania: The Changed Mood*, a suggestion was made which is relevant: "Perhaps marches and demonstrations may once again focus attention and concern upon their plight and condition relative to the larger society. Just as these activities were instrumental in spawning government and societal concern in the 1960s, renewal of marches and demonstrations hopefully will rekindle commitments to economic equity and social justice."

### Educational Reformation

*There is no such thing as a neutral educational process. Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, or it becomes "the practice of freedom," the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world.—Paulo Freire*

We must conscientiously engage in the latter course. We must transform and restructure education if we ever hope to end our oppression. Culture and a coherent philosophy of the African-American experience must be incorporated into the educational programs for our youth. Self-worth and collective identity are only possible outcomes of an educational system controlled by and accountable to the Black community.

Circumstances compel meaningful collective action by Blacks if we are to survive. The youth in the Black community are our infra-structure. They not only determine our future but also are a testimony to our status and worth as a people. In a brilliant convocation speech, Dr. James E. Cheek, President of Howard University, (Cheek, 1980) laid down the type of challenge which falls on those who must determine the Black community's fate in the latter part of the 20th century.

We make no apology for doing what our times and circumstances compel us to do. For the First Emancipation was the burden of the white man, and that is why it remained only a proclamation. But the Second Emancipation is the burden of the Black man, and that is why it must be made a reality.

And I ask you, if we do not assume this burden, then who will?

---

### Sources

1. Bins, Milton and Townsel, Alvin, "Changing/Declining Enrollments in Large City School Systems", in *Declining Enrollments: The Challenge of the Coming Decade*, Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education, 1979.
2. Center for Disease Control, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, *U.S. Immunization Survey: 1978*, Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, 1979.
3. Cheek, James E. "If We Do Not, Then Who Will? The Continuing Burden to undo the Yoke of Bondage". *ISEP Monitor*, 4 (December 1980): 1-5.
4. Congressional Budget Office, "Inequalities in the Educational Experience of Black and White Americans", September 1977.
5. Edelman, Marian, W. *Portrait of Inequality: Black and White Children in America*. The Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C. 1980.
6. Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York: Seabury Press 1970.
7. Gill, Gerald, *Meanness Mania: The Changed Mood*, Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1980.
8. Glasgow, Douglas G. *The Black Underclass*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers, 1980.
9. Green, Walter J., "Generations Without Work", *RF Illustrated*, IV (4): 14, April, 1980.
10. Hayes, Floyd W., "Preliminary Notes on the Future of African American Studies", *ISEP Monitor*, Vol. 4, (December 1980): 1-5.
11. Hill, Robert B., "Discrimination and Minority Youth Unemployment", in *A Review of Youth Employment Problems, Programs, & Policies: Volume II*, Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1980.
12. Karenga, M. Ron, *Essays on Struggle: Position and Analysis*, San Diego, California 1978.
13. Lerman, Robert, "An Analysis of Youth Employment Problems", in *A Review of Youth Employment Problems, Programs & Policies: Volume I*, Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1980.
14. National Center for Health Statistics, *Health, United States 1978*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1979.
15. "Teenagers Without a Future," *New York Times*, 15 March 1979, p-A-22.
16. Public Health Service, *Healthy People: The Surgeon General's Report on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1979.
17. *The Status of Black Children in 1980*, National Black Child Development Institute, Washington, D.C. 1981.

# **Reception for A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence: Dunbar High School of Little Rock**

**By Faustine Jones**

On July 16, 1981, the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy (ISEP) sponsored a reception celebrating publication of *A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence: Dunbar High School of Little Rock, Arkansas* by Dr. Faustine Childress Jones at the Stouffer's Riverfront Towers in St. Louis.

Dunbar of Little Rock is the case study of a Black public high school program with a reputation for academic excellence. Dr. Jones gathered her information through the use of alumni questionnaires, interviews, old records and papers and other extensive research. Through this research, she discovered the people, programs and policies that made Dunbar High School a successful learning center.

"The educational attainments of the respondents to the questionnaire give us evidence that children and youth do not have to be restricted by the educational limitations of their parents," said Jones.

Dunbar was an earlier success story covering the years from 1930 to 1955. However, Jones noted that the concept is still viable in public education today.

"I hope that society will realize that the investment it makes in education can pay off many times over for the individuals being educated, the families they produce, their communities and the society," Jones said. "There is absolutely no societal advantage to be gained by restricting sizeable portions of the citizenry."

Dr. Kenneth S. Tollett, Director of ISEP, expressed praise for Jones' second book, stating that it was "another excellent piece of research by Dr. Faustine Jones and demonstrates that schools and community support for them can make a significant difference in the educational attainment of Black youth."

Over 300 guests, including many Dunbar graduates, attended the reception which was held during the school's reunion. Dunbar graduates who attended the reception included Isaac Gillam, Director of the NASA Dryden Flight Research Center; Thomas Bailey Shropshire, Senior Vice President and Treasurer of Miller Brewing Company; Addie Lou Patterson, City Commissioner of Compton, California; Geraldine Washington, Los Angeles school administrator and Ozell Sutton, National President of Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity.



**Dr. Faustine Childress Jones, author of *A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence: Dunbar High School of Little Rock*, comments on her findings at the St. Louis reception.**



**Dr. Jones autographs publication for fellow classmates.**



**Dr. Jones and Dr. Tollett welcome guest at the reception.**



## Advisory Board Luncheon For A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence: Dunbar High School of Little Rock, Arkansas



**Tony Brown of *Tony Brown's Journal*, Faustine Jones, Darryl Fears, Campus Editor of the *Hilltop*, Art Carter, Editor *Washington Afro-American* and Luther Brown, ISEP Research Information Officer.**

On August 17, 1981, the ISEP National Advisory Board hosted a special luncheon meeting to announce the publication of *A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence: Dunbar High School of Little Rock, Arkansas* by Dr. Faustine Childress Jones. Dr. Kenneth Tollett, ISEP Director and Chairman of the Advisory Board, in introducing Dr. Jones, cited her continuing excellent scholarship and commitment to Black educational and social progress. Dr. Jones is also the author of another ISEP publication, *The Changing Mood in America: Eroding Commitment?* published in 1977. Dr. Jones is currently the editor of the *Journal of Negro Education*.

Thirteen distinguished guests attended the luncheon during which Dr. Jones made a presentation summarizing the findings and significance of her book (see Jones, *infra* at-26). Guests included Ms. Floretta McKenzie, *supra* at-1), Dr. George Rhodes, Executive Assistant to Vincent Reed, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Mr. Samuel Ethridge, representing the National Education Association,

and Mr. Charles Harris, Executive Director of the Howard University Press.

Representatives of the media included Mr. Tony Brown, *Tony Brown's Journal*, Mr. Art Carter, Editor-in-Chief of the *Washington Afro-American*, Mr. Darryl Fears, Campus Editor *Howard University Hilltop*, Ms. Lucy Howard, of *Newsweek Magazine*, Mr. David Mazie, representing Carl Rowan, Mr. Isaiah Poole of *Black Enterprise Magazine*, Ms. Jean Saddler, of *Time Magazine* and Mr. Juan Williams of *The Washington Post*.

After Dr. Jones' presentation a lively question and answer session followed. The guests were provided with pre-publication copies of the book. Members of the ISEP National Advisory Board who attended the luncheon were Dr. Kenneth Tollett, Chairman, Dr. Elias Blake, Jr., Dr. Willie T. Howard, Dr. Clark Kerr, Dr. James Lawson, Dr. Lionel Newsom, Dr. James Perkins, Dr. Horace Traylor, Dr. Lorraine A. Williams and Dr. Stephen Wright.



**Dr. Lorraine A. Williams, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Howard University, Ms. Floretta McKenzie, Superintendent, D.C. Public Schools, Dr. Faustine C. Jones, and Dr. George Rhodes, Executive Assistant to Vincent Reed, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education.**



# Remarks By Dr. Faustine C. Jones On A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence: Dunbar High School of Little Rock, Arkansas Luncheon



## I. Thanks

I want to express my appreciation to the people and programs that made this book possible. First, I want to thank Dr. Lorraine A. Williams, our Vice President for Academic Affairs, for it was under the University-Sponsored Research Program in the Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities that the initial grant was awarded me to initiate this project. Thank you, Dr. Williams. Secondly, I want to express my appreciation to the Advisory Board of the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, for you assessed the project and judged it worthy of becoming an Institute effort at a time when our primary concerns were in the realm of higher education. Thank you, members of the Advisory Board. Third, I want to thank Dr. Kenneth S. Tollett, Director of the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, for his personal interest, support, and encouragement, as well as for the use of Institute personnel and resources in the conduct of this research effort. Thank you, Dr. Tollett. Fourth, I want to thank the Howard University Press for publishing the book, for its ongoing publicity about the work, and its dissemination efforts. Thank you, Mr. Charles Harris.

## II. The Format of the Book

As you look at what we call "the Dunbar book," you will see immediately that it was written for two audiences. Clearly, one is the alumni of Dunbar, and its teachers, principals, parents, friends, and community—those persons who answered questionnaires and were otherwise a part of the Dunbar experience. That explains the presence of Appendix G and Appendix I, for example. The other audience is the academic com-

munity, along with other persons today interested in public secondary education. That explains the presence of Appendices A, B, C, D, E, F, and H, for example.

## III. Background

Dunbar High School in Little Rock, Arkansas was the only black public high school in that city from 1930-1955, a 25-year period. As a high school it had been preceded by Union, Capitol Hill, and Gibbs High School. It was succeeded by Horace Mann, the last of five all-black high schools that served the population in the days of enforced segregation. Dunbar, therefore, had the responsibility for an *unselected* student body—those youth who stayed in school to graduate were distributed across the income range, levels of advantage in the home, and the color spectrum.

It was in 1973 that I became interested in the graduates of Dunbar. That year Don Walters of Detroit, Michigan was instrumental in spearheading the first *national* reunion of the classes, an event which I attended. Some three or four hundred people were in attendance, and I was struck by how well these people seemed to be doing personally in the diverse occupations in which they were distributed, the opportunities they seemed to be able to offer their children, their apparent self-confidence, and the overall degree of satisfaction they seemed to exhibit with respect to their adult lives. In most of the conversations a great deal of credit was given to the Dunbar experience for its basic preparation—even though many of the people to whom I was talking were college graduates or holders of advanced degrees.

When I returned to Howard University I wrote a proposal that had the good fortune to pass the review of the committee that oversees the university-sponsored research grants, and I was able to initiate the research in August of 1974. A 97-item instrument was constructed and mailed to the 1,532 graduates for whom current addresses could be found. Four hundred and two usable responses were received, a 26% return. While this rate of return is too small to make firm generalizations, the responses did not differ from interview data obtained from principals and teachers—or from conversations with graduates over a seven year span. I ask you to remember also that graduates of Dunbar are dispersed all over the United States, and that Dunbar had not been a high school since 1955. Many of its graduates had not seen each other since high school days, and most of them had not seen me since the late 1940s. It is also highly probable, I should point out, that only those graduates who considered themselves successful answered the two questionnaires.

#### IV. Findings

You will have to read the book to see the detailed findings in each of the nine areas covered by the questionnaire—(1) purposes and goals of the school, (2) school rules and regulations, (3) curriculum, (4) teacher attitudes and teaching practices, (5) communication or personal relationships between groups, (6) extracurricular and athletic programs, (7) satisfaction with the characteristics of the school and people's interaction with each other, (8) the effects of the school on students, (9) the relationship between parents' level of education and that of the respondents. In general, however, these alumni said that Dunbar made a positive difference in their life-chances because of the quality of the schooling experience—not only the cognitive experience, which was substantial, but the affective and conative experiences, as well. Well-educated teachers and principals, who were consistently demanding but at the same time supportive, were the nucleus of the school that worked well. There was an infectious school spirit, high morale, friendly competition among students, positive school/community interactions, high interpersonal expectations, and dependable family support systems which aided and enhanced the scholarly learning experience. Students did not want to be absent from school, since school was "where it was happening." Dunbar was one's home away from home where he/she was taught, nurtured, supported, corrected, encouraged, and punished if/when necessary. It was not Utopia. There were a few teachers who were cited as uncaring, partial, or harshly punitive. But over the twenty-five year period there were many more positive elements than negative ones.

One could consider arguing that Dunbar was an interesting historical experience, but one that cannot be replicated at this point in time. That appears to be false, for the characteristics of Dunbar parallel those of schools that have been studied in the 1970s—schools that are effective in educating students who are black and/or poor. In 1971 George Weber examined four inner-city elementary schools that housed poor, minority children with high achievement.<sup>2</sup> Common characteristics evident in these four schools were: (1) strong leadership; (2) high teacher expectations; (3) good atmosphere; (4) strong emphasis on reading, additional reading personnel, use of phonics, individualization; (5) careful evaluation of pupil progress.

Thomas Sowell in 1976 examined six high schools and two elementary schools which had been distinguished by a tradition of excellence, and found these traits common to them: (1) an insistence on orderliness and discipline with strong parental support; (2) determined and committed administrative leadership; (3) some form of "ability grouping" of students; (4) a disdain for faddish teaching methods and subject areas; (5) an informal process of selection to weed out hard-core disrupters.<sup>3</sup>

Ronald Edmonds, working in New York, has identified public schools today that are effectively teaching children. In those schools these characteristics prevail: (1) there is strong administrative leadership (2) there is a

---

***There was an infectious school spirit, high morale, friendly competition among students, positive school/community interactions, high interpersonal expectations, and dependable family support systems which aided and enhanced the scholarly learning experience.***

---

climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum levels of achievement; (3) an orderly but not rigid atmosphere, conducive to instruction; (4) a philosophy which makes it clear that pupil acquisition of basic academic skills is the first order of business, taking precedence over all other school activities; (5) the flexibility to allow school energy and resources to be diverted from other business in furtherance of the fundamental objectives; (6) some means by which pupil progress can be monitored frequently and evaluated.<sup>4</sup> It is clear that these characteristics were evident at Dunbar High School in Little Rock, Arkansas at a much earlier point in time, and that those characteristics were the essential components of a school that successfully educated many of its graduates to be functional and competitive in American society.

The most definitive work on the effects of secondary schools on children at this point in time may be Michael Rutter's *Fifteen Thousand Hours*, which reports the results found by Rutter's team in a three-year study of secondary schools in London. Rutter and his colleagues show that schools can make a difference in the lives of children, despite the adverse effects of economic disadvantage and family misfortune. Even though there were vast differences in the twelve schools they studied, what was very basic was that the main sources of variations between schools in their effects on the children did not lie in such factors as buildings or resources. The crucial differences had to do with the school's functioning as a social organization. Morale, climate, and atmosphere—staff actions and activities, made the larger difference as to whether schools worked well for children and youth who were not the most advantaged in the society. This finding *should suggest to school boards as policymakers the necessity for superintendents and principals to make careful personnel selection for urban schools where academic achievement might not be the first order of business in the minds of the young if those young are left alone to their own devices.*<sup>5</sup>

There is a new book by Robert Benjamin, *Making Schools Work: A Reporter's Journey Through Some of America's Most Remarkable Classrooms*, published this year. I have read a review of the book by Dan Morgan in the *Washington Post*, but have not yet had time to read the book. Morgan reports that Benjamin's examination of outstanding schools in inner cities found that there usually was a strong-willed personality, e.g., a



determined principal, behind school success stories. Enthusiastic teachers who were also well-trained, made a difference in other successful schools. In other words, good principals and teachers make good schools—not fads, methods, or million-dollar research studies, Morgan reported.<sup>6</sup>

*Phi Delta Kappa* has expressed some interest in publishing an article about Dunbar. If our correspondence results in their acceptance of an article, the Rutter and Benjamin research will be included in its citations.

Dunbar's faculty was composed of well-educated teachers, devoted to duty. Principals were even more highly educated than the teachers; they were demanding, but fair and even-handed. There was little turnover of faculty, staff or administrators. A common philosophy of life and purpose was evidence among teachers, principals, parents, students and the community. All these factors led to positive human interactions which were supportive of youth in school as they sought to attain academic goals, and to formulate plans for their lives.

In the 1950s, Dunbar sent 60% of its graduates to college, according to a publication of the Little Rock School System. Half of those could be expected to graduate, by chance. Therefore, if 30% of Dunbar's graduates completed college—and it seems fair to believe that they did—that was far more than national figures for blacks or whites of the era under discussion. An examination of Census data shows that in 1960 only 4.1% of the black population nationwide had completed four years of college or more. Even in 1974 only 8.1% of all blacks 25-34 years old had completed four years of college or more. Even in the white population, in 1960 only 11.9% of those 25-34 years old had completed four years of college or more, and by 1974 that proportion was up to 21%. Therefore, it appears safe to say that Dunbar's record of sending graduates to college in the 1950s and expecting that they would subsequently graduate was greater than national norms for blacks or whites during that period.

Finally, as you have no doubt guessed by now, the Dunbar respondents to the questionnaire far outstripped their parents in terms of educational attainment. *This finding should tell policymakers that educational aspirations and attainment of young blacks are not circumscribed by the educational attainment or economic circumstances of their parents.* This finding was statistically significant—the probability that the differences between parents' level of education and that of their offspring would have occurred by chance is less than one in a thousand (page 52).

In August, 1980, Dunbar High School of Little Rock, Arkansas was approved for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. I had the honor of writing the statement of significance for the application. Its philosophical and social/humanitarian effects, as well as its educational results, are visible in the product—its alumni, as well as in greatly enhanced life chances for the progeny of those alumni. Since these people are widely dispersed today, Dunbar has made a contribution not only to Little Rock, Arkansas, but to many other cities and states where concentrations of its graduates

---

***Public policymakers at the local level, the state level, and the federal level must be willing to formulate public policies in education that will enhance learning opportunities and capabilities of Black children.***

---

reside. *This should say to policymakers that the investment in education of these Dunbar graduates has paid off many times over—for the alumni as individuals, for the families they produced, their communities, and the society.*

In conclusion, the Dunbar case study makes it clear that *there is absolutely no societal advantage to be gained by restricting sizeable portions of its citizenry.* Further, it is an unjust burden on the young to be placed in the position where they are forced to succeed "in spite of the system." *Public policymakers at the local level, the state level, and the federal level must be willing to formulate public policies in education that will enhance learning opportunities and capabilities of Black children.* The Dunbar case study provides concrete evidence that qualitative educational experience is one means of improving people, and ultimately the whole society. So many of Dunbar's graduates are teachers, ministers, physicians, lawyers, judges, secretaries, businesspersons, executives of corporations, high-level federal employees, college professors, principals, even two college presidents. They contribute to the society in multifaceted ways; they are not a drain on societal resources. Their ability to contribute did not occur by chance. The educational experience at Dunbar was a primary factor in preparing these Blacks so that they did become qualified, contributing adults.

Thank you.

1. Faustine Childress Jones, *A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence: Dunbar High School of Little Rock, Arkansas* (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1981).
2. George Weber, *Inner City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools*, Occasional Paper No. 18, (Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971).
3. Thomas Sowell, "Patterns of Black Excellence," *Public Interest*, No. 43 (Spring 1976), pp. 26-58; idem, "Black Excellence—The Case of Dunbar High School" (Washington, D.C.), *Public Interest*, No. 35, (Spring 1974), pp. 3-21.
4. Ronald R. Edmonds, "Some Schools Work and More Can," *Social Policy*, Vol. 9, No. 5 (March/April 1979), pp. 28-32; idem, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 37 (October 1979), pp. 15-18. See also Lawrence W. Lezotte, et. al., *School Learning Climate and Student Achievement: A Social Systems Approach to Increased Student Learning* (Tallahassee, Florida: The Site Specific Technical Assistance Center, 1980), pp. 16-20.
5. Michael Rutter, et. al., *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979).
6. Dan Morgan, "Outstanding Schools in Inner Cities," *The Washington Post*, Summer *Education Review*, Review of Robert Benjamin, *Making Schools Work: A Reporter's Journey Through Some of America's Most Remarkable Classrooms* (New York: Continuum Publishers, 1981).



## **Publications of the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy**

- \*\* *Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in U.S. Higher Education: An Assessment*, 2nd Edition, by Dr. Elizabeth A. Abramowitz
- \*\* *The Lengthening Shadow of Slavery: A Historical Justification for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education*, by Dr. John E. Fleming
- \* *Directory of National Sources of Data on Blacks in Higher Education*, 1976 Edition
- \* *Proceedings from the National Invitational Conference on Racial and Ethnic Data*, edited by Dr. Elizabeth A. Abramowitz
- \*\* *The Changing Mood in America: Eroding Commitments?*, by Dr. Faustine C. Jones
- \* *Higher Education's Responsibility for Advancing Equality of Opportunity and Justice*, by Dr. James E. Cheek (Occasional Paper)
- \* *The Bakke Case Primer*
- \* *Advancing Equality of Opportunity: A Matter of Justice*, edited by Dr. Cynthia J. Smith
- \*\* *Equal Educational Opportunity: More Promise Than Progress*, 2nd Edition, by Dr. Elizabeth A. Abramowitz
- \* *Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education: A Report*
- \*\* *The Case for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education*, by Dr. John E. Fleming, Gerald R. Gill, and Dr. David H. Swinton
- \* *The "Measurement Mystique": Issues in Selection for Professional Schools and Employment*, by Dr. Sylvia T. Johnson
- \*\* *Elusive Equality: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education*, by Dr. Lorenzo Morris
- \*\* *The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two Year Colleges*, by Dr. Michael A. Olivas
- \* *Minorities in Two Year Colleges: A Report and Recommendations for Change*
- \*\* *Meanness Mania: The Changed Mood*, by Gerald R. Gill
- \* *The Black College Primer*
- \* *Equal Educational Opportunity: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education. 1975-1977*
- \* *ISEP Monitor*, Volume 1-4, Numbers 1-4
- \* *ISEP Monitor*, Volume 5, Numbers 1 & 2
- \* *ISEP Briefs on Bakke*, Vol. 1, Nos. 1, 2
- \*\* *A Traditional Model of Educational Excellence*, by Dr. Faustine C. Jones
- \* *Structures of Dominance and the Political Economy of Black Higher Education in a Technocratic Era: A Theoretical Framework*, by Floyd W. Hayes, III (Occasional Paper)
- \* *Black Institutions of Higher Learning: Inadvertent Victims or Necessary Sacrifices?*, by Kenneth S. Tollett (A Reprint)

\*\*Howard University Press

\*Institute for the Study of Educational Policy

**Institute for the Study of  
Educational Policy  
Howard University  
2900 Van Ness Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20008**

**Howard University Press  
2900 Van Ness Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20008**

# **Executive Order**

## **Historically Black Colleges and Universities**

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution of the United States of America in order to advance the development of human potential, to strengthen the capacity of historically Black colleges and universities to provide quality education, and to overcome the effects of discriminatory treatment, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Secretary of Education shall supervise annually the development of a Federal program designed to achieve a significant increase in the participation by historically Black colleges and universities in Federally sponsored programs. This program shall seek to identify, reduce, and eliminate barriers which may have unfairly resulted in reduced participation in, and reduced benefits from, Federally sponsored programs. This program will also seek to involve private sector institutions in strengthening historically Black colleges.

Section 2. Annually, each Executive Department and those Executive agencies designated by the Secretary of Education shall establish annual plans to increase the ability of historically Black colleges and universities to participate in Federally sponsored programs. These plans shall consist of measurable objectives of proposed agency actions to fulfill this Order and shall be submitted at such time and in such form as the Secretary of Education shall designate. In consultation with participating Executive agencies, the Secretary of Education shall undertake a review of these plans and develop an integrated Annual Federal Plan for Assistance to Historically Black Colleges for consideration by the President and the Cabinet Council on Human Resources (composed of the Vice President, the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, Agriculture, Labor, Housing and Urban Development, and Education, the Attorney General, the Counsellor to the President, and the White House Chief of Staff).

Section 3. Each participating agency shall submit to the Secretary of Education a mid-year progress report of its achievement of its plan and at the end of the year an Annual Performance Report which shall specify agency performance of its measurable objectives.

Section 4. Prior to the development of the First Annual Federal Plan, the Secretary of Education shall supervise a special review by every Executive agency of its programs to determine the extent to which historically Black colleges and universities are given an equal opportunity to participate in Federally sponsored programs. This review will examine unintended regulatory barriers, determine the adequacy of the announcement of programmatic opportunities of interest to these colleges, and identify ways of eliminating inequities and disadvantages.

Section 5. The Secretary of Education shall ensure that each president of a historically Black college or university is given the opportunity to comment on the proposed Annual Federal Plan prior to its consideration by the President, the Vice President, and the Cabinet Council on Human Resources.

Section 6. The Secretary of Education, to the extent permitted by law, shall stimulate initiatives by private sector businesses and institutions to strengthen historically Black colleges and universities, including efforts to further improve their management, financial structure, and research.

Section 7. The Secretary of Education shall submit to the President, the Vice President, and Cabinet Council on Human Resources an Annual Federal Performance Report on Executive Agency Actions to Assist Historically Black Colleges. The Report shall include the performance appraisals of agency actions during the preceding year to assist historically Black colleges and universities. The report will also include any appropriate recommendations for improving the Federal response directed by this Order.

Section 8. The special review provided for in Section 4 shall take place not later than November 1, 1981. Participating Executive agencies shall submit their annual plans to the Secretary of Education not later than January 15, 1982. The first Annual Federal Plan for Assistance to Historically Black Colleges developed by the Secretary of Education shall be ready for consideration by the President, the Vice President, and the Cabinet Council on Human Resources not later than March 31, 1982.

Section 9. Executive Order No. 12232 of August 8, 1980, is revoked.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
September 15, 1981

/s/ Ronald Reagan

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of Media Liaison

For Immediate Release

September 15, 1981

President Ronald Reagan today signed a new Executive Order to help strengthen Black colleges. The signing took place at a White House luncheon for Black college supporters.

The new Executive Order, established to improve and protect Black colleges, increases Black participation in federally sponsored programs; mandates government-wide coordination to ensure full opportunities for Black college participation in federally sponsored programs; and calls on the Secretary of Education to encourage private sector initiatives in assisting historically Black institutions.

Under the order, President Reagan has directed Secretary of Education T.H. Bell to submit an Annual Performance Report on Executive Agency Actions to ensure Black college participation in federally sponsored programs. This "report card" will be reviewed by the Cabinet Council on Human Resources, the Vice President, and the President.

The President has asked Vice President Bush to work with the heads of federal agencies in conducting a special policy review to serve as a basis for all future planning for these educational institutions.

"We are gathered today because all of us want to nourish and protect an American institution that has served this nation well...the traditional Black colleges and universities," the President said. "Hundreds of thousands of young Americans received training at these schools over the past 100 years, expanding their opportunities as individuals and laying the foundation for social progress. It should never be forgotten that when educational opportunities were denied elsewhere, these institutions offered hope to Black Americans...that someday they would break the bonds of prejudice and discrimination.

"These institutions...have offered Black citizens a variety of opportunities to develop their skills and talents. It is through such diversity that freedom flourishes. And it is through education that individuals can make themselves into the type of people they choose to be...."

"America's colleges and universities have been hard pressed to maintain standards in the face of inflation that increases the cost of everything from books to typewriters....With a serious commitment to protecting these unique educational institutions, we have made certain that in an era of budget cuts, Black colleges and universities will actually receive a \$9.6 million increase in Federal Title III funds--a jump of almost 8 percent."

In stressing the importance of private-sector initiatives to provide assistance to historically Black institutions, President Reagan said, "The Federal Government's role can be to provide equal opportunity, but the private sector has an even greater potential, and a challenging responsibility, to provide direct assistance to these institutions....The future success of these schools will depend, more than anything else, on the efforts of Black Americans. What has been accomplished already is a tremendous source of pride. The future depends on an even stronger commitment to excellence and diversity in education."



THE WHITE HOUSE  
Office of Media Liaison

For Immediate Release

September 15, 1981

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT  
AT LUNCHEON HONORING BLACK COLLEGE SUPPORTERS

THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon. We are gathered today because all of us want to nourish and protect an American institution that has served this nation well. I am, of course, referring to the traditional Black colleges and universities.

Hundreds of thousands of young Americans received training at these schools over the last 100 years, expanding their opportunities as individuals and laying the foundation for social progress. It should never be forgotten that when educational opportunities were denied elsewhere, these institutions offered hope to the Black Americans--hope for a better life and hope that someday they would break the bonds of prejudice and discrimination.

These educational institutions did their job well. They have produced 50 percent of the Black business executives, 75 percent of the Black military officers, 80 percent of the Black judges, and 85 percent of the Black physicians in this country.

The Black colleges and universities in America have offered Black citizens a variety of opportunities to develop their skills and talents. It is through such diversity that freedom flourishes. And it is through the education they offer that individuals can make themselves into the type of people they choose to be, not what some central planner says they should be.

In the pursuit of equal opportunity for Black Americans, economics becomes as important as education. For a long period of our history, Black people were prevented the chance of bettering themselves not only because they were denied the opportunity to learn, but because job opportunities were limited as well.

It will do no good to educate young people if there are no jobs for them once they get out of school. And you, more than any of our citizens, know how important a vibrant economy is to the progress of Black Americans particularly, and all Americans as well.

America's declining economy cut Black family income. From 1959 to 1969 the median family income of Blacks, after adjusting for inflation, rose at 5 percent per year, but from 1969 to 1979 it stopped going up and actually dropped.

MORE

I believe that our economic program will provide more opportunity for all Americans, including Black college graduates. Most Black progress has occurred during times of prosperity in America, and we are working to create a new era of prosperity for everyone.

Economic dislocation hurts institutions as well as individuals. America's colleges and universities have been hard pressed to maintain standards in the face of inflation that increases the cost of everything from books to typewriters.

With this in mind and with a serious commitment to protecting these unique educational institutions, we have made certain that in an era of budget cuts Black colleges and universities will actually receive a \$9.6 million increase in Federal Title III funds--a jump of almost 8 percent.

In our continuing review of Executive Orders, we found a need to improve upon an existing order on historically Black colleges. I am happy today to sign a new Executive Order that will strengthen the Federal commitment to historically Black colleges, while seeking new ways for the private sector to increase its support for these vital institutions.

Our commitment takes several forms:

First the Executive Order commits us to increase Black college participation in federally sponsored programs.

Secondly, this order mandates government-wide coordination to ensure that these colleges and universities are given a full opportunity to participate in federally sponsored programs.

Now, we all know that the Federal Government has a troublesome history of issuing reports with no teeth in them. This Administration believes in setting measurable objectives--and then turning loose the creative resources to meet them. To ensure that the Annual Federal Plan called for in this Order gets results, I am directing Secretary of Education Bell to submit an Annual Performance Report on Executive Agency Actions to carry out their plans. This is "management by objectives" in action. The "report card" prepared by Secretary Bell will be reviewed by the Cabinet Council on Human Resources, the Vice President, and me.

To reinforce this Administration's commitment, I am asking Vice President Bush to play a special role. The Vice President will work with the heads of Federal agencies to help ensure the fullest cooperation possible in conducting a special policy review to serve as a basis for all our future planning on Black colleges and universities. He will then discuss the findings with the Presidents of the historically Black colleges.

Finally, this Executive Order breaks new ground by calling on the Secretary of Education to encourage private sector initiatives in assisting historically Black institutions. The Federal Government's role can be to provide equal opportunity, but the private sector has an even greater potential, and a challenging responsibility, to provide direct assistance to these institutions.

MORE

We should remember that, just as in the past, the future success of these schools will depend, more than anything else, on the efforts of Black Americans. What has been accomplished already is a tremendous source of pride.

But now is not the time to rest on past accomplishments. The future depends on an even stronger commitment to excellence and diversity in education. To paraphrase the motto of the United Negro College Fund, let us recognize that America's historically Black college is a terrible thing to waste.

###



## EXECUTIVE ORDER

-----  
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution of the United States of America, in order to advance the development of human potential, to strengthen the capacity of historically Black colleges and universities to provide quality education, and to overcome the effects of discriminatory treatment, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Secretary of Education shall supervise annually the development of a Federal program designed to achieve a significant increase in the participation by historically Black colleges and universities in Federally sponsored programs. This program shall seek to identify, reduce, and eliminate barriers which may have unfairly resulted in reduced participation in, and reduced benefits from, Federally sponsored programs. This program will also seek to involve private sector institutions in strengthening historically Black colleges.

Sec. 2. Annually, each Executive Department and those Executive agencies designated by the Secretary of Education shall establish annual plans to increase the ability of historically Black colleges and universities to participate in Federally sponsored programs. These plans shall consist of measurable objectives of proposed agency actions to fulfill this Order and shall be submitted at such time and in such form as the Secretary of Education shall designate. In consultation with participating Executive agencies, the Secretary of Education shall undertake a review of these plans and develop an integrated Annual Federal Plan for Assistance to Historically Black Colleges for consideration by the President and the Cabinet Council on Human Resources (composed of the Vice President, the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, Agriculture, Labor, Housing and Urban Development, and Education, the Attorney General, the Counsellor to the President, and the White House Chief of Staff).

Sec. 3. Each participating agency shall submit to the Secretary of Education a mid-year progress report of its achievement of its plan and at the end of the year an Annual Performance Report which shall specify agency performance of its measurable objectives.

Sec. 4. Prior to the development of the First Annual Federal Plan, the Secretary of Education shall supervise a special review by every Executive agency of its programs to determine the extent to which historically Black colleges and universities are given an equal opportunity to participate in Federally sponsored programs. This review will

more

(OVER)

examine unintended regulatory barriers, determine the adequacy of the announcement of programmatic opportunities of interest to these colleges, and identify ways of eliminating inequities and disadvantages.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Education shall ensure that each president of a historically Black college or university is given the opportunity to comment on the proposed Annual Federal Plan prior to its consideration by the President, the Vice President, and the Cabinet Council on Human Resources.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of Education, to the extent permitted by law, shall stimulate initiatives by private sector businesses and institutions to strengthen historically Black colleges and universities, including efforts to further improve their management, financial structure, and research.

Sec. 7. The Secretary of Education shall submit to the President, the Vice President, and the Cabinet Council on Human Resources an Annual Federal Performance Report on Executive Agency Actions to Assist Historically Black Colleges. The report shall include the performance appraisals of agency actions during the preceding year to assist historically Black colleges and universities. The report will also include any appropriate recommendations for improving the Federal response directed by this Order.

Sec. 8. The special review provided for in Section 4 shall take place not later than November 1, 1981. Participating Executive agencies shall submit their annual plans to the Secretary of Education not later than January 15, 1982. The first Annual Federal Plan for Assistance to Historically Black Colleges developed by the Secretary of Education shall be ready for consideration by the President, the Vice President, and the Cabinet Council on Human resources not later than March 31, 1982.

Sec. 9. Executive Order No. 12232 of August 8, 1980, is revoked.

RONALD REAGAN

THE WHITE HOUSE,

September 15, 1981.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 21, 1981

Dear College President:

On September 15, 1981, President Reagan signed an Executive Order on Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

During the remarks, President Reagan restated his commitment to Black Colleges as well as his commitment to the implementation of the Executive Order. The President stated, "Now we all know that the Federal Government has a troublesome history of issuing reports with no teeth in them. This Administration believes in setting measurable objectives-- and then turning loose the creative resources to meet them. To ensure that the Annual Federal Plan called for in this Order gets results, I am directing Secretary of Education Bell to submit an Annual Performance Report on Executive Agency Actions to carry out their plans. This is 'management by objectives' in action. The 'report card' prepared by Secretary Bell will be reviewed by the Cabinet Council on Human Resources, the Vice President and me."

For your information, I have included the President's remarks, a copy of the Executive Order and a picture of the signing. Since I have been getting requests from public relations offices from many of our Black Colleges, I trust that you will share this information with them.

If you have any questions or if I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Thelma Duggin  
Deputy Special Assistant  
to the President

Enclosures



D R A F T

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

December 9, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY HEADS

FROM: CRAIG FULLER

SUBJECT: White House Briefing Session on Federal Annual  
Plans For Executive Order on Black Colleges

On December 16, 1981 from 9:30 to 12:30 p.m., a briefing session on Executive Order 12320 will be held at the White House in the Family Theater. The meeting will provide an orientation of the Executive Order and direction for how your agency is to complete the Annual Plan required by Executive Order 12320.

For security clearance, please have your designated agency representative call in his/her name to the Office of Public Liaison at 456-7896 by December 14, 1981.

Thank you for your support in this effort.

LIST OF DESIGNATED AGENCIES FOR EXECUTIVE ORDER 12320

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

1. The Honorable John R. Block  
Secretary of Agriculture  
Department of Agriculture  
14th and Independence Avenue S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20250
2. The Honorable Malcom Baldrige  
Secretary of Commerce  
14th St. Between Constitution Ave. & E. St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20230
3. The Honorable Casper W. Weinberger  
Secretary of Defense  
The Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20301
4. The Honorable Terrel H. Bell  
Secretary of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20202
5. The Honorable James B. Edwards  
Secretary of Energy  
James Forrestal Bldg.  
1000 Independence Avenue S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20585
6. The Honorable Richard S. Schweiker  
Secretary  
Department of Health and Human Services  
200 Independence Avenue S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20201
7. The Honorable Samuel R. Pierce, Jr.  
Secretary  
Department of Housing & Urban Development  
451 7th Street S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20410
8. The Honorable James G. Watt  
Secretary of Interior  
Department of Interior  
C Street Between 18th and 19th Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20240

9. The Honorable William French Smith  
Attorney General of the United States  
Department of Justice  
Constitution Avenue and Tenth Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530
10. The Honorable Raymond J. Donovan  
Secretary of Labor  
Department of Labor  
200 Constitution Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530
11. The Honorable Alexander M. Haig, Jr.  
Secretary of State  
Department of State  
2201 C Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20250
12. The Honorable Andrew L. Lewis, Jr.  
Secretary of Transportation  
Department of Transportation  
400 7th Street S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20590
13. The Honorable Donald T. Regan  
Secretary of the Treasury  
Department of the Treasury  
15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20229
14. The Honorable Thomas W. Pauken  
Director  
ACTION  
806 Connecticut Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20525
15. The Honorable M. Peter McPherson  
Acting Director  
Agency for International Development  
320 21st Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20523
16. The Honorable Albert P. Smith, Jr.  
Federal Cochairman  
Appalachian Regional Commission  
1666 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20235
17. The Honorable William J. Casey  
Director of Central Intelligence  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D.C. 20505



18. The Honorable Ann McGill Gorsuch  
Administrator  
Environmental Protection Agency  
401 M Street S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20460
19. The Honorable Al Sweeney  
Director  
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission  
2401 E Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20424
20. The Honorable Gerald P. Carmen  
Administrator of General Services  
General Services Administration  
General Services Building  
18th and F Streets N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20405
21. The Honorable John W. Shirley  
Acting Director  
International Communication Agency  
1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20547
22. The Honorable Alan M. Lovelace  
Acting Administrator  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20546
23. The Honorable Lawrence Cornell  
Chairman  
National Credit Union Administration  
1776 G Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20427
24. The Honorable Livingston L. Biddle, Jr.  
Chairman  
National Endowment for the Arts  
2401 E Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20500
25. The Honorable Joseph D. Duffey  
Chairman  
National Endowment for the Humanities  
806 15th St. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20506

26. The Honorable Lewis M. Branscomb  
Chairman  
National Science Foundation  
1800 G Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20550
27. The Honorable Joseph M. Hendric  
Chairman  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
1717 H Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20555
28. The Honorable Michael Cardenas  
Administrator  
Small Business Administration  
1441 L Street N.W.  
Washington, D.c. 20416
29. The Honorable S. Dillion Ripley  
Secretary  
Smithsonian Institution  
Washington, D.C. 20560
30. The Honorable S. David Freeman  
Chairman  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
400 Commerce Avenue  
Knoxville, TN 37902
31. The Honorable Donald L. Custis  
Acting Administrator  
Veterans Administration  
810 Vermont Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20420
32. John B. Slaughter, Director  
National Science Foundation  
1800 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20550




UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

DEC 16 1981

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM

TO : The Honorable George Bush  
Vice President of the United States

FROM : Thomas Patrick Melady 

SUBJECT: Coy Eklund, President and CEO of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, and other Related Issues

Mr. Milton Bins, Executive Director of the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities met with Mr. Eklund on December 8, 1981, to discuss the intent, mandate and the role of the private sector in carrying out the objectives and mission of Executive Order 12320. Mr. Eklund is very interested in the private sector having a major role in the activities of the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities' Program. He is committed to the ideals as manifested by his company's past and current involvement with Black colleges and universities.

He is aware of the receptions of January 25 and 26, and could possibly play a leadership role at the receptions with other CEO's. I recommend you telephone him to commend him for his efforts and successes in working with Black colleges and universities, and to invite him personally to attend one or both of the receptions. You might wish to meet with him before the first scheduled reception to explore his role in assisting you to get other CEO's to the reception and in securing a commitment from them to work with Black colleges and universities. (See attached brochure by Coy Eklund - Giving Education The Edge).

To insure the success of these receptions I think it is important that you personally call to invite the 8 CEO's listed below. These CEO's had already accepted our earlier written invitation for the reception that was postponed:

1. Edward G. Jefferson, Chairman of the Board  
I.E. Dupont de Nemours, (302) 774-1000
2. Vincent C. Burke, Jr., Chairman of the Board  
Riggs National Bank of Washington, D.C.  
(202) 624-2000



3. William Weisz, Chief Officer, Motorola Inc.,  
Chicago, Illinois, (312) 397-5000
4. H.E. Hockeiner, President, Ford Aerospace  
and Communications,  
Detroit, Michigan, (313) 568-7500
5. William Sculley, President, Pepsi Cola Division,  
Purchase, New York 10577, (914) 253-2000
6. Theodore A. Adams, President, Unified Industry,  
Springfield, Virginia, (703) 922-9800
7. T.M. Alexander, Sr., President  
T.M. Alexander and Company, Inc.  
Washington, D.C., (202) 338-6984
8. William H. Kolberg  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
National Alliance of Business  
Washington, D.C., (202) 457-0040

I look forward to hearing from you on these requests.

Attachment

cc: Thadd Garrett  
Mary Gall

# MEMORANDUM

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

TO : Mr. Milton Bins  
Executive Director  
White House Initiative on Historically  
Black Colleges and Universities

DATE: **FEB 26 1982**

FROM : Thomas P. Melady  
Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education

SUBJECT: Monthly Memorandums to Black College/University Presidents

I have requested that your office send out monthly memorandums to the above Presidents. Only the January memorandum has been mailed out as of to date. The draft for the February memorandum was to be sent to my office on February 15, 1982 for review. I have yet to receive a copy of that draft.

Please inform me of any problems you are having in carrying out this monthly requirement.


bcc: Thelma Duggin

# MEMORANDUM

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

TO : Mr. Milton Bins  
Executive Director  
White House Initiative on Historically  
Black Colleges and Universities

DATE: FEB 26 1982

FROM : Thomas P. Melady   
Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education

SUBJECT: Travel and The Annual Plan

I reluctantly approved your travel to Nashville, Tennessee, and to Montgomery, Alabama for February 28 through March 2, 1982. My reservations stemmed from my concern over whether we will meet our deadline date of March 31, 1982 for the submission of the Annual Plan. The following dates have already slipped and I have yet to receive from you any updated timelines:

Annual Plans Due from All Agencies	-- January 15, 1982
First Draft of Annual Report (to my office)	-- February 22, 1982
First Draft Mailed to Black College/ University Presidents	-- February 26, 1982

Since the above timelines were not met it appears to me that all of the remaining timelines cannot be met.

I am requesting that you submit to me a detail plan on how you are progressing with the Annual Plan. I must be assured that we will have a timely and creditable product.

bcc: Thelma Duggin