

Local approval for the Pre-School program was given for a number of reasons, as described by the pueblo officials and parents. The children of Santa Clara normally spend their pre-school years with only their kinsmen and have no experience with others, hence are very shy when they begin school and often do not have success commensurate with their potential. For most of the children, Tewa is the language spoken in the home and English is not learned until they begin school. Under such conditions it is often necessary for the children to spend one or two semesters in a "pre-first grade" class to learn sufficient English to do the normal work. Moreover, they tend to speak English with a noticeable accent and their ability to think in English is sometimes limited. The officials and several parents have pointed out that the children in the Pre-School program learn to get along with others, overcome their shyness, learn English, and are otherwise better prepared to enter the regular school system. To repeat, approval of the Pre-School program was enthusiastic. It may be noted that in Santa Clara at the time this research began, approval of the Teacher-Director was strong.

The Pre-School program, at the time of the study, included one Teacher-Director, four teacher's aides, one cook, and one assistant cook. The Teacher was a college graduate and had post-graduate work in pedagogy, including training in the Montessori method. The teacher's aides had received training of several weeks duration through the Consortium at the Arizona State University in Tempe.

Problems arose in the re-funding of the Pre-School component, to be effective June 1966. The submitted proposal made reference to the use of the "Montessori Method" in the program, an expression that apparently was not favorably received by the OEO personnel who review the proposals. The latter refused to accept the proposals, as far as can be ascertained, on the basis that the Montessori technique does not fit well into the educational practices approved by modern educators. Indeed, an official at Washington OEO is alleged to have expressed the opinion that three-year old children are limited in their learning capacity—at a time when the US Office of Education is beginning to spend substantial sums for research and preparation of teaching materials for the three-five year age category. Aside from the question of how well the educational experts in OEO know the different Indian psychological or personality types, the different societies and cultures, this was clearly a rejection of a program earnestly desired by the people of the pueblo. OEO has maintained that programs should stem from the people of the community and not be imposed by the Government in terms of what is thought to be good. The attitude was expressed by several people connected with the Santa Clara CAP and Pueblo that "you can get anything you want from the OEO—as long as they think it's good for you." OEO has thus, apparently, partially assumed the position which various officials have ascribed to the BIA.

As a result of the rejection of the proposals embodying the term "Montessori Method," the proposals had to be written and were eventually approved. This was a time-consuming process, and as a result the hiring of teachers for the 1966-67 school year was difficult; recruiting was delayed until funds were committed, and after most teachers had already signed contracts for the year elsewhere.

The rejection of the proposal was interesting also from the point of view that the pre-school method used only aspects of the Montessori method; it was, in fact, a combination of methods adapted to the particular student group. The program had been investigated by a number of evaluation groups, and had been highly praised. It was deeply wanted by the parents of the pueblo, and yet almost rejected by OEO.

A number of individuals and teams of varying competence visited the Santa Clara Pre-School program. The number of evaluators and the haphazard manner of the evaluation has made the people of Santa Clara suspicious of such activities. This suspicion, an HSR researcher was told, had for some weeks fallen on him.

While the Neighborhood Youth Corps is not formally a part of the CAP, it is administered locally as a component, and hence must be considered in the context of the CAP. The CAP Director and staff are responsible for the preparation of the proposals, as well as the administration of the program.

The NYC was initiated in the summer of 1965. Enrollees were placed in a variety of positions, including several working in offices and two in one of the Santa Fe museums. Several were placed in the school office in Española, and others in various firms in Los Alamos—several of the latter group secured per-