

going to expect kids to run the conventional rat race of right answers and coverage of large quantities of stale obsolete bodies of knowledge (or what one of the delegates referred to as the four R's of "rote, recall, regurgitation, and restraint").

One thing is becoming increasingly clear to me. The money poured into Title I is largely going to be wasted if we continue to spend it on bolstering the present system of educating children. Somehow we have to devise a way of putting at least that much money every year into research and the development of new and better ways of doing things.

Title I has to become much more directed toward breaking the established habits and patterns that have proved themselves totally incapable of even helping, much less educating, disadvantaged children. If this requires Congress to rewrite the title, so be it. But simply to assist the present system to do in a more elegant way what it is already doing so badly is to pervert the possibility of what American education should and could be.

**Peter G. Kontos**, professor of education, Princeton University

The major gaps in practices that were identified are: A lack of psychological and sociological theoretical frameworks from which an interactive effect of programs can be demonstrated; an absence of data as to the effect of an educational policy of programming early intervention; no real understanding of language development; a lack in definitive programs in teacher preparation; and, finally, an absence of adequate evaluation techniques.

Basically, the disadvantaged child, like all children, learns best in a child-centered, inductive, educational situation which is also racially integrated.

Staff development and teacher training are keys to the successful educational process; guidelines should therefore not be so tightly drawn—as they are now—as to include staff training for any *specific* Title I programs. Changing the basic attitudes of teachers and administrators toward educational innovation and toward acceptance of disadvantaged children as learners should be a program which may be separately funded under Title I and should not be required to be part of any specific action program.

There is a great danger that programs that closely approximate the familiar are too easily funded. Evidence is beginning to indicate that these programs are most susceptible to failure. Disadvantaged children must not be subjected to playing the remediation catch-

up game in which educators institutionalize the child by laying out his life in nine daily 40-minute remedial periods. In the midst of an educational revolution we cannot afford to prolong the dull and advocate the pedestrian.

**Charles Benson**, associate professor of education, University of California, Berkeley

It seemed to be generally agreed that teaching talent is distributed unequally among the schools in large cities, with slum schools having a disproportionate number of less trained and provisionally certificated persons. One primary way to attack the problem is desegregation, but this cannot be a short-term answer, physically speaking, in the largest cities—or not a complete answer anyway. What would seem to be good is that the Office of Education encourage the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers to devise schemes, semivoluntary from the point of view of the teacher, to afford staffs in slum schools that are balanced with respect to age, sex, training, and experience. It was suggested that teachers must work in a school setting in which they can be successful. Presently, criteria of success are mainly related to the academic performance of the collegebound. It was hoped that it might be possible to broaden the definition of success to include helping the disadvantaged to achieve at a higher level, starting from where the disadvantaged are. The analogy made was the satisfaction many teachers appear to gain from helping the physically handicapped to make progress.

The suggestion was made in our panel that there be established in inner-city areas institutions called professional schools. These schools would be centers of inservice training and educational research. An analogy would be the teaching hospital. Hopefully, teachers would regard it as a professional opportunity to be associated with these schools. One task of such schools could be to develop materials appropriate for the instruction of the disadvantaged. This suggestion combines opportunity for relevant inservice training and the reallocation of high-grade teaching talent to the inner city. It might serve to restore the large cities to a position of educational leadership.

I would also like to suggest that Title I programs emphasize mathematics in the middle school years. For the disadvantaged, there are fewer cultural blocks to excelling in mathematics than there appear to be in reading and verbal activities generally. Employment opportunities for persons who manage to acquire mathematical competence are good and seem likely to remain