

been my experience that the most critical element is the guy at the top of the organization," he said. "A lot can be done by fiat. A lot can be done by incentive and encouragement, and recognition of effort."

"This says a lot for the process of getting leaders. If we're going to have any massive intervention into the problems of the poor, we've got to find ways to get good people into key spots in leadership roles. There is a tremendous premium on the character of the person who is leading. A program won't work unless the person at the top is receptive to it."

Chairman Cleveland added that Title I presents opportunities which have never before been available to the administrator and teacher on behalf of the children who heretofore have simply been problem children.

"A good thing about Title I," he said, "is that you don't have to succeed. You just have to try something new."

Panel IA

Panelist Philip Montez, State President, Association of Mexican-American Education, Los Angeles, Calif., told of an experiment with a group of alienated Hebrew and Mexican-American children in Los Angeles. Money was made available under Title I for the teachers to involve themselves at the community level. "... here I saw a teacher sitting with three or four kids drinking a coke, ... talking their jazz, talking their lingual ... This teacher in this program has been allowed time to participate with individual kids on things that are important to them, being willing to accept the threat of maybe entering into a world that she or he doesn't really understand. I think this is crucial in education today."

Another panelist, Arthur Pearl, Professor of Education, University of Oregon, said that the poor were "locked out" of our society and Title I could be used to change this situation. "The fact of the matter is right now, today, a Negro with a college education makes less money than a white person with a 10th grade education in this country," he said. "The unemployed rate with Negroes with less than high school education is just the same as if they had a high school education."

"Now, you have got \$1 billion that can be used to start changing the world for people who are locked out. ... The point is that out of ... Title I you can hire poor people to teach. And you can start opening up the world for them."

Panel IIIA

One participant advised that Title I money be spent on the radical and revolutionary, "for the wilder the

idea is, the more likely that it will do some good."

The participants were confused as to what innovation was supposed to mean and whether the ideas should be new *per se* or simply new to their school districts. Consultant Nolan Estes, Director, Division of Supplementary Plans and Services, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education (OE), outlined four essential steps for innovation: research or inquiry, development, diffusion, and utilization.

A question arose: Why concentrate on the innovative? Some contended that Title I presents an opportunity to get funds for old ideas that have not been tried in a school system previously because the money has never before been available. Such ideas, while old to the field, would be new to such a system.

Another contention was that innovative ideas usually require the kinds of specialized personnel that are hard to find and harder to train. In partial answer, it was suggested that, once Title I innovations are introduced, old parts of the curriculum that have not worked be eliminated, freeing the staff and equipment for the new programs. It was further advised that "our additive approach will run out. We need adaptive procedures because otherwise we'll run out of space, personnel, materials, and everything else."

The similarity of Title I projects was discussed, and some effort made to trace back their source. In at least one instance a publishing house has sent out a model proposal which, in turn, has been widely copied. The Federal guidelines and model proposals sent out by some of the States have been taken as gospel by some school systems and have been followed like blueprints. One reason for this is that, in the early stages of Title I, time was short and personnel to write proposals scarce. The participants expressed a desire for help in working up proposals and advice from coordinators and from college faculty in developing ideas.

This discussion got into the role of the Title I coordinator. Is the coordinator's function simply to see that the proposal is in order and pass it along for approval? Or is he to act as an innovator, encouraging superintendents and others to new ideas? There was no final agreement on the coordinator's role, although it was clear that some of the coordinators were functioning as program developers with local school systems.

A further, more basic question threaded its way through the meeting: Whether ideas that have failed in the past should be funded. An example was offered in the field of reading. Some 70 percent of all funded proposals are in the area of remedial reading, although remedial reading often has not been effective. Should the coordinator reject such proposals on the