PUPILS AND SCHOOLS in New York City

A FACT BOOK

by Eleanor Bernert Sheldon

and Raymond A. Glazier

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION, NEW YORK, 1965

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
CARD CATALOGUE NUMBER: 65–26788

CONNECTICUT PRINTERS, INC.
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Factors influencing American education are numerous, various, and complex; it is impossible to conceive of any single set of factors that adequately explain what is happening to our schools. Our attempt in this volume is to describe some aspects of the New York City school system in order to provide a factual basis and perspective for examining and planning educational programs and policies.

To compile and collate the materials provided here required the patient cooperation of many professional staff members at the Board of Education. To each we owe our grateful acknowledgment. Warranting especial appreciation are: J. Wayne Wrightstone, Assistant Superintendent in Charge, Bureau of Educational Research; Joseph Justman, Assistant Director, Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics; Frederick H. Williams, Director, Human Relations Unit; Morris Herskowitz, Assistant Administrative Director, and Shu-Ting Hsia, Statistician of the Central Zoning Unit; Hannah Kostiner, Chairman, Open Enrollment Committee; Joseph DeMartino, Administrative Associate, Bureau of Personnel; Gerald Brooks, Office of Teacher Recruitment; and Richard Vaill, Office of Information.

For providing access to and advice on various demographic data we are indebted to Evelyn Mann and Martin Oling of the Department of City Planning, City of New York, and to the late Florence Cuttrell of the Community Council of Greater New York.

For his contributions to Chapters 3 and 4 we are indebted to James R. Hudson, now of Bryn Mawr College. Jacqueline Guillou, our secretary and chief data processor, provided a myriad of indispensable services for which we are deeply appreciative.

An earlier manuscript was critically reviewed by Marvin Bressler, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Princeton University. His comments and suggestions aided considerably in basic revisions and provided the stimulus for a fact book presentation. We, of course, accept full responsibility for any shortcomings of the volume.

Chapter 1 of this report places the discussion of New York City schools within a broader context of social change in the nation. Chapter 2 presents a brief sketch of the population changes in the city that have affected public school enrollments and some facts and figures characterizing these enrollments. Chapter 3 tells how the city's schools are organized and describes major school programs, including these designated as compensatory. Chapter 4 relates how the schools are staffed. Chapter 5 focuses attention on the city's open enrollment programs and a proposed school reorganization. These materials are summarized in Chapter 6 via an analysis of pupil performance in schools participating in compensatory programing and permissive zoning, as compared with performance in other schools. A set of tables is provided for those who seek to go beyond the text statements.

We have tried to simplify the intricacies of the statistical data and to describe some of the official policies and programs of the Board of Education. Our aim has been clarification rather than judgment. We trust that, in the process, distortion has not crept into the picture.

ELEANOR BERNERT SHELDON
RAYMOND A. GLAZIER

July, 1965

EDUCATION *in a* CHANGING SOCIETY

1

Controversy surrounds the public schools in New York City. This report attempts to provide an informed perspective of the system by a factual description of pupils, schools, and programs. The materials and descriptions emerge from a background of concern about changing functions of schools as they are linked to changes in the characteristics of their pupils.

THE DISTRIBUTIVE FUNCTION OF SCHOOLS

American education is in the throes of being dismantled and reassembled. Many parts of the educational process seem to have worn thin, or worn out; many are inadequate or malfunctioning. Articulate criticism has been voiced and response to it is evident. Both the demands of the critics and often even the nature of the response call for "revolution." Explicit in the dialogue is the recognition that knowledge is no longer a luxury; it is no longer unproductive of social and economic goods and services. Knowledge and the means by which it is acquired—education—have become increasingly productive of both economic and social rewards.

The value placed on education has been enhanced by what is referred to as "automation"—that is, the rapid substitution

of work by machine techniques based on knowledge for work by human hands. Today's—and surely tomorrow's—society will provide work and reward for mental rather than for manual skills.

This value assigned to education is not new. American history provides plentiful evidence of the importance of schooling in determining adult economic and social position. What is new is that knowledge (and thereby education) has become, or at least is becoming, the *primary* distributor of future economic and social status in American life. Whereas previously status could be attained by dint of hard work or by the grace of one's family, in a society that assigns social position on the basis of "talent," "ability," and "achievement," the school emerges as its primary distributive agent.

As the educational threshold of employment has steadily risen, the schools have become the focal point in allotting future life chances, in conferring future social status, and in providing for future consumption possibilities. Thus our educational problems have assumed a dimension somewhat different from those of earlier generations. Our schools still function to maintain and to transmit the values and beliefs of our society and its accumulated knowledge and skill. The search for and creation of new knowledge and the encouragement of innovation in general now have assumed a greater functional importance for the school, planting and nurturing a seed of controversy vis-à-vis the school's conservative role of preservation and transmission. It is the distributive role, however, that creates much of the conflicts and tensions among the school, teachers, parents, and pupils. Any attempt at educational change, let alone revolution, must come to grips with this central function.

It is hardly conceivable that educators today are not explicitly aware that their schools promote, demote, and assign a future to their pupils. Nonetheless, these social claims have imposed upon schools and teachers demands that far exceed devotion to exclusively educational tasks. The distributive function of schools has generated an almost intolerable strain and responsibility on school personnel. Not only does the school provide the skills for allocating and fulfilling future

roles, it is also the locale for demonstrating abilities to perform some adult roles. As a basic sorting mechanism it judges, evaluates, and predicts achievements and performance. Even the very assignment of pupils to particular schools and programs allows or excludes certain possibilities of future position and way of life.

POPULATION CHANGE AND URBAN SCHOOLS

Coupled with the strains and tensions inherent in the assigned distributive function of the schools are those occasioned by the impact of population change in the nation's large urban centers.

The shift of population in the United States to metropolitan areas is quite familiar by now. The concomitant movement of population from the central cities to the suburbs has also become increasingly pronounced, particularly during the 1950's. Metropolitan concentration and suburban dispersal themselves, however, are perhaps less significant than the sorting-out process that is changing markedly the social and economic characteristics of the population of central cities and outlying areas.

Central cities seem to be losing long-term residents to the suburbs and replacing them partially with migrants from nonmetropolitan areas, often rural migrants from the South. Though the figures indicate only a small net loss of the population of central cities, there has been a high rate of gross migration turnover, involving large numbers of persons of different ethnic, social, and economic characteristics.

Results of these shifts in residence are seen in the changing population structure of the city and outlying areas. During the past decade the white population of the nation's central cities increased by only 5 per cent, while the corresponding nonwhite population increased by 51 per cent. In the cities of the Northeast this difference is even more striking, for whites in these central cities actually decreased in number. One result of this ethnic shift in large cities is that the remaining

white population is considerably older than the nonwhite, containing many more elderly persons and relatively fewer children of school age.

In the central city are housed ethnic pockets of segregated minorities. While European ethnic groups have declined in significance our new metropolitan minorities are native citizens—the Negro, the Puerto Rican, the Southern hillbilly—who are often ill-equipped for the complex life of the city. Upon the schools is placed the task of providing the road to assimilation and integration into the mainstream of metropolitan life.

This complex of demands on the school systems of central cities creates another set of unique educational problems—those posed by the "culturally deprived," the "educationally disadvantaged." These names, always hesitantly and apologetically used, refer to a characteristic set of features relating to pupils' family background, home and neighborhood environment, motivation for education, school performance, etc. These pupils emerge from a culture of poverty; their families, homes, and neighborhoods fail to provide them with an initial educational orientation; and consequently they lack early language and conceptual skills, motivation for school learning, and an adequate estimate of self.

The school then in these areas faces a set of additional responsibilities, akin to those of a welfare role, that must be assumed for the proper functioning of the educative role. To the school, usually in conjunction with other agencies, has been assigned an obligation to attack community problems affecting family life, housing, employment, and the like—all of which buttress or hinder the basic instructional functions of the school.

Two general approaches to the solution of these problems have been proffered. For the lack of alternative terms we shall refer to them as "compensatory" or "supplementary" programing, on the one hand, and "permissive zoning" and school reorganization, on the other. Both approaches share the assumption that the public school system is to provide means for equalizing access to the best of its educative and thereby distributive opportunities. Compensatory education

frankly recognizes that pupils from culturally deprived backgrounds require more than the regular educational programs. These programs are generally offered in schools qualifying as to need. Both permissive zoning and school reorganization plans are efforts to override the effects of residential segregation by "integrating" the schools and the classrooms with pupils from both privileged and underprivileged backgrounds, with pupils from both the majority and minority groups. Both approaches are currently being used in New York City.

2 POPULATION CHANGE *and* SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS

INTRODUCTION

The complex of problems that confront the administrators of an educational system are chiefly influenced by (1) the goals set by both professional educators and the public; (2) the characteristics of the pupils; and (3) the capacities of the available teaching and supporting personnel. Changes in educational policy may be made necessary by significant changes in any of these elements. In addition, of course, changes may result from improvements in the available educational technology achieved through research and experimentation. In a sense, these innovations in educational practice, as well as the growing body of empirical knowledge on which they are based, provide evidence of increased awareness within the system of the interrelationships among the goals, the pupils, and the personnel, and of a heightened sensitivity to the alterations made desirable or even imperative by changes in these elements.

Some of the important alterations in the school system are the extension of changes that have been going on over a relatively long period. Some changes, which may occur with comparative rapidity, are adjustments to the changing needs of society in general. For example, the schools may be expected to respond to significant trends in the general technological development of the nation and to consequent shifts

in the occupational structure—that is, to changes in the kinds of employment opportunities that are likely to be open to students after graduation. Under current conditions we might expect to find less emphasis on narrowly specialized vocational training in high schools, increased efforts to retain pupils until they have graduated from high school, and increased stress on adequate preparation for various types of higher education.

Other changes in the schools, particularly relevant in New York City, are responses to more strictly local circumstances. Among these the most important are changes in the composition of the pupil population and in the cultural backgrounds and attitudes toward education of the pupils and their families.

New York City has been the initial terminus for a substantial portion of nearly all the "great migrations" that have contributed to the growth of the nation. Consequently the city has faced the continuing problem of assimilating large numbers of newcomers, groups usually speaking a language other than English, almost invariably following different customs, and often lacking much education and special occupational skills. The substantially successful integration of these groups into the life of the city is attested by the variety of ethnic background of the present inhabitants and the considerable social and occupational mobility achieved by the immigrant groups and their children, as well as by the continuing vitality of the community's cosmopolitan tradition. Apart from occupational experiences, the city's public school system has provided the most important link between the new and the established.

Following a brief summary of population trends in New York City over the first half of the century, this chapter highlights the most important changes in the characteristics of the city's inhabitants since 1950 and the closely related changes in public school enrollments. Because of our central concern with contemporary problems and responses in the city's schools, attention will be focused on the two groups that contain large numbers of more recent migrants and constitute an important proportion of the city's school-age population.

These groups are the Negro population, a substantial proportion of which has migrated to New York City from the South during the past two decades, and the city's Puerto Rican residents, a large majority of whom were born in Puerto Rico and have come to the city in the years following World War II.

NEW YORK'S CHANGING POPULATION

Four major themes characterized population developments in New York City from 1900 to 1950.

(1) *Growth:* During this half century the total population grew substantially, stimulated in the earlier decades by a high level of immigration from Europe, and later sustained at a much lower rate through migration from elsewhere in the United States. Between 1900 and 1950 the population of the city grew from 3,500,000 persons to 7,900,000 persons, an increase of 130 per cent. (Table 1)

(2) *Dispersal:* This growing population was redistributed among the city's five boroughs, a suburbanization movement that took place to a significant degree within the technical boundaries of the city. Manhattan declined in its proportion of the city's population each successive decade to the benefit largely of Queens and the Bronx. The proportion of the population residing in Brooklyn remained relatively constant throughout the period. (Tables 2 and 3)

(3) *Assimilation:* The ethnically variegated immigrant groups were relatively successfully assimilated, as shown in part by patterns of ethnic shifts in the residential sub-areas of the city and in part by the occupational mobility of the first, second, and now third generations of foreign-born stock.

(4) *Aging:* The average age of the population continuously increased during this 50-year period, reflecting a substantial growth in the proportion of the aged population and concomitantly a decline among children and youth. (Table 4)

While the last three of these processes—dispersal, assimilation, and aging—continued, to a lesser extent, during the decade 1950 to 1960, they no longer suffice to indicate the most important aspects of recent population change in New York City. Since 1950 the outstanding developments have been the rapid change in the racial and ethnic structure of the city's inhabitants, together with the consequent changes in the size and composition of the school-age population.

The long sustained rise in New York City's total population was reversed—at least temporarily—from 1950 to 1960. During the decade the city experienced a high level of out-migration, a significant portion of which may be attributed to the movement of families to the suburbs. As a result, population declined 1.4 per cent from its 1950 level of 7,892,000 to approximately 7,782,000 in 1960. At the same time, the color and ethnic composition of the city's population changed considerably. The relatively small decline of about 110,000 residents includes a net migration loss of 1,200,000 white inhabitants (excluding Puerto Ricans), only partially offset by an excess of births over deaths (natural increase) amounting to over 400,000 among the white population. The population increase among Negroes and Puerto Ricans totaled an approximate 725,000 persons. (Table 5)

Changes in the ethnic and color composition of a population resulting from substantial in-migration, like demographic changes generally, are of interest to the social scientist or administrator not only because of their implications for the aggregate size of a population, but primarily because of their influence on the economic and social fabric of a community. These effects, as well as the rapidity with which they become apparent, are frequently more striking if there is at the same time a significant out-migration of the population of different characteristics. As we have seen, this is substantially what has been occurring in New York City over the past decade or so, thus enlarging the impact of Negro and Puerto Rican in-migration.

Persons moving into the city and those moving out during the past decade or so were most often young adults starting

families. A significant result of this migration exchange is a school-age population that is increasingly Negro or Puerto Rican.

While in 1950 the city's Puerto Rican inhabitants constituted about 3 per cent of the total population of all ages, they accounted for 4 per cent of the preschool population, and approximately 5 per cent of the children of school age, but less than 1 per cent of the population at retirement ages. Although the share of the total accounted for by Puerto Rican residents had advanced to 8 per cent by the end of the decade, they then constituted over 13 per cent of the preschool group, and more than 11 per cent of the population of school age, though accounting for less than 2 per cent of those at retirement ages.

Data for the city's nonwhite residents exhibit a similar pattern. In 1950 nonwhites (excluding nonwhite Puerto Ricans) constituted almost 10 per cent of the population of all ages, 11 per cent of the preschool population, over 10 per cent of the school-age group, and less than 5 per cent of those of retirement age. By 1960 the city's nonwhite residents accounted for more than 14 per cent of the city's total population but constituted almost 20 per cent of the preschool group, and over 16 per cent of the community's population of school age, while accounting for less than 7 per cent of the population in the oldest age groups. (Table 6)

Related to the age distribution of the population recently moving into the city is the educational attainment level of its adult members. There is a widespread notion that Negroes who have recently migrated to New York City from elsewhere in the United States have markedly less schooling than the resident population.

Analysis of the 1955–1960 migration data yields the following relevant observations:

(1) Nonwhite migrants to New York City from other parts of the United States show a *higher* average level of schooling than the resident population of the city—*both white and nonwhite.*

(2) These differences in educational attainment can be explained in considerable measure by the younger age-distribution among the nonwhite migrants.
(3) Similarly, white in-migrants average higher educational attainment levels than white or nonwhite residents.
(4) Among in-migrants of both color groups a considerably larger proportion originated from metropolitan areas, thereby contributing to the educational differences favoring migrants.
(5) The average educational attainment level of out-migrants exceeded that of in-migrants.

It is readily apparent from these observations, documented in Tables 7 and 8, that in the process of population replacement, particularly during the years 1955–1960, the city lost to its suburbs and other areas young adults of the highest level of schooling; moving into the city was a population of higher educational attainment than the resident group. The net effect of this shift from the perspective of the school is that the pupils leaving the city's schools came from families with higher educational achievement than their replacements among the newer migrants. Though the in-migrant families, on the average, attained higher levels of schooling than did those who remained in the city, the nonmigrant residents are generally older, therefore contributing less to a school-age population.

PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS

Enrollment levels in the public schools and changes in these levels are the result of three general factors. The primary and limiting factor is, of course, the numbers of children who are, broadly speaking, at the usual ages of school attendance. They constitute a pool of potential students, and we might expect that changes in the size of this pool ordinarily will be paralleled by changes in school enrollments.

Secondly, the trend in the proportions of children and youth of various ages who are attending school—the changes in enrollment rates—accounts for changes of enrollment levels in all schools in the city. Not all youths at the prevailing ages of school attendance are enrolled in school, however; and the proportions who do attend vary with respect to age, color or ethnic group, and to a lesser extent, sex.

The third major factor affecting changes in the numbers of pupils enrolled in the city's public schools is the proportion enrolled in parochial and other nonpublic schools.

The following changes in these three factors in New York City are reflected in the changing enrollment levels of its public schools.

The number of children of school age (5 to 17 years) in New York City increased from 1,247,000 in 1950 to 1,478,000 in 1960, an average growth of about 23,000 each year. The number of school-age children in 1965 is estimated at about 1,625,000, representing an average increase of about 29,000 annually.

In 1950, of the children of school age, 88 per cent, or 1,100,000, were actually enrolled in school. In 1960 the corresponding enrollment rate was 90 per cent, or 1,330,000 children.

White children are more apt to attend school than are nonwhite children—at all ages, but especially at the older ages. The following figures demonstrate this clearly.

Enrollment Rates, New York City: 1960

Age	*White*	*Nonwhite*
5 to 17 years	90.3	88.6
5 to 13 years	92.0	90.5
5 and 6 years	75.9	74.6
7 and 13 years	96.7	95.9
14 to 17 years	85.9	82.2
14 and 15 years	93.5	91.5
16 and 17 years	78.7	72.6

While registers of both private and public schools increased over the 1950–1960 decade, nonpublic enrollments grew at a

much faster rate. The total number of students in all schools of the city rose from about 1,179,000 in 1950 to 1,396,000 in 1960, an increase of slightly over 18 per cent. Of this increment of 217,000 pupils, the city's nonpublic schools absorbed about 109,000—approximately half of the total. From an estimated 300,000 in 1950, registrations in private schools increased to 409,000 in 1960, a growth of over 35 per cent. (Table 9)

During the same period enrollments in the public schools of New York City grew from 879,000 at the beginning of the decade to 987,000 in 1960. The additional 108,000 pupils represented an increase of less than 15 per cent in the number attending public schools.

As a consequence of this shift in enrollment patterns, the proportion of students attending nonpublic schools increased from about 25 per cent in 1950 to almost 30 per cent in 1960.

The private and parochial schools are continuing to absorb their proportional share of increased total enrollment—accounting for approximately 30 per cent since 1960. Among children registered in the elementary grades (1 to 8) about a third are in nonpublic schools. At the high school level (9 to 12) about 20 per cent of the city's pupils are in independent schools. In addition, nonpublic schools account for about 15 per cent of all pupils in kindergarten. (Table 10)

Over a third of the white elementary school children are in private schools, as compared with about 8 per cent of the nonwhite pupils at this level. Twenty-five per cent of the city's white high school pupils are in private schools as compared with 7 per cent among nonwhites. Corresponding figures for kindergarten enrollments are over 20 per cent for whites and 5 per cent for nonwhites. (Tables 11 and 12)

To complete our survey of changing enrollments, we shall examine recent trends in the size and ethnic composition of pupil registers in New York City's public schools since the Fall of 1957 when the Board of Education inaugurated its annual ethnic census. This practice was adopted to aid the Board in dealing with the problems presented by *de facto* segregation and in the planning of supplementary programs di-

rected primarily to the special needs of minority group children. This special census enumerates pupils according to a threefold ethnic classification: Negro, Puerto Rican, and "Other." While the last category contains a relatively small number of nonwhite students (chiefly Orientals), it is mainly composed of non-Puerto Rican white pupils. To avoid repetition of an awkward phrase the "Other" category will often be referred to as white.

The total number of students on public school registers increased by 85,000 from about 953,000 in the Fall of 1957 to 1,038,000 by the 1964–1965 school year, an enrollment increase of just less than 10 per cent. During this period, the number of Negro students had increased by 111,000 or 64 per cent, and enrollment of Puerto Rican pupils increased by 60,000 or 46 per cent. At the same time, however, the number of white students decreased by some 85,000, a decline of about 13 per cent. (Table 13)

In the Fall of 1957, Negro students constituted 18 per cent of all pupils on register in the city's public schools; students of Puerto Rican birth or ancestry accounted for about 14 per cent of the total; and white students made up the balance of 68 per cent. By January, 1965, the proportion of enrollments accounted for by Negro students had risen to over 27 per cent, and the representation of Puerto Rican pupils had increased to 18 per cent of the total register. Steady declines over the years reduced the share accounted for by the white students to less than 55 per cent of total enrollments.

These changes in the ethnic composition of the city's public schools occurred at all school levels. In the elementary schools the proportion of Negro pupils increased from 20 per cent in 1957 to almost 30 per cent by 1965. The share represented by Puerto Rican students rose from 15 per cent to over 20 per cent; and the proportion of white pupils showed a corresponding decline from 64 to 49 per cent of the total.

A similar pattern characterizes the shifts in over-all ethnic composition of public school registers in each of the city's

boroughs: a decline in the proportion of white students and increases in the proportions of total enrollments accounted for by Negro and Puerto Rican pupils. (Tables 14 and 15)

At the junior high school level the share accounted for by Negroes increased from 19 per cent at the beginning of the period to 28 per cent in January, 1965; the proportion of Puerto Ricans showed a much smaller increase from 16 per cent to 19 per cent; and the representation of white students dropped from 65 to 53 per cent of the total register.

Generally speaking, the changes in the shares made up by the three ethnic groups were less extensive for public high schools than for junior high and elementary schools, and somewhat narrower for vocational than for academic high schools. An exception may be noted for the Puerto Rican students, however, who showed greater percentage point increases in both types of high schools than at the junior high school level. In the academic high schools the proportion of Negro students increased from 9 per cent in 1957–1958 to 18 per cent of the total in January, 1965; students of Puerto Rican birth or ancestry, constituting only 5 per cent in the earlier year, accounted for 9 per cent at the end of the period; and the proportion of white pupils declined from 86 per cent to 73 per cent of all enrollments.

The representation of each of the two minority groups in the vocational high schools advanced by less than 5 percentage points during the period; the Negro pupils from 24 to nearly 29 per cent and Puerto Rican students from 20 to 24 per cent of the total. For both kinds of high schools combined the proportion accounted for by Negro students increased from 12 per cent to almost 20 per cent, while the share constituted by Puerto Rican pupils increased only from 7 to 11 per cent. Corresponding to these increases, the proportion of white students among all enrollments in the public high schools of the city declined from 81 per cent to 69 per cent between 1957 and January, 1965.

Of interest is the striking difference in the proportions in

which both Negro and Puerto Rican students are represented in public elementary and junior high schools compared with high schools, and in vocational high schools contrasted with academic high schools. In January, 1965, Negro students made up 30 per cent of all enrollments in public elementary schools, and 28 per cent of the total in junior high schools, while constituting less than 20 per cent of the population of the relevant ages. On the other hand, while accounting for 29 per cent of all students in vocational high schools, Negro enrollments in the city's academic high schools were only 18 per cent of the total. A similar pattern is found for the representation of Puerto Rican students, who formed 21 per cent of elementary enrollments, 19 per cent of students on register in junior high schools, and 11 per cent of all public high school students. Although Puerto Rican pupils made up 24 per cent of the total in vocational high schools, members of this ethnic group accounted for only 9 per cent of all enrollments in academic high schools.

To facilitate the study of trends in ethnic composition, the Board of Education has classified schools into three types according to the ethnic distribution of their students. While the designations for the three ethnic types—they are called "X"-schools, "Y"-schools, and "Z"-or "midrange" schools—are the same for each school level, the criteria used in classifying elementary schools differ somewhat from those applied to schools at the higher levels.

At the elementary level, an X-school is one in which the combined enrollment of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils is 90 per cent or more of the total register. At the other extreme, a Y-school is one in which "other" students constitute 90 per cent or more of the total enrollment. An elementary school in which Negro and Puerto Rican pupils constitute between 10 and 90 per cent of all pupils is called a Z-school. The Z-or midrange schools are sometimes referred to as integrated schools. For the junior high schools and high schools the corresponding criterion was set at 85 per cent. Consequently, at these levels, a Z-school is one in which Negro and Puerto Rican students represent between 15 and 85 per cent of the total enrollment.

Although this classification was developed primarily for recording changes in the number of schools exhibiting each of the three ethnic profiles, the underlying data also permit us to observe the changes in total enrollment that occurred between the Fall of 1957 and January, 1965, in the schools of each ethnic type. In addition, the same data provide a measure of the changes that have occurred in the proportion of all Negro and Puerto Rican children who were attending segregated or integrated schools.

Among elementary schools, enrollments in ethnic segregated or X-schools rose from 84,000 pupils in 1957 to some 177,000 in 1965, an increase of nearly 110 per cent; and registration in integrated schools increased by about 16 per cent from 223,000 to over 258,000, while enrollments in white segregated or Y-schools declined by 39 per cent from 247,000 in the earlier year to 151,000 at the end of the period. (Table 16)

At the junior high school level, enrollments in nonwhite segregated schools increased by almost 140 per cent from only 22,000 at the beginning of the seven-year period to almost 53,000 by January, 1965; pupils attending integrated schools showed an increase of 35 per cent from about 74,000 to over 99,000; and the number of students enrolled in white schools dropped 22 per cent from 74,000 in 1957 to 59,000 to the middle of the 1964–1965 school year.

In the academic high schools the proportionate increase in enrollments in X-schools was rather large, although it should be noted that the number of students attending these schools increased by only 6,700 from about 1,000 in 1957 to approximately 7,700 in 1965. On the other hand, the number of academic high school students attending integrated schools increased by 79 per cent from 54,000 to 96,000, while registration in white schools dropped 28 per cent from 133,000 in 1957 to 95,000 at the end of the seven-year period.

Keeping in mind the difference in the definitions of the three ethnic types used at the elementary level as compared

with all higher levels, we can usefully outline these changes for all of the city's public schools. Between 1957 and 1965 the number of students enrolled in minority group segregated schools increased 130,000 (119 per cent); pupils registered in integrated schools increased by 107,000 (28 per cent) from 382,000 to 489,000; and enrollments in white segregated schools dropped by nearly 155,000 (34 per cent) from 461,000 to 307,000.

As a consequence of increasing numbers of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils in the public schools—and the concomitant decrease in enrollments of white pupils between 1957 and 1965, combined with the resulting shifts in the number of children attending schools in each of the three ethnic classifications—there were significant increases in the *proportions* of those minority group children who were attending X-schools. While in the Fall of 1957 approximately 41 per cent of the combined total of Negro and Puerto Rican students registered in the city's public elementary schools were attending ethnic segregated schools, by January, 1965, the proportion had increased to nearly 58 per cent. In the junior high schools the proportion increased from 36 per cent in the earlier year to over 50 per cent at the end of the period.

Similarly, there were changes in the proportions of white students who were enrolled in predominantly white or Y-schools. From nearly 68 per cent in 1957 the proportion of white pupils attending Y-schools at the elementary level declined to about 51 per cent in 1965. In the city's junior high schools the proportion declined from 65 per cent in the earlier year to only 47 per cent at the end of the period, and in the academic high schools the proportion was reduced from more than 78 per cent in the Fall of 1957 to 66 per cent over the seven-year interval.

At both the elementary and junior high school levels the shifts in the number of X-, Y-, and Z-schools over the 1957–58 to 1964–65 period substantially parallel the relative changes in the numbers of students attending schools in each

of these ethnic classifications. During the seven-year interval the number of elementary schools increased by 21 (just under 4 per cent) to a total of 586 schools in the Fall of 1964. The number of X-schools rose by 84 or 131 per cent during the same period, and numbered 148 schools by the beginning of the 1964–1965 school year. Concomitantly the number of Y-schools dropped by 118 (about 41 per cent), and the increase of 55 Z-schools represents a rise of about 26 per cent over the number in 1957. (Table 17)

As a result of these changes, X-schools accounted for 25 per cent of all elementary schools in the Fall of 1964, compared with only a little over 11 per cent in 1957; the proportion of Y-schools dropped from 51 per cent to 29 per cent of the total; and the remaining share accounted for by Z-schools increased from 37 to about 45 per cent.

At the junior high school level the 15 schools added during the seven-year interval represented an increase of about 12 per cent and brought the total to 138 schools by the end of the period. While the number of X-schools in the city increased by 18 making a total of 34 in 1964, the number of Y-schools declined by 15 and the total number of Z-schools increased by 12 or 22 per cent over the number recorded at the beginning of the seven-year period.

The consequent change in the distribution of junior high schools by ethnic composition shows a pattern very similar to that found at the elementary level. The proportion of X-schools increased from about 13 per cent in 1957 to almost 25 per cent in 1964–1965; while the share accounted for by Y-schools declined from 42 to 27 per cent; and the proportion of Z-schools increased from about 45 to 49 per cent of all junior high schools.

In summary, we have reviewed briefly recent population trends in New York City focusing on the changing characteristics of the school-age population and the consequent effects on public school enrollments. The substantial in-migration of Negroes and Puerto Ricans concomitant with the out-migration of whites altered the ethnic composition of the

school-age population to a much greater extent than it did the total population. Because of the ethnic differentials in enrollment in nonpublic schools, most of the effect of the changing composition has been directly reflected in public school registers.

Largely as a result of segregated residential patterns and in combination with the growth in the number of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, ethnic segregated schools have increased rapidly during the past seven years. At the same time the number of white segregated schools has declined, resulting in a larger number of integrated schools.

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION *and* PROGRAMS

3

ORGANIZATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

The explicit aims and objectives of public school education in New York City, as elsewhere in the nation, involve primarily the preservation and transmission of our heritage; the development of traditional values in our children; the provision of an environment where the abilities and talents of a child may find expression and expansion. To implement the achievement of these goals the school system is currently organized in three major divisions: the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools, often referred to as the 6-3-3 plan. It has been the assumption that these three divisions correspond with the major age groupings of child development, each having unique characteristics.

Children from the approximate ages of 5 to 12 or 13 generally attend the elementary school, which serves an immediate local neighborhood. Groups of elementary schools constitute the feeder schools for junior high schools, generally consisting of grades 7, 8, and 9. Senior high schools, subdivided into academic and vocational schools, generally cover grades 10 to 12. There are exceptions, of course, to this general organizational pattern; for example, some schools have grades K to 3, some have K to 8, but the vast number of schools constituting a total of approximately 600 elementary schools, 130 junior high schools, and 90 high schools conform to this pattern.

Most high schools receive their pupils from a feeder pattern of junior high schools. These are generally referred to as regular district high schools. There are exceptions to this policy as well. Four academic high schools in the city (Brooklyn Technical, Bronx Science, Stuyvesant, and Music and Art) recruit their pupils through open competitive examinations on a city-wide basis. In addition, entrance into vocational high schools usually requires aptitude tests measuring the applicant's ability for the specialization offered in the school. Moreover, options are offered to pupils who seek specialized training not offered in the district high school.

Underlying the organizational structure and the educational program is another assumption concerning the growth and development of children. This assumption is very explicitly recognized and stated in the guides to curriculum development: a child's level of maturity partly determines what he learns, when he learns, and how he learns. Although growth and development patterns of children reveal common characteristics, each child grows according to his own pattern. Not all children reach the same developmental level and display the same characteristics at the same age. At each stage of an individual's development there are certain tasks—learnings, achievements, behaviors—of which he is capable and which may be expected of him by society.

From this is derived both the pattern of progression through the school system and the section variations within each grade. Grade progression throughout the system is based on the allocation of the pupil to one grade for one year. Thus a pupil enters the school system at a minimum age level (5 to 6 years) and from then on is generally expected to proceed within the system from grade to grade at a regular pace based upon yearly promotion. In recognition of possible deviations from this general pattern, based upon the abovementioned assumptions concerning child development, pupils are graded and classified within a given grade level in accordance with standardized test results and teacher estimates of ability and social maturity. Thus, though there is a very explicit policy of continuous annual progress through grades 1 to 6, it is recognized that some children who are rapid learners may

require only 5 years, while others may require 7. Generally, reading ability is the major factor in grading and classification within a grade. However, because it is also explicitly assumed that children fare best when they progress with their age mates, there are limits to both retention and acceleration. A child may not be retained in grades 1 to 6 more than once, and enrichment is generally favored over acceleration for those children who are achieving above their grade level.

Children may enter kindergarten at age 5 and kindergarten classes are generally grouped according to age. Teachers are advised to make every effort to identify intellectually gifted children by the end of the kindergarten year in anticipation of their later placement. Children whose sixth birthday falls with the calendar year of admission are admitted to the first grade. Section placement in the first grade is determined by kindergarten teachers and supervisors on the basis of their judgment of the child's physical, mental, and social maturity. The placement of nonkindergarten children is at the discretion of the school principal. It is a stated policy that all children are to be promoted from the first to the second grade unless there are some very exceptional circumstances. Retention in the first grade requires the approval of the assistant superintendent of schools in that district.

Beginning in the second and third grades children are grouped in grade sections according to "ability," with reading the usual index for ability classification. Children in the second grade who at the end of the year are still at a reading-readiness level are retained in the second grade rather than promoted. Children in the third grade who have fallen two years behind in their reading ability and who have not been held back earlier may be retained by placement in a special class of grade 3 or in what is referred to as an Opportunity Class.[1]

Similarly, classroom performance and test results also determine those pupils who may be placed in advanced grades

---

[1] For a fuller discussion, see Board of Education, City of New York, Division of Elementary Schools, *Handbook,* 1963–1964, p. 16.

or in accelerated sections of a grade. If in a given school there are not enough children to constitute an entire class for acceleration, these children are nonetheless kept together as part of the top class of their grade and are exposed to a program of enrichment or advancement.

Classes in grades 4 to 6 are similarly organized on the basis of academic achievement. Retardation and retention generally take place at the end of grades 4 and 5 and only rarely does retention take place at the end of grade 6. Children with reading levels below grade 5 who have not been retained once in grades K to 6 are not sent on to junior high school, other than in exceptional cases. However, it should be remembered that a child may be retained only once in the K to 6 division.

At the junior high school level the diversity of backgrounds, interests, abilities, and talents among pupils entering the schools is also recognized. While adaptability and flexibility characterize the curriculum at the elementary school level, at this next level the possible combinations of programs, classes, and sections become even more numerous. Within the basic pattern, eight alternative programs are offered including schedules for majors in art, music, foreign language, etc. The programs differ largely with respect to the use made of optional periods. Each pupil in the junior high school then follows a program supposedly best suited to his abilities, thereby reducing the range of abilities in any given subject area class. Corrective work as well as the exploration of special talent are made possible. There are also very explicit requirements for promotion from grade to grade as well as for graduation. The most significant of the requirements is the attainment of reading standards for promotion from each grade in addition to the traditional attainment of satisfactory ratings in subject areas. In grade 7 the reading standard required for promotion is a grade 5 reading level. In grade 8 a reading grade of 5.5 is essential. Pupils who do not meet these requirements may be retained at the lower grade for corrective work.

At the completion of grade 9 a pupil may receive either a diploma or a certificate. In order to receive a diploma the junior high school requires that the pupil receive passing

grades in at least four major and three minor subjects plus a reading grade score of not lower than 7.0. Those receiving passing marks in only two major and two minor subjects and whose reading score is not lower than 6.0 are granted certificates. Children who receive certificates upon graduation may earn a junior high school diploma after they have been in senior high school one or more terms provided that they are then able to meet the requirements in reading and in subject areas.

Senior high schools are divided into academic and vocational schools with the academic schools constituting approximately two-thirds of the total. The academic high schools provide a general education both for those who intend to complete their formal education with graduation from high school and for those who intend to enter a higher institution. The academic high schools offer a variety of courses and three main types of diplomas: the academic diploma, the general diploma, and the commercial diploma. In 1962–1963 approximately half of the total diplomas awarded were academic and about 40 per cent general. Elective courses are available in many subject areas and are designed to satisfy the requirements of the various diplomas. Credits earned in the ninth year of the junior high schools are applied in meeting the requirements for the diplomas.

The academic diploma is intended primarily for pupils who are preparing for college entrance. The general diploma is intended primarily for pupils who do not plan to go to college. Whereas 19 units are required for the academic diploma and Regents examinations in 10 of these, 18 units are required for graduation with a general diploma and no Regents are necessary. The commercial diploma is intended for those who seek to enter business after graduation. Nineteen units are required with Regents examinations in at least nine of them.

Most academic high schools are zoned in local districts. All pupils residing within an academic high school zone apply for admission to that school unless they are candidates for courses not offered in the district school. High schools having no zoning restriction may admit pupils to courses offered in

those schools. There are no zoning restrictions for vocational high schools but space in them may be limited.

The vocational high school combines training for earning a living with general secondary education. Terminal courses are offered preparing for occupations in the industrial and commercial fields and in the service trades.

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS IN THE CITY'S ELEMENTARY AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Built upon this structure are some programs which are considered part of the basic efforts of the schools.

At the elementary school level gifted children are sought, identified, and placed in a special program called the **Intellectually Gifted Children's Program** (IGC Program). Pupils are selected for the program on the basis of a combination of criteria including measured intelligence, achievement in reading and mathematics, social and emotional adjustment, good physical health, and supervisors' and teachers' judgments. Supervisors and teachers may exercise the final decision with respect to admission to the program and "may supercede statistical requirements if those recorded for the child are not valid."[2] Only master teachers specially trained in methods of teaching the intellectually gifted are selected for these classes.

Classes for intellectually gifted children are based on enrichment rather than acceleration at the regular upper-elementary grades: 4, 5, and 6. If there are not enough intellectually gifted children in a school to organize a class, upon recommendation of the principal and with the approval of the assistant superintendent and parent, the child may be sent to a central school in his district that has such a class. Free transportation is furnished where necessary. The Board of

---

[2] Board of Education, City of New York, Division of Elementary Schools, *Handbook,* 1963–1964, p. 101.

Education allows an additional $2.00 for each child enrolled in these classes and in addition the National Defense Education Act provides special funds for the purchase of science equipment and special mathematics and foreign language material. There has been considerable expansion in this program over the past 40 years when it started in one school, with two classes serving 52 children. The first significant expansion occurred in 1940 when the number of pupils jumped to 1,440 and the number of classes to 45. By 1960 there were 18,724 gifted children enrolled in 538 special classes. By 1963 there were 24,587 pupils in 730 classes at 239 elementary schools.

Special programs are also available to pupils with physical and mental handicaps. Those with physical handicaps are classified into two groups: (1) pupils who can be accommodated in regular classes; and (2) pupils for whom special classes are organized. Physically handicapped pupils in regular classes may have visual handicaps, defective hearing, or minor orthopedic handicaps. Some may also have special cardiac conditions, be epileptic, or diabetic. For each classroom teacher special services are available to help her in meeting the unusual problems these children may present. Classroom teachers also have available to them advice and special techniques in assisting these pupils to become part of the regular classroom program and to overcome sensitivity to their disabilities.

Other atypical children are cared for in special classrooms. Sight conservation classes, classes for the blind, health conservation (cardiac classes), health conservation (lowered vitality) classes, and the like are provided by the Board of Education for pupils with more extreme handicaps. In addition, some physically handicapped are cared for in hospitals and convalescent homes known as **"400" Schools.** Arrangements can also be made for home instruction for those who are unable to attend classes.

Mentally retarded children are cared for in classes for **Children with Retarded Mental Development** (CRMD) and **Low Intelligent Quotient** classes (LIQ). Children in CRMD classes have IQ's between 50 and 75 on individual intelligence tests.

Children in LIQ classes have IQ scores between 40 and 50. CRMD classes in elementary schools care for children aged 6½ to 13. Elementary LIQ classes accept pupils from 7 to 16 years of age. These classes are established as part of the regular school plan in an attempt to avoid stigmatization of the child. Pupils attending these classes are accepted as part of the assembly and playground groups, as monitors, and as participants in other school activities.

Slow-learning children in grades 4, 5, and 6 may be placed in **Opportunity Classes.** These children generally have IQ's ranging from 75 to 90. The emotionally disturbed child may also be placed in this group. Small enrollment in an Opportunity Class generally permits the teacher to give the children more individualized instruction and pupils are transferred to their regular class groups as soon as they are able.

Emotionally unstable, antisocial children are treated and educated in about 44 **"600" Schools.** Distinctive symptomatic behavior must be exhibited before an application can be filed for entrance into a "600" school. The application is made by the assistant superintendent of the district after determining that the home school can no longer cope with a history of serious disruptive and aggressive behavior. The child has to be from 9 to 16 years of age with an IQ above 75. There are four major types of "600" schools: 14 day schools for boys and 1 for girls; remand center schools for children awaiting cases in the children's division of the Domestic Relations Court; psychiatric schools for severely disturbed children; and institutional schools for neglected, rejected, or delinquent children.

As additional services there are also available guidance teachers, guidance coordinators, court liaison teachers, school attendance officers, special mathematics teachers, remedial reading teachers, health counselors, special speech teachers, and the like.

Special Progress and **Special Progress Enrichment** are two junior high school programs offering specialized curriculum to pupils with above-average intelligence. Special Progress, in effect since 1913, compresses the standard three-year junior high school curriculum into two years. In 1958, Special Prog-

ress Enrichment was offered as an alternative to Special Progress Classes, which had come under criticism.

The Special Progress Enrichment Classes offer "greater opportunity for study in depth of literature and creative writing in language arts, and of the history, geography, and culture of our country and other countries."[3] It also permits greater work in such areas as foreign language, science, and mathematics. The program hopes to give junior high schools more opportunity to prepare pupils for the demanding studies they will undertake in high school. S. P. E. pupils are also encouraged to serve as office aides and student coaches and to participate on the school newspaper, magazine, and General Organization Councils.

Pupils enter Special Progress programs on the recommendation of their elementary school principal. If an elementary school does not feed into a junior high school that has the program, a pupil may be sent out of the regular feeder patterns. For the two-year program pupils must be at least 11 years 3 months of age at the beginning of their seventh school year. This essentially eliminates all pupils who have been accelerated at the elementary level. To remain in either program, pupils must maintain an over-all year-end average of 85 per cent. In the entire Junior High School Division there are about 26,000 pupils in one or the other S. P. programs, that is, approximately 13 per cent of the 194,000 junior high enrollment. Class size ranges from 7 to 49.

SUPPLEMENTARY AND COMPENSATORY SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

As a complex organization, the New York City school system has many departments and bureaus working on several problems, services, and programs. In addition to the major

---

[3] Board of Education, City of New York, *A Three-Year Program for S. P. Classes: First Year*, June, 1960, p. 1.

divisions (elementary, junior high, and senior high school) based on educational level there are special service bureaus such as the Bureau of Child Guidance, Bureau of Attendance, Bureau of Curriculum Research, Bureau of Community Education, and Education Information Services and Public Relations. Some of these cut across educational level divisions, some are bureaus within these divisions. Likewise, some separate programs may overlap with elements of others making it difficult to distinguish in some cases where one ends and another begins. The programs and the schools in which they are located constantly change, often due to expansion in the size of the pupil population with given characteristics or with actual shifts in school locale. These revisions make it difficult to be precise about how many schools have which programs at any given time. Thus, it is almost impossible to determine what any given pupil will receive or precisely how many pupils are helped by a particular program or service. This section attempts to give a broad overview of some of the services and programs implemented by the Board of Education and to indicate some areas of overlap in concentration as well as the scope of these efforts.

Equality in and quality of education require that schools provide services for children consistent with their determined needs. This implies that more services and a greater variety of services should be provided for those children who lack the cultural and educational advantages usually enjoyed by children from middle-income backgrounds. Additional services encompass not only those necessary to expand educational opportunities but also services that establish greater cooperation among the home, the school, and the community.

Special Service Schools. Just as the Board has recognized that some pupils have special needs that cannot be met by the regular educational program, it has also noted that there are some schools that have a high incidence of special needs requiring additional services. In the middle 1950's this official recognition obtained an institutional form in the creation of "Special Service" schools. The phrase, descriptive less of the

schools than of the compensatory efforts entailed, replaced earlier titles such as "difficult schools," "rotation schools," and "subject schools."

The School Board has stated explicitly[4] that most of the children attending Special Service schools have missed the out-of-school experiences which children from more favored areas have had—experiences that tend to develop concepts, abilities, and attitudes favorable to school success. Children in underprivileged areas generally have more limited vocabularies than children of equivalent ability from more privileged homes; their motivation for learning is further limited by the fact that expected learnings are often unreal or irrelevant to them; and often these expected learnings conflict with their out-of-school interests and goals. Economic and social conditions are difficult and family problems frequent—all perhaps having a damaging effect upon personalities and interfering with school learning and adjustment. Though it is recognized that the school *per se* cannot be expected to compensate fully for community and family difficulties interfering with the child's development, the Board nonetheless has accepted responsibility of dividing and allocating the educational dollar in order to attempt to compensate for some of these cultural and environmental inadequacies of children from the underprivileged neighborhoods of the city.

In the 1963–1964 school year about 420,000 pupils in approximately 225 elementary schools and 60 junior high schools, about 45 per cent, received over $49,000,000 worth of additional services—personnel, textbooks, and other instructional materials—in an effort to provide compensatory measures to overcome the learning disadvantages caused by social and economic deprivation. This figure represents an annual average expenditure of $117 *more* per pupil than the regular annual per-pupil allotment. These schools enjoyed a smaller average class size than regular schools and in addi-

---

[4] Board of Education, City of New York, *Toward Greater Opportunity:* A Progress Report from The Superintendent of Schools . . . Dealing with Implementation of Recommendations of the Commission on Integration, June, 1960, pp. 10–15.

tion received personnel assignments of teachers, assistants-to-principals, school secretaries, attendance officers, guidance counselors, psychologists, social workers, and school aides in more favorable proportions. These added services are available only to designated elementary and junior high schools.

Special Service schools are identified by a statistical index that includes measures of pupil mobility, per cent of pupils receiving free lunches, number of teachers on permanent license, per cent of non-English speaking pupils, and results from reading and IQ tests.

Special Service schools are of interest not only because they are allocated large shares of normal school resources but also because most of the other compensatory programs for culturally deprived are concentrated in these schools.

Supplementary and Compensatory Programs. The programs described here range from those that are comprehensive in goals, grade levels, and numbers of schools and pupils involved to those aimed at a small number of pupils in a few schools with specific educational problems. Variable emphasis, techniques, and assumptions are also discernable in the programs. Some emphasize supplementary basic education such as remedial training in basic skills. In some programs the implied or explicit goal is to dispose the pupil to accept educational stimuli by raising his aspirational level or overcoming specific psychological impediments to learning. Also intertwined in some of these undertakings is an effort to give the child certain developmental experiences within a framework of emotional support and cultural enrichment. Common to each of the programs is a set or a partial set of assumptions about the educational propensities of children from deprived homes in contrast to those deemed more favorable and purported to emerge from and be enhanced in middle-class homes and communities. In each case these programs seek to supplement regular school activities in some way to reduce the supposed differences between the deprived and the privileged home, peer group, and neighborhood.

After School Study Centers, begun in December, 1963, is the most extensive of the programs. During the 1964–1965 school year 217 elementary and 77 junior high schools were involved. An average of 70,000 elementary school pupils were reached each week. At the junior high school level about 26,000 to 27,000 pupils participated weekly. In addition, 37 academic and 22 vocational high schools offered after school programs. All pupils attending these schools were eligible for the program.

The goal of the program is to supplement the regular school curriculum in order to improve academic performance of children in disadvantaged neighborhoods. These schools are located in areas with large minority group populations. The programs offered are tailored to the needs of the neighborhood and vary, of course, with grade level. In the high schools, for example, capable pupils are offered special help so they may qualify for college. Actual or potential dropouts are stimulated to continue their education. All centers offer remedial help in subject areas and provide additional instruction in reading and mathematics. The remedial courses limit enrollment to 15. Aside from actual course work, library facilities are available and homework clinics are organized.

To overcome the stifling of educational motivation in disadvantaged children the Demonstration Guidance Project was begun in 1956 at Junior High School 43, Manhattan. Aimed at seventh-, eighth-, and ninth-grade pupils of the greatest academic potential with the intention to follow them through secondary education, the efforts utilized included "expanded guidance and counseling staffs, special instructional and remedial services, broader cultural experiences, increased contacts with parents, and clinical and financial assistance."[5] The success of this project prompted its expansion into the **Higher Horizons** program in 1959.

Higher Horizons, in contrast with the Demonstration Pro-

---

[5] Board of Education, City of New York, *Higher Horizons,* Progress Report, January, 1963, p. 3.

ject, includes all children in the grades affected. Its basic goal is derived from a major underlying principle of compensatory education: to offer disadvantaged children "the kind of education which, adjusted to their needs, will enable them to compete with other children on an equal basis, and to receive a fair share of the rewards of society."[6]

This represents a recognition that segments of the school population are working under serious handicaps stemming from problems originating in society, problems resulting from unfavorable social and economic conditions. Thus, Higher Horizons is directed at the total educational environment of culturally deprived pupils. The major emphasis is on providing an educational opportunity to meet realistically the problems of these pupils. As a matter of policy Higher Horizons includes all students in given grades of the selected schools. In 1959 the program was launched simultaneously in grade 3 of selected elementary schools and grade 7 of selected junior high schools. A grade was added each year until the program encompassed grades 3 through 10. By the school year 1962–1963, Higher Horizons' programs were in 52 elementary schools, 13 junior high schools, and 11 high schools, serving a total of 64,075 pupils.

Higher Horizons is a decentralized operation; the school principal and field superintendent determine specific school programs within the general framework of goals to be achieved. Thus the individual programs vary widely from school to school.

By directing attention to the pupils, their teachers, and their parents, the program seeks to develop pupil potential through identifying need, enhancing motivation, and providing cultural enrichment. An illustration of a specific effort is the provision of additional teachers and guidance counselors in the Higher Horizons schools to reduce class size and case loads. A major effort consists of training and retraining teachers by demonstration lessons, individual and group conferences, special exhibits, and a variety of other proce-

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

dures and techniques. Guidance functions, including individual pupil, teacher, and parent counseling has been the objective of Higher Horizons.[7] At many schools efforts are made to attach value and reward to academic success. Posted honor rolls, "Students of the Month," and other strategies of praise are employed. Greater time allotments are provided in curricular areas promoting verbal facility, particularly reading. Guidance and instructional programs are accompanied by enrichment endeavors—exposure to activities that broaden cultural horizons. The heart of this aspect of the program involves planned cultural experiences through trips to museums, parks, theaters, libraries, concerts, industrial plants, public agencies, etc. Parents' associations, workshops, cultural trips and the like are encouraged.

The program of **School Volunteers,** initiated as a pilot project in 1956 by the Public Education Association and incorporated into the New York City school system in 1962, is aimed at pupils who, either because of a deprived or foreign-language background, are handicapped in school achievement. The program, involving about 500 volunteers serving on a regular basis in 14 elementary schools, 3 junior high schools, and 1 senior high school, has very broad goals. It offers assistance to pupils who are having difficulty with their normal school work, with the major emphasis on reading. Yet it is concerned not only with developing skills needed for a fruitful education but also with giving a broader cultural experience to pupils. The program has even helped to clothe children from underprivileged families. The entire effort is underscored by a belief that "The volunteer may discover that a behavior problem is back of the reading problem. The children feel that someone cares about them, is interested in them, and is encouraging them to succeed."[8] That is, enrichment, emotional support, and the identification of psychologi-

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[8] Board of Education, City of New York, "School Volunteers," December, 1962, p. 2.

cal impediments to learning are all part of the school volunteer's work, in addition to aiding with skill improvement. Within the general School Volunteer Program another program developed, the Conversational English Program, which offers specific help to pupils who do not have a speaking command of the English language.

The program of the **All-Day Neighborhood Schools** operates in 14 elementary schools, each of which had been designated as a Special Service school; had requested inclusion in the program; and had been able to provide the necessary space requirements (three classrooms). The program employs a threefold approach in its attempt to help deprived children function in a school setting: "(1) work in curriculum and guidance during the school day in a team relationship with classroom teachers, with special emphasis on the implementation of a sound reading program on all grade levels; (2) a specialized group work program after school from 3–5 p.m., supporting the day school reading program by providing enriching experiences which give an opportunity for both emotional growth and further language development; (3) close cooperation with home, community and child serving agencies."[9] Approximately 4,900 pupils (70 per cent are Negro or Puerto Rican) participate in the regular school day program; 2,200 children of working mothers (90 per cent are Negro or Puerto Rican) are involved in the after-school club program.

Of a somewhat more concentrated effort and specific aim are the various special reading programs in the elementary schools. In addition to the School Volunteer reading help program cited earlier there are the Corrective Reading Program, the Reading Consultant Program, the Reading Clinic Program, and the Reading Improvement Program. Though the programs are not necessarily directed at socially and economically deprived groups, Special Service schools account

---

[9] Board of Education, City of New York, Division of Elementary Schools, *Handbook,* 1963–1964, p. 27.

for the bulk of the efforts and resources allocated to the programs. (Table 34)

The **Corrective Reading Program,** operating in about 285 elementary schools with approximately 270 special teachers, provides diagnostic and corrective service to retarded readers, special assistance to newly appointed teachers, and consultation services in preventing reading disabilities. Pupils selected for the program must have a minimum IQ of 75, be in grades 3 to 6, be retarded two years or more in reading achievement, and be free of serious physical or emotional disabilities. About three-quarters of the pupils serviced are in grades 3 and 4. In a recent year over 23,000 pupils received reading assistance in small groups (two additional hours a week) and over 3,600 classroom teachers were assisted by demonstrations of remedial techniques, diagnoses of reading difficulties, and the provision of special materials.

The **Reading Clinic Program** serves those children in grades 3 to 6 who have emotional problems judged to be disruptive of their reading progress. Generally they have not responded to the ordinary remedial efforts and perhaps not to a Corrective Reading Teacher. Its program is unique in providing for an integration of instructional and clinical services. In the instructional program children are seen in a small group twice a week for one hour each session; the aim is to make the child want to read and feel that he can. Conferences with classroom teachers are scheduled twice a month. Each child is seen by a psychologist who provides a diagnosis. In order to seek cooperation and to indicate parental responsibilities all parents are seen by a psychiatric social worker. Selected children and parents are seen for treatment, either individually or in groups. About 2,900 children from over 75 schools are involved in the program.

The **Reading Improvement Program** provides a reading improvement teacher who teaches a regularly scheduled reading class relieving the classroom teacher for reading preparation work. These special teachers also help train the classroom teachers in reading instruction. In a recent school year about 11,000 classes were taught by about 550 reading improvement teachers, relieving 8,500 classroom teachers for special preparation. About 380,000 pupils were involved.

The **Reading Consultant Program** provides resource persons to district superintendents to assist in the coordination and implementation of the various reading programs, including an in-service training program.

Team Teaching is defined by the Board as a pattern of staff utilization for the improvement of the quality and quantity of pupil learnings. A team consists of three or more teachers who have joint responsibility for the educational program of all children on the team, while each teacher remains directly responsible for the children of her assigned class. The program, introduced in the elementary schools in 1962, provides on one grade level for the pooling of talents and abilities of three to five teachers. Its aims are to improve the quality of the educational programs through cooperative planning and the use of special teachers, to provide for a more rapid orientation and growth for new teachers by working with more experienced staff, and to increase attention to the individual needs of children through flexible groupings of slow and fast learners. The 1964–1965 budget included a request for an additional expenditure of $7.00 per child for special books and equipment for pupils enrolled in the program at the elementary school level. In 1962 less than 20 per cent of the schools involved were in the Special Service category; in 1963 this increased to 41 per cent; and in 1964, 42 per cent of the schools in the program were those also providing special services.

In a pilot project involving six schools and about 150 students the Junior High School Division pioneered in introducing team teaching into the school system in 1959. By 1963 there were over 55 junior high schools conducting team teaching projects in social studies, language arts, and Career Guidance. More than 6,000 pupils and 30 teachers were participating by 1963 with the 130 Career Guidance teachers focusing on prevention of dropouts as well as motivating students toward a suitable high school curriculum.

To provide other additional services to pupils from culturally disadvantaged areas, the Board of Education organized a **New Summer Elementary School Program** in seven schools. Each

of the schools selected is, during the regular school year, a Special Service school. The program is available for kindergarten children and grades 2 to 6. The program aids pupils needing help with their school work with special emphasis on reading. While the major appropriations come from the Board of Education, the program also receives support in the provision of personnel from voluntary agencies. The program averaged between 1,400 to 1,500 pupils per day in all schools at all levels in the summer of 1964.

As in the case of the special reading programs, guidance programs in the elementary schools are not specifically directed at pupils from deprived areas, though over two-thirds of the resources for these programs are located in Special Service schools (Table 34). The **Early Identification and Prevention Program** tries to identify children in kindergarten through the third grade who have difficulties or potential difficulties in adjusting to school. The program provides a team of a guidance counselor, social worker, and psychologist with consultative help from a psychiatrist to identify the maladjusted and to develop programs providing support to these pupils in an attempt to inhibit the development of more serious problems.

Junior Guidance Classes Program organizes special classes supported by both educators and mental health consultants to handle pupils who have emotional problems so severe that they cannot be served in regular classes. A wide range of socially and emotionally maladjusted pupils are included in these classes, including those who are extremely disruptive, destructive, immature, withdrawn, and even some pupils with severe psychic disorders as diagnosed by clinicians. An attempt is made in some schools to establish separate classes for the "overt, aggressive children who were pre-suspension or suspension cases."[10] While such problems "come from all economic classes, the favored as well as the deprived,"[11] about 60 per cent of the 62 schools with such classes are also

---

[10] Board of Education, City of New York, Division of Elementary Schools, *Handbook*, 1963–1964, p. 112.

[11] Board of Education, City of New York, *The Junior Guidance Classes Program*, June 30, 1961, p. 1.

Special Service schools. In the school year 1962–1963, 217 teachers of Junior Guidance Classes, supported by additional staff, served approximately 1,700 pupils.

Two semi-autonomous undertakings—each requiring and obtaining the cooperation of the Board of Education—are aimed specifically at compensatory education for children from culturally deprived families and neighborhoods. An **Enrichment Program for Pre-School Children** and a companion program at the kindergarten level draws upon a considerable research literature[12] which shows that deficits in many cognitive processes, particularly language development, are related to the learning difficulties of underprivileged urban children. This particular program is conducted in six Special Service schools in Manhattan.

Mobilization for Youth, an independent corporation representing welfare, civic, and religious institutions on the Lower East Side of Manhattan, conducts a delinquency prevention program that engages in many school endeavors. Their educational program operates in 16 elementary schools (15 of which are Special Service schools), 5 junior high schools (4 are Special Service), 2 "600" schools, and 2 senior high schools. The aim is twofold: (1) to provide more instructional and pupil personnel services; and (2) to test and evaluate new ways of improving the education of slum pupils.[13] Mobilization has established a *Curriculum Center* where staff creates and disseminates curriculum ideas and materials for

---

[12] Deutsch, Martin, "Some Psycho-Social Aspects of Learning in the Disadvantaged," 1964. Multigraph. Deutsch, Martin, "The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition," a paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, April, 1964, Chicago, Ill.; and "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in *Education in Depressed Areas,* Passow, A. Harry, editor, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1963, pp. 163–179.

[13] Tannenbaum, Abraham J., "Mobilization For Youth in New York City," a paper based on a presentation at the Educational Conference on School Progress for Delinquency Prevention and Control held in Washington, D.C., on October 30 and 31, 1962, sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, p. 2.

experimental use. Curriculum specialists go into the local schools to implement the use of these materials. *Early Educational Intervention* programs, similar to preschool enrichment described above, have been established in 2 preschool, 20 kindergarten, and 20 first-grade classes. Several correctional programs deal with problems of reading retardation particularly with respect to early identification and intervention. A *"Homework Help"* program with a focus on reading skills uses high school pupils from low-income, minority group families to coach fourth and fifth graders after school.

Another program, not directly linked to reading, is the *"Second Chance" Guidance and Tutoring Program.* Guidance teachers work with dropouts and with teenagers in other parts of the Mobilization program helping them particularly in basic number and language skills. Finally in the elementary and junior high school program laboratory schools give preservice training to the teachers and are using experimental curriculum and materials.

To reach into the community the following programs are available: *School Community Relations* and *Small Group Program* are efforts to encourage teachers to visit the homes of their pupils. Also social workers serve as consultants to the teachers to provide more information on the culture of low-income families. An *In-Service Training Program* offers to teachers courses such as "The Lower East Side Community" and "The Negro in the United States." The *Parent Education Aide* orients newcomers to the community and helps these persons meet with school personnel.

The **Plan for More Effective Schools,** put into operation in 10 elementary schools in 1964–1965, represents a core portion of the Board's program for "quality integrated education." The design of the plan includes a collation of most of the compensatory efforts discussed above: "It includes pre-kindergarten education, the lengthening of the school day and week, lower class size, modern teaching methods, abundant supplies of up-to-date teaching materials, close liaison with colleges and universities, use of teacher specialists in such subjects as art and music, and programs in fostering im-

proved human relations."[14] It seeks additional support of psychologists and guidance counselors and the most skillful supervisors and teachers available. Volunteers were sought to fill these positions. Of the ten schools involved in these initial efforts eight are in areas of deprivation with Negro and Puerto Rican enrollments in excess of 85 per cent.[15] The program was also introduced in one Bronx school serving a predominantly white group of pupils (70 per cent) and another in Staten Island where Negro and Puerto Rican pupils constitute only 48 per cent of the pupil population.[16] The cost of implementing the program is approximately $3,800,000 or about $422 per year per pupil supplementary to current costs.

While special compensatory programs at the elementary school level are aimed primarily at the development of basic skills and the mediation of conditions which may interfere with that development, at the junior high and high school levels such programs are primarily directed at basic and occupational skill development and the retention in school of the potential dropout. Again, the target population may not be explicitly pupils from disadvantaged areas, but in program implementation it is these pupils who warrant and receive whatever benefits may be derived from the program's resource allocations.

The **Career Guidance** program, organized in 1958, has evolved into a highly specialized program for potential dropouts in their ninth year of school. Pupil selection for participation in the program is broadly based on the following criteria: (1) pupil is 15 years of age or over; (2) able to speak and understand the English language; (3) retarded in reading and other tool subjects; (4) has attended junior high

---

[14] Board of Education, City of New York, Press release N418-63/64, June 30, 1964, p. 11.

[15] One of these eight schools was not yet opened at the beginning of the school term though its organization, staffing, and pupil population were known; three additional ones were in annexes of existing schools.

[16] The program was established in annexes of existing schools.

school at least one year; and (5) desires to leave school when legally able. Both males and females are eligible. Formulated for the older junior high school pupil, the program is structured with specialized and intensive guidance, with a curriculum centered around the world of work, with the intention of motivating pupils to set higher educational goals for themselves. Under close supervision and in small classes (maximum register of 15) the 3 R's are taught on a highly individualized basis; the pupil is exposed to specially prepared experimental courses in social studies, mathematics, language arts, science, etc.; he has at least weekly meetings with a guidance counselor; and he is offered the opportunity for part-time job placement in the hope that in the work world he will discover the necessity of learning[17] (job placement personnel also seek full-time employment for pupils who drop out of school).

The program of Career Guidance classes has two primary objectives. First, those junior high school pupils who have not done well in school up to this point and who are merely marking time until they can leave are provided specialized guidance and training. This guidance and training, it is hoped, will demonstrate to the pupils that they do have the ability to continue their education successfully. Through emphasis on work the need for mastering basic skills is made apparent. Secondly, the program is teaching useful skills to pupils so that even if they do not go on with their education, they will still have sufficiently useful and marketable abilities to attain employment. Though these classes, often constituting a "school within a school" may sometimes serve as "holding companies" or "school-day custodial centers" for the difficult and aggressive child, several pupils do meet promotional requirements and go on to high school. Currently about 1,200 boys and 150 girls are served by the program in 90 classes located in 30 schools.

---

[17] Another objective of the job placement aspect is to provide the student an opportunity to earn some money. With over 90 per cent of the Career Guidance units in Special Service schools wages earned may be more than of token value.

Following five years of experimentation with a high school program to give potential dropouts orientation to work and basic skills, the **School to Employment Program** (STEP) was instituted. Sixteen schools now participate in its program of "individual guidance, proper curriculum, and a job."[18] Small classes of high school sophomores (20 per class) who are "reluctant learners, truants, misfits of various kinds"[19] are assigned to a teacher providing special curriculum materials related to basic skills and "the proper attitude toward work."[20] They also attend regular classes in the high school connected with their program. Afternoons they work at a neighborhood job obtained by the teacher and paid for by the employer.

The **Municipal Civil Service Cooperative Program** joined the city's cooperative education endeavors in 1961. By 1963, 37 schools were participating and approximately 660 juniors and seniors in high school were employed. In 1964 over 800 students participated in alternate weekly training on a municipal job and training in school. These student trainees work in municipal government offices as typists, clerks, junior draftsmen, key punch operators, lunchroom helpers, etc. Prevailing wages are paid and the students are encouraged to take regular civil service examinations at the end of the program.

Sixteen-year old pupils who wish to continue their education even though employed on a full-time basis may pursue a program leading to high school diplomas in the **Evening Schools (Project II).** A counselor is provided in each of the 11 evening high schools to aid the student worker in meeting school and work problems that arise. Pupil participants must take at least two subjects each term and attend regularly.

---

[18] Board of Education, City of New York, Division of High Schools, *Dropouts in the New York City High Schools,* January 31, 1964, p. 1. Mimeographed.

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

Job Education Project (Project III) is a one month pre-employment course for 16-year-olds followed by job placement and follow-up on the job. "It is intended for boys and girls who are alienated from school and whose employability is low."[21] Those who lose their jobs are required to return to school for further job placement or more schooling.

Operation Return, begun in 1962, is designed to bring pupils who have been out of school for more than six months back to high school provided they have the capacity and can be graduated before their twenty-first birthday. About 200 pupils are included in this program. There is one school for men and one school for women. Another program, the **Summer Evening High Schools,** tries to re-educate and retrain dropouts. It hopes not only to guide dropouts to complete high school but also to train adults in useful skills for the business world.

The **Pre-Employment Technical Program in Computer Technology** takes pupils who majored in technical courses, mathematics, and physics, and trains them in fundamentals of data processing. A panel of educators screens pupils for this program on the basis of their records. They are then given a comprehensive examination. The results of this examination are used to select the group who will receive the training. Begun in 1963, 24 pupils attend classes six hours daily for one school year. Another program, **Trade School Scholarship Program,** provides potential dropouts a scholarship to attend one of the private New York City trade schools. There are eight such scholarships, worth $1,000 per year, donated by eight private trade schools in New York City.

To encourage minority group and culturally deprived pupils to seek higher education, several programs have been launched in the last few years to make a college education more accessible. **Project Able,** begun in 1961, identifies pupils in the ninth grade who are "able" to go on to higher education

---

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

but for reasons of educational background and motivation would not qualify. These pupils are given extra guidance and counseling so that they may overcome these handicaps. The more promising of those selected are given even more intensive services, e.g., psychiatric help. Three schools have approximately 2,500 pupils in this program.

The **College Admissions Program** seeks seniors in Higher Horizons schools whose academic records "reflect effects of cultural deprivation but whose potential and commitment to further education is evidenced by interest and motivation as reported by school counselor."[22] The program operates in cooperation with College Admissions Center of the Association of College Admissions Counselors in order to seek release from normal entrance requirements. The 1964 pilot program has 76 seniors from 13 schools.

The **College Discovery Program,** also begun in 1964, seeks admission into community colleges for pupils whose high school records prohibit admission to the Municipal Colleges. It is hoped that after successfully completing a program in the community college, a student can move into a Municipal College to complete his work. This program has 500 pupils in it and has a $1,200,000 budget including Federal and State funds.

PROGRAMS FOR PUERTO RICANS

Puerto Rican pupils in the New York City school system present a special case for compensatory education. Arriving at a time when educational accomplishment is so closely related to success in the work world, Puerto Ricans cannot afford the luxury of slower assimilation into society that early migrants were permitted. The burden the Puerto Ricans place

---

[22] Board of Education, City of New York, *The Public Schools of New York City Staff Bulletin,* Supplement, "Programs for Potential and Actual Dropouts, Early School Leavers, Employed, Underemployed and Unemployed Youth and Adults (Facts and Figures)," April, 1964, p. 5.

upon the school because of their language difficulties and cultural differences is increased proportionately as the need for education continues to mount. The school, as a primary socializing agency, is forced to take up the slack and provide the bridge to the benefits possible in our society.

A high proportion of Puerto Rican pupils attend Special Service schools and thus have available to them the supplementary component services of these schools. In addition, as indicated above, these same schools also offer the lion's share of other compensatory programs aimed at the culturally deprived. Added to these measures special efforts are being made to bring to the Puerto Rican pupil the educational promise of the city's school system. These endeavors are generally aimed toward improving the English-language facility of the pupils and their parents; toward providing greater understanding of and motivation for the desirability of education; and toward a mutuality of respect for cultural differences.

In the 1963–1964 school year there were approximately 175,000 pupils of Puerto Rican background in the city's public schools, representing about 17 per cent of the total pupil register. Sixty-five per cent of these pupils were attending elementary schools, 169 of which contained more than 100 non-English speaking pupils. Over 20 per cent of the Puerto Rican pupils were enrolled in junior high schools, 32 of which had 10 per cent or more of their pupil register from Puerto Rican backgrounds. Puerto Ricans enrolled in high school, about 15 per cent of the total, were widely distributed among many schools.

As indicated in earlier reviews[23] a substantial number of these children leave the city and return to Puerto Rico and each year are replaced by about the same number of children coming from the island, thus necessitating continued programs in orientation and English. In 1963–1964 over half of

---

[23] Morrison, J. Cayce, *The Puerto Rican Study 1953–1957*. Board of Education, City of New York, 1958. Padilla, Ellen, *Up From Puerto Rico*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1958.

these pupils (51 per cent) at the elementary school level were in the process of learning English as compared with 25 per cent at the junior high school level. More than 23,000 Puerto Rican pupils (22 per cent of the total) were registered in widely distributed high schools in the city, but only about 300 of them received an academic diploma in 1963.

Since a working knowledge of English is prerequisite to learning in New York's schools, there is considerable emphasis on programs facilitating the acquisition of this skill. At the elementary school level in 1963–1964, there were 106 Spanish-speaking auxiliary teachers assigned into schools to assist the new arrivals to adjust to school as well as to help orient their parents to the school and other community agencies. Most of these "SAT's" are graduates of the University of Puerto Rico.

Also at the elementary level are more than 80 Non-English Coordinators, who are special teachers directly involved in the schools in screening, placing, and testing, and in the development of special materials for pupils and teachers. An additional 30 Non-English Teachers work in small classes of pupils who are learning English as a second language. Paralleling the functions of the Non-English Coordinators in elementary schools are 32 coordinators at the junior high school level.

Under a program entitled **Operation Understanding** 14 elementary school teachers are sent to Puerto Rico for a year while 14 island teachers come to work in the New York schools. Approximately 50 principals who have schools with large numbers of Puerto Rican pupils visit Puerto Rico for a week in order to gain first-hand knowledge and insight on the development of programs of education and adjustment.

Other efforts aimed at the Puerto Rican pupil have also been implemented: specially prepared teaching guides, in-service training courses, Spanish language tests, after-school Spanish clubs, mathematics and science courses taught in both languages, and other bilingual curriculum materials. The Bureau of Attendance has a specialized service for Puerto Rican absentees. It utilizes bilingual and bicultural attendance personnel. The aim of using bilingual and bicul-

tural personnel is to facilitate liaison with the parents of Puerto Rican students to orient them to their responsibilities to their children and the demands of the school system.

Efforts to reach the Puerto Rican parents include bilingual communications from the school, mothers clubs and workshops, teachers' home visits.

Auxiliary programs, not directly emerging from the Board of Education, receive encouragement and support from the Board. For example, the Puerto Rican Forum, an organization concerned with the problems of Puerto Ricans in the United States, sponsors a program called **ASPIRA.** This agency hopes to create an esprit among Puerto Rican pupils, to raise their occupational aspirations, and to give them a sense of pride in their culture. One of its goals is to keep the Puerto Rican community intact so that pressure can be used to gain advantages for Puerto Ricans in New York City. ASPIRA sponsors 12 clubs in high schools, provides lectures for Puerto Rican pupils given by successful Puerto Rican professionals, and has developed a body of volunteers called "Las Madrinas (Godmothers) de ASPIRA" who visit the homes of Puerto Rican pupils to help them and their parents overcome problems faced in the school system.

Special problems of the Puerto Rican school children are studied by private agencies with the cooperation of the Board. The Public Education Association's study of the needs of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils in the city schools, and the Puerto Rican Study of 1953–1957[24] are examples.

---

[24] Public Education Association, *The Status of the Public Education of Negro and Puerto Rican Children in New York City,* 1954. Morrison, J. Cayce, *op. cit.*

4 STAFFING THE SCHOOLS

There are almost 47,000 teachers in the New York City school system serving in classrooms, holding administrative positions such as principalships, providing special services such as guidance, and directing, administrating, and serving in the various bureaus and offices of the Board of Education. This chapter will discuss the recruitment, assignment, transfer, promotion, and in-service training programs and policies for elementary and junior high school divisions. This will give a general picture of how personnel policy is purported to operate in these divisions. Those in the school system are familiar with many exceptions to these policies and the dynamic nature of the school system itself tends to alter these programs almost faster than they can be reported.

RECRUITMENT OF NEW TEACHERS

Even though other areas make some contribution, the vast majority of public school teachers comes from the city colleges of New York.[1] There has long been a close working re-

[1] Rabinowitz, W., and K. Crawford, "A Study of Teachers' Careers," *The School Review*, vol. 68, Summer, 1961, p. 38. These authors estimate that 60 per cent of the city's public school teachers come from the four colleges of City University (Brooklyn, City, Hunter, and Queens) and that most of the remaining come from other colleges and universities in the area.

lationship between the local colleges and the Board of Education, with teacher training programs in the colleges being directed largely toward future assignment in the city public schools. These schools serve as practice teaching sites for city colleges; and college faculty members often have had earlier positions in the lower system. Further, since the colleges are free to city residents, they tend to be filled with local residents—students who were schooled in the city, whose family, friendship, and social ties are there. Finally, since the Board of Education requires all teachers to pass examinations administered by its Board of Examiners, it is much easier for local persons to take these examinations without travel expense and inconvenience.[2] One may assume that the local teaching institutions are more attuned to the examinations and, therefore, are better able to prepare their students for these examinations.

New York City does not have any reciprocal agreements with other states or licensing agencies. Consequently, any "outsider" wishing to teach in the city must meet the testing standards established by the local Board. Provisions are made, however, for experience, level of education, and specialization for incoming teachers from other states. These are considered in placement and starting salary once the licensing examinations have been passed.

Thirty years ago because job scarcity led teachers to retain their positions once they were employed and because enrollment increments were not great, recruitment was hardly a problem. For a span of the depression decade, at least, few additions were made to the teaching staff. Today between 3,000 and 5,000 new teachers must be recruited each year to enlarge the staff and to replace teachers who resign. The combination of increased enrollments and a Board policy of gradual reduction in class size has resulted in a constant effort to recruit new teachers.

In 1950–1951 there were 15,265 regular elementary grade classes, enrolling 481,992 pupils in classrooms averaging

---

[2] See discussion of a new recruitment center in Washington, D.C., p. 53.

31.6 pupils. A decade later there were 15,965 classes, averaging 30.1 pupils with a total register of 480,721. By 1962–1963, 488,574 pupils were enrolled in 16,112 classes, in rooms averaging 30.3 pupils. Authorized teaching positions for these three periods—1950, 1960, 1962—numbered 18,922, 21,154, and 22,479, respectively; licensed teachers in these positions amounted to 18,758, 20,328, and 20,188. At the beginning of the postwar decade, therefore, 99 per cent of authorized teaching positions were filled by regularly licensed teachers in the elementary schools; this dropped to 96 per cent in 1960 and to 90 per cent by 1962–1963.

At the junior high school level there were 2,917 regular classes in 1950–1951, 5,901 a decade later, and 6,176 in 1962–1963. Average class size amounted to 32, 30.8, and 31 in 1950, 1960, and 1962, respectively. At the beginning of the last decade 94.3 per cent of the authorized teaching positions were filled by regularly licensed teachers. By 1960 approximately 70 per cent of these positions were occupied by licensed teachers and by 1962 the figure increased slightly to 72 per cent.

The changing ethnic composition of the school population (see Chapter 2), correlative with ecological shifts and increases in areas of "cultural deprivation," have created special teacher recruitment and assignment problems. In response to growing concern with these questions, the Superintendent of Schools created a Committee on Teacher Recruitment in the spring of 1955. The following November the Board of Education established an Office of Teacher Recruitment.

The Office of Teacher Recruitment has several mimeographed and printed brochures that it distributes to prospective teachers. Included in these brochures is a great deal of information regarding the opportunities for teaching and promotion in the New York school system, the cultural life of New York City, etc., as well as answers to probable queries of the prospective teachers. The Office also sponsors Future Teacher Clubs in almost all the city junior high schools to encourage pupils to become teachers.

On the college level, the Office of Teacher Recruitment has the Auxiliary Recruiter Program. Since the fall of 1963, about

150 volunteers who are outstanding teachers and supervisors, recommended by their principals and/or their district superintendents, have been accompanying members of that office in visits to local colleges. They address students in teacher-training programs, participate in radio programs, and speak to Future Teacher Clubs in the secondary schools. Auxiliary recruiters receive briefings from the Office of Teacher Recruitment for orientation and are excused from their regular teaching assignments on the days they participate in the program.

The Office of Teacher Recruitment has recently begun to widen its area of activity. Members of its staff have taken extended trips into the northeastern United States, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Tennessee to tell about the opportunities available in New York City. A fundamental policy change was made in November, 1963, when for the first time the Board of Examiners conducted examinations outside the city. The examination center in Washington, D. C., had a very specialized target, Negro students from southern colleges. This particular examination site was chosen because it was discovered that New York City's colleges did not have a large number of Negro students upon which to draw for public school teaching.[3]

The problems of teacher recruitment stemming from the increasing population of culturally deprived pupils from Negro and Puerto Rican families are being met by specialized training programs in some of the local colleges. Two such projects, sponsored by departments of education in Queens College and Hunter College, are discussed here.

The BRIDGE Project: Queens College. The BRIDGE Project

---

[3] As a component part of its integration efforts the Board of Education actively seeks to enlarge the number of Negro and Puerto Rican teachers and supervisors. An apparent conflict in the assignment of these teachers has emerged: On the one hand, there is an assumption that Negro and Puerto Rican pupils may be more responsive to teachers from similar racial and social background; on the other hand, the concentration of minority group teachers in classes composed largely of minority group pupils raises negative charges of discriminatory assignment.

(Building Resources for Instruction of Disadvantaged Groups in Education) started in February, 1961, and terminated in January, 1965. The program had two major activities: the Demonstration Project at Junior High School 8 in South Jamaica (Queens) and the BRIDGE Group Study. The combined activities had two goals that were intended to encourage teachers to seek assignments with deprived children: (1) to introduce middle-class teachers to minority group youngsters from lower socioeconomic levels; and (2) to obtain from participating college students information on how their contacts with such pupils affects their future teaching plans. By developing materials directly related to working with culturally deprived pupils, the college staff hoped to be able to influence new teachers to accept teaching positions in difficult schools, fully cognizant of both the advantages and disadvantages.

Three newly assigned teachers were involved in the Demonstration Project. Under the provisions of the project plan, an incoming teacher was given a seventh-grade class as a home room and was expected to continue with the class for three years. One class contained pupils who scored below the fourth-grade level on the reading examination given to sixth-graders. The other two classes had pupils assigned at random with no regard to ability or achievement. The teachers had teaching assignments in their major academic areas.

The major emphasis of this part of BRIDGE was to acquire careful records of the teachers' experiences and to use these experiences in training others to teach in difficult schools. The teachers submitted their written observations to the college committee, and these materials were incorporated into mimeographed texts for use in education courses at Queens College. The use of actual experiences presented in the words of recent graduates was seen as a way to underscore the impact on the new teachers of the initial and continuing contact with culturally deprived children. Such information, it was hoped, would give a greater understanding to students training for teaching in the city schools. Close coordination between the teachers and the college was maintained in order to give guidance and help to the teachers. Within the school a coordinator of instruction worked with the teachers

and the college committee. A psychologist trained in testing was also assigned to the project.

The other major activity was the BRIDGE Group Study, an after school project. Beginning in 1961 approximately 50 Queens College students, as a part of an educational psychology class, were required to work in selected Special Service junior high schools throughout the city. These students led small groups of pupil volunteers in activities such as science, reading, drama, typing, and foreign language clubs. The intent, rather than tutorial, was to develop an enriched educational program in an informal setting. As in the Demonstration Project reports of the student experiences were put into mimeographed form for classroom use at Queens College. The short thumbnail sketches of the groups, the student's reactions, the pupil's reactions, and other general observations were intended to affect student attitudes toward teaching disadvantaged children. In the three years of its operation, the BRIDGE Group Study gave about 170 college students an opportunity to work with culturally deprived children. This project was recently curtailed because of the introduction into these schools of the After School Study Centers by the Board of Education. Since the clients of these two efforts would be approximately the same, the Queens College project was discontinued.

The net impact of the BRIDGE program in stimulating more teachers to seek assignments in Special Service schools is being evaluated. It has been reported tentatively that these efforts are attracting more new teachers into such schools. The experience in the BRIDGE Group Study has also helped some student teachers to evaluate realistically their capabilities and preparedness to handle such pupils.[4]

Project 120: Hunter College. Project 120 was developed by the Department of Education at Hunter College to deal specifi-

---

[4] A report fully describing the project as well as an evaluation of it was received too late for inclusion here. See Gertrude L. Downing *et al.*, *The Preparation of Teachers for Schools in Culturally Deprived Neighborhoods* (*The Bridge Project*), Queens College, The City University of New York, Flushing, New York, 1965. Processed.

cally with the program of staffing junior high schools in culturally deprived neighborhoods. The aim of the program is to provide first-hand knowledge to students about teaching in Special Service schools. The project hopes to overcome adverse attitudes and publicity that has made new teachers reluctant to accept such positions. Furthermore, the Department of Education realizes that even if new teachers would prefer assignment to a more normal school, current Board of Education personnel policies do assign new teachers to difficult schools, where the need is greatest. Consequently new teachers who have not received training for these schools must teach in them nonetheless.

Since the fall of 1961 a group of volunteers in the regular education program has received student teaching experience in selected Special Service junior high schools. Those who select the program are given special training, including orientation to the differences between the middle-class teacher and the lower-class pupils, the unique disciplinary problems, and problems of ignorance and bias fostered by negative information and publicity. To these ends, Hunter College provides a team approach to supervision and guidance for the teachers and pupils in the program, bringing in auxiliary specialists such as social workers, youth workers from the Police Department, and sociologists. Since the junior high school administration and the staff know that the student-teachers may be their colleagues the next term, close supervision and a great degree of cooperation is probable.

In the first three semesters of the project, 19 of the 24 teachers have elected to stay in these schools. There is no penalty for those who decide not to remain. The real benefit, according to one of the Project 120 staff members, is that those teachers who take part in the training and elect these schools have a greater esprit than those who must take such assignments without special training and contrary to their preference. The project thus seeks to create a core of dedicated teachers who will accept the challenges of difficult schools and will continue to serve in these schools, thereby reducing the problems that result from a highly transient staff.

INITIAL ASSIGNMENT

A major determinant of teacher assignment in New York City is teacher classification, which in turn is based upon examinations. There are two types of teachers in the system —those who are regularly licensed and those who are certified as substitutes; with requirements for substitute tests less stringent than those for regular tests.[5] In order to qualify for licensing or certification examinations, a prospective teacher must meet established minimum educational requirements, which vary with the type of examination to be taken, subject matter specialty, and grade level. While the basic entrance requirements for teaching in an elementary school are a more or less standard education major from an accredited college, if a teacher wishes to receive a license in social studies for junior high school or move into supervision, more training on the graduate level may be prescribed. For elementary teaching a baccalaureate degree from an accredited college is required, with course distribution in the field of education and certain allied fields such as child development, guidance, or child psychology. The requirements are specific but not rigid. For example, in lieu of practice teaching, actual teaching experience may be offered. Further, the requirements and regulations are subject to frequent review and revision. The following is a broad picture of how new assignments are made of regularly licensed and substitute teachers to New York elementary schools.

The Board of Examiners conducts periodic license examinations for regularly licensed teachers at the request of the Superintendent of Schools and at specific times of the year.

---

[5] The majority of new teachers entering the school system at the elementary level have a regular license. In contrast, the majority entering at the secondary level have a substitute license. Griffiths, D. E., and others, *Teacher Mobility in New York City*, A Study of the Recruitment, Selection, Appointment, and Promotion of Teachers in the New York City Public Schools. New York University, School of Education, 1963, Chapter III. Processed. See also Board of Education, City of New York, Board of Examiners, *A Review of the New York University Study* "Teacher Mobility in New York City," 1964. Mimeographed.

The results of these examinations are used to promulgate lists of eligible licensed teachers in the specialty for which the examination was given. The lists for two specialties, Common Branch and Early Childhood Education, are used to meet the staffing needs of elementary schools. A Common Branch license is for grades 1 to 6 and Early Childhood Education license is for grades K to 2.

Both the appointment of newly licensed teachers to the elementary schools and reassignment or transfer of regularly licensed teachers already holding appointments are organized to contribute to the goal of giving each school its proportionate share of all the regularly licensed elementary teachers active in the school system. Since 1954, the Board of Education has utilized an index of school personnel to place teachers. The school personnel index is computed for the city as a whole and for each school; it is the proportion of authorized positions that are filled by regularly licensed teachers. For September, 1964, the city-wide index was 69 per cent. Priority for appointments of regularly licensed teachers is given to schools whose index is below the city-wide index.

Schools below index are open first to transfers by regularly licensed teachers already holding appointments. Remaining positions in these schools are filled to the extent necessary to bring each school up to the city-wide index by the following procedure. The Bureau of Personnel proceeds through the list of eligibles, always considering them by rank on the license examination. After transfers the first to be placed are mutual choices, cases where a principal has requested an eligible, who has also requested assignment to that school. Rank order of examination score is followed if there are more mutual requests for the school than the index allows. Once appointments by mutual preferences have been made, the remaining positions in schools below the city-wide index are available for assignment of eligibles on the basis of their own requests, in accordance with rank order of the eligible. Where an eligible requests an available position the assignment is made as requested by the teacher. Where the requested position is not open, that is, when the school has enough positions filled to bring it up to index, the eligible is

assigned to another school in the same borough—or the closest to the eligible's place of residence. When all schools in a borough have been brought up to index, no more teachers may be assigned to that borough until the needs of the other boroughs have been met. Since there are always more openings than eligibles, no preferences for any given borough are filled below the borough cut-off point.[6] After borough openings are filled the remaining eligibles are assigned to fill the positions according to the following general rules.

First, Richmond is treated separately, and its positions are generally filled by persons living there. For the other four boroughs, assignments are made "as conveniently as possible to maximize acceptance." No teacher is given an appointment that is more than an hour and a half travel time from his home. If there are eligibles available who cannot "conveniently" be assigned to distant schools that are still below index, they are assigned to Special Service schools near their homes. Special Service schools are subject to this saturation of assignments, even though they may be at or above index, because they are likely to have a disproportionately high rate of declinations.

There are two clearly stated exceptions to the general rules of assignment as outlined. Regardless of index or borough cut-off point, a principal of a Special Service school may be assured that he will be assigned any eligible he requests who chooses his school if the eligible meets either one of two qualifications: (1) he was a regular substitute in that school during the February-to-June term preceding the September an assignment begins, or (2) he served as a student teacher in that school during the school year preceding the September the assignment begins.

Since 1954, the city colleges have altered the student teach-

---

[6] The borough cut-off point is established in the following way: After all positions are filled in each borough necessary to bring the schools in that borough up to the city index, the examination mark of the last person assigned on the current eligibility list is used as the borough cut-off point, stopping all further appointments in that borough until all schools in the city have been brought up to index.

ing program. Prior to that date student teachers did not practice in difficult schools. Now students receive two teaching experiences; half their student teaching time is spent in a school with culturally deprived pupils and half in other schools. Under these conditions students learn first-hand the problems and challenges of each type of school. The response to the opportunities in culturally deprived schools has been growing; in the past four to five years 35 to 40 per cent of the mutual requests have been for Special Service schools.

The appointments to assignments made generally in accordance with the procedures outlined above may be accepted or declined. When an eligible declines an assignment the declination must be accompanied by a written explanation. The explanation is then considered on its merits. If the reasons for declination are acceptable, the eligible is given another assignment. An eligible who has declined an appointment and whose reasons for declining are judged unacceptable may still seek employment in the school system as a regular substitute or a per diem substitute.[7] His name, however, will be placed at the bottom of the list of those being assigned as regular substitutes.

Assignment of regular substitutes was until recently a matter for agreement between a principal and anyone who had passed the substitute examination and sought appointment in a particular school.[8] The Bureau of Personnel made appointments of regular substitutes as recommended by the principals. The contract between the United Federation of Teachers and the Board of Education changed this method as

---

[7] A per diem substitute teaches in various schools on a daily basis. A regular substitute is appointed to a school on a yearly basis and serves in school in the same way as a regularly licensed teacher except he does not join the retirement program, cannot move above the sixth step of the 14-step pay scale, and cannot secure tenure. A regularly licensed teacher receives retirement program benefits and, after three consecutive years of acceptable teaching, is given tenure. In the case of substitute teachers who secure a regular license in the course of their work in the system, substitute service for two or more years may be offered as two-thirds of the three-year probationary period prior to tenure.

[8] Substitute examinations are conducted on a continuous basis with applications accepted at all times.

of February, 1962, in junior and senior high schools and as of September, 1964, in elementary schools. Under the provisions of the union contract assignment of regular substitutes is now under the supervision of the Bureau of Personnel. Each year a list of those who have passed the substitute examination is promulgated. Unlike other examinations no mark is reported and consequently the list is arranged alphabetically. There is no way to differentiate one substitute from another. Each certified substitute may then register, that is, declare his availability for the following year. As in the case of regular licensed assignments, the Bureau of Personnel lists the names by borough. Assignments are made by borough on a somewhat chance basis. Cards listing the names of registered substitutes are drawn at random. The Bureau of Personnel then compares the address of the applicant and the openings within the borough. The primary consideration is the need of the schools and following that, the residential proximity of available teachers. Once the borough of residence is completely staffed, regular substitutes receive assignments in other boroughs. There are cases where the rule is not strictly followed. For example, if a teacher lived near the Brooklyn-Queens boundary line but in Queens, a nearby Brooklyn school would be a more appropriate assignment than one far across Queens. Members of the Bureau of Personnel appear alert to the needs of the teachers and take pride in the amount of individual attention they give each case.

The Bureau also tries to observe the hour and a half journey to work as the maximum required of substitutes. A longer journey to work can be a legitimate reason for declining an assignment. The Bureau of Personnel also gives especially convenient assignments for hardship cases, for example, a teacher who has to care for a sick relative. Where such exceptions are requested, the teacher must supply a statement from a doctor or other supporting evidence. The penalty for an unacceptable declination is removal from the list. A person who declines assignments as a regular substitute can still seek employment on a per diem basis and may ask to be placed on the regular list the following year.

TRANSFERS

There are many reasons for reassigning a regularly licensed teacher to another school. For example, declining population in one school area may create an excess of teachers in that area. The closing of one school and the opening of another also may require shifts in assignment for teaching staffs. In this section we discuss primarily transfer requests that result in a vacancy at the school of origination and the removal of a vacancy at the school of destination.

Prior to the 1963 United Federation of Teachers' contract, regularly licensed teachers transferred from one school to another through a series of decentralized informal channels. Since there was no official central register of openings of types of licenses needed for vacant positions, teachers seeking a transfer moved about talking to other staff members. Under this system there was a great deal of informal communication among teachers, principals, and superintendents. A person familiar with this old system suggested that monthly meetings of principals and superintendents sometimes served as exchanges of information on needs and openings. A teacher who sought transfer needed four signatures: the principal of the school from which the teacher sought the release, the district superintendent, the principal to which the teacher wished to be transferred, and that district's superintendent. None of these signatures was automatic and failure to get any one prevented the transfer. The Bureau of Personnel had final decision over transfers. As already pointed out, after the adoption of the School Personnel Index in 1954 transfers would not generally be approved to schools above index.

Under the 1963 agreement with the United Federation of Teachers the transfer policy became more formal and more centralized in the Bureau of Personnel.[9] A list is made avail-

---

[9] United Federation of Teachers, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, *Agreement Between the Board of Education of the City of New York and the United Federation of Teachers, Local 2, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO Covering Classroom Teachers,* July 1, 1963–June 30, 1965, New York, n.d.

able to all persons in the school system of the vacancies for the following year. A teacher desiring transfer initiates action by requesting assignment to a particular vacancy or a ranked list of preferences, up to six in number. Whether that request will be honored by the Bureau of Personnel depends, in part, on the School Personnel Index and in part on the teacher's eligibility for release from the school where he is already assigned. Potential transfers must have a minimum of three years of service on a regular license. Each school prepares a Transfer List including all eligible teachers who are requesting transfer ranked according to seniority.[10] If two teachers having the same amount of seniority request transfer, the amount of time on a regular appointment and scores on the eligibility list may be decisive in the selection process.

The Bureau of Personnel in agreement with the United Federation of Teachers limits the number of transfers from any given school. In schools with less than 20 regularly licensed teachers one transfer is permitted; where there are 21 to 39 regularly licensed teachers two transfers are allowed; in larger schools the number of transfers cannot exceed 5 per cent of the regularly licensed staff. Teachers who are accepted as transfers are generally assigned to their choice among the vacancies, for relatively few transfers actually take place every year.

As in every other area of personnel policy there are exceptions. For example, teachers who wish to be transferred into Special Service schools will be given special consideration and the requirements may be waived. Or if the teacher is a hardship case, the rules can be circumvented. Since this is a new policy, its effectiveness cannot be judged until it has been in operation for some time. Both the Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers realize that the policy may need revision and further negotiations appear probable.

---

[10] Seniority is based upon the number of years served in the school including regular substitute service. Lengthy military service and service in "newly organized schools" are also included in determining seniority.

ADVANCEMENT: PROMOTION AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING

There are two major types of promotion within the school system: promotions to academic appointments and promotions to administrative appointments. For example, a teacher may seek to be promoted from a regularly licensed Common Branch teacher to a position as a junior guidance counselor, or on the junior high school level from a license in social science to a chairman of a social science department. Or a teacher may also seek to move from the classroom to become an assistant principal, then a principal. It is possible to pursue a career in the school system combining academic and administrative assignments. Another possibility is assignment to the Board of Education itself. Teachers are usually appointed to the Board to work on a particular project or in a particular Bureau. Positions at the Board are not obtained through special examination but by appointment. Board positions, however, are available only to those who have obtained regular licenses. Selections for these positions are made on the recommendation of someone on the project or in the Bureau who knows the teachers. Appointments to the Board are temporary. A teacher maintains status in the school of most recent service and accrues seniority in that school. Service at the Board continues for the duration of the project or until either party wishes to make a change. The Board discourages frequent movements between a school and the Board, since this requires personnel adjustments in the school from which the teacher has been released.

Practically all promotions are based upon licensed examination given under the supervision of the Board of Examiners. There are over 1,000 licensed positions in the New York City school system and a teacher may hold more than one license at a time. A teacher with multiple licenses has more flexibility in finding a school in which to teach. Eligibility for taking an examination varies with each specialty but usually includes some combination of length of service and specialized training. The training required may be available through in-service training courses or in an accredited college or university. If a teacher satisfies the requirements and passes the examination,

his name is put on a list promulgated by the Board of Examiners in the same way as is described for initial assignments. Actual assignment, and in this case promotion, also follows the same general pattern. The needs of the schools and the number of persons seeking appointments in their new license are matched, taking into account such things as school-residence propinquity, rank-order on examinations, and teacher's and principal's requests. For some highly specialized areas where the number of licenses is small, like health conservation, assignments may be made on the basis of more informal considerations than is possible where eligibility lists number in the hundreds and even thousands.

Every regular teacher receives periodic salary increments that are a reflection of successful service and do not necessarily indicate any change in position or rank. To qualify for salary increments after a certain step, a teacher must acquire supplementary training from in-service courses. These courses are not acceptable as graduate credits and therefore cannot be used to qualify for a license that requires graduate study in a college. The Board of Education through the Bureau of In-Service Training offers an extensive program of classes conducted by school system personnel and by outside agencies and institutions.

The Bureau of In-Service Training is essentially a clearing house. It brings together those who have special skills and teachers who desire more training in these skills. Of special interest are the large number of courses dealing with racial and ethnic problems. With the growing concern over the problems of the culturally deprived, the increasing proportion of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils in the school population, and the general emphasis on integration, the Bureau of In-Service Training has been offering a wider range of courses dealing specifically with these problems. The major responsibility for staffing these courses has fallen to the Human Relations Unit of the Board of Education. In particular, the Human Relations Unit has been giving courses aimed at overcoming racial stereotypes, bias, and ignorance. The need to re-educate teachers so they can help promote better understanding among the various racial and ethnic groups is based

on the recognition that many of these teachers have come through the same segregated schools as they are teaching in.

Until September, 1961, the Bureau of Community Relations was primarily responsible for work in this area. Since that time a more intensive program by the Human Relations Unit has been developed to bring the teachers closer to the communities they service. To meet problems occasioned by the rapidly changing ethnic and racial balance in the schools, the in-service courses have focused upon such concerns as the self-image of the Negro child, the special problems of Puerto Rican children learning about American life, and the culture of the lower socioeconomic groups in American society.[11]

The Professional Promotional Seminars, organized in February, 1964, give special preparation prior to the examination for the assistant principal license in elementary schools. The course meets twice a week and runs for three semesters just prior to the scheduled examinations. While they are open to all eligible teachers the seminars were organized especially in hopes of encouraging minority group members to prepare for this examination. An enrollment of about 200 was originally anticipated. Almost 1,800 teachers, of whom approximately 450 are Negroes or Puerto Ricans, registered for the seminars. In the entire school system there are about 3,700 Negro and Puerto Rican teachers; thus about one in eight is attending Professional Promotional Seminars. By contrast only one of every 34 other teachers is participating.

CONCLUSION

As suggested in the introduction there are many exceptions to and informal changes in the official policies described here. Furthermore, the programs themselves undergo considerable change, even over short periods of time.

---

[11] The Unit also develops and administers similarly oriented programs, such as luncheon discussions, that do not carry in-service credit.

In the official policies, at least, every effort is made to provide those schools most in need of the best teaching a priority in obtaining it. On the assumption that Special Service schools qualify as schools most in need and that the designation of teachers on permanent license indicates the best in teaching, the data provided in Tables 25, 32, and 43 suggest a basis for evaluation of policy implementation.

The data show that less than one-fourth of the Special Service schools at the elementary level had as many as 65 per cent of its teaching staffs on permanent license in contrast with over two-thirds of the regular schools. Over 55 per cent of these Special Service schools were operating with a personnel index below the city average in contrast with only 30 per cent in the other schools. At the junior high school level only 2 per cent of the Special Service schools had as many as 65 per cent of its teachers on permanent license as compared with 34 per cent in the non-Special Service schools.

However, these data include a history of personnel assignment policies that were not always explicitly designed to favor the most needy schools. Changes that take place in these proportions over the ensuing years will bear observation.

5 ETHNIC IMBALANCE *and* REMEDIAL DEVICES

INTRODUCTION

As described in Chapter 2 rapid demographic changes have altered the size, geographic distribution, and ethnic composition of the city's public school population and also have contributed heavily to the spread of a group of interrelated problems faced by the public school system. The continuing increases in the over-all number of public school enrollments together with changes in the density of student population in various parts of the city and delays in the construction of new schools have led to serious overcrowding in some areas while, at least temporarily, schools are underutilized at other locations. Overcrowding, in turn, has tended to encourage larger class size in some schools at a time when efforts were being made to reduce the average number in a class, and in a substantial number of schools overcrowding led to the introduction of "double sessions" and in many cases to "short time" instruction schedules as well.

Other demographic and ecological factors in combination have resulted in a rapid increase in the number of schools with a heavy concentration of Negro and Puerto Rican students, while a substantial number of other schools enroll very few children from these minority groups—a situation commonly referred to as *de facto* segregation. An important factor has been the rising enrollment of Puerto Rican and Negro students in the public schools during a period when—as a

consequence of out-migration and increased attendance in private and parochial schools—the number of white pupils on public school registers was declining. However, ethnic imbalance in the public schools results primarily from the prevailing patterns of residential segregation, which involve major proportions of the city's Negro and Puerto Rican residents.

At least since the middle of the 1950's the Board of Education has been formally committed to a policy of actively promoting racial and ethnic integration of the public schools of New York City. Despite the existence of a large fund of good will on the part of responsible public officials and a climate of opinion generally sympathetic to this policy, from the outset it has been apparent that the possibilities for substantial progress toward integration are drastically limited as long as the patterns of residential concentration of these ethnic minorities persist. As early as October, 1954, the President of the Board of Education noted that "All of the attempts of the Board . . . artificially to integrate the schools by adjusting district lines end up as puny efforts in the face of this pattern of residential segregation. Unless, and until, these social attitudes are changed, the integrated school population, which should be our goal, . . . will remain impossible."[1] About ten years later a statement by the Board reflected substantially the same conclusion: "De facto segregation in housing exists on such a wide scale that the Board of Education could not possibly produce racial balance in all schools without wholesale shifts of school populations."[2]

An important facet of the difficulty is rooted, of course, in the fact that the most practicable and generally most desirable organization of school attendance is along neighborhood lines, at least for children in the lower elementary grades. It is reasonable to assume, moreover, that the factors underlying the long-established tradition of the neighborhood elementary

---

[1] Quoted in Board of Education, City of New York, *Toward Greater Opportunity,* June, 1960, p. 4.

[2] Board of Education, City of New York, *Plan for Better Education Through Integration,* January 29, 1964, p. 1. Mimeographed.

school will in most cases continue to be as attractive to parents of very young Negro and Puerto Rican pupils as they have been to parents of other children. On the other hand, a growing body of evidence suggests that attachment to the principle of the neighborhood school may be much less important at the junior high school level. As we might expect, therefore, recognition of the practical and educational problems associated with the concept of the neighborhood school has exercised a continuous influence on the Board in shaping its policies for dealing with the problems raised by the existence of *de facto* segregation.

In order to implement its basic commitment to integration on the one hand and to prevent—wherever feasible—the spread of *de facto* segregation on the other, the Board has developed a number of policies and programs. While each of these policy areas may be considered as a branch of the fundamental problems of "zoning," it is convenient to restrict the meaning of that term to the establishing or redrawing of school attendance boundaries indicating the schools normally attended by children living in proximate geographic areas. The Board has and continues to engage in efforts aimed at attaining a numerical balance among ethnic groups of pupils. In addition to promoting numerical ethnic integration as a positive educational experience for life in a democratic society, the numerical shifts are intended to provide lower-class and minority group children a white, middle-class school climate presumed conducive to raising achievement aspirations and levels. Underlying this latter notion is the argument that the stimulation of competition and cooperation with majority group peers will raise the educational aspirations and performance of minority group children.[3]

These activities fall into two major categories: first, site selection and rezoning in the traditional sense of determining

---

[3] See, for example, Havighurst, Robert J., "Urban Development and the Educational System" in Passow, Harry A., editor, *Education in Depressed Areas.* Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1963, pp. 24–45.

locale of new schools and of establishing and redrawing attendance zone boundaries. The second category relates to "permissive zoning" and school reorganization, often involving the bussing of pupils to schools other than those they would ordinarily attend. Though the first is discussed briefly in this chapter it is to the device of "permissive zoning" that our attention is primarily directed.

SITE SELECTION AND REZONING

Site Selection. In selecting sites for new school construction ethnic balance is followed as one of the guiding criteria when possible. Logically this requires locating schools in areas comprising ethnic heterogeneity—"fringe areas"—though the Board frankly recognizes the difficulties of implementing such a criterion. Very early in its deliberations[4] the Board pointed out that schools must be placed where there are children; that children often live in areas which are ethnically homogeneous; that in many sections of the city it is impossible to locate an elementary school site which will meet pupil needs and result in an integrated school; that the problem is less difficult in locating new junior high schools. The Board is also explicitly aware that a site may be originally located in a fringe area and open with a pupil register that is ethnically homogeneous. The rapidity of ethnic succession often means that, during the usual three-year lapse between site acquisition and building opening, the predicted balanced school population has been replaced by a homogeneous one.

In September, 1964, following public hearings on the proposals made by the Superintendent of Schools, the Board of Education adopted a comprehensive school building program, covering the period 1965–1971.[5] The original proposals were

---

[4] Board of Education, City of New York, *Toward Greater Opportunity, op. cit.*, p. 175.

prepared by the School Planning and Research Division to meet the needs indicated by assistant superintendents of the education divisions. Recommendations were reviewed in the light of basic demographic data and school enrollment projections prepared by the Programming and Research Section.[6]

The plan endorsed consists of two parts, the 1965–1966 School Building Program, and a 1966–1971 Long-Range Program. The former is summarized here.

The school building program adopted for 1965–1966 includes 39 projects for construction, 38 projects for advance site acquisition or planning or both, and an additional 40 projects recommended for advance site acquisition only. Apart from 3 renovations of electrical or sanitary systems in existing high schools, the current construction program provides for 16 new elementary schools (including 10 replacements of existing buildings), 7 new junior high schools (including 1 replacement), 5 new high schools (including 3 replacements), 1 new "600" school to replace an existing obsolete building, and additions to 7 elementary schools, 3 of which serve also to replace existing obsolete school buildings.

Of the 38 projects recommended for planning, 4 will be additions to existing schools, and 29 will be new schools (including 16 projects that will replace existing buildings). Of the 40 projects in the 1965–1966 program recommended for advance site acquisition only, 29 or nearly 75 per cent of the total will replace existing schools, and the remaining 11 will be entirely new schools to serve growing populations.

For most of the projects in the planning category definite

---

[5] Board of Education, City of New York, *Adopted 1965–1966 School Building Program and 1966–1971 Long-Range Program,* September 17, 1964.

[6] A review of the general types of demographic information and techniques of population projection utilized by the School Planning and Research Division, as well as suggested improvements involving the projection of ethnic composition of school population, are included in a recent report of research conducted by the Institute of Urban Studies. See "Memorandum #3: Critique of Technical Aspects of the School Building Program," Tentative Draft. Institute of Urban Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, November 20, 1964. Mimeographed.

sites have not yet been selected; they are not known, of course, for the projects in the advance acquisition group. However, the limited potential of site selection possibilities for promoting ethnic integration may be adequately illustrated by considering only the schools slated for current construction. For example, of the seven additions to be made to elementary schools, two are additions to X-schools and five are additions to schools that currently are Y-schools.[7] Again, in the case of new elementary schools, five of the replacement schools and five of the "relief" schools are located in areas where increasing minority segregation is to be expected. In addition, at least one of the new junior high schools will be located in an area where ethnic balance is unlikely. It is not known just how many of the elementary schools are likely to be Y-schools.[8]

In April 1965 the Board of Education gave formal approval to a change in policy providing for reorganization of the city's school system on the so-called 4-4-4 plan which had been recommended by the State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions.[9] The proposal provides for primary schools which will serve students only through fourth grade, intermediate schools for grades 5 through 8, and four-year comprehensive high schools which will include both academic and vocational courses (ex-

---

[7] At the elementary level, an X-school is one in which Negroes and Puerto Ricans make up 90 per cent or more of the total register; a Y-school is one in which "other" students make up 90 per cent or more of the total. In a Z-school, Negroes and Puerto Ricans constitute between 10 and 90 per cent of the total.

[8] Revision of the planned locations of the five new high school buildings was strongly urged in a report by the State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions in connection with their recommendation of four-year comprehensive high schools. The report notes that "at least four of these [five high schools] are now projected for location in heavily segregated residential areas." See State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions, *Desegregating the Public Schools of New York City* (A Report Prepared for the Board of Education of the City of New York), Albany, N.Y., May 12, 1964, p. 15.

[9] Board of Education, City of New York, *Statement of Policy: Excellence for the Schools of New York City*, April 22, 1965. Mimeographed.

cept for a few "one-trade" schools which will be continued). Initial plans call for completion of the new construction required to carry out the reorganization by 1972–73, assuming that adequate funds are made available. The most recent school construction proposal, prepared in June 1965 for public hearings to be held by Local School Boards, reflects the general outline of the changes in building plans which are required to implement the new scheme of grade organization.[10] Nearly all of the planned additions to existing elementary school buildings will no longer be needed. For the immediate future the major volume of new building will be intermediate schools, and with some modification the already projected high school construction program will be accelerated. In many instances the new intermediate schools simply replace, under their new designation, already planned elementary schools that were included in the Board's earlier budget proposals. In a number of cases, however, provision for larger capacity in the intermediate school that replaces a projected elementary school will require increased funds. Nevertheless, a few of the previously planned elementary schools, particularly those designed to serve new large-scale housing projects and other areas with growing populations, are still scheduled for construction as primary schools.

For the most part, adoption of the new organizational pattern will have no appreciable influence on the ethnic composition of schools serving children at the lowest grade levels. And until further information becomes available concerning the time schedule for implementation of the plan, as well as data on proposed feeder patterns for the intermediate and high schools, it will be impossible to gauge the practicable extent of improvement in ethnic balance which can be achieved at the higher school levels.

Rezoning. In addition to the traditional objectives of school zoning (safety, easily accessible schools, optimum school and class size, etc.) ethnic balance has emerged as a

---

[10] Board of Education, City of New York, *School Building Program and Proposed Amendments to the 1965–1966 Capital Budget,* June 1965.

cardinal principle.[11] School attendance zones are constantly redrawn in New York City as new housing and population changes occur, always with the explicit intent of encouraging integrated schools.

The most recent experiment in implementing ethnic balance as a principle of school zoning follows the theme of the Princeton Plan—with variations primarily on the name employed: paired schools or community zoning. Essentially the device involves the reclassification of schools that share a common boundary to handle fewer grades and thus serve larger areas.

Four sets of paired elementary schools were instituted in New York City in 1964–1965, wherein adjoining school areas were reclassified into a single zone with one school building serving the lower and the other the upper elementary grades. In three sets an X- and a Z-school were paired and in one set two integrated schools were paired. In each set the Z-school paired with an X- or Z-school was in the highest category on IQ and reading scores. The alternate school of each pair showed lower performance averages.

Changing feeder patterns of junior high schools are also illustrative of community zoning techniques aimed at encouraging school integration. This device involves sets or groups of junior high schools and the elementary schools that feed into them.

It is apparent from the materials presented in Chapter 2 that the constant changes in attendance lines, either traditionally or imaginatively conceived, are ineffective in promoting large-scale ethnic balance. The changing ethnic structure of the school population, coupled with the desire for easily accessible schools particularly at the lower levels, has removed the basic condition necessary for numerical balance—a corresponding balance and ethnic variation in the school population itself. With increasing proportions of Negro and Puerto Rican children attending the city's public schools and a spread in the size and geographic extensiveness of ethnic residential

---

[11] As early as 1954 this was made explicit. See Board of Education, City of New York, *Toward Greater Opportunity, op. cit.*, pp. 151–152.

"ghettos" no amount of boundary changes will effectuate integrated schools. Perhaps the most that can be hoped for through both judicious site selection and zoning manipulation is stemming the pace of increasing segregation.

PERMISSIVE ZONING AND SCHOOL REORGANIZATION

The earliest program under which substantial numbers of pupils were transported to schools other than their normal neighborhood schools was instituted primarily to alleviate serious overcrowding in certain areas. In implementing this program, however, the Board was also able to make inroads on the problem of integration. While the attacks on the problems of overcrowding and ethnic imbalance are not necessarily the same, they do converge where overcrowding and increased concentration of Negroes and Puerto Ricans coincide. Under this program, for example, approximately 50,000 students were transferred from overutilized schools to schools operating at less than capacity during the years 1958 to 1963. In addition to reducing the number of children receiving less than full-time instruction, the program "also resulted in a more varied ethnic pupil population in the schools to which the pupils were transferred."[12]

Open Enrollment and Free Transfer Programs.[13] The first program adopted for the explicit purpose of effecting at least some ethnic redistribution of pupils among schools and involving potentially large-scale bussing of pupils was called

---

[12] Board of Education, City of New York, *The Open Enrollment Program in the New York City Schools: Progress Report, September 1960—September 1963*, n. d., p. ii. Mimeographed.

[13] A portion of this section has been adapted from Sheldon, Eleanor Bernert, James R. Hudson, and Raymond A. Glazier, "Administrative Implications of Integration Plans for Schools: Open Enrollment in New York City," in Reiss, Albert J., Jr., editor, *Schools in a Changing Society*. The Free Press, New York, 1966.

the Open Enrollment Program. While the operation of this plan was also linked to the availability of space in underutilized schools in many sections of the city, it differed in fundamental concept from the earlier program in permitting significant numbers of minority group children in segregated schools to participate without regard to the utilization factor in their own neighborhood school. In the words of the President of the Board of Education, the aim of Open Enrollment was to "institute a program . . . whereby parents of pupils in schools with a heavy concentration of minority groups can be given the opportunity to transfer their children to schools with unused space and to an educational situation where reasonably varied ethnic distribution exists."[14]

This attack on the problem of *de facto* segregation through Open Enrollment was initiated on a pilot-program basis for the school year beginning in September, 1960, and the scope of the program was considerably extended in subsequent years. After operating for three-and-a-half years the Open Enrollment program was replaced in February, 1964, by a Free Choice Transfer Program, which may be considered as a further expansion of its predecessor.

The Central Zoning Unit of the Board of Education was responsible for selecting, on the basis of its records showing ethnic composition and space utilization ratios for each school, the "sending" schools and "receiving" schools that would participate in the Open Enrollment Program. For both elementary and junior high school programs, receiving schools were defined as "schools with 75 per cent or more 'others' . . . and utilized below 90 per cent."[15] However, the utilization criterion for receiving schools was set at 95 per cent for schools having a declining population during preceding years.

At the elementary level sending schools were designated as those having 90 per cent or more Negro and/or Puerto Rican students or those with 90 per cent or more "others."[16] Initially,

---

[14] Board of Education, City of New York, *Open Enrollment Program, op. cit.*, p. 1.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

two categories of sending elementary schools were distinguished for participation in the program at the junior high school level. Category A, which received priority in pupil placement, comprised "elementary schools which fed junior high schools having 85 per cent or more Negro and/or Puerto Rican population"; and Category B, which referred to "elementary schools which had 90 per cent or more Negro and/or Puerto Rican population and which fed junior high schools having between 15 per cent and 25 per cent 'others.' "[17] Although progress reports on the Open Enrollment Program did not stress the fact, it is apparent that Category B was included in order to slow the process of enhancing the "minority group segregation" of the receiving junior high schools. Early in the program, however, it was necessary to eliminate Category B because of lack of additional space in receiving junior high schools.

Participation of eligible children in the Open Enrollment Program was an entirely voluntary decision of their parents. Pupils in the sending schools were given an application blank (to be filled out by their parents) and the appropriate list of receiving schools. Parents who elected to have their child transferred under the program were given the opportunity of indicating up to four preferences of the receiving school to which they would like to send their child. Because space in receiving schools was limited, it was necessary to implement a system of priorities based on the order of receipt of applications. Final processing of applications and assignment of pupils to receiving schools was carried out by the Central Zoning Unit, thereby relieving the local principal of responsibility.

For the pilot program beginning in September, 1960, nearly 7,900 applications were distributed to students in the third, fourth, and fifth grades of 16 sending schools. All 284 of the

---

[16] *Ibid.* Under the applicable criteria elementary schools enrolling 90 per cent or more "others" and utilized under 90 per cent of capacity *could be* designated as both a sending and a receiving school.

[17] *Ibid.*

applications received were authorized for transfer; 212 pupils, or less than 3 per cent of the number of applications distributed, completed transfers to 31 receiving schools in October, 1960.

Following the pilot program in 1960, the Open Enrollment Program was put into full operation in 1961. From September, 1961, to September, 1963, there were 237,501 applications distributed for admission to the third, fourth, and fifth grades and to junior high schools. More than 300 elementary schools and 60 junior high schools participated in the program. Over 20,000 transfers were requested and approximately 14,000 transfer pupils actually registered at receiving schools.

Response to the program showed considerable variation by school level. The data suggest that for admission into grades 3, 4, and 5 the proportion of distributed applications actually requesting transfer was less than 5 per cent, while the requests for transfer into receiving junior high schools amounted to about 20 per cent of the applications distributed. For the combined grade levels, less than 10 per cent of the applications distributed resulted in a request for transfer. Of the total requests for transfer received about 60 per cent were for participation in the junior high school program and 40 per cent for the elementary schools. However, largely because of space limitations in receiving junior high schools, the respective proportions of total transfers authorized was approximately reversed for the two levels. To permit a larger number of the pupils to participate in September, 1963, the utilization factor for receiving junior high schools was raised from 90 per cent to 95–100 per cent of capacity.

The Open Enrollment Program, including the pilot program of 1960, ran from September, 1960, to February, 1964, when it was replaced by the Free Choice Transfer Program—an extension of the Open Enrollment Program. All schools in the New York City system were reviewed for possible inclusion as a sending or a receiving school. The same selection criteria were used in this program as in the earlier one with the exception that utilization factors of 100 per cent or more of capacity, i.e., approaching the city-wide utilization factors,

could be used for identifying receiving schools. Under the Free Choice Transfer Program any child in a sending school could apply for transfer to any school in the city where space was available. In February, 1964, approximately 1,500 elementary pupils and 400 high school pupils were transferred under the new plan.

Obviously, the number of pupils involved in the combined Open Enrollment and Free Choice Transfer Program is small in relation to the number remaining in *de facto* segregated schools. Nonetheless, despite the continuing and ever-increasing concentration of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils in some districts, the program has resulted in an improved ethnic distribution to the extent that the proportion of "white" segregated schools has declined. Correspondingly, however, the proportion of minority group pupils attending minority segregated schools continues to increase.

Grade and School Reorganization. Another program recently inaugurated by the Board to provide an ethnically integrated educational environment for additional numbers of minority group children is not easily classifiable, although for most of the children initially affected it involves elements similar to those found in the Free Choice Transfer and community zoning programs. Fundamentally, however, the new program represents an experimental approach to the question of altering the grade organization of the city's school system in order to provide an improved ethnic balance for at least the older children. It represents a step in the direction of changing a 6-3-3 school organization plan to a 4-4-4 design.

Under this new plan, the ninth grade was eliminated from 10 junior high schools, and beginning in September, 1964, their pupils attended ninth-grade classes established in designated and reorganized four-year high schools. At the same time, sixth-grade classes were formed in 8 of these 10 junior high schools. The remaining 2 schools enrolled seventh- and eighth-grade students only. Of the 10 junior high schools involved in the program, 9 have student populations that are 85 per cent or more Negro and Puerto Rican. Three of the junior

high schools are located in Brooklyn, 2 each in Manhattan and the Bronx, and the remaining 3 in Queens. More than 4,500 pupils who would have taken their ninth-grade course in these 10 junior high schools were transferred to 33 senior high schools that have a more balanced ethnic distribution. On the other hand, the program has no appreciable effect on the ethnic composition of the junior high schools from which these pupils were transferred.

The students shifted under this plan were invited to indicate up to five choices, in order of preference, of the high school they would like to attend. The choice was limited to high schools within the student's own borough, except that Manhattan pupils could choose high schools from among those listed for the Bronx as well. Final assignments were made by the High School Division and the Central Zoning Unit after considering such factors as building utilization, traveling distance from the student's home, and ethnic distribution in the high school. After completing the ninth grade, these students could again select the high school that they would like to attend for the remaining three years.[18]

In addition, approximately 3,400 pupils who previously would have attended sixth grade in 30 elementary schools regularly feeding into 8 of these 10 junior high schools were tentatively assigned to the newly formed sixth-grade classes in these reorganized junior high schools.[19] As an alternative, parents of these pupils from the feeding schools were given the choice of transferring their children to the sixth grade of a better integrated elementary school outside of their immediate neighborhood.[20] In a few instances it was found possible to offer a selection of two or even three alternate integrated ele-

---

[18] Board of Education, City of New York, *Action Toward Quality Integrated Education*, May 28, 1964, p. 1.

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] This feature of the plan was not originally part of the program, but was adopted to meet the objections of major community and civil rights groups that these sixth-grade students would only be transferred from segregated elementary schools to segregated junior high schools at an even greater distance from their house. See *The New York Times*, "Rights Groups In Switch Back School's Racial Plan," June 16, 1964.

mentary schools. Parents of about one-quarter of these students applied for transfer of their children under this option in preference to registering them in the sixth grade of the *de facto* segregated junior high school nearer their home.

A number of important aspects of this new program invite further comment. In the first place, it is interesting to note that the plan implicitly takes advantage of the fact that the hold of the neighborhood school idea is much less strong in the higher than the lower grades. Secondly, while involving grade reorganization in only 10 of the city's junior high schools, the plan became the vehicle for introducing ninth-grade classes in many high schools as well as effecting a change in the grade organization of many elementary schools. Third, while the program alleviates some of the problems associated with overcrowding in the elementary schools it obviously puts additional pressures on available space in the already overcrowded high schools. Finally, apart from the possibility that this relatively small-scale program may foreshadow more extensive organizational innovations in the schools, the most striking feature of the implementation of this plan is found in the way it combines elements of compulsion and free choice in redeeming the Board's pledge to promote integrated education for larger numbers of Negro and Puerto Rican children.[21]

This change in the grade organization of 10 junior high schools, together with the associated changes required at the elementary and senior high school levels represent a response —modified in scope—to recommendations contained in a report submitted to the Board early in May, 1964, by the State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions. In this report the Advisory Committee urged the establishment of four-year comprehensive high schools, and "middle schools" that would

---

[21] Efforts to improve integration through bussing programs such as Open Enrollment and Free Choice Transfer have been criticized by some civil rights groups on the ground that their effectiveness tends to be limited by the fact that participation depends on the voluntary choice of parents of minority group children.

serve pupils in grades 5 through 8. The currently predominant type of elementary schools that enrolls pupils for kindergarten and grades 1 through 6 would be replaced by a new "primary unit" comprising kindergarten through grade 4, and "as soon as they can be added, one or two years of pre-kindergarten education."[22] In the form presented in the Advisory Committee's report, the recommended system has been referred to as the 4-4-4 plan of school organization.

Programs and policies discussed in this chapter focus on maximizing the ethnic balance among pupils in the city's public schools. Two basic assumptions are made: (1) that effective education for democratic life requires that children of varied ethnic groups have the opportunity of learning together; and (2) that academic aspirations and school performance of children from deprived backgrounds can be raised by their participation in school and classroom milieux of higher aspirations and performance.

The various devices employed under the general rubric of zoning and school reorganization policies have not had a great numerical impact on *de facto* segregated schooling. This is due more, however, to the combined forces of the changing ethnic composition of the city schools and segregated residential patterns than to Board policies and programs that ardently attempt to promote integration and stem the creeping segregation inherent in both the demographic and ecological patterns of growth and succession.

Unfortunately, data useful in evaluating the social or academic effects of the various programs are either not available or nonexistent. Information provided in Chapter 6, however, offers data that might be helpful in suggesting possible outcomes.

---

[22] See State Education Commissioner's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions, *Desegregating the Public Schools of New York City, op. cit.*

6 COMPENSATORY PROGRAMING *and* PERMISSIVE ZONING: *Revisited*

We have described briefly the organization of New York City's public school system and many of its programs and services, some designated as compensatory or supplementary, offering more than the regular city-wide programs. This chapter compares in greater detail those schools of the city that receive the compensatory programs with regular schools, with a view toward an assessment of some of these efforts. We shall also present some corresponding data relative to the schools participating in the permissive zoning and reorganization plans.

COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS

Elementary Schools. Over 35 per cent of the city's elementary schools, or approximately 225 of them, are designated as Special Service schools. This very designation implies that they provide more services and a greater variety of services to their pupils—children whose educational problems rest in part upon their earlier experiences in the home, their lack of motivation for school learning, and their general orientation to society—the environmentally handicapped. The supplementary services are predicated on the very explicit as-

sumption that, though the school in and of itself cannot be expected to compensate for the lackings in the child's background and environment, the school nonetheless has the responsibility to offer compensatory cultural, educational, and environmental experiences for the child.

The city's most comprehensive effort to extend additional educational and related services to those children most in need of them is involved in the official recognition of some schools as Special Service schools. Schools are selected for this classification, as mentioned earlier, on the basis of a combination of criteria involving IQ and reading test results, measures of pupil and teacher mobility, the extensiveness of the free-lunch program, and the proportion of non-English speaking pupils. Generally the additional services provided under the canopy of Special Service involve supplemental personnel assignments and result in smaller class sizes and more favorable proportion of guidance counselors, secretaries, librarians, and so forth.

In the 1963–1964 school year more than 55 per cent of the Special Service schools were segregated Negro and/or Puerto Rican schools.[1] The remaining 45 per cent of the Special Service schools were integrated schools.[2] None of the "white" schools[3] were provided the supplementary personnel and services offered by this designation. (Table 18) These figures contrast markedly with the non-Special Service schools where approximately 75 per cent are integrated, less than 25 per cent are "white," and less than 1 per cent are Negro and/or Puerto Rican schools. Thus, though the criteria for designation of Special Service status do not directly include a color measure, and only an extreme ethnic measure (related to non-English speaking pupils), it is those schools comprising extremely large proportions of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils

---

[1] Schools where pupil registers were 90 per cent or more Negro and/or Puerto Rican.

[2] Schools where pupil registers were less than 90 per cent Negro and/or Puerto Rican and less than 90 per cent "other."

[3] Schools where pupil registers were more than 90 per cent "other."

that are provided with the largest share of the compensatory efforts corresponding to Special Service status, e.g., smaller class size, additional textbooks and other instructional materials, additional supervisors and other personnel. Of the minority group segregated schools[4] 95 per cent are provided with these additional services, whereas in the segregated white schools there are no additional services provided by this program. Of the total number of integrated schools only 35 per cent receive these services.

Two criterion variables utilized in the designation of Special Service elementary schools result from standard city-wide tests given to sixth-graders, namely, mean IQ and reading scores.[5] Therefore, it is to be anticipated that test results for Special Service schools would be lower than for the other schools in the system. Though differentials are to be expected, the data indicate a gap between the two types of schools that resembles a great divide. (Table 19) Though Special Service schools constitute over a third of all schools in the system they account for only 2 per cent of the schools whose mean IQ scores is 100 or more. More than 97 per cent of the non-Special Service schools attained mean scores of 95 or more in contrast to only 13 per cent of the Special Service schools. That more than 25 per cent of the Special Service schools could achieve mean scores of only 70 to 84 indicates further the extremity of the differences between the two types of schools —whether they are due to the inappropriateness of the test to some groups of pupils, to the ineffectiveness of the particular schools involved, or to a combination of these and other factors.

Whatever the underlying basis for these extreme differences they are reflected and affirmed in the reading levels of

---

[4] "Segregated nonwhite schools" and "Negro and/or Puerto Rican schools" and "minority group segregated schools" are used interchangeably.

[5] In line with the Board's integration plan and on the basis that they were unfair to minority group pupils and underprivileged children, group IQ tests were abandoned in March, 1964.

the same sixth-grade pupils. (Table 21) More than 85 per cent of the non-Special Service schools achieved reading levels of the sixth grade or better in contrast to *less than 5 per cent* of the Special Service schools. At the other end of the sixth-grade reading continuum, almost 70 per cent of the Special Service schools had mean scores bordering two years or more of retardation in comparison with only 1 per cent of the regular schools.

The distribution of IQ and reading scores by the ethnic composition of schools reflects the pattern of ethnic segregation of Special Service schools. White segregated schools (Y) show a markedly high performance on IQ and reading tests. Minority group segregated schools (X) on the average show the poorest test returns; and test results for integrated or middle-range schools (Z) fall between the two extremes. (Tables 20 and 22)

Two additional criteria in selecting Special Service schools involve measures of pupil mobility and teachers on permanent license.[6] The data confirm the obviously anticipated difference in the distribution of these measures by type of school and ethnic composition. Again, however, extreme differences are exhibited, reflecting not only the relevance of the selection criteria and their successful application, but, more importantly, the vast differences among the city's public elementary schools, with white segregated schools exhibiting the most favorable conditions—the least pupil turnover and the highest proportions of permanently licensed teachers. (Tables 23, 24, 25, and 26) Schools with a high per cent of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils show the least favorable conditions, with integrated schools falling in the middle.

Similarly, pupil attendance and promotion rates manifest the same patterned distribution. It is evident that, though they are not criterion variables in the designation of Special Service status, attendance rates and promotion rates do differentiate

---

[6] Proportion of non-English speaking pupils and pupils on the free-lunch program are also variables designating Special Service schools.

the two types of schools, with markedly lower rates in Special Service schools. For each of these variables the differences by ethnic composition of schools are correspondingly in anticipated directions (Tables 27, 28, 29, and 30), with white schools exhibiting highest attendance and promotion rates and the Negro/Puerto Rican schools the lowest.

Table 31 presents medians for the criterion and related variables by Special Service status and ethnic composition. These data summarize the pattern of differentials described above.

That the Board of Education is not only cognizant of these vast differences but also seeks ways of diminishing them is evident in the allocation of supplementary or compensatory educational programs and, at least officially, in its teacher assignment policies. Tables 32, 33, 34, and 35 indicate that the allocation of compensatory programs to schools most in need of them is apparently more successful than is the implementation of teacher assignment policies. Considerably fewer authorized teaching positions are filled with regularly licensed teachers in the Special Service and X-schools than the non-Special Service and Y-schools. Tables 32 and 33, for example, show that more than half of the Special Service schools were operating at below city average with respect to this personnel measure in contrast to less than a third of the other schools. Similarly, white segregated schools fare far better with respect to filling the quota of licensed teachers with over 85 per cent of the schools at or above the city standard in contrast to ethnic segregated schools with 60 per cent below the city average for the 1963–1964 school term.

Supplementary and compensatory programs, however, are concentrated largely in Special Service and therefore in ethnic segregated schools. The Corrective Reading Program, apparently the most comprehensive with respect to its extensiveness in the elementary schools, is available in almost half of the total schools. However, more than two-thirds of the programs are located in Special Service schools, which constitute only a third of the elementary schools in the city. (Table 34) More than half of schools providing corrective reading programs

are integrated; of the remaining schools offering the program over 40 per cent are segregated nonwhite and less than 5 per cent are segregated white schools. (Tables 34 and 35)

Programs specifically designed to reach pupils from educationally depressed backgrounds are of course heavily concentrated in Special Service schools (After School Study Centers, Higher Horizons, PEA School Volunteer Program, All-Day Neighborhood Schools, Early Identification and Prevention Program, Pre-Kindergarten Classes, and Non-English Speaking Program). Relative to their distribution in the city, the Special Service schools and thus the Negro/Puerto Rican segregated schools are provided a markedly disproportionately large share of the programs of a compensatory character. On the other hand, team teaching and programed instruction—newer techniques for accelerated progress—are more heavily concentrated in non-Special Service schools, closely approximating the proportionate distribution of these schools in the city-wide system. Similarly, the two programs are offered in white segregated and integrated schools roughly proportionate to their distribution in the city, though programed instruction projects tend to favor integrated schools at the expense of segregated schools.

Junior High Schools. Of 129 junior high schools in New York City 58, or approximately 45 per cent, have been designated as Special Service schools. Almost half of these are X-schools and the remaining are Z-schools. No junior high schools whose pupils are largely white (Y-schools) receive the supplementary services provided with the designation. (Table 36)

Indices of pupil performance (IQ and reading scores), items among the criteria for Special Service designation, are apparently effective measures of differentiation. *None of the Special Service junior high schools achieved mean IQ scores in eighth grade as high as 100.* (See Table 37) In sharp contrast 93 per cent of the regular schools showed mean IQ levels of 100 or greater. Over 75 per cent of the Special Service schools had scores lower than 95 and more than 40 per cent had mean IQ scores lower than 85.

No schools with highly segregated Negro and/or Puerto Rican pupil registers reported mean IQ scores at 95 or greater! Seventy-five per cent of these schools showed mean IQ levels of only 70–84. All of the white segregated schools had mean IQ scores of 100 or more! (Table 38) Integrated or middle-range schools fall between the two extremes with less than half reporting means of 100 or more and over a third with mean IQ scores of less than 95.

The distribution of schools by mean grade reading scores also sharply separate the types of schools. (Table 39) Though only half of all the junior high schools in the city scored at grade level or above on eighth-grade tests only *one* Special Service school achieved a mean grade level of 8 or over on these tests. Ninety per cent of the regular schools, on the other hand, reported mean reading results at grade level or higher for their eighth-graders. Consequently *no* minority group segregated school could report median reading scores for eighth-graders that were at grade level. This contrasts sharply with 94 per cent of the white schools reporting median reading scores at grade level. (Table 40)

Pupil mobility rates are generally lower in the junior high schools than in the city's elementary schools, due in part to larger school districts at the higher level of schooling. Improvement in these rates is considerably more marked in the Special Service and nonwhite segregated schools than in the other schools. At the elementary level pupil turnover rates averaged about 70 per cent in the Special Service and nonwhite schools, making possible a lowering of the rate in enlarging the school district. Though these rates are reduced to a median of about 45 per cent at the junior high school level, they still exceed those for non-Special Service, white or integrated schools (Tables 41, 42, and 49), reflecting both the use of pupil mobility as a criterion variable in designating school status and the extensive overlap of nonwhite and Special Service schools.

Because of the nature of seniority, tenure, and promotion in the public school system measures relating to teachers on

permanent license are indicative of teacher stability or mobility. All types of junior high schools in comparison with elementary schools suffer from lower proportions of teachers on permanent license. It is apparent from the data provided (Tables 43 and 44) that the stability of teaching staffs in all the junior high schools is extremely low and that the experience in the nonwhite segregated schools and Special Service schools is scarcely believable. *Not a single nonwhite segregated junior high school could report in 1963–1964 that as many as 65 per cent of its teachers were on permanent license.* Only one Special Service school could make this report. Over half of the white segregated schools and 12 per cent of the integrated schools had as many as 65 per cent of their teachers on permanent license. More than a third of the non-Special Service schools shared this experience. If we accept teacher certification as a minimum indicator of quality teaching, then junior high schools in general fare poorly and only those servicing segregated white pupils can be said to approach a reasonable level. The data in Table 49 show that half of the white schools have 65 per cent or more of their teachers on permanent license. Comparable medians for the nonwhite and integrated schools are 44 per cent and 53 per cent, respectively.

Though slightly higher attendance rates generally characterize the junior high schools in contrast to the elementary schools, promotion rates at the upper schools are generally lower (Tables 31 and 49), with the highest rates in both measures occurring in the white and non-Special Service schools, and lowest in the Special Service minority group schools. Variations in attendance and promotion rates by school status and ethnic composition are in the anticipated directions. (Tables 45, 46, 47, and 48)

Comparing median levels on the two ability measures (IQ and reading) for the elementary and junior high schools suggests a cumulative deficit in performance on the part of deprived pupils. Central to the notion is that mean scores on ability measures will show increasing retardation from the

lower grades to the upper ones for schools containing large proportions of pupils from deprived areas. These data suggest that early education handicaps as depicted by these measures at the two school levels in conjunction with school type (Special Service and minority group segregated) will become greater through progression in the school career. Supporting this possibility is the decrease in median IQ and reading achievement levels for the Special Service and ethnic segregated schools from the elementary to the junior high school grades. Sixth-grade median IQ scores for Special Service and minority group schools amounted to 88.8 and 87.7, respectively. Comparable scores at the eighth-grade level declined to 86.7 and 81.7 for Special Service and nonwhite schools, respectively. Reading retardation for Special Service schools continued at approximately two grade levels between the sixth and eighth grades, but for the nonwhite segregated schools retardation in reading increased slightly. White schools, on the other hand, maintained high IQ and reading scores at both school levels. (Tables 31 and 49)

It is readily apparent from Tables 50 and 51 that whatever compensatory educational programs there are at the junior high school level (After School Study Centers, Higher Horizons, Career Guidance, and PEA School Volunteers) these endeavors are highly concentrated in schools most in need of them, the Special Service schools and the ethnic segregated schools. About 40 per cent of the Special Service junior high schools do not have some combination of special progress and enrichment classes while all regular schools offer such programs. Integrated junior high schools provide the locale for many of the compensatory programs as well as a large share of the acceleration efforts.

PERMISSIVE ZONING

For each of the indices of pupil achievement and school quality the scores of the sending schools participating in the *Open Enrollment Program* show a lower level of academic per-

formance and a less favorable educational climate, while the scores of the receiving schools cluster heavily on the end of the distribution showing higher levels of performance and more desirable climate. (Table 52)

Data on the mean IQ scores of sixth-grade pupils show that almost 99 per cent of the receiving schools had mean IQ scores in the two upper ranges (95 and over) in contrast to less than 6 per cent in the sending schools. In addition, a third of the sending schools had mean IQ scores below 85. Among the nonparticipating schools about 70 per cent had IQ scores of 95 or over and only 7 per cent below 85. Though sending schools constitute less than 20 per cent of the city's elementary schools, they account for more than 40 per cent of the schools with a mean IQ score of less than the city "average."

The distribution of mean grade scores on the city-wide sixth-grade reading tests for elementary schools presents a picture very similar to that exhibited by the distribution of mean IQ scores. Thus, more than three-quarters of sending schools' sixth-graders show an average reading level of less than fifth grade. No receiving school scores as low and only 20 per cent of the nonparticipating schools have average reading levels as retarded. Approximately half of all the sending schools have mean reading scores two grades less than the average for the city and all but one sending school scored below the city average. Although receiving schools comprise only about one-fourth of the total number of schools, they account for over 40 per cent of schools with mean reading scores of sixth grade and over.

The disparities in pupil mobility scores among the three classes of schools are not quite as marked as those found in the distributions of IQ and reading scores. Nonetheless, whatever effect high rates of pupil turnover during the school year may have on the educational process, it is by no means confined to the sending schools particularly as compared with nonparticipating schools. Nonetheless, pupil turnover rates in receiving schools are far less than the corresponding measures in sending schools.

From one point of view the distribution of scores on teacher stability is the most interesting of all. It shows for each school

the proportion of teachers on permanent license and is the one factor among those considered that is most directly amenable to administrative control within the school system. In the "average" (median) elementary school in the city, approximately 64 per cent of the teachers are on permanent license. Over 40 per cent of sending schools have less than half of their teachers on permanent license as compared with 7 per cent for the receiving schools and 20 per cent among the nonparticipating schools. Conversely less than 5 per cent of the sending schools have as many as three-fourths of their teachers on permanent license as compared with approximately 40 per cent and 25 per cent for the receiving and nonparticipating schools, respectively.

Pupils participating in the open enrollment program are leaving schools of low educational performance, high pupil mobility, and low in "quality" teaching and entering schools with a diametrically opposite characterization. Also being left behind, however, is a high concentration of corrective and compensatory programs (Table 53) in exchange for schools where these efforts are far less.

In the *Experimental Reorganization* of schools that took place in 1964–1965 (pp. 80–83) the data point out that the junior high schools receiving sixth-graders may be considerably less conducive to a "positive educational experience" than the schools from which the transfers originated. (Table 54) At least on the basis of performance scores the recipient junior high schools exhibited lower averages than the originating elementary schools. In sharp contrast, the alternate elementary schools available to these sixth-graders provided greater ethnic balance and offered a climate of high educational performance, lower pupil mobility, and higher teacher stability.

CONCLUSION

The data presented indicate that there is wide variation in pupil performance, teacher stability, special programing and

the like among the schools of the city at both the elementary and junior high levels. That the Board of Education attempts to reduce some of these differentials, at least officially, to the extent of saturating some types of schools with compensatory programs is also apparent. Further, the materials indicate that these saturation efforts to date have not been particularly effective in minimizing some of the differences, particularly those concerned with average pupil performance in Negro/Puerto Rican schools as compared with white or even integrated schools.

Many antecedent factors related to the observed differences can be hypothesized. Such factors range from differences in inborn aptitude, educational deprivation, economic insecurity, racial discrimination, to inappropriate curriculum, inept teaching, and a host of other factors as well as their interrelationships. There is no direct evidence in support of a hypothesis of inborn differential aptitudes and only inferential data, such as those presented, with respect to the relationship between pupil performance and educational and economic deprivation, school programs, and the like. Related hypotheses suggesting that segregated schooling is associated with low aspirations and thereby low academic achievement have also been proposed. Again the evidence is not clear and there has been little research designed to test the effects of *de facto*, rather than *de jure*, or legalized, segregation. Considerable debate, however, has focused on the issues of the relation of self-concept to achievement motivation, the relation of school environment to potential and manifest intelligence, the role of the family, the community, the school, etc.

In concluding this information volume, however, two additional observations may be relevant:

(1) The compensatory programs and services offered by the school system to reduce performance differentials among pupils and schools cover the range of grades from preschool through junior high and even into high school, with the heaviest efforts beginning about the fifth grade. Research evidence strongly indicates that with respect to intelligence measures 20 per cent of adult intelligence is developed by age 1, 50 per

cent by age 4, and 80 per cent by age 8.[7] Similar results on general achievement, reading comprehension, and vocabulary development show that 50 per cent is attained by age 9 and that 75 per cent of the pattern has been developed by age 13.[8] With respect to the data presented in this chapter indicating vast performance difference among sixth- and eighth-graders (averaging 12 through 14 years of age), the research findings warrant some pessimism concerning the potential effectiveness of the present saturation in compensatory programing. If such a large percentage of IQ and reading development is attained by age 9 or 10 then available resources among the city's compensatory programs might well warrant reallocation.[9]

(2) Permissive zoning and alternative school reorganization designs (6-3-3, 5-3-4, 4-4-4) are not founded on any known and tested learning theory. On the other hand, they may temporarily stem the increasing ethnic segregation of the city's schools. It is at least equally probable, however, that demographic changes—persistent in past trends—could do much to vitiate the positive effect of these efforts on numerical integration alone, irrespective of any social or academic advances anticipated.

It will be some considerable time before the variety of plans, policies, and programs coalesce in any results relevant to social integration and academic progress. The Board of Education has been engaged in a large-scale effort—much of which has been described here. Its plans for the future[10] add to both

---

[7] Bloom, Benjamin S., *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics.* John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1964, p. 57.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[9] Additional resources, derived largely from federal funds, are being allocated for an eight-week kindergarten program for five- and six-year-old preschool children. As part of the nation's "war on poverty" this program—*Project Head Start*—could reach about 20,000 children during the summer of 1965.

[10] Board of Education, City of New York, *Statement of Policy, Excellence for the Schools of New York City,* April 22, 1965; *Implementation of Board Policy on Excellence for the City's Schools,* April 28, 1965. Mimeographed.

the size and extensive variations of the effort. Revised teacher training and school assignment, changes in school organization and curriculum, experimentation with new administrative and teaching techniques and programs will be watched with close scrutiny and will often be met by criticism and demands for something more, or less, or different. Perhaps some of the data and information presented in this volume will serve to provide a basis for both responsible discussion and, at least in part, sound assessment of current and future changes in the city's schools.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

TABLE 1. Population of New York City: 1900 to 1960

Year	Population	Change from Preceding Census	
		Number	Per Cent
1960	7,781,984	– 109,973	– 1.4
1950	7,891,957	436,962	5.9
1940	7,454,995	524,549	7.6
1930	6,930,446	1,310,398	23.3
1920	5,620,048	853,165	17.9
1910	4,766,883	1,329,681	38.7
1900	3,437,202	—	—

SOURCES: Derived from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General Population Characteristics, New York,* Final Report PC(1)–34B, Table 20; *Sixteenth Census of the United States* [*1940*], *Population,* vol. 2, *Characteristics of the Population,* Part 5, New York-Oregon, [New York] Table C–36; *Fourteenth Census of the United States,* vol. 2, *Population: 1920, General Report and Analytical Tables,* Table 16.

TABLE 2. Percentage Change in Total Population by Decade: New York City and Boroughs, 1900 to 1960

Area	Percentage Change						
	1900–50	1950–60	1940–50	1930–40	1920–30	1910–20	1900–10
New York City	129.6	– 1.4	5.9	7.6	23.3	17.9	38.7
Bronx	623.8	– 1.8	4.0	10.2	72.8	69.8	114.9
Brooklyn	134.7	– 4.0	1.5	5.4	26.8	23.5	40.1
Manhattan	5.9	– 13.4	3.7	1.2	– 18.2	– 2.0	26.0
Queens	913.6	16.7	19.5	20.2	30.1	65.1	85.6
Richmond	185.8	15.9	9.8	10.2	35.9	35.6	28.3

SOURCES: Derived from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General Population Characteristics, New York,* Final Report PC(1)–34B, Tables 20 and 27; *Sixteenth Census of the United States* [1940], *Population,* vol. 2, *Characteristics of the Population,* Part 5, New York-Oregon, [New York] Tables C–36, D–36, E–36, F–36, G–36, H–36; *Fourteenth Census of the United States,* vol. 2, *Population, 1920: General Report and Analytical Tables,* Table 16.

TABLE 3. Percentage Distribution of Population by Borough: New York City, 1900 to 1960

Area	1960	1950	1940	1930	1920	1910	1900
New York City	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Bronx	18.3	18.4	18.7	18.3	13.0	9.0	5.8
Brooklyn	33.8	34.7	36.2	36.9	35.9	34.3	34.0
Manhattan	21.8	24.8	25.4	26.9	40.7	48.9	53.8
Queens	23.3	19.7	17.4	15.6	8.3	6.0	4.5
Richmond	2.8	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.1	1.8	1.9

SOURCES: See Table 2.

TABLE 4. Percentage Distribution of Population by Selected Age Groups: New York City, 1900 to 1960

Age Group	1960	1950	1940	1930	1920	1910	1900
All ages	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under 5 years	8.8	8.4	5.8	7.7	10.0	10.7	11.6
5 to 9 years	7.7	6.8	6.3	8.3	9.6	9.2	10.3
10 to 14 years	7.4	5.6	7.5	8.3	8.8	8.9	8.8
15 to 19 years	6.2	5.9	8.2	8.7	8.1	9.6	8.8
20 to 44 years	33.5	40.7	44.7	45.9	44.3	45.1	44.6
45 to 64 years	25.9	24.9	21.9	17.3	16.1	13.7	13.1
65 years and over	10.5	7.7	5.6	3.8	3.1	2.8	2.8

SOURCES: Derived from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General Population Characteristics, New York,* Final Report PC(1)–34B, Table 20; *Census of Population: 1950,* vol. 2, *Characteristics of the Population,* Part 32, New York, Table 33; *Sixteenth Census of the United States* [1940], *Population,* vol. 2, *Characteristics of the Population,* Part 5, New York-Oregon, [New York] Table C–35; *Fourteenth Census of the United States,* vol. 2, *Population, 1920: General Report and Analytical Tables,* Table 15.

TABLE 5. Components of Population Change by Color or Ethnic Group: New York City, 1950 to 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

Population Group	Population		Change 1950–1960		Components of Change	
	1960	1950	Number	Per Cent	Natural Increase	Net Migration
All classes	7,782	7,892	– 110	– 1.4	747	– 857
White	6,053	6,890	– 837	– 12.1	402	– 1,239
Nonwhite	1,116	756	360	47.6	188	172
Puerto Rican	613	246	367	149.2	157	210

NOTE: In this table the white and nonwhite population groups exclude persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage classified in those color groups. Natural increase represents the excess of births over deaths. A negative value for net migration indicates net out-migration.

SOURCES: Derived from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General Population Characteristics, New York,* Final Report PC(1)–34B, Table 20; *U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960, Census Tracts* (New York, N.Y. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, Part 1, New York City) Final Report PHC(1)–104, Part 1, Table P–5; *U.S. Census of Population: 1950,* vol. 2, *Characteristics of the Population,* Part 32, New York, Table 33; *Ibid.,* vol. 4, *Special Reports,* Part 3, Chapter D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States, Table 3; Department of City Planning, The City of New York, *Newsletter,* October 1962, and September 1961.

TABLE 6. Percentage Distribution of Population in Selected Age Groups by Color or Ethnic Group: New York City, 1950 and 1960

Age Group	1960				1950			
	All Classes	White	Nonwhite	Puerto Rican	All Classes	White	Nonwhite	Puerto Rican
All ages	100.0	77.8	14.3	7.9	100.0	87.3	9.6	3.1
Under 5 years	100.0	66.5	19.9	13.6	100.0	84.2	11.4	4.4
5 to 19 years	100.0	72.1	16.4	11.5	100.0	85.4	10.0	4.6
20 to 44 years	100.0	73.4	17.0	9.6	100.0	84.9	11.5	3.6
45 to 64 years	100.0	86.3	10.5	3.2	100.0	91.6	7.0	1.4
65 years and over	100.0	91.8	6.6	1.6	100.0	94.6	4.6	0.8

NOTE: For this table white and nonwhite population in each age group excludes persons of Puerto Rican birth or parentage classified in that color group. Data relating to Puerto Ricans in New York City in 1950, classified by color and age, were obtained directly from published census tabulations. The required estimates for 1960 were derived using the proportion nonwhite among Puerto Ricans in each age-sex group for New York State—Urban. The total Puerto Rican population of New York City accounted for 96.1 per cent of all Puerto Ricans in urban areas of New York State in 1960, and nonwhite Puerto Ricans residing in the city comprised 95.6 per cent of nonwhite Puerto Ricans living in urban areas of the state.

SOURCES: Derived from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General Population Characteristics, New York,* Final Report PC(1)–34B, Table 20; *Ibid., Subject Reports, Puerto Ricans in the United States,* Final Report PC(2)–1D, Table 1; *U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960, Census Tracts,* (New York, N.Y. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, Part 1, New York City), Final Report PHC(1)–104, Part 1, Table P–5; *U.S. Census of Population: 1950,* vol. 2, *Characteristics of the Population,* Part 32, New York, Table 33; *Ibid.,* vol. 4, *Special Reports,* Part 3, Chapter D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States, Table 3.

TABLE 7. Percentage Distribution of Nonwhite Population 25 Years Old and Over by Years of School Completed and Migration Status 1955–1960: New York City, 1960

Years of School Completed	Non-migrants	Total In-migrants	In-Migrants From: Ring of NY SMSA[a]	In-Migrants From: Other SMSA	In-Migrants From: Nonmetropolitan Area	Out-Migrants: To Ring of NY SMSA	Out-Migrants: Total From NY SMSA
Number of persons 25 years old and over	568,004	32,395	3,091	17,217	12,087	8,615	28,198
Percentage Distribution							
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Elementary: Less than 8 years	29.9	25.0	24.9	21.0	30.7	22.7	24.7
Elementary: 8 years	16.7	12.2	13.3	11.7	12.6	13.9	11.9
High School: 1 to 3 years	23.1	23.9	25.5	23.0	24.7	21.5	22.8
High School: 4 years	21.5	21.2	22.1	22.1	19.9	23.8	22.4
College: 1 to 3 years	5.4	8.5	7.1	10.7	5.6	8.2	9.5
College: 4 years or more	3.4	9.2	7.1	11.5	6.5	9.9	8.7
Median School Years Completed	9.4	10.6	10.4	11.3	9.8	10.9	10.8

[a] The abbreviation NY SMSA refers to the New York Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area that comprises New York City and four additional New York State counties: Nassau, Rockland, Suffolk, and Westchester.

NOTE: Persons not reporting place of 1955 residence are not included in this table. The in-migrant group does not include persons who were abroad in 1955. Out-migrants from New York SMSA exclude persons who were abroad in 1960.

SOURCE: Derived from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports, Mobility for Metropolitan Areas*, Final Report PC(2)–2C, Tables 4 and 5.

TABLE 8. Percentage Distribution of White Population 25 Years Old and Over by Years of School Completed and Migration Status 1955–1960, New York City, 1960

Years of School Completed		Non-migrants	Total In-migrants	In-Migrants From			Out-Migrants	
				Ring of NY SMSA	Other SMSA	Nonmetro-politan Area	To Ring of NY SMSA	Total From NY SMSA
Number of persons 25 years old and over		3,964,903	143,927	35,577	84,448	23,902	264,315	410,677
Percentage Distribution								
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Elementary:	Less than 8 years	21.5	8.7	9.7	8.0	9.5	8.5	9.9
	8 years	21.3	9.7	12.5	8.6	9.5	12.4	12.3
High School:	1 to 3 years	19.9	14.2	19.3	12.3	13.2	20.7	16.3
	4 years	22.3	23.5	25.5	22.9	22.6	31.5	27.1
College:	1 to 3 years	7.0	15.3	13.7	16.3	14.1	11.3	13.9
	4 years or more	8.0	28.6	19.3	31.9	31.1	15.6	20.5
Median School Years Completed		10.1	12.7	12.3	12.9	12.8	12.3	12.4

[a] The abbreviation NY SMSA refers to the New York Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area that comprises New York City and four additional New York State counties: Nassau, Rockland, Suffolk, and Westchester.

NOTE: Persons not reporting place of 1955 residence are not included in this table. The in-migrant group does not include persons who were abroad in 1955. Out-migrants from New York SMSA exclude persons who were abroad in 1960.

SOURCE: See Table 7.

TABLE 9. Change in Enrollments in Public and Nonpublic Schools by School Level: New York City, 1950 to 1960

(Numbers in thousands)

School Level and Type	Enrollment		Change 1950 to 1960	
	1960	1950	Number	Per Cent
All Levels (K–12)[a]	1,396	1,179	217	18.4
Public	987	879	108	12.3
Nonpublic	409	300	109	36.3
Kindergarten	89	64	25	39.1
Public	75	54	21	38.9
Nonpublic	14	10	4	40.0
Elementary (1–8)	926	805	121	15.0
Public	607	565	42	7.4
Nonpublic	319	240	79	32.9
High School	366	306	60	19.6
Public	290	256	34	13.3
Nonpublic	76	50	26	52.0

[a] Includes figures for handicapped pupils in public schools who were not under grade classification. These numbered about 4,000 in 1950, and 16,000 in 1960.

SOURCES: Derived from Board of Education, City of New York, *Sixty-Third Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools,* Statistical Section, School Year 1960–1961, Tables 21–23; *Fifty-Seventh Annual Report . . .* , School Year 1954–1955, Table 36.

TABLE 10. Enrollments in Nonpublic Schools as Per Cent of Total Enrollments by School Level: New York City, 1950 to 1962

School Level	1950	1955	1957	1960	1962
All Levels	25.4	28.8	29.0	29.3	28.7
Below High School (K–8)	28.8	32.1	32.5	32.8	31.8
Kindergarten	15.6	16.7	16.0	15.7	14.4
Elementary (1–8)	29.8	33.5	34.0	34.5	33.6
High School (9–12)	16.3	20.2	20.2	20.5	21.4

SOURCES: Derived from Board of Education, City of New York, *Sixty-Fifth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools,* Statistical Section; School Year 1962–1963, Tables 46–48; *Sixty-Third Annual Report . . .* , School Year 1960–1961, Tables 21–23; *Sixtieth Annual Report . . .* , School Year 1957–1958, Tables 21, 22 and 24; *Fifty-Seventh Annual Report . . .* , School Year 1954–1955, Table 36.

TABLE 11. Per Cent of Students Enrolled in Nonpublic Schools by Color and School Level: New York City, April, 1960

School Level	Total	White	Nonwhite
All Levels	28	32	8
Kindergarten	18	22	5
Elementary (1–8)	31	36	8
High School (9–12)	22	25	7

SOURCE: Derived from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General Social and Economic Characteristics, New York,* Final Report PC(1)–34C, Tables 73 and 77.

TABLE 12. Percentage Distribution of Enrollments in Public and Nonpublic Schools by Color and School Level: New York City, April, 1960

School Level and Type	Total	White	Nonwhite
All levels, total	100	83	17
Public	100	78	22
Nonpublic	100	95	5
Kindergarten, total	100	81	19
Public	100	78	22
Nonpublic	100	95	5
Elementary (1–8), total	100	82	18
Public	100	76	24
Nonpublic	100	95	5
High School (9–12), total	100	86	14
Public	100	83	17
Nonpublic	100	95	5

SOURCE: Derived from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960, General Social and Economic Characteristics, New York,* Final Report PC(1)–34C, Tables 73 and 77.

TABLE 13. Number, Percentage Distribution, and Changes in Public School Enrollments by Ethnic Group and School Level: New York City, 1957–1958 and 1964–1965

School Level and Ethnic Group	Enrollments				Per Cent Change
	1964–1965		1957–1958		
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	1957–1958 1964–1965
All Schools—Total	1,037,988	100.0	952,617	100.0	9.0
Negro	283,714	27.3	172,957	18.2	64.0
Puerto Rican	188,588	18.2	128,980	13.5	46.2
Other	565,686	54.5	650,680	68.3	– 13.0
Elementary Schools	590,080	100.0	554,419	100.0	6.4
Negro	177,603	30.1	113,744	20.5	56.1
Puerto Rican	122,187	20.7	84,695	15.3	44.3
Other	290,290	49.2	355,980	64.2	– 18.5
Junior High Schools	210,758	100.0	169,635	100.0	24.2
Negro	58,942	28.0	32,039	18.9	84.0
Puerto Rican	39,472	18.7	27,270	16.1	44.7
Other	112,344	53.3	110,326	65.0	1.8
Academic High Schools	198,724	100.0	187,282	100.0	6.1
Negro	36,185	18.2	17,450	9.3	107.4
Puerto Rican	17,613	8.9	8,601	4.6	104.8
Other	144,926	72.9	161,231	86.1	– 10.1
Vocational High Schools	38,426	100.0	41,281	100.0	– 6.9
Negro	10,984	28.6	9,724	23.6	13.0
Puerto Rican	9,316	24.2	8,414	20.4	10.7
Other	18,126	47.2	23,143	56.0	– 21.7

NOTE: Data for 1964–1965 refer to January 15, 1965; figures for 1957–1958 refer to registers as of September 30, 1957.

SOURCE: Derived from unpublished tabulations of Special Census of School Population, January 15, 1965, supplied by Board of Education, City of New York; and Board of Education, City of New York,

TABLE 14. Enrollments in Public Schools by Borough and School Level: New York City, 1957–1958 and 1964–1965

	1964–1965	1957–1958
New York City		
All Schools	1,037,988	952,617
Elementary Schools	590,080	554,419
Junior High Schools	210,758	169,635
Academic High Schools	198,724	187,282
Vocational High Schools	38,426	41,281
Bronx		
All Schools	202,210	177,392
Elementary Schools	118,638	102,721
Junior High Schools	43,248	36,607
Academic High Schools	34,988	32,104
Vocational High Schools	5,336	5,960
Brooklyn		
All Schools	388,564	348,031
Elementary Schools	223,456	199,745
Junior High Schools	78,272	61,702
Academic High Schools	73,481	72,978
Vocational High Schools	13,355	13,606
Manhattan		
All Schools	170,283	180,533
Elementary Schools	94,695	103,094
Junior High Schools	34,774	34,976
Academic High Schools	28,970	25,950
Vocational High Schools	11,844	16,513
Queens		
All Schools	240,600	217,290
Elementary Schools	131,863	127,915
Junior High Schools	48,458	36,350
Academic High Schools	53,287	48,930
Vocational High Schools	6,992	4,095
Richmond		
All Schools	36,331	29,371
Elementary Schools	21,428	20,944
Junior High Schools	6,006	—
Academic High Schools	7,998	7,320
Vocational High Schools	899	1,107

NOTE: Data for 1964–1965 refer to January 15, 1965; figures for 1957–1958 refer to registers as of September 30, 1957.

SOURCES: See Table 13.

TABLE 15. Percentage Distribution of Public School Enrollments by Ethnic Group, School Level, and Borough: New York City, 1957–1958 and 1964–1965

Area and Ethnic Group	All Schools		Elementary		Junior High		Academic High		Vocational High	
	1964–1965	1957–1958	1964–1965	1957–1958	1964–1965	1957–1958	1964–1965	1957–1958	1964–1965	1957–1958
New York City										
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Negro	27.3	18.2	30.1	20.5	28.0	18.9	18.2	9.3	28.6	23.6
Puerto Rican	18.2	13.5	20.7	15.3	18.7	16.1	8.9	4.6	24.2	20.4
Other	54.5	68.3	49.2	64.2	53.3	65.0	72.9	86.1	47.2	56.0
Bronx										
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Negro	26.9	15.6	28.6	17.1	26.7	14.7	20.9	9.5	29.3	25.8
Puerto Rican	30.6	19.8	34.2	22.6	30.4	21.2	15.9	6.5	46.2	35.9
Other	42.5	64.6	37.2	60.3	42.9	64.1	63.2	84.0	24.5	38.3
Brooklyn										
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Negro	29.5	17.5	33.3	21.0	30.5	16.7	16.8	7.4	27.8	24.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other	53.6	72.3	46.8	66.8	52.6	71.8	76.7	90.2	51.6	60.0
Negro	38.9	32.7	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Negro	38.9	32.7	41.2	35.7	39.2	33.7	33.9	24.3	31.3	24.8
Puerto Rican	32.6	30.4	36.0	33.6	34.2	34.0	22.2	16.9	26.5	24.0
Other	28.5	36.9	22.8	30.7	26.6	32.3	43.9	58.8	42.2	51.2
Queens										
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Negro	18.9	10.9	21.5	12.4	19.2	12.5	11.9	5.1	21.9	16.8
Puerto Rican	2.1	1.4	2.0	1.7	2.1	1.5	1.4	0.7	9.0	2.8
Other	79.0	87.7	76.5	85.9	78.7	86.0	86.7	94.2	69.1	80.4
Richmond										
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Negro	8.1	6.2	8.9	7.1	9.7	—	4.6	2.6	11.2	12.0
Puerto Rican	2.1	1.4	2.1	1.7	2.5	—	1.6	0.6	4.5	1.8
Other	89.8	92.4	89.0	91.2	87.8	—	93.8	96.8	84.3	86.2

SOURCES: Derived from unpublished tabulations of Special Census of School Population, January 15, 1965, supplied by Board of Education, City of New York; and Board of Education, City of New York, News Bureau Release, N–151–63/64, January 6, 1964. Mimeographed.

TABLE 16. Changes in Public School Enrollments by School Level and Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1957–1958 to 1964–1965

School Level and Ethnic Composition[a]	Total Enrollment		Change 1957–1958 to 1964–1965		Percentage Distribution	
	1964–1965	1957–1958	Number	Per Cent	1964–1965	1957–1958
All Levels						
All Schools	1,035,137[b]	952,617	82,520	8.7	100.0	100.0
X	239,191	109,046	130,145	119.3	23.1	11.4
Y	306,560	461,151	– 154,591	– 33.5	29.6	48.4
Z	489,386	382,420	106,966	28.0	47.3	40.1
Elementary School						
All Schools	587,229[b]	554,419	32,810	5.9	100.0	100.0
X	177,007	84,481	92,526	109.5	30.1	15.2
Y	151,377	247,341	– 95,964	– 38.6	25.8	44.7
Z	258,845	222,597	36,248	16.3	44.1	40.1
Junior High School						
All Schools	210,758	169,635	41,123	24.2	100.0	100.0
X	52,914	22,144	30,770	138.9	25.1	13.1
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Z	99,281	73,524	25,757	35.0	47.1	43.3

Academic High Schools	58,563	73,967	−15,404	−20.8	27.8	43.6
	[illegible]	[illegible]	11,412	6.1	100.0	100.0
X	7,670	991	6,679	674.0	3.9	0.5
Y	95,065	132,593	−37,528	−28.3	47.8	70.8
Z	95,989	53,698	42,291	78.8	48.3	28.7
Vocational High School						
All Schools	38,426	41,281	−2,855	−6.9	100.0	100.0
X	1,600	1,430	170	11.9	4.2	3.5
Y	1,555	7,250	−5,695	−78.6	4.0	17.6
Z	35,271	32,601	2,670	8.2	91.8	78.9

[a] *Elementary Schools*

X = Schools with 90 per cent or more Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans. (Segregated nonwhite schools)
Y = Schools with 10 per cent or fewer Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans. (Segregated white schools)
Z = Schools with 10 to 90 per cent Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans. (Integrated schools)

Junior High and High Schools

X = Schools with 85 per cent or more Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans.
Y = Schools with 15 per cent or fewer Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans.
Z = Schools with 15 to 85 per cent Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans.

[b] Minor variations in enrollment figures as compared with those in Tables 13 and 14 are due to computational differences.

SOURCES: Derived from Board of Education, City of New York, New York City Public Schools, Central Zoning Unit, *Ethnic Distribution of Pupils in the Public Schools of New York City*, March 24, 1965, Table 4; mimeographed; and unpublished tabulations supplied by Board of Education, City of New York.

TABLE 17. Changes in Number and Distribution of Elementary and Junior High Schools by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1957–1958 to 1964–1965

School Level and Ethnic Type	Number of Schools		Change 1957–1958 to 1964–1965		Per Cent Distribution	
	1964–1965	1957–1958	Number	Per Cent	1964–1965	1957–1958
Elementary						
All Schools	586	565	21	3.7	100.0	100.0
X	148	64	84	131.2	25.3	11.3
Y	172	290	– 118	– 40.7	29.3	51.3
Z	266	211	55	26.1	45.4	37.3
Junior High						
All Schools	138	123	15	12.2	100.0	100.0
X	34	16	18	112.5	24.6	13.0
Y	37	52	– 15	– 28.8	26.8	42.3
Z	67	55	12	21.8	48.6	44.7

SOURCES: Derived from Board of Education, City of New York, New York City Public Schools, Central Zoning Unit, *Ethnic Distribution of Pupils in the Public Schools of New York City,* March 24, 1965, Tables 3a and 3b; and Board of Education, City of New York, News Bureau Release, N–151–63/64, January 6, 1964. Mimeographed.

TABLE 18. Percentage Distribution of Elementary Schools by Special Service Status and Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1963–1964

Status of School	Ethnic Composition			
	X[a] (Negro/ Puerto Rican)	Y[b] ("Other")	Z[c] (Middle Range)	Total[d] (N = 596)
Special Service	95	0	26	37
Non-Special Service	5	100	74	63
Total	100	100	100	100
Special Service	56	0	44	100
Non-Special Service	2	24	74	100
Total	22	15	63	100

[a] X = Schools with 90 per cent or more Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans. (Segregated nonwhite schools)
[b] Y = Schools with 10 per cent or fewer Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans. (Segregated white schools)
[c] Z = Schools with 10 to 90 per cent Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans. (Integrated schools)
[d] The total number of schools refers to those schools where data on the joint distributions are available. Insofar as joint distributions are compiled from separate and unpublished sources from the Board of Education there is some variation in the size of N in each table that follows.

TABLE 19. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Mean Grade IQ Scores for Sixth-Grade Tests by Special Service Status: New York City, 1962–1963

Status of School	Mean IQ Scores[a] 100 and over	95–99	85–94	70–84	Total (N = 543)
Special Service	2	34	93	98	37
Non-Special Service	98	66	7	2	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	3	10	60	27	100
Non-Special Service	85	12	3	—[b]	100
Total	53	11	25	11	100

[a] IQ scores based on city-wide sixth-grade tests. Median IQ for all schools is 99.8.
[b] Less than 1 per cent.

TABLE 20. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Mean Grade IQ Scores for Sixth-Grade Tests by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1962–1963

Ethnic Composition	Mean IQ Score[a] 100 and over	95–99	85–94	70–84	Total (N = 543)
X	0	7	54	65	22
Y	29	3	0	0	15
Z	71	90	46	35	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	0	3	64	33	100
Y	98	2	0	0	100
Z	60	16	18	6	100
Total	53	11	25	11	100

[a] IQ scores based on city-wide sixth-grade tests. Median IQ for all schools is 99.8.

TABLE 21. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Mean Grade Reading Scores for Sixth-Grade Tests by Special Service Status: New York City, 1962–1963

Status of School	Mean Grade Level[a]				
	6.0 and over	5.0–5.9	4.0–4.9	Less than 4.0	Total (N = 547)
Special Service	3	59	99	100	37
Non-Special Service	97	41	1	0	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	4	28	67	1	100
Non-Special Service	87	12	1	0	100
Total	55	18	26	1	100

[a] Mean grade score on city-wide sixth-grade tests. Median reading level for all schools is 6.4.

TABLE 22. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Mean Grade Reading Scores for Sixth-Grade Tests by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1962–1963

Ethnic Composition	Mean Grade Level[a]				
	6.0 and over	5.0–5.9	4.0–4.9	Less than 4.0	Total (N = 547)
X	0	21	63	67	22
Y	28	0	1	0	15
Z	72	79	36	33	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	0	19	80	1	100
Y	99	0	1	0	100
Z	63	22	15	—[b]	100
Total	55	18	26	1	100

[a] Mean grade score on city-wide sixth-grade tests. Median reading level for all schools is 6.4.
[b] Less than 1 per cent.

TABLE 23. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Pupil Mobility Rates by Special Service Status: New York City, 1962–1963

Status of School	Pupil Mobility Rates[a]				
	Less than 40 per cent	40–49 per cent	50–74 per cent	75 per cent and over	Total (N = 548)
Special Service	19	35	69	90	37
Non-Special Service	81	65	31	10	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	26	14	47	13	100
Non-Special Service	69	17	13	1	100
Total	53	16	26	5	100

[a] Per cent of pupils (excluding first-graders and graduating class) entering or leaving school during school year.

TABLE 24. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Pupil Mobility Rates by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1962–1963

Ethnic Composition	Pupil Mobility Rates[a]				
	Less than 40 per cent	40–49 per cent	50–74 per cent	75 per cent and over	Total (N = 548)
X	11	19	41	31	22
Y	23	14	4	3	15
Z	64	67	55	66	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	27	15	50	8	100
Y	78	14	7	1	100
Z	55	17	23	5	100
Total	53	16	26	5	100

[a] Per cent of pupils (excluding first-graders and graduating class) entering or leaving school during school year.

TABLE 25. Percentage Distribution of Elementary Schools by Proportion of Teachers on Permanent License by Special Service Status: New York City, 1962–1963

Status of School	Per Cent of Teachers on Permanent License				
	65 and over	50–64	35–49	Less than 35	Total (N = 556)
Special Service	17	40	75	84	37
Non-Special Service	83	60	25	16	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	22	34	29	15	100
Non-Special Service	62	30	6	2	100
Total	47	31	15	7	100

TABLE 26. Percentage Distribution of Elementary Schools by Proportion of Teachers on Permanent License by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1962–1963

Ethnic Composition	Per Cent of Teachers on Permanent License				
	65 and over	50–64	35–49	Less than 35	Total (N = 556)
X	8	23	36	60	22
Y	24	12	2	5	15
Z	68	65	62	35	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	19	35	27	19	100
Y	72	24	2	2	100
Z	50	31	15	4	100
Total	47	31	15	7	100

TABLE 27. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Attendance Rates by Special Service Status: New York City, 1962–1963

Status of School	Attendance Rates[a] 94 and over	92–94	90–92	88–90	Less than 88	Total (N = 579)
Special Service	17	16	31	57	86	37
Non-Special Service	83	84	69	43	14	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	—[b]	8	41	40	11	100
Non-Special Service	1	24	54	18	1	100
Total	1	18	49	26	5	100

[a] Average daily percentage of attendance September 10, 1962, to June 28, 1963, inclusive, excluding Regents days.
[b] Less than 1 per cent.

TABLE 28. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Attendance Rates by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1962–1963

Ethnic Composition	Attendance Rates[a] 94 and over	92–94	90–92	88–90	Less than 88	Total (N = 579)
X	50	11	19	29	45	22
Y	33	31	16	6	0	15
Z	17	57	65	65	55	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
X	2	9	43	35	10	100
Y	2	37	51	10	0	100
Z	0	17	51	27	4	100
Total	1	18	49	26	5	100

[a] Average daily percentage of attendance September 10, 1962, to June 28, 1963, inclusive, excluding Regents days.

TABLE 29. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Promotion Rates by Special Service Status: New York City, 1963–1964

Status of School	Promotion Rates[a]				
	98 per cent and over	96–98 per cent	94–96 per cent	Under 94 per cent	Total (N = 575)
Special Service	6	30	64	85	37
Non-Special Service	94	70	36	15	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	5	20	33	42	100
Non-Special Service	56	28	11	5	100
Total	37	25	20	18	100

[a] Per cent of pupils promoted to next higher grade level at end of school year.

TABLE 30. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Promotion Rates by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1963–1964

Ethnic Composition	Promotion Rates[a]				
	98 per cent and over	96–98 per cent	94–96 per cent	Under 94 per cent	Total (N = 575)
X	1	20	38	22	22
Y	33	12	3	16	15
Z	66	68	59	62	63
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	2	23	33	41	100
Y	18	19	3	0	100
Z	39	27	18	16	100
Total	37	25	20	18	100

[a] Per cent of pupils promoted to next higher grade level at end of school year.

TABLE 31. Median Levels of Selected Variables for Elementary Schools by Special Service Status and Ethnic Composition: New York City, circa 1963

Variable	Characteristic of School					Total
	Special Service	Non-Special Service	X	Y	Z	
IQ (Sixth Grade)[a]	88.8	100.0+	87.7	100.0+	100.0+	99.8
Reading (Sixth Grade)[b]	4.4	6.0+	4.3	6.0+	6.0+	6.4
Pupil Mobility[c]	69.9	−40.0	70.9	−40.0	−40.0	−40.0
Teachers on Permanent License[d]	52.5	63.5	51.9	65.0+	65.0+	63.5
Attendance Rate[e]	89.9	91.1	88.3	91.6	90.7	90.8
Promotion Rate[f]	94.5	98.0+	94.5	98.0+	97.2	97.0

[a] IQ scores based on city-wide sixth-grade tests. Median IQ for all schools is 99.8.
[b] Mean grade score on city-wide sixth-grade tests. Median reading level for all schools is 6.4.
[c] Per cent of pupils (excluding first-graders and graduating class) entering or leaving school during school year.
[d] Per cent of teachers on permanent license.
[e] Average daily percentage of attendance September 10, 1962, to June 28, 1963, inclusive, excluding Regents days.
[f] Per cent of pupils promoted to next higher grade level at end of school year.

TABLE 32. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Personnel Index by Special Service Status: New York City, 1963–1964

Status of School	Personnel Index[a]		Total (N = 569)
	Below City Average	At or Above City Average	
Special Service	54	29	37
Non-Special Service	46	71	63
Total	100	100	100
Special Service	55	45	100
Non-Special Service	30	70	100
Total	39	61	100

[a] Proportion of authorized positions filled by regularly licensed teachers.

TABLE 33. Percentage Distribution of Elementary School Personnel Index by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1963–1964

Ethnic Composition	Personnel Index[a]		Total (N = 569)
	Below City Average	At or Above City Average	
X	35	15	22
Y	5	22	15
Z	60	63	63
Total	100	100	100
X	60	40	100
Y	14	86	100
Z	38	62	100
Total	39	61	100

[a] Proportion of authorized positions filled by regularly licensed teachers.

TABLE 34. Percentage Distribution of Supplementary and Compensatory Programs in Elementary Schools by Special Service Status: New York City, circa 1963–1964

Program	Special Service Status			Number of Schools
	SS	N-SS	Total	
After School Study Centers	87	13	100	217
Higher Horizons	81	19	100	52
PEA School Volunteers	84	16	100	20
All-Day Neighborhood Schools	100	0	100	14
Corrective Reading Program	67	33	100	285
Early Identification and Prevention Program	72	28	100	37
Junior Guidance Classes	58	42	100	62
Pre-Kindergarten Classes	85	15	100	33
Team Teaching	42	58	100	68
Non-English Speaking Program	95	5	100	145
Programmed Instruction Project	33	67	100	33
Total[a]	37	63	100	605

[a] See Table 18, note d.

TABLE 35. Percentage Distribution of Supplementary and Compensatory Programs in Elementary Schools by Ethnic Composition: New York City, circa 1963–1964

Program	Ethnic Composition			Total	Number of Schools
	X	Y	Z		
After School Study Centers	59	0	41	100	217
Higher Horizons	75	0	25	100	52
PEA School Volunteers	50	5	45	100	20
All-Day Neighborhood Schools	71	0	29	100	14
Corrective Reading Program	42	4	54	100	285
Early Identification and Prevention Program	41	2	57	100	37
Junior Guidance Classes	31	1	68	100	62
Pre-Kindergarten Classes	64	0	36	100	33
Team Teaching	28	16	56	100	68
Non-English Speaking Program	49	0	51	100	145
Programmed Instruction Project	6	15	79	100	33
Total[a]	22	15	63	100	596

[a] See Table 18, note d.

TABLE 36. Percentage Distribution of Junior High Schools by Special Service Status and Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1963–1964

Status of School	Ethnic Composition			Total[d] (N = 129)
	X[a] (Negro/ P.R.)	Y[b] ("Other")	Z[c] (Middle-Range)	
Special Service	100	0	44	45
Non-Special Service	0	100	56	55
Total	100	100	100	100
Special Service	48	0	52	100
Non-Special Service	0	46	54	100
Total	22	25	53	100

[a] X = Schools with 85 per cent or more Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans.
[b] Y = Schools with 15 per cent or fewer Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans.
[c] Z = Schools with 15 to 85 per cent Negroes and/or Puerto Ricans.
[d] See Table 18, note d.

TABLE 37. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Mean Grade IQ Scores for Eighth-Grade Tests by Special Service Status: New York City, 1963–1964

Status of School	Mean IQ Scores[a] 100 and over	95–99	85–94	70–84	Total (N = 125)
Special Service	0	64	100	96	45
Non-Special Service	100	36	0	4	55
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	0	12	46	42	100
Non-Special Service	93	6	0	1	100
Total	50	9	21	20	100

[a] IQ scores based on city-wide eighth-grade tests. Median IQ for all schools is 100.0+.

TABLE 38. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Mean Grade IQ Scores for Eighth-Grade Tests by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1963–1964

Ethnic Composition	Mean IQ Scores[a] 100 and over	95–99	85–94	70–84	Total (N = 125)
X	0	0	27	84	22
Y	52	0	0	6	25
Z	48	100	73	16	53
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	0	0	25	75	100
Y	100	0	0	0	100
Z	47	17	30	6	100
Total	50	9	21	20	100

[a] IQ scores based on city-wide eighth-grade tests. Median IQ for all schools is 100.0+.

TABLE 39. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Median Grade Reading Scores for Eighth-Grade Tests by Special Service Status: New York City, 1963–1964

Status of School	Mean Grade Level[a] 8.0 and over	7.0–7.9	6.0–6.9	Less than 6.0	Total (N = 127)
Special Service	1	63	100	96	45
Non-Special Service	99	37	0	4	55
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	1	21	39	39	100
Non-Special Service	89	10	0	1	100
Total	50	15	17	18	100

[a] Mean grade score on city-wide eighth-grade tests. Median reading level for all schools is 8.2.

TABLE 40. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Median Grade Reading Scores for Eighth-Grade Tests by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1963–1964

Ethnic Composition	Mean Grade Level[a] 8.0 and over	7.0–7.9	6.0–6.9	Less than 6.0	Total (N = 127)
X	0	5	41	43	22
Y	51	5	0	4	25
Z	49	90	59	53	53
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	0	5	45	50	100
Y	94	3	0	3	100
Z	42	23	18	17	100
Total	50	15	17	18	100

[a] Mean grade score on city-wide eighth-grade tests. Median reading level for all schools is 8.2.

TABLE 41. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Pupil Mobility Rates by Special Service Status: New York City, 1963–1964

Status of School	Pupil Mobility Rates[a]			Total (N = 129)
	Less than 40 per cent	40–50 per cent	50–74 per cent[b]	
Special Service	25	100	93	45
Non-Special Service	75	0	7	55
Total	100	100	100	100
Special Service	40	36	24	100
Non-Special Service	99	0	1	100
Total	72	16	12	100

[a] Per cent of pupils (excluding entering and graduating class) entering or leaving school during school year.
[b] No junior high school experienced pupil mobility rates as high as 75 per cent.

TABLE 42. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Pupil Mobility Rates by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1963–1964

Ethnic Composition	Pupil Mobility Rates[a]			Total (N = 129)
	Less than 40 per cent	40–50 per cent	50–74 per cent[b]	
X	9	66	40	22
Y	35	0	0	25
Z	56	33	60	53
Total	100	100	100	100
X	29	50	21	100
Y	100	0	0	100
Z	77	10	13	100
Total	72	16	12	100

[a] Per cent of pupils (excluding entering and graduating class) entering or leaving school during school year.
[b] No junior high school experienced pupil mobility rates as high as 75 per cent.

TABLE 43. Percentage Distribution of Junior High Schools by Proportion of Teachers on Permanent License by Special Service Status: New York City, 1963–1964

Status of School	Per Cent of Teachers on Permanent License				
	65 and over	50–64	35–49	Less than 35	Total
Special Service	4	42	64	86	45
Non-Special Service	96	58	36	14	55
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	2	36	52	10	100
Non-Special Service	34	41	24	1	100
Total	19	40	36	5	100

TABLE 44. Percentage Distribution of Junior High Schools by Proportion of Teachers on Permanent License by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1963–1964

Ethnic Composition	Per Cent of Teachers on Permanent License				
	65 and over	50–64	35–49	Less than 35	Total
X	0	14	38	43	22
Y	68	20	13	0	25
Z	32	66	49	57	53
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	0	25	64	11	100
Y	52	30	18	0	100
Z	12	48	34	6	100
Total	19	40	36	5	100

TABLE 45. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Attendance Rates by Special Service Status: New York City, 1962–1963

Status of School	Attendance Rates[a] 94 per cent and over	92–94 per cent	90–92 per cent	Less than 90 per cent[b]	Total (N = 130)
Special Service	0	11	56	81	45
Non-Special Service	10	89	44	19	55
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	0	9	31	60	100
Non-Special Service	13	57	19	11	100
Total	7	35	25	33	100

[a] Average daily percentage of attendance September 10, 1962, to June 28, 1963, inclusive, excluding Regents days.
[b] No junior high school had attendance rates lower than 88 per cent.

TABLE 46. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Attendance Rates by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1962–1963

Ethnic Composition	Attendance Rates[a] 94 per cent and over	92–94 per cent	90–92 per cent	Less than 90 per cent[b]	Total (N = 130)
X	0	4	16	51	22
Y	67	44	16	5	25
Z	33	52	68	44	53
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	0	7	17	76	100
Y	18	61	15	6	100
Z	4	35	32	28	100
Total	7	35	25	33	100

[a] Average daily percentage of attendance September 10, 1962, to June 28, 1963, inclusive, excluding Regents days.
[b] No junior high school had attendance rates lower than 88 per cent.

TABLE 47. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Promotion Rates by Special Service Status: New York City, 1964

Status of School	Promotion Rates[a] 98 per cent and over	96–98 per cent	94–96 per cent	Under 94 per cent	Total (N = 128)
Special Service	4	31	58	78	45
Non-Special Service	96	69	42	22	55
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Special Service	1	9	26	54	100
Non-Special Service	37	34	16	13	100
Total	21	28	20	31	100

[a] Per cent of pupils promoted to next higher grade level at end of school year.

TABLE 48. Percentage Distribution of Junior High School Promotion Rates by Ethnic Composition: New York City, 1964

Ethnic Composition	Promotion Rates[a] 98 per cent and over	96–98 per cent	94–96 per cent	Under 94 per cent	Total (N = 128)
X	4	14	27	38	22
Y	74	29	8	2	25
Z	22	57	65	60	53
Total	100	100	100	100	100
X	4	18	25	53	100
Y	61	30	6	3	100
Z	9	30	25	36	100
Total	21	28	20	31	100

[a] Per cent of pupils promoted to next higher grade level at end of school year.

TABLE 49. Median Levels of Selected Variables for Junior High Schools by Special Service Status and Ethnic Composition: New York City, circa 1963

Variable	Characteristic of School					
	Special Service	Non-Special Service	X	Y	Z	Total
IQ (Eighth Grade)[a]	86.7	100.0+	81.7	100.0+	99.1	100.0+
Reading (Eighth Grade)[b]	6.3	8.0+	6.0	8.0+	7.7	8.2
Pupil Mobility[c]	47.1	– 40.0	45.7	– 40.0	– 40.0	– 40.0
Teacher on Permanent License[d]	46.5	59.0	44.2	65.0+	53.2	53.2
Attendance Rates[e]	89.6	92.7	89.1	93.0	91.4	91.4
Promotion Rates[f]	– 94.0	97.3	– 94.0	98.0+	95.1	95.8

[a] IQ scores based on city-wide eighth-grade tests. Median IQ for all schools is 100.0+.
[b] Mean grade score on city-wide eighth-grade tests. Median reading level for all schools is 8.2.
[c] Per cent of pupils (excluding entering and graduating class) entering or leaving school during school year.
[d] Per cent of teachers on permanent license.
[e] Average daily percentage of attendance September 10, 1962, to June 28, 1963, inclusive, excluding Regents days.
[f] Per cent of pupils promoted to next higher grade level at end of school year.

TABLE 50. Percentage Distribution of Supplementary and Compensatory Programs in Junior High Schools by Special Service Status: New York City, circa 1963–1964

Program	Special Service Status			Number of Schools
	SS	N-SS	Total	
After School Study Centers	96	4	100	51
Higher Horizons	100	0	100	12
Career Guidance	93	7	100	30
PEA School Volunteers	50	50	100	4
Special Progress and Enrichment	35	65	100	105
Total	45	55	100	129

TABLE 51. Percentage Distribution of Supplementary and Compensatory Programs in Junior High Schools by Ethnic Composition: New York City, circa 1963–1964

Program	Ethnic Composition				Number of Schools
	X	Y	Z	Total	
After School Study Centers	59	0	41	100	51
Higher Horizons	83	0	17	100	12
Career Guidance	50	0	50	100	30
PEA School Volunteers	50	0	50	100	4
Special Progress and Enrichment	11	31	58	100	105
Total	22	25	53	100	129

TABLE 52. Selected Variables for Elementary Schools in 1962–1963 by Open Enrollment Status: New York City, 1961–1963

Variable and Score	Status of School, 1961–1963[a]								Percentage Distribution By Status of School			
	Total		Sending		Receiving		Other					
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Total	Sending	Receiving	Other
IQ[b]												
70–84	58	10.3	37	33.6	0	0	21	6.7	100.0	63.8	0	36.2
85–94	141	25.0	67	60.9	2	1.4	72	23.1	100.0	47.5	1.4	51.1
95–99	64	11.3	5	4.6	9	6.3	50	16.0	100.0	7.8	14.1	78.1
100 and over	301	53.4	1	0.9	131	92.3	169	54.2	100.0	0.3	43.5	56.1
Total	564	100.0	110	100.0	142	100.0	312	100.0	100.0	19.5	25.2	55.3
Reading[c]												
3.5–3.9	3	0.5	2	1.8	0	0	1	0.3	100.0	66.7	0	33.3
4.0–4.9	146	25.9	82	74.5	0	0	64	20.5	100.0	56.2	0	43.8
5.0–5.9	103	18.3	25	22.7	10	7.0	68	21.8	100.0	24.3	9.7	66.0
6.0 and over	312	55.3	1	0.9	132	93.0	179	57.4	100.0	0.3	42.3	57.4
Total	564	100.0	110	100.0	142	100.0	312	100.0	100.0	19.5	25.2	55.3

75 and over	32	5.7	7	6.4	0	0	25	8.0	100.0	21.9	0	78.1
50–74	152	26.9	57	51.8	11	7.7	84	26.9	100.0	37.5	7.2	55.3
40–49	89	15.8	17	15.4	25	17.6	47	15.1	100.0	19.1	28.1	52.8
Under 40	291	51.6	29	26.4	106	74.6	156	50.0	100.0	10.0	36.4	53.6
Total	564	100.0	110	100.0	142	100.0	312	100.0	100.0	19.5	25.2	55.3
Teachers on Permanent License[e]												
Under 30	18	3.2	9	8.2	1	0.7	8	2.6	100.0	50.0	5.6	44.4
30–49	102	18.1	37	33.6	9	6.3	56	17.9	100.0	36.3	8.8	54.9
50–74	303	53.7	59	53.6	78	54.9	166	53.2	100.0	19.5	25.7	54.8
75 and over	141	25.0	5	4.5	54	38.0	82	26.3	100.0	3.5	38.3	58.2
Total	564	100.0	110	100.0	142	100.0	312	100.0	100.0	19.5	25.2	55.3

[a] Recently organized schools are excluded.
[b] IQ scores based on city-wide sixth-grade tests. Median IQ for all schools is 99.8.
[c] Mean grade score on city-wide sixth-grade tests. Median reading level for all schools is 6.4.
[d] Per cent of pupils (excluding first-graders and graduating class) entering or leaving school during school year.
[e] Per cent of teachers on permanent license.

TABLE 53. Percentage Distribution of Selected Supplementary and Compensatory Programs in Elementary Schools by Open Enrollment Status: New York City, 1961–1963

Program	Open Enrollment Status			Number of Schools
	Sending	Receiving	Other	
After School Study Centers	54	0	46	214
Higher Horizons	74	2	24	50
Corrective Reading	39	13	48	280
Team Teaching	25	24	50	67
Total[a]	21	24	55	593

[a] The total number of schools refers to those schools where data on the joint distributions are available. Insofar as joint distributions are compiled from separate and often independent sources some variation in the size of N is to be anticipated.

TABLE 54. Percentage Distribution of Selected Variables for Elementary and Junior High Schools in 5–3–4 Experimental Reorganization: New York City, 1963–1964

Variable	Sending Elementary Schools (N = 30)	Receiving Junior High Schools (N = 8)	Alternate Receiving Elementary Schools (N = 36)
Ethnic Composition			
X	83	88	0
Y	0	0	22
Z	17	12	78
Total	100	100	100
IQ			
70–84	32	62	0
85–94	61	38	0
95–99	7	0	0
100+	0	0	100
Total	100	100	100
Reading			
2.1 to 2.5 years below grade level	4	37	0
1.1 to 2.0 years below grade level	75	50	0
0.1 to 1.0 years below grade level	21	13	0
At grade level or above	0	0	100
Total	100	100	100
Pupil Mobility			
75 and over	0	0	0
50–74	53	13	3
40–49	18	62	14
Under 40	29	25	83
Total	100	100	100
Teachers on Permanent License			
Under 30	14	0	0
30–49	39	62	6
50–74	47	38	51
75 and over	0	0	43
Total	100	100	100

NOTE: For variables 2 through 5 data are available for only 28 of the 30 "sending" elementary schools, and for only 35 of the 36 "receiving" elementary schools involved in this program.

INDEX

THE AUTHORS

Eleanor Bernert Sheldon, Ph.D., is Sociologist and Executive Associate at Russell Sage Foundation. She is currently engaged in a study of the impact of demographic changes on the public services of New York City.

Raymond A. Glazier, M.B.A., is Chief of the Bureau of Community Statistical Services at the Community Council of Greater New York. While collaborating on this book he was a research associate at Russell Sage Foundation.