Here They Come, Ready or Not

An Education Week Special Report on the ways in which America's 'population in motion' is changing the outlook for schools and society
Today's Numbers, Tomorrow's Nation

Demography's Awesome Challenge for Schools

For the past several years, Harold L. Hodgkinson has been crossing the country warning American educators and policymakers that they may be about to repeat a mistake they made—and paid dearly for—at the onset of the Baby Boom. Changes at least as drastic are on the horizon, the former college president and National Institute of Education director tells audiences across the country. The same lack of foresight that sent school districts scrambling for teachers and classroom space in the early 1950's, he says, is evident once again.

Much of what Mr. Hodgkinson says is already vaguely familiar to his listeners—that the nation is aging, that the minority portion of the youth population is growing, that children born during the Baby Boom become the poorest segment of the society, that the family structure is undergoing radical change.

But bare statistics have a bloodlessness that blunts their impact. When Mr. Hodgkinson gives them life—through analysis, through anecdote, through an interweaving of implications—audiences from Maine to California react with the same sense of indignant surprise. At practically every stop on a growing speaking itinerary, he says, a post-speech questioner asks him, "Why haven't we been told about this?"

The "this" is no secret. It is a demographic portrait of the United States. And the changes it portends are already becoming as apparent as the overcrowded maternity wards of the postwar era that signaled the Baby Boom long before its full impact was felt.

The new demographic shockwave is being heralded not by the maternity wards but by the garish statistics. There are now, for the first time, more Americans over 65 than under 18. Their numbers will soar even more dramatically when the Baby Boomers begin to retire.

In their enormous wake, demography tells us, a markedly different generation of Americans is developing. It will be smaller, and it will be more racially and ethnically diverse than any previous generation in American history.

And in the demography of the emerging generation will be written large the shifting patterns in the nation's class and family structures, in its immigration flow, in its workforce and social-support systems, and in its regional concentrations of people. Mr. Hodgkinson predicts these changes will be drastic. And social and political institutions—beginning with the schools—will have to reckon with them.

Next: September, more than 3.6 million children will begin their formal schooling in the United States.

- 14 percent will be the children of teenage mothers.
- 10 percent will be physically or mentally handicapped.
- As many as 15 percent will be immigrants who speak a language other than English.
- 14 percent will be children of unmarried parents.
- 40 percent will live in a broken home before they reach 18.
- 10 percent will have poorly educated, even illiterate, parents.
- Between one quarter and one third will be latchkey children with no one to greet them when they come home from school.
- A quarter or more of them will not finish school.

These children, the early wave of the baby boomlet that will enter the schools over the next five years, will in these ways clearly reflect the forces at work in American society. That many will bring with them baggage—familial, racial, ethnic, socioeconomic stress is well known to educators. What is less well understood is that current trends persist, the proportion of children "at risk" for school failure for these reasons will grow with each passing year for the foreseeable future.

One of the most widely used cliches by commencement speakers at this time of year is that the young are the hope of the future. They will inherit the responsibility for sustaining and directing the social, political, and economic institutions of this nation.

It is in this context that the growing proportion of at-risk children in the emerging generations becomes a portent of the future. If demographic trends and projections prove reasonably accurate, these children will face awesome challenges as society seeks to replace the skills of the retiring Baby Boomers. And, if our past experience in dealing with the most needy children is any guide, they will be ill-equipped to meet those challenges.

Today, it is the nation's educational system that faces the awesome challenge. Although "at-risk" children represent a minority of school enrollments, their impact on the system is great.

Some educators argue in fact that it was the at-risk group that precipitated the current school-reform movement—that had these children not been in the schools, there would have been no drive for reform.

For many, the irony of the situation is that, thus far, reform has not only produced few solutions for the problems of at-risk children but may in fact be exacerbating them.

If the United States is "a nation at risk," as the National Commission on Excellence in Education said in 1983, the "risk" may be largely concentrated in this growing segment of educationally disadvantaged children. They will comprise the workforce that will compete in an increasingly technological marketplace. And they will be looked to for the economic productivity to sustain a burgeoning support system for the elderly. Yet, as reform seeks "excellence" through tightened standards that often exclude them, these children appear, more than ever, to be virtually doomed to lifelong membership in a permanent underclass.

Scott Miller, a program officer with the Exxon Education Foundation, writes in a Commentary in this issue that "several of our inner cities have effectively become the planet's first truly international multicultural, multilingual developing 'countries.' " In a very real sense, an underdeveloped country of some 40 million people has grown in our midst. The majority of its inhabitants are poor, nonwhite, uneducated if not illiterate, unemployed and often unemployable, and largely dependent on government for their survival.

The New York Regional Plan Association confronted the phenomenon this month in a report on prospects for the economic future of the New York City metropolitan area. While foreseeing growing prosperity for the already affluent segments of the population, the group predicted deepening poverty for the metropolitan region's poor and poorly educated. "More than anywhere else in the country, we are creating a two-tier society of haves and have nots," said the panel's chairman, William S. Woodside, chairman of the American Can Company. "Poverty in the midst of plenty could become intolerable."

Michael Harrington recognized that 20
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years ago in a landmark study alerting the nation to the existence of an invisible "other America" populated by "unskilled workers, the migrant farm workers, the aged, the minorities, and all the others who live in the economic underworld of American life."

The poor are still here. But there is also a growing recognition that the high toll of poverty is not limited to the personal tragedy of millions of individual Americans. Recent studies and reports have documented the enormous cost to society of poverty's progeny: illiteracy, unemployment, teenage pregnancy, violence, and crime.

And the eroding power of the United States in the world marketplace and the declining number of young people in the society have led to a growing awareness that the United States can no longer afford to waste a sixth or more of its human resources. If the nation is to prosper and be secure, business, the military, and academe must have an expanding supply of well-educated young people.

Translation: The schools must do a better job, must find ways to meet the demand.

Schools are in the vanguard. They have always been expected to cope: to fuel the various social and economic revolutions, to assimilate the waves of immigrants, to integrate the races, to uplift the handicapped, to substitute for the family—all the while instilling the common values and preserving the common culture. And as the stabilizing and socializing influence of home and church has waned, our reliance on the school has grown.

Carrying the problems of society, the children come, ready or not. And the schools must deal with them, ready or not. In the past, they have succeeded remarkably well by any measure. Indeed, it is a testimony of progress that at-risk children are in classrooms at all. It was not so long ago that many of them did not attend and their absence went unremarked. But now they are there, and the schools become for them the first hope—and perhaps the last.

In the following pages, Education Week looks at some of the major demographic forces that have shaped and are shaping the society, and explores, through a roundtable discussion, some of their implications for schooling.

Demography is a relatively new branch of the social sciences, but it is a powerful tool. One scholar has likened it to "celestial mechanics"—the search for huge, invisible engines that make social systems work the way they do.

For educators, says Mr. Hodgkinson, "demographics provides a truly new perception of educational systems as people in motion. By knowing the nature of those coming into 1st grade in the United States, one can forecast with some precision what the cohort of graduating high-school seniors will be like 12 years later, and can reveal with very little error what the entering college class will look like in the 13th year."

But public policy can influence human behavior, and, consequently, alter the direction of demographic and social trends. Governments, for example, can use tax policies to encourage or discourage individual decisions to marry, have a family, buy a home, seek a college degree, or retire.

As John I. Goodlad puts it in A Place Called School: "Futurists have a tantalizing way of describing the year 2001 as though being there has little to do with getting there. The future simply arrives full-blown. But it is the succession of days and years between now and then that will determine what life will be like. Decisions made and not made will shape the schools of tomorrow."

—The Editors

Without a middle-class majority, we simply will not be the United States of America.

—Harold Hodgkinson
The Patterns in Our Social Fabric Are Changing

Today, we are a nation of 240 million people, about 50 million (21 percent) of whom are black, Hispanic, and Asian. Although federal and private projections vary, they all point in the same direction: Soon after the turn of the century, one out of every three Americans will be nonwhite. Immigration patterns and differential fertility rates among various groups are significantly changing the nation's racial composition.

In 1957, at the height of the Baby Boom, American women were having children at a rate of 3.7 per lifetime. Today, that rate has plummeted to 1.8, well below the 2.1 fertility rate that demographers say is necessary for one generation to replace itself with another of equal size.

The nation's population, however, will continue to grow, reaching 265 million in the year 2020. Much of that growth will be among minority groups in the society.

Currently, the fertility rate for white American women is 1.7 children per lifetime. The comparable rate for black women is 2.4; for Mexican-American women, it is 2.9—precisely the same average rate for white women during the Baby Boom era. Moreover, the average white American is 31 years old; the average black American is only 25 and the average Hispanic American only 23. White Americans are moving out of their child-bearing years just as black and Hispanic Americans are moving into them.

In 1980, 27 percent of public-school students were nonwhite, a 6 percent increase from a decade earlier.

Most of the nonwhite student population is concentrated in a band of states that begins in New York, stretches southward down the Atlantic coast, and then westward, ending in California. Black enrollment is highest in the District of Columbia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia; Hispanic enrollment, meanwhile, is highest in New Mexico, Texas, California, and Arizona.

California now has a “majority of minorities” in its elementary schools; 46 percent of the students in Texas are black and Hispanic. In the 25 largest city school systems, the majority of students are minorities.

America has always been a nation of immigrants. The resulting ethnic and cultural diversity has given this society a distinctive vitality. But the assimilation of newcomers into the mainstream culture has been a difficult and tumultuous process that has sometimes strained the social fabric even as it strengthened it.

The first great period of immigration in this country was between 1910 and 1930, when the number of foreign-born Americans reached a peak 14.2 million. In 1984, some 544,000 people immigrated legally to the United States—roughly as many as the annual average during the 1920’s. Add to that the estimated 300,000 to 500,000 people who entered the country illegally and 1884 becomes the greatest year for immigration in our history. Immigrants entering the United States each year account for two-thirds of all the immigrants in the world. If the nation continues to allow 750,000 immigrants to settle here annually, by 2030 the population will be about 18 percent larger than it would otherwise be.

During the early part of this century, the majority of immigrants to the United States were of European heritage, and the color of their skin undoubtedly eased their assimilation into the predominantly white American mainstream. Today, however, most are Hispanic and Asian. About 40 percent of all legal immigrants come from Asia and another 40 percent from Mexico, Central and South America, and the Caribbean. Three out of four of the illegal immigrants came from Latin America—50 percent from Mexico and 25 percent from other Central and South American countries.

Most parts of the nation as yet feel little impact from this wave of immigrants because the majority of the newcomers are choosing to settle in relatively few places. But in those areas, the effects have been astounding.

California provides the most extreme example. In 1984, 17.4 percent of all legal immigrants to the United States planned to move into one of five metropolitan areas in the state. Moreover, 30 percent of all the illegal immigrants counted in the 1980 census resided in Los Angeles County. Demographers predict that, as a combined result of low white birth rates and immigration, by 2010 California will become the first state in the union—with the exception of Hawaii—to have a population whose majority is made up of minorities.

Like a number of their predecessors in the early part of the century, many of today’s immigrants are unwilling to abandon their cultures—and their native languages—as the price for becoming American. Today, the Southern California Gas Company can tell its customers in Chinese, Spanish, Korean, Vietnamese, and English how to install a gas stove.

Recently, a major market-research firm conducted a study for the Spanish International Network, a nationwide chain of 27 Spanish-language television stations, to determine what aspects of their culture Hispanics wanted most to preserve. More than 4 out of 5 of the respondents listed the preservation of the Spanish language as their top priority.

The assimilation of Hispanics and other nonwhites into the mainstream culture—of all races—remains a major challenge for the nation.
How tolerant will we be of the racial and ethnic diversity coming into the system? Each part of the country will have to deal with that.
—Harold Hodgkinson
Our ethnic and racial diversity is increasing rapidly. Immigration, legal and illegal, is at an all-time high, and the white fertility rate is at an all-time low. As a result, demographers say, by shortly after the year 2000 one out of three Americans will be nonwhite.

Children of Color: Births by Race, 1950 to 2030
(numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total births</th>
<th>Black-and-other-races births</th>
<th>Percent Black and other races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3,631.5</td>
<td>523.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>4,097.2</td>
<td>612.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4,297.4</td>
<td>675.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3,701.1</td>
<td>849.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3,737.2</td>
<td>860.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3,653.6</td>
<td>911.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3,723.7</td>
<td>926.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3,737.2</td>
<td>925.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total births</th>
<th>Black-and-other-races births</th>
<th>Percent Black and other races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>3,826.2</td>
<td>750.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3,849.1</td>
<td>774.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3,627.9</td>
<td>759.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,494.8</td>
<td>768.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,673.2</td>
<td>842.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3,546.9</td>
<td>875.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The American Melting Pot: Immigration to the United States, 1900-1984

And Where They Are Going—Top 10 Intended Areas of Resettlement, 1984
Between 1946 and 1964, 70 million Americans were born—more than in any previous two decades in the country’s history. That “Baby Boom” of the post-World War II era has profoundly affected every aspect of our national life—and it will continue to do so as it moves through the system like a very large mouse through a very small snake.

The Baby Boom has caused a seeming demographic anomaly: The nation is growing both older and younger at the same time. In 1983, we passed a demographic watershed. For the first time in our history, the number of Americans over age 65 surpassed the number of American teen-agers. That is a situation that will not change during the lifetime of anyone reading this report. Today, the median age of the U.S. population is just over 30 years. By the turn of the century, the median age will reach 36; shortly after 2030, it will pass 40. One hundred years from now, the median age of the population will be 42, more than 10 years...
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older than the median age today.
Even more striking are predictions regarding life expectancy. Today, about 1 out of 10 Americans (11.6 percent) is 65 or older; by 2030, 1 out of 5 Americans will be over 65 (21.2 percent). Children born today can expect to live and work to age 82, then retire and live for almost 20 more years.

Another measure of the phenomenon:
This year, about 30 people a day are turning 100. By 2030, when the last of the Baby Boomers reach retirement age, about 280 people a day will do so.

The Baby Boomers have not been nearly as prolific as their parents.
But even though they are not quite replacing themselves on a one-for-one basis, the sheer numbers of children they are having are producing a second, if smaller, bulge in the population—a "baby boomer." This six-year blip on the population charts will pass through our schools by the end of the century. But it is beginning to be felt in some parts of the nation and it will boost enrollments in preschools and elementary schools into the next decade.
The post-World War II Baby Boom was mainly a white middle-class phenomenon; in 1955, more than 85 percent of all newborns were white. By 1984, that percentage had dropped to 80 percent and it is expected to continue falling well into the 21st century. The emerging baby boomer, and the cohorts of children born after it ends, will be disproportionately nonwhite.
Between 1985 and 1993, elementary-school enrollment is expected to increase by about 4.5 million. The number of children 18 and younger is expected to rise from about 63 million today to 67 million by the end of the century.
National figures, however, often mask major differences among the states. The nation's population is heavily concentrated in the East and will remain so for the foreseeable future. For example, more than 50 percent of all zip code areas are located in the Eastern time zone; 30 percent are in the Central zone, 5 percent in the Mountain zone, and 14 percent in the Pacific zone.
But Americans are highly mobile and population shifts will dramatically affect some states—and their schools.
The population ages 19 and younger will grow by 20 percent or more in 13 states between 1980 and 2000. All but one of those states—New Hampshire—are in the West.
This age group will more than double in 3 states: in Wyoming, it will grow by 120 percent; in Nevada, by 103 percent; and in Utah, by 102 percent.
Five states, meanwhile, will experience a decline of 20 percent or more in their 19-and-under populations. These states include New York (-27 percent), Massachusetts (-24 percent), Rhode Island (-22 percent), Connecticut (-22 percent), and Pennsylvania (-21 percent).
Over the past five years, the U.S. population has increased by 12.2 million; almost all of that increase (more than 90 percent) occurred in Southern and Western states. The West grew by 15.6 percent, or double the national average for those years, and the South by 8.6 percent. The figures indicate a continuing migratory trend toward the Sun Belt states that began in the late 1940's and picked up dramatically in the 1970's.
Some experts, however, believe that the exodus from the Midwestern "Rust Bowl" has been stemmed, at least temporarily. Last summer, Detroit created more new jobs than Houston, where 20 percent of all office space is unrented.
A relatively small "baby boomlet" will boost school enrollments through the end of the century. But America is growing steadily older. There are now more people over 65 than under 18. Between 2011 and 2030, close to 70 million Americans will retire.

The Graying of America: Current and Projected Percent Distribution of the Population, by Age

Empty Seats and Overcrowding: Percent Change in Public School Enrollment, by State, 1970 to 1982

Looking Toward 2001: Projected Percent Change in State Populations, 19 and under, 1980 to 2000
The number of births among teenagers has been declining over the past decade, largely, say experts, because of the decline in the number of teens in the population and the availability of birth-control devices and legal abortion. Nonetheless, the number of teen pregnancies continues to increase, as does the number of unmarried teenagers who give birth.

And the United States continues to lead most developed and developing nations in its rate of teen-age pregnancy.

Although blacks account for only about 15 percent of the teen-age population, half of all births to teens in 1983 were to black mothers. The overall birth rate for teen-age blacks, however, has been declining, while the birth rate for white teens (still below that for blacks) is increasing.

Premature babies tend to be low-weight babies, have poorly developed immune systems, grow up to be less healthy on the average than others, and later exhibit learning difficulties more often. About 20 percent of such children born in America are born to teenagers. Teen-age mothers also tend to give birth to children who become teen-age mothers themselves. If a girl gives birth to one child in her teens, there is a 1-in-3 chance that she will have a second child as well. In fact, every day in America 40 teen-agers give birth to their third child.

Nearly half (43 percent) of all young women who drop out of school do so because of pregnancy or marriage. Half of all teen-age mothers drop out of school and never return. Teen-age fathers are about 40 percent less likely to graduate than their peers who do not father children.
We have allowed the family to disintegrate. Thirteen-year-olds are having children they are in no position to give values to.

—Donald Smith
The "traditional" family—a mother, father, and two children—is vanishing. Single-parent families, mostly headed by women, are becoming commonplace, and 20 million Americans live alone. Every day in America 40 teen-agers give birth to their third child.

### Mothers on Their Own:
Living Arrangements of Children Under 18; 1984, 1980, and 1970
(numbers in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, all children under 18</strong></td>
<td>62,139</td>
<td>50,620</td>
<td>9,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with two parents</td>
<td>46,555</td>
<td>41,009</td>
<td>3,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with mother only</td>
<td>12,646</td>
<td>7,641</td>
<td>4,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living with two parents</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with mother only</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

### An Epidemic of Pregnancy: Teen-age Pregnancy Rate and Outcomes, 1970-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Miscarriage rate</th>
<th>Abortion rate</th>
<th>Birth rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Congressional Budget Office, from reports by The Alan Guttmacher Institute and the National Center for Health Statistics

### ... And Illegitimacy: Birth Rates for Unmarried Women, 15-17 and 18-19, 1970-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White, 15-17</th>
<th>White, 18-19</th>
<th>Black, 15-17</th>
<th>Black, 18-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Center for Health Statistics
Who's Dependent Upon Whom?

A growing percentage of the nation's children are being born into, and growing up in, environments that in one way or another endanger their physical, emotional, and intellectual development.

In 1974, children became the poorest segment of American society, displacing the aged.

Since then, child poverty has grown deeper and more widespread. In 1984, nearly one-fourth of all children under 17 lived in poverty, including 1 of every 2 black children and 2 of every 5 Hispanic children.

Today, there are approximately 13.6 million children under age 18 who live in families with annual incomes below the poverty line. That suggests that 8 out of 10 families headed by teen-age girls live in poverty.

The nation's health-care system for the elderly faces even graver problems. Experts are predicting that the Medicare hospital trust fund, which currently provides care to about 27 million elderly persons, will be depleted by sometime in the mid-1990's.

As the older segment of the population grows in size, it will also grow in political influence—already, the number of eligible voters ages 65 and over slightly outnumbers those ages 18 to 24. The concern of many educators and policymakers is that older citizens without children, worried about their pensions and their health care, will be less willing to support the rising costs of education.

Although the possibility of a generation-al war in the future, raised by some observers, may be extreme, concern is mounting about the potential for strife between the young and old. Recently, an organization called Americans for Generational Equity was formed in Washington, D.C. The idea of U.S. Senator Dave Durenberger, Republican of Minnesota, AGE is intended to represent the interests of the younger generation destined to bear the heavy financial and social costs of the aging Baby Boomers. The group says it will promote "the long-term welfare of younger and future generations of Americans."
When you talk about the real underclass, then you are talking about blacks, Hispanics, and Appalachian whites and Native Americans. With those populations, poverty seems to be permanent.

—Raul Yzaguirre
About one in four American children lives in poverty; they are the largest group of impoverished Americans. More than half the children living in households headed by single women are poor. A black child is about three times as likely as a white child to be born into poverty; a Hispanic child is more than twice as likely to be poor.

Black Families in Crisis

Poverty is high in all black families...

But higher for families headed by women

The Hierarchy of Poverty

Percent of children in 1983 in poverty in each group

- White married couples: 11.7%
- All married couples: 13.2%
- White: 17.7%
- All children: 22.1%
- Black married couples: 23.0%
- White female heads of households: 47.8%
- All female heads of households: 55.8%
- Black female heads of households: 66.9%

Children in Poverty: Percentages by Age and Race, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Spanish Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, all ages</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 15 years</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 17 years</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 21 years</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black Families Headed by Women

Most Are as Poor as Ever

Incidence of poverty, in percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Two-parent families</th>
<th>Female-headed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... And There Are More of Them

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census
At Risk: Pupils and Their Teachers

In the years ahead, the population diversity that Americans consider a hallmark of their democracy will become more pronounced. For educators, that means working with cohorts of children more ethnically and racially diverse than ever before—and more of whom will bring with them the array of "risk" factors that bode ill for their development.

A growing proportion of America's young people will be poor, nonwhite, limited-English-proficient, and from families in which parents themselves lack education. Can schools prepare these generations for higher education, work, and active citizenship? Consider the record to date:

- Despite modest gains in recent years, black and Hispanic children on the average continue to score far below their white peers on standardized tests. Average scores for blacks and Hispanics on the Scholastic Aptitude Test's verbal and mathematics sections are about 100 points lower than those for whites. Black and Hispanic children also consistently score below, and whites consistently above, the national means on the various subject-matter tests administered by the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

In 1974, NAEP conducted a one-time "mini-assessment" of functional literacy among 17-year-olds. The test measured such skills as the ability to locate and dial the telephone-information number in New York City and to determine the maximum amount of medical coverage allowable under an auto-insurance policy. More than 91 percent of the white students who took the test passed. More than 40 percent of the black children and 30 percent of the other minority children who took the test failed.

- In spite of improvement over time, minority children are still far more likely than whites to drop out of high school. In 1983, more than three-fourths of all white 18- and 19-year-olds were high-school graduates; slightly less than 60 percent of all blacks and slightly more than 50 percent of all Hispanics in the same age group could claim that achievement. Data from a 1979 Census Bureau study showed that 35 percent of Hispanics and 25.5 percent of blacks ages 18 through 21 had dropped out of school, compared with only 15.5 percent of all whites of similar age.

Moreover, some educators worry that stiffened graduation and promotion policies enacted in the current school-reform movement will force even more minority students to drop out. As of 1984, only a handful of states that had raised their standards included provisions aimed at helping students who did not achieve the new goals.

- Black and Hispanic children who do graduate from high school are less likely than white graduates to enroll in college, and the college-going rate for minority graduates has been falling. Almost 30 percent more blacks graduated from high school in 1982 than in 1976, but black enrollment in college dropped 11 percent during the same period. High-school graduation rates for Hispanics increased 38 percent during that period, but Hispanic college enrollment declined by 16 percent.

The percentage of degrees awarded to minority college students is also declining. Only 6.5 percent of all bachelor's degrees awarded in 1981 went to black students, compared with 10 percent of such degrees in 1976. The percentage of master's degrees awarded to blacks also fell from 6.6 percent to 5.8 percent over the same period. The percentage of bachelor's and master's degrees awarded to Hispanic students, meanwhile, increased by less than 1 percent (from 2 percent to 2.3 percent of all bachelor's degrees and from 1.7 percent to 2.2 percent of all master's degrees).

- Even as the number of minority students increases, the scarcity of minority teachers is becoming acute. Not only are fewer minority students going to college, but a smaller percentage of those who do are deciding to major in education. Between 1976 and 1983, the percentage of bachelor's degrees in education awarded to blacks declined by 52 percent; the percentage of such degrees awarded to Hispanics climbed by only a fraction of a percent.

The growing trend toward requiring prospective teachers to pass competency tests in order to be licensed is likely to shrink the pool of minority teachers even more.

At the same time that the indicators for minority groups' academic success seem negative, the education community faces broader uncertainties about the size and quality of the overall teaching force in the years ahead.

The average age of the American teacher is now 42, and about half of the 2.1 million teachers working today will retire, resign, or die in the next six years. Meanwhile, only half as many college students are majoring in education as did so in 1972. The U.S. Education Department projects that by 1993, elementary and secondary schools will need 211,000 new teachers each year but that schools of education will be graduating only 133,000 teacher candidates, a shortfall of about 37 percent.

In many states, particularly in the Sun Belt, the shortage of teachers is already severe. Policymakers and educators are adopting alternative routes to certification, creating incentives to lure young people into the profession, raising salaries, and mounting vigorous teacher-recruitment programs. Knowledgeable observers are contending that the real "crisis" in teaching will be one of quality. The shortage, they say, will not be a shortage of teachers, but a shortage of qualified teachers.

About 20 percent of all teachers are now teaching in fields for which they are not certified or eligible for certification; in subject areas such as mathematics and science, more than half of today's teachers have substandard qualifications.

Moreover, the teaching profession is attracting fewer academically able young people than it has in the past. The average S.A.T. scores of students planning to major in education traditionally have been lower than those for other students and have been declining at a relatively steeper rate in recent years. In addition, a study of women who entered the teaching profession in North Carolina in 1973 revealed that almost two-thirds of those who scored in the top decile on the National Teachers Examination had left the profession by 1980.

To assure that there is a teacher in every classroom, states and districts will very likely provide for emergency certification and alternative routes to certification. And that, many educators warn, could lead to a generation of teachers ill-prepared and ill-equipped to provide a meaningful education for the burgeoning at-risk populations.
Black and Hispanic children continue to lag far behind their white peers on most measures of educational achievement. About 35 percent of Hispanics and 25 percent of blacks ages 18-21 are high-school dropouts.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Dropping Out: Rates by Age and Race, 1979

Special Children, Special Needs: A Measure of Relative Need for Special Educational Services Based on Demographic Characteristics

The Achievement Gap: SAT Averages by Ethnicity 1975-76 to 1983-84

Verbal Test Scores

Math Test Scores

Making the Grade: High School Graduation Rate by State, 1982 and 1984

Source: U.S. Education Department; Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation; Planning and Evaluation, February 1986.
Help Wanted: Competition For the Young

Not long ago, because of the Baby Boom, businesses and educational institutions that depend upon a steady supply of young people could afford to adopt a "throw-away" attitude about potential employees and students. Those days are coming to an end.

The population of 18-to-24-year-olds reached a time high of 30.4 million in 1980. That group has shrunk by 5 percent since then and now stands at 25.8 million, representing 10.2 percent of the total population. During the next 15 years, that young-adult group is expected to decline by more than 7 million. Because of the current baby boomlet, it will rebound slightly after the turn of the century and then will begin falling once again.

The coming changes have not been lost on America's business leaders. "Over the next 10 to 15 years, the workforce will undergo a major change in composition," notes the National Alliance of Businesses in a recent report on employment policies of the future. "Most striking will be the growth of less well-educated segments of the population that have typically been the least prepared for work. The number of minority youth will increase, while the total number of youth of working age will decline. The number of high-school dropouts will rise as will the number of teen-age mothers. At the same time, entry-level jobs will increasingly require basic, analytical, and interpersonal skills."

"Will our youth be able to meet these requirements or will they become a part of a growing underclass with no hope for employment?" the report asks in what is more than a rhetorical question.

What sorts of jobs await America's youth? During the late 1970's and early 1980's, 20 million new jobs were created by the nation's businesses; only 5 percent were in manufacturing, while 95 percent were in the service and information industries.

Much has been written about the impending employment boom in high-technology industries. However, those businesses now provide only 6.4 percent of all jobs in the United States and are expected to provide only 0.6 percent of all jobs by 1995. Moreover, of the 4 percent of all workers employed by such businesses are actually involved in "high-tech" work; the vast majority are assemblers, clerks, janitors, and other laborers.

Most of the new jobs that will be created in coming years will be in low-paying categories. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1 out of 5 people who graduated from college in June 1985 will work in a job that requires no college training at all. By 1990, 7.5 percent of all new jobs will require only minimal education or technical training beyond the high-school level.

The result, some observers predict, will be the creation of a bi-polar labor force. Few people will hold high-paying jobs requiring high levels of skill; the vast majority of workers will be locked into low-paying, low-skill positions. The American middle class, they say, is disappearing.

But not all experts agree on that scenario. Some contend that technological advances are creating a need for higher skill levels in the workforce and that adult work-related education is of paramount importance. Moreover, they argue, the better educated the workforce, the more sophisticated the economy is likely to become and the more likely that higher-level jobs will be created.

A large segment of the minority youth population has looked to the military as a means of escaping poverty since the integration of the armed services in the 1950's. As the young-adult population declines, the military will find itself in competition with business and higher education for the young men and women it will need to replenish the ranks of its All-Volunteer Force.

The military, like other social institutions, will draw its recruits from a pool of young adults that will include many in the at-risk population. But technological advances in weaponry and support services may close the door to a career in the military for such disadvantaged candidates.

The Army, whose manpower needs are the greatest among the armed services, inducted 125,500 recruits in fiscal 1985, or about 1 in 12 of the eligible population in the 17-to-19 age group. Overall, the armed services will require about 315,000 recruits annually through 1991 to maintain the current status of the All-Volunteer Force, or about 1 of every 4 17-to-19-year-olds.

Today, all military recruits must have a high-school diploma or must score above 50 percent on the Armed Forces Qualification Test. With the high-school completion rate for minority 16- and 17-year-olds hovering around 55 percent, it is clear that a career in the military is no longer an option for a significant percentage of these young adults. It is equally clear, some say, that a draft will eventually be necessary to maintain the armed forces at a level adequate for national security.

When people reach retirement age in the future, there better be enough well-educated people out there working to pay for Social Security.

—Raul Yzaguirre
Business, the military, and academe will be competing for a declining number of young people—many of them "at-risk" youth. To maintain present levels of manpower, for example, by 1995 the military will need to attract 55 percent of all eligible 18-year-olds.

Out of School, Out of Work: Unemployment Rates Among High-School Graduates and Dropouts, by Race, 1982

Where the Jobs Will Be: Largest Number of New Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Growth in employment in thousands, 1978-90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janitors and sextons</td>
<td>671.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses' aides and orderlies</td>
<td>594.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales clerks</td>
<td>200.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashiers</td>
<td>245.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiters/waitresses</td>
<td>211.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General clerks, office</td>
<td>108.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional nurses</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation &amp; service workers, fast food restaurants</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck drivers</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Rapidly Growing Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Percent growth in employment, 1975-90</th>
<th>Number of new jobs by 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All occupations</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>21,980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-processing machine mechanics</td>
<td>147.6%</td>
<td>96,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal personnel</td>
<td>129.4%</td>
<td>39,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-systems analysts</td>
<td>107.8%</td>
<td>203,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer operators</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>151,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office-machine and cash-register service workers</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>40,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer programmers</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>162,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero-astronautic engineers</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>41,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation &amp; service workers, fast food restaurants</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>491,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment interviewers</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>35,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax preparers</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>19,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Looking for Work: Teen-age Employment by Race, 1985


Source: National Alliance of Business
Diversity, Class: 'Different Issues'

Education Week: Social and demographic forces are reshaping our society in profound ways—the dissolution of the traditional family, the massive influx of immigrants, the increasing number of at-risk children, the growth of the elderly population and the shrinking of the younger population. Is this a situation for the nation and its schools? What are its dimensions?

Harold L. Hodgkinson: One dimension is what is happening to the family in the United States. Only 4 percent of the households are traditional families—mother, father, two-school-age children. Twenty-two million people live alone. There has been a steady decline in the percentage of family households with children in public schools. In Livenia, Michigan, for example, 1 household in 18 has a child in public school.

Many people are not aware of the population changes within their state. I was in Indiana yesterday speaking to a state-sponsored conference of 1,400 people. Indiana is experiencing a fairly significant increase in the minority population and an increase in poverty in most of its urban areas. Yet there must have been 50 people who came up afterwards and said, "Why hasn't anybody told us about this?"

The thing about demographics is that you can follow these cohorts through and it doesn't take you 14 years to make conclusions about your entering freshman class at Purdue. They were born 18 years earlier.

David Hornbeck: In Baltimore City, 9 out of 10 teen-age births are to young women who are unmarried, and we have a high school in Montgomery County with 79 households with children in public schools. We look at issues of increasing poverty on a daily basis.

Though we have a relatively decent equalization formula in Maryland, there remains a $9,000-per-pupil expenditure gap between the highest-spending system and the lowest-spending. That means a difference of $90,000 between one classroom of 20 kids and another classroom of 30 kids.

Mr. Hodgkinson: In Los Angeles last week, I saw an elementary-school teacher who was teaching a class of 31 children in the 3rd grade, and the 31 children spoke six languages, none of which was English. The teacher has one year of Spanish in her collegiate training.

I mentioned Indiana, where the diversity is low. But the tolerance for diversity is also low. If the student body in Indiana goes from 10 percent minority to 15 percent, that is an issue. Just as it is an issue in elementary schools in California where more than half the students are not white.

How tolerant will we be of the new racial and ethnic diversity that is coming into the system? Each part of the country will have to deal with that question.

Chester E. Finn Jr.: There is a huge distinction between the diversity issue and what I would call the underclass issue. They are really very, very different, and they keep getting commingled in data and in various reports that have attempted to look at the changing population of American schools.

Diversity means that we have more nationalities, languages, cultures than we used to and in larger numbers. This is a trend. It is not necessarily a problem. It has one set of implications, and they are not brand new implications for a country that has always been a melting pot country. The problems may be larger in scale than they have been in the past, but they are not fundamentally different than those we have dealt with in the past.

That is one set of things. The other involves very worrisome data about social decay in the form of poverty, illiteracy, illegitimacy, other things that are signs of social pathology, underclass issues. That carries with it a whole set of problems and implications, but they would be problems even if there were no diversity.

Donald Smith: We have never had a national policy that welcomes diversity when that diversity includes peoples of all cultures.

The diversity that has been welcomed here typically has been the European diversity. It has not been African and Latin American diversity. As we address the question of diversity, we have to bear in mind that some groups are favored and some are not. We have to come to some national consensus about diversity and about language.

Raul Yzaguirre: We ought to put the so-called immigration problem in perspective. As a percentage of total population, the proportion of immigrants was much greater at the turn of the century. It is not as though we're inundated by immigrants. The problem is that the immigrants are much more diverse and that does present some challenges for us. Immigration is not a huge numerical problem, nor is it a new problem for this society.

Mr. Hodgkinson: It is new in the sense that the concentrations of these populations are not distributed evenly across the country and it does have a heavier impact in certain places than others. I would take exception to Checker Finn's clear, somewhat rigid dichotomy between diversity and underclass.

Donald Smith: We have never had a national consensus about diversity when that diversity includes peoples of all cultures.

Our problem is that we have a concentration of populations that have been traditionally disadvantaged in America. And what has been true historically for them will continue to hold true as they move in larger numbers to our cities. It does not matter what you do about it. Direct action will have to be taken or these disadvantaged will not naturally move through the system. They will not naturally move into universities. They will not naturally move into jobs that they should have because roadblocks have been set up that are very clear to the communities and institutions that are open to other groups.

Mr. McMurrin: Poverty is probably the greatest roadblock these children experience in our city. Just 10 years ago, when I
came to Milwaukee, 28 percent of the children lived in poverty; now it is probably 65 percent. And the poverty is more severe. It affects the families to a greater extent.

Mr. Finn: Can we resist the easy assumption that this kind of poverty, which is a real problem, is either an urban or a minority problem? Has anybody been to New Hampshire lately or to eastern Tennessee and looked at impoverished, white, drifting families living in trailer camps, kids going a few weeks to school here and a month there and living somewhere else with some other relative, some other member of the family?

This is not exclusively an urban phenomenon. It is not a minority phenomenon. It is a class and economic phenomenon, and it is a real one. If it is a barrier, it is a barrier for people of all kinds who experience it.

Mr. Hornbeck: Is it not the case that if you are black you are more likely to be poor and unemployed than if you are white? Isn't that a fact?

Mr. Hodgkinson: There's no question.

Mr. Hornbeck: Is it not natural, then, to conclude that while we clearly have a problem that relates to the poor whites, there is an exacerbated problem as it relates to poor blacks?

Mr. Smith: When I was director of the Center for Innercity Studies in Chicago, we used to work with a diverse population—black people on the south and west sides, Hispanics living on the south side, a few on the north side, Native Americans, people from the southern mountains. A critical distinction I observed at that time was that most poor whites felt they were poor because they were down on their luck or didn't meet job requirements, didn't have the skills. But most minorities felt very clearly that even luck and job skills were not the entire quotient, that their skin color was a major factor holding them back.

When we talk about the poor, we have to remember that the nonwhites are stigmatized groups and their feelings about themselves clearly relate to their aspirations and their degree of belief that they have some control over their own destiny and that there is some degree of fairness in the land.

Mr. McMurrin: In many states, the majority population or the influential population will not give attention either to minority children in urban centers or to the poor who live in rural areas.

E.W.: If there is an underclass, does it really make a difference whether it is black, Hispanic, or white? Are there any statistics that suggest there is an increase or decrease in the proportion of white poor as opposed to the proportion of poor minorities?

Mr. Hodgkinson: It is clear in the heartland states that there is an increase in poverty among rural whites as a percentage of whites overall in the population. But even with the increase, it is nothing compared to the percentage of poverty among other groups, rural or urban.

Mr. Yzaguirre: Obviously, there is an underclass, and obviously a majority of the underclass are white—two-thirds are white. But that is not the real issue. The question is: To what extent is poverty an intractable, almost unsolvable kind of problem for different populations? When you talk about the real underclass, when you talk about people who are third-generation poor, then you are talking about blacks, Hispanics, and Appalachian whites and Native Americans. With those populations, poverty seems to be permanent.

Mr. Smith: The problem is one that requires a comprehensive approach. It is the problem of employment, health, housing, education. The school can do only so much. I'm not sure that the schools now do as much as they can, but we have to recognize their limitations. Who bears the responsibility for bringing the other segments together to address what is becoming a national crisis? Who bears that responsibility?
ROUND TABLE IMPLICATIONS

‘The Dropouts Go on Everyone Else’s Rolls’

E.W.: What are the implications of these “intractable” social problems and powerful demographic forces for society and for the schools?

Mr. McMurrin: They present us with a very tough task, I can tell you that. For instance, Head Start has only served a small proportion of those who were eligible and those who need it. Head Start ought to be part of schooling and it ought to be identified with schooling and look like the first step of schooling.

Mr. Smith: We talk about at-risk children and their increasing numbers. We need to also look at the risks that those at-risk children pose for the larger society if something does not happen to improve their circumstances and their condition.

Those of us who live in cities are acutely aware of what will happen when large numbers of young people are cut out on the streets and become victimized by drugs, victimized by a lack of job opportunities.

They will survive as they have to survive, and the entire infrastructure will be at risk. Everybody is going to be at risk. How to deal with that is a major question. It is not just a question of what is humane to do for a society that includes those who dropped out before that, in the 9th grade. The percentage did not increase much in a long time. Why will it be worse?

Mr. Yzaguirre: It’s a differential problem. It has gotten to be much more of a serious problem for Hispanics. There have probably been improvements in the white situation, but there is more of a problem for blacks and Hispanics.

Mr. Hodgkinson: It is clearly differential. In Minnesota, about 80 percent of the young people graduate from high school on time. In Mississippi, it’s about 62 percent. It is true that in 1990 about 10 percent of young people graduated from high school.

So we’ve made great progress. But retention appears to be dropping.

And attendance is falling sharply because truant officers no longer have any authority. In California, a study completed last month indicates that when you make kids go to school, daytime burglaries drop —30 percent in the city of Stockton, for example. The kids who aren’t going to school are going to get into some kind of trouble.

Mr. Smith: The situation is getting worse. And here’s why. For African Americans, dropout rates in some of our major cities—like New York and Chicago—are already at an epidemic level. In fact, it was recently discovered that the dropout rate in New York City, which had been estimated at more than 70 percent for both African Americans and Hispanic Americans, was based upon those who left school after the 9th grade. The percentage did not include those who dropped out before that, in junior high school. That makes it worse.

And the circumstances that cause dropouts continue to get worse. We have allowed the African American family to disintegrate. Thirteen-year-olds are having children. Those young women who are giving birth to children cannot be employed. Very often, the father is nowhere to be found, so they are living in poverty.

The poverty rate is increasing. The drop-out rate is increasing. Teen-age pregnancies are increasing. Incarceration rates are increasing. We already have a crisis and it is going to get even worse if there are not major interventions.

I attended the National Forum on Excellence in Education in Indianapolis in December of 1985 to follow up on the “Nation at Risk” report. Neither that report nor its major follow-up conference concerned itself with dropouts, with the education of minorities.

There is no national leadership and very little local leadership on the crisis that I am talking about. In New York State, the Regents’ plan didn’t even mention the word “dropouts”—as if the problem doesn’t exist. But New York State has the 5th-highest dropout rate in the nation, and New York City is the worst.

We are going to have to face the issue very soon or it is going to consume us.

E.W.: If the reform movement is exacerbating these problems, are its higher standards going to do more harm than good in the long run?

Mr. Hornbeck: The success of the school-reform movement in this regard is going to depend on what sort of support mechanisms are adopted to help kids meet the higher standards.

Mr. Finn: If we are going to have meaningful standards that kids are going to be held to—and that is certainly the central concept of the reform movement—we have got to make those standards plain the first day of 1st grade. We’ve got to make this clear from the instant the kid encounters education—what he is going to have to do by tomorrow, what he is going to have to do by next week, what he’s going to have to do by next year. Then we’ve got to apply these things fairly, firmly, and with support all the way along.

Mr. McMurrin: Standards aren’t bad in themselves. People are beginning now to think maybe the standards are too high and there’s something wrong with the standards. But there is something about standards that creates higher expectations, which we need for our students and the teachers.

Mr. Smith: There’s no question about the need for high standards, but there are some very important considerations in attempting to achieve them.

The school system, the state legislature, the federal government must be willing to provide the kinds of resources that are necessary to help children who have been neglected for many years to reach those standards.

If there are high levels of expectation for children, then teachers ought to have equally high levels of expectations that these children can be taught and they can learn.

If these things are present, at-risk children can achieve higher standards.

Mr. Yzaguirre: It is great to raise the hurdle, but you’ve got to provide better coaching as well. Because if all you’re doing is raising hurdles, fewer people will be able to go over them. That really doesn’t accomplish anything.
Mr. McMurrin: There are some windows of opportunity now with these children. For instance, we have all the knowledge we need about how early intervention for 3-, 4-, 5-year-olds, for example, can influence a child's future. We don't need any more research. What we need is action.

Mr. Hornbeck: The single most important initiative that we can take would be to provide the opportunity for more kids to become involved in early-education programs. Now the opportunity is generally only available to the affluent, not the poor.

Mr. McMurrin: They can't get early education because of the economic constraints—the schools don't have the money. And there's not enough public support for early-childhood education.

Mr. Finn: I'm going to have to demur again. Since the mid-60s, the percentage of public dollars spent in constant dollars in public schools in this country has tripled. There is quite a lot more money being spent on public education today than there was before—per teacher, per pupil, per everything.

Mr. McMurrin: But look at the burdens we're carrying. We have youngsters who are handicapped and who can cost $30,000 a year just to get them to school because they are brought in an ambulance. We have youngsters who are institutionalized.

Mr. Finn: These represent conscious choices to do more for some children.

Mr. McMurrin: Schools have been given these additional responsibilities, and we have not paid for them. Someone else did them, and the dollars were appropriated somewhere else. Or they weren't done at all.

Mr. Finn: But school support has shifted its focus to handicapped and non-English-speaking. But that is not evidence of diminishing public support. It is evidence of another use of the system.

Mr. Hornbeck: It isn't the issue whether funding has gone up or down, but whether we have adequate per-pupil attendance.

In Baltimore City, we don't have enough money for preschool programs. I don't know whether we have less than in 1940 or more. We don't have enough money for preschool programs.

Mr. Finn: What are you doing with your money? Baltimore must be spending close to $5,000 per pupil.

Mr. Hornbeck: No, it's about $2,900.

Mr. Finn: Most other big cities are spending more than the national average, which is close to $4,000.

Mr. McMurrin: But you need to compare the cities with the surrounding suburbs. I bet you'll find Baltimore's spending is about half of that of some of the suburbs.

Mr. Finn: But the State of Maryland has chosen to organize its school financing in a way that causes those suburbs to be spending more than Baltimore City.

Mr. McMurrin: Financial reform favored the suburbs, not the city, and it is called an equalization program.

Mr. Finn: But this year almost $4,000 was spent for each public-school student, on the basis of average daily attendance nationwide. Using the formula of 30 kids per classroom, that works out to an average investment of $120,000 per classroom across this country in public education. It is not equal. I've found in public systems where it's $7,000 per pupil. It is not uniform, and it is different, having the same amount of money, and it is legitimate to ask what it is buying.

Mr. Yzaguirre: Yes, we ought to be asking the question of what our money is buying. And we should ask how we can improve what we are doing with the existing resources. But the fact remains that even if per-pupil expenditures are increasing, they are not increasing enough. National defense costs more today than it did a hundred years ago, and many important people say we don't spend enough on the defense.

The question is, how much do we need to spend, and are we spending that much?

Mr. Hodgkinson: It's a means-ends-range issue. Checker Finn quotes me, and I tend to quote ranges. Whatever the national averages, teachers in Mississippi, for instance, were five years ago. You can find 150 good urban minority high schools that are performing at an incredibly high rate; you can also find 150 big, high schools that are doing absolutely abominably.

But I have to say also that I see some really quite exciting things happening. And a lot of them are happening right now. It is an absolute abomination.

Mr. Finn: When we talk about ranges, such as Checker Finn quotes me, and I tend to quote ranges. Whatever the national averages, teachers in Mississippi, for instance, were five years ago. You can find 150 good urban minority high schools that are performing at an incredibly high rate; you can also find 150 big, high schools that are doing absolutely abominably.

But I have to say also that I see some really quite exciting things happening. And a lot of them are happening right now. It is an absolute abomination.

Mr. Finn: We should not overlook minority progress and the evidence of growing middle-class work among schools. E.W.: What is the formula for that success?

Mr. Hodgkinson: Public concern, getting the most important interest is right.

Mr. Hornbeck: One of the most intriguing pieces of the effective-schools research demonstrated that in any school that really made progress, you really had to take seriously the achievement of kids, and that is correlated highly with expectation. In my state, if you look at the scores over the last two years, one of their top five priorities was to deal with the issue of minority achievement. They have concentrated on the lowest ten percent, and they are now seeing impressive results.

The issue is not whether kids are improving on the average. The average by definition is that there are a whole bunch of kids above and a whole bunch of kids below. The issue is whether every single kid is receiving that kind of care and concern and attention and high expectations and high standards with the support that is necessary for that kid to achieve.

Mr. Finn: I'm going to have to demur to an important point—people in the private sector—the church, the family, business—then it is easy for us. If schools are doing absolutely abominably, they are doing that.

The question in part is: Should we continue the role of moral equals? Should we continue to act as if the value of a school is not part of the solution to those problems? If you have parents who are in our institutions, for better or for worse, six hours a day for 12 years?

If the answer is no, schools have no responsibilities. And if the answer is yes, we have responsibilities, then the question is: What part and what initiatives and what programs do we need to meet that responsibility?

Mr. Finn: No, sir, you're not going to see that kind of work.

Mr. Hornbeck: I couldn't agree more. How do you instill motivation and pass on values when the family is dete-
Who Bears the Responsibility?

E.W.: We have been talking about the markedly changing characteristics of American society and the implications of these changes for schools. Let's turn now to questions about the handicapped. Lee McMurrin has used the word "intervention." Are policy interventions called for in view of the emerging demographic realities? Who should do what and for what reasons?

Mr. Smith: The National Alliance of Black School Educators produced a report entitled "Saving the African-American Child." It was our own recognition that if there had never been a "Nation at Risk," our children were still at very great risk. The report called for academic and cultural exceptions, because if the major causes of poor achievement of our children is a belief by teachers, communities, parents, and the children themselves that they are unworthy, that they don't have the capacity for high levels of achievement. And when this belief is pervasive among those who teach, those who administer, the parents, and the children, then it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

People speak of blacks and Hispanics as "retarded," if you will, at all levels. That they are racially isolated, you are implying that unless they are racially mixed, there isn't much hope for them.

Mr. Yzaguirre: You don't say that an all-white school is racially isolated.

Mr. Smith: Exactly. And there therefore is a very strong reason to intermix them. There is no question that the curriculum of the schools in the United States is a curriculum that places Europeans at an advantage and places blacks, Native Americans, and who are at great risk—blacks and Latinos and Native Americans—at a disadvantage. The truth of their existence, their contribution, and their historic contributions to this country today, simply are not present in the curriculum.

So when you see the reality of the outside—the slums, the nonworking parents, the drug addiction—and then into the school and see no evidence there of any working adults, there is no surprise that there is considerable disablement by the child in himself and in his group.

But school reform began in Africa. The first universities and colleges began in Africa when scholars from Asia and Europe went to the universities in Subsaharan Tumbuka and other places to learn. This simply is not known. Not only is it not known by black children, it is not known by white children either.

The revelation of what is true can make a difference in how all groups feel about themselves. Not only is it correcting the distortions of reality for minority children, but it also corrects the distortions for majority children, too, and this is terribly important.

When one-third of the American population are minorities, we have to think about other kinds of students. We have to think about citizenship in society. Think of it in terms of polarized democracy, which would post that a child has the right to learn about different cultures and still learn about the majority culture and still be respected. White children have that right. White children also have that right, but they are the ones who come from the majorized cultures, about Latinos, about African Americans, because the world is increasingly narrowing and their being able to function in that world is going to be dependent upon their ability to communicate, to know about and to deal with other cultures.

Mr. McMurrin: The group within which the children identify is important, but I think the biggest problem we have at this point is the acceptance within the larger society.

Only by mainstreaming individuals within society in their education, housing, and employment, and by giving them equal access, equal opportunity can we solve these problems.

Mr. Hornbeck: I would like to frame the question in terms of who might do what. Who has the responsibility for what in response to these issues?

The local, state, and federal levels have various responsibilities, and in the final analysis it is obvious that what goes on in the classroom and at the school level is going to be the key factor.

The question is how and where we get the leadership that will influence the greatest number of classrooms and schools across this country. Better or worse, that leadership is going to come at the state level.

If we are going to have equalization in resources, it is going to happen in the state context. There may be a greater or contribution to that at the federal level than there is right now.

If we are going to have substance as well as form in graduation requirements, and if we're going to have renewed curricular initiatives, that is largely going to happen at the state level.

Given the average size of local school systems and the character of central-office staffs, the resources aren't going to be there to make it happen.

It is going to be vital for states to support equity and access, principally under legal mandates at the federal level. Civil-rights initiatives by the federal government have been helpful to the handicapped have come largely from the federal government, but states must active role in assuring access and equity. I would say that there needs to be a great effort made to think about raising salaries. The action is going to be at the state level and so states need to be active role in assuring access and equity, principally under legal mandates at the federal level.

The state has a critical role to play in addressing the teacher issues—from certification to raising salaries. The action is going to be at the state level. It is going to be at the state level and so states need to be active role in assuring access and equity, principally under legal mandates at the federal level.

The protection of constitutional and civil rights is certainly one of the federal responsibilities. But that recognition is supported by the fact that there is a major problem in America with regard to the education of minorities. I don't hear any statement that we have the will to do that. I just don't hear it. I don't hear it coming out of the President. I don't hear it coming out of our undersecretary. We need to be factored into a lot of other expensive propositions that this society is facing.

And, of course, research and statistics are appropriate federal responsibilities.

Mr. Smith: We have to say with some candor that we have no statistics coming out of the Department of Education that recognize that there is a major problem in America with regard to the education of minorities. I don't hear any statement that we have the will to do that. I just don't hear it. I don't hear it coming out of the President. I don't hear it coming out of our undersecretary. We need to be factored into a lot of other expensive propositions that this society is facing.

Mr. Finn: That is an important point that echoes a frequently made observation by Secretary Bennett that parents are the first in some of the other rights in educational literacy level, that improved their political sense. That can be threatening to schools, once parents' political sense has been improved. That is a necessary element in the participation of citizens. Federal programs have to be devised by schools that may, in fact, support parents as parents.

Mr. McMurrin: Nor can parents do the job without others within this metropolitan area taking on these children as they were their very own.

But the question is how and where we get the leadership that will influence the greatest number of classrooms and schools across this country. Better or worse, that leadership is going to come at the state level.

If we are going to have equalization in resources, it is going to happen in the state context. There may be a greater or contribution to that at the federal level than there is right now.

If we are going to have substance as well as form in graduation requirements, and if we're going to have renewed curricular initiatives, that is largely going to happen at the state level.

Given the average size of local school systems and the character of central-office staffs, the resources aren't going to be there to make it happen.

It is going to be vital for states to support equity and access, principally under legal mandates at the federal level. Civil-rights initiatives by the federal government have been helpful to the handicapped have come largely from the federal government, but states must active role in assuring access and equity. I would say that there needs to be a great effort made to think about raising salaries. The action is going to be at the state level and so states need to be active role in assuring access and equity, principally under legal mandates at the federal level.

The state has a critical role to play in addressing the teacher issues—from certification to raising salaries. The action is going to be at the state level. It is going to be at the state level and so states need to be active role in assuring access and equity, principally under legal mandates at the federal level.

The protection of constitutional and civil rights is certainly one of the federal responsibilities. But that recognition is supported by the fact that there is a major problem in America with regard to the education of minorities. I don't hear any statement that we have the will to do that. I just don't hear it. I don't hear it coming out of the President. I don't hear it coming out of our undersecretary. We need to be factored into a lot of other expensive propositions that this society is facing.

And, of course, research and statistics are appropriate federal responsibilities.

Mr. Smith: We have to say with some candor that we have no statistics coming out of the Department of Education that recognize that there is a major problem in America with regard to the education of minorities. I don't hear any statement that we have the will to do that. I just don't hear it. I don't hear it coming out of the President. I don't hear it coming out of our undersecretary. We need to be factored into a lot of other expensive propositions that this society is facing.
The question is whether we as a society have the will to apply the solutions we know will work.

—David Hornbeck

We've seen that in this Administration. And so in the short run, I see an awful lot of problems. But the fact that we are talking about education as much as we are and the fact that for whatever reasons, whatever motivations, more and more people are concerned about what we're doing, makes me believe that we are going to find not the solution, but a variety of solutions.

Mr. Hornbeck: The problem is no mystery. We know what the problems are. We also know what the solutions are. We may not know how to cure cancer, but we know how to deal with these issues.

The question is whether as a society we have the imagination, the resources, and the will to apply the solutions we know will work to the problems we know exist. If we do, we will succeed as no society in human history has. If we don't, the consequences of disaster will be quite significant economically and politically for this country.

Which way that will be 15 years from now, I have no earthly idea.

Mr. Finn: We need the requisites that Dave Hornbeck has described at every level—in the family and in the private sector.

I want to emphasize the distinction between diversity—which is not a bad thing, not a new thing, and which we accommodate in various ways—and the underclass problem, which is a grave and intractable one that I don't think we can deal with entirely within the bounds of education.

Nor can we deal with it very successfully by further elaborating the conventional welfare-state apparatus. That is what makes it so intractable.

As far as education can deal with underclass issues, it deals with them through a mixture of samely applied high standards for everyone, character enhancement and ethical formation, and a radical restructuring of the delivery system for public education in this country, which I think will cause it to work a lot better for a lot of people—including underclass kids.

Mr. Smith: We have an opportunity to set an international and historical example of being able to accept, respect, and educate our total diversity. We have that opportunity. I don't think we have the will to do it—yet. I am not sure we ever will.

The will to respect, educate, and liberate all of our people would require, first, recognition that we oppress minorities in this country educationally, politically, and socially. It is a very deep, explosive, and painful issue. Only some kind of critical emergency could force us to recognize and explore that.

For example, in the late 1960's, the Urban Coalition was formed after 100 cities were burning in America. Colleges and universities began to recruit and fund programs for minorities after Dr. Martin Luther King was assassinated.

We seem to respond, not because we recognize that it is the humane thing to do, but because we face a crisis. And I think all the elements of crisis are here now.

The only point at which we will begin to recognize the oppression and exploitation of minorities in this country and be forced to do something about it, in the schools in particular, is when we see ourselves in such a dire situation that we think the entire nation's welfare is in the balance.

I believe it will be. It depends upon how soon it is recognized.