

*Amilkar Velez-Lopez*

**"THOROUGH AND EFFICIENT"  
PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION.  
FOR PUERTO RICAN CHILDREN  
IN NEW JERSEY**

**Puerto Rican Consortium  
for a Thorough and  
Efficient Education  
  
786 Broad Street,  
Newark, N. J. 07102**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank the Puerto Rican Consortium for providing the staff responsible for gathering the data that made this project possible. We also wish to thank the staff of the Consortium for their assistance in directing the project. We are indebted to the staff of the Consortium for their assistance in gathering the data that made this project possible. We are indebted to the staff of the Consortium for their assistance in gathering the data that made this project possible. We are indebted to the staff of the Consortium for their assistance in gathering the data that made this project possible.

### **"THOROUGH AND EFFICIENT" PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION FOR PUERTO RICAN CHILDREN IN NEW JERSEY**

Prepared by:

**Puerto Rican Consortium  
for a Thorough and  
Efficient Education**

**786 Broad Street,  
Newark, N. J. 07102**

**Telephone 642-8080**

**(Made possible by a grant from the Office of Program Development,  
New Jersey State Department of Education).**

**(Second printing of this document was made possible by a partial grant from  
the N. J. Education Reform Project Greater Newark Urban Coalition).**

PUERTO RICAN CONSORTIUM  
—For a Thriving and Effective Education—

Members

Aspiris, Inc. of New Jersey  
Mr. Dennis McDermott  
Program Director  
708 Broad Street  
Newark, New Jersey

G. V. E. Incorporated  
Mr. Robert Brown  
Executive Director  
50 Center Street  
Newark, New Jersey

Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey  
Mr. Alfonso Gomez

L. J. O. A.  
Dr. Art Thomas

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We wish to thank the Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey for their assistance in acquiring the funds that made this project possible. Our gratitude is also extended to Aspiris, Inc. of New Jersey for directing the project. We are particularly indebted to Mr. Kal Wagenheim for his research work and writing this position paper. We are also indebted to Mrs. Marina Berkowitz and Mrs. Donatila Ortiz de Legnosky for the discussion papers presented at the June, 1974 conference held by the consortium and to Mrs. Amelia Voorsanger for coordinating administrative aspects. Finally we would like to thank all the people who gave their time and contributed to the work of the consortium.

Franklin  
Mr. John Azzano  
Chairman of the Board  
447 Broad Street  
Newark, New Jersey

27 Calverton Street  
Newark, New Jersey

Participants

Mr. Louis M. Maravilla, Principal  
Dr. William Brown School  
201 East Essex Street  
Vineland, New Jersey

Mr. Diego Castiello  
Director of Minority Initiatives  
State Department of Education  
225 West State Street  
Newark, New Jersey

Dr. Francisco Rivera  
Principal  
Woodland Board of Education  
108 Laurel Avenue  
Fairport, New Jersey

Mr. Jorge Acosta  
Principal  
School of Hispanic  
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Mrs. Rose Lopez  
Coordinator of Bilingual Program  
Fairport Board of Education  
1 Cedar Street  
Fairport, New Jersey

Mr. Arnold S. Fink  
C. A. P.  
27 Main Street  
Hackensack, New Jersey

Mrs. Thelma Douglas  
Project Coordinator  
Newark Board of Education  
600 South Avenue  
Newark, New Jersey

Mrs. Beverly Patricia Luperón  
Assistant Principal  
Dunellen School  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Mrs. Maria Del Carmen Duky  
Department of Community Education  
200 South 11th Street  
111 Washington Place  
Newark, New Jersey

Mrs. Maria Bachman  
State Department of Education  
Bilingual Instructional Coordinator  
225 West State Street  
Newark, New Jersey

**PUERTO RICAN CONSORTIUM**  
—For a Thorough and Efficient Education—

**Organizations**

Aspira, Inc. of New Jersey  
Mrs. Estela McDonnell  
Program Director  
786 Broad Street  
Newark, New Jersey

Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey  
Rev. Alfonso Roman  
Executive Director  
222 West State Street  
Trenton, New Jersey

P.R.O.C.E.E.D.  
Mr. Rafael Vargas  
Executive Director  
715 Elizabeth Avenue  
Elizabeth, New Jersey

F.O.C.U.S.  
Mr. John Rosario  
Chairman of the Board  
443 Broad Street  
Newark, New Jersey

O. Y. E., Incorporated  
Mr. Ramon Rivera  
Executive Director  
59 Spruce Street  
Newark, New Jersey

L. I. O. N.  
Mr. Art Thomas  
Executive Director  
997 18th Avenue  
Newark, New Jersey

New Jersey Education Reform Project  
Greater Newark Urban Coalition,  
Incorporated  
Mr. Richard Roper  
Director  
24 Commerce Street  
Newark, New Jersey

**Individuals**

Mr. Louis M. Martinez, Principal  
Dr. William Mennies School  
3rd and Elmer Streets  
Vineland, New Jersey

Dr. Fernando Bonilla  
Bilingual Coordinator  
Vineland Board of Education  
106 Landis Avenue  
Vineland, New Jersey

Mrs. Rosa Acosta  
Administrator of Bilingual Program  
Newark Board of Education  
2 Cedar Street  
Newark, New Jersey

Mrs. Trinidad Gonzalez  
Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund  
815 Second Avenue  
New York, New York

Mrs. Maria Del Castro Blake  
Department of Community Education  
Rutgers Newark  
18 Washington Place  
Newark, New Jersey

Mr. Diego Castellanos  
Bureau of Bilingual Education  
State Department of Education  
225 West State Street  
Trenton, New Jersey

Mr. Jorge Acevedo  
Bilingual Program  
Board of Education  
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Mr. Arnaldo E. Forte  
C. A. P.  
57 Main Street  
Hackensack, New Jersey

Mrs. Donatila Ortiz de Legnosky  
Assistant Professor  
Douglass College  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Mrs. Marina Berkowitz  
State Department of Education  
Equal Education Opportunity  
225 West State Street  
Trenton, New Jersey

# INTRODUCTION

On April 2, 1977, the State Agency for Higher Education presented the current report of the State Agency for Higher Education to the State Board of Education.

The following was made for the introduction and content of the report:

The report's content was based on the following: To state what is known, to identify the areas for which the State Board of Education should be responsible, and to provide the State Board of Education with the information it needs to make decisions.

## Contents

Introduction .....	i
Historical Background .....	1
Profile of Puerto Ricans in New Jersey .....	3
Education of Puerto Ricans in New Jersey .....	5
A "Thorough and Efficient" Education .....	6
Priority No. 1 .....	8
Priority No. 2 .....	10
Priority No. 3 .....	15
Priority No. 4 .....	17
Priority No. 5 .....	19
Suggested Additional Reading .....	20
Appendix (Tables 1-16).....	21

The State Board of Education recognized the need for a study of the education of Puerto Ricans in New Jersey. The study was conducted by the State Agency for Higher Education in order to identify areas for improvement.

In the document, the State Board of Education for a Thorough and Efficient Education adopted the goal of New Jersey Public Schools to provide an education of "thorough and efficient" education. This document was prepared to provide information regarding the education of Puerto Ricans in New Jersey, and to provide a "thorough and efficient" education.

The following study was conducted in order to identify areas for improvement.

1. A review of current state policy on higher education revealed the fact that the State Board of Education is not responsible for the tertiary levels, and the State Board of Education is not responsible for the secondary levels. This study was conducted in order to identify areas for improvement.

2. Evaluation of educational programs for Puerto Ricans in New Jersey revealed that the State Board of Education is not responsible for the tertiary levels, and the State Board of Education is not responsible for the secondary levels. This study was conducted in order to identify areas for improvement.

\* This study was conducted in order to identify areas for improvement. It was not intended to provide a comprehensive review of the education of Puerto Ricans in New Jersey.

## INTRODUCTION

On April 3, 1973, the New Jersey Supreme Court declared that the current method of financing the state's public school system violates the requirement of the New Jersey constitution that:

The legislature shall provide for the maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient system of free and public schools for the instruction of all children in this state between the ages of 5 and 18 years.

The court's decision was based on the fact that, in 1972-73, local school districts, via property taxes, paid for 68.7 percent of the public education budget. The Federal government paid 4.7 percent, and the state provided only the remaining 26.6 percent.

Most other state governments in the United States provide a much higher share of public school costs. The nation-wide average is 41 percent.

There is abundant evidence that children from disadvantaged environments, or with special learning problems, require higher-than-average school expenditures.

Since New Jersey relies so heavily upon local property tax revenues for public school support, poorer communities (which have high proportions of disadvantaged children) are unable to raise adequate revenues for education.

The Supreme Court gave the New Jersey legislature until December 31, 1974 to devise a new system of public school financing, that will permit a "thorough and efficient" education for all children in the state.

The Supreme Court also ordered the legislature to "define in some discernible way," the meaning of a "thorough and efficient" education.

In other words, the Supreme Court recognized that it is not enough to restructure the system of raising revenues for education. The state must also restructure the apportionment of these revenues, in order to remedy present inequities.

In this document, the Puerto Rican Consortium For a Thorough and Efficient Education presents the views of New Jersey's Puerto Rican community on the issue of a "thorough and efficient" education.\* This document lists priorities which are viewed as essential if children of Puerto Rican birth or parentage in New Jersey are to receive a "thorough and efficient" education.

The priorities (details provided in subsequent pages) are:

1. Allocation of public school funds based on needs, taking into account the fact that most Puerto Rican children are of pre-school age, or are enrolled in the primary grades, and that many drop out of school in the secondary grades; thus, dollars spent at the secondary level never reach many of those children who need help most.

2. Establishment of bilingual/bicultural programs for all children whose English-language deficiency prevents them from effectively taking part in the learning process. The goal of such programs shall be to develop the child's ability to speak, understand, read and write English, while at the same time offering

---

\* These views were solicited at conferences and public meetings, in "man on the street" public polls, and by requesting written studies and position papers from professionals engaged in studies of education.

substantive courses in Spanish. The "bicultural" aspect of the program shall be to reinforce the child's sense of self, in terms of language, culture and heritage.

3. Affirmative action to recruit and train Puerto Rican and other Hispanic personnel for professional positions in teaching and related support services (guidance counseling, health and nutrition, psychology, etc.).

4. Continuous, regular evaluation of student achievement, in order to measure how "thorough and efficient" an education is being provided in the public schools; this acquisition of empirical data will allow for pragmatic decisions that allocate resources where they are most needed.

5. Establishment of a Bilingual/Bicultural Division within the State Department of Education, which will be involved in the policy-making process in terms of monitoring program quality, recruiting personnel, developing bilingual/bicultural materials, and encouraging parental-community involvement.

The Puerto Rican Consortium is in contact with numerous Puerto Rican professionals who have expertise in the field of bilingual/bicultural education, and who are familiar with the special problems of children of Puerto Rican birth or descent. We stand ready to work with the State Legislature, the State Department of Education, with teachers' associations, and with all other interested groups in achieving a "thorough and efficient" education for New Jersey's children.

Based on recent court decisions at the city, state and Federal level, there is ample precedent to justify the development and implementation of the actions listed in these "priorities." If action is not forthcoming, the Puerto Rican community of New Jersey intends to vigorously pursue these goals in the courts.

## HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The island of Puerto Rico was occupied by the United States during the Spanish-American War, in July 1898, after four centuries of Spanish colonial rule.

In 1917, Congress granted United States citizenship to all Puerto Ricans. Since then--in the political and juridical sense--Puerto Ricans have been as "American" as natives from any part of the Union.

When Congress granted citizenship to Puerto Ricans, the vast majority of the people on the island spoke only one language, their native Spanish. The granting of citizenship involved no conditions that the people change or abolish their culture and mother tongue. Spanish was tacitly recognized by the Congress as the legal, primary language of Puerto Ricans. It remains so today, and will likely be so forever.

Because we Puerto Ricans are United States citizens by birthright, we are not "immigrants"\* when we change residence to the United States mainland. We are "migrants,"\* just as is a native Californian when he moves to Ohio, or a New Jerseyan, when he crosses the Hudson River and takes up residence in Manhattan.

Therefore, when we Puerto Ricans seek our constitutional rights to fair employment opportunities, to decent housing, and to a "thorough and efficient" education, we do so in our full capacities as citizens of this nation, many of whom have fought and died in its defense.\*\*

\*\*\*

### Migration to the United States Mainland

There were relatively few Puerto Ricans on the United States mainland before World War II, mainly because the Depression of the 1930's offered few job opportunities. As of 1940, only about 70,000 Puerto Ricans lived on the mainland, and 88 percent of them were clustered in New York City, the most common point of travel between the United States and the island.

The postwar economic boom sparked mass migrations within the United States. Blacks and whites moved from the farm regions of the south to the industrial centers of the midwest and northeast. Puerto Ricans were part of that huge wave of humanity, in search of jobs or better jobs. In many cases, recruiters from farms and factories in New Jersey, New York, Illinois and Connecticut came to the island and convinced Puerto Ricans to migrate north, in order to meet the growing demand for manpower.

Between 1940 and 1950, the Puerto Rican population on the mainland more than quadrupled, to 301,000. (This included 226,000 native-born Puerto Ricans and 75,000 children born on the United States mainland to Puerto Rican parents.)

Between 1950 and 1960, the mainland Puerto Rican population grew by more than half a million, to 887,000. (This included 615,000 persons born in Puerto Rico and 272,000 born on the United States mainland.)

---

\* An "immigrant," according to the dictionary definition, is "one who leaves a country to settle permanently in another." A "migrant" is "a person who moves from one region to another."

\*\* More than 6,000 Puerto Rican residents of New Jersey have fought in the United States military, with some rendering service as far back as World War I.



HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Between 1960 and 1970, the Puerto Rican community grew by another half million, to 1.4 million.\* (Of this number, 783,000 persons were born in Puerto Rico, while 646,000 were born on the United States mainland.)

As we can see, the Puerto Rican population on the mainland has grown dramatically, and much of the increase is due to the birth of Puerto Rican children here on the mainland. (See Table I)

Together with this growth, there has been a marked shift away from New York. In 1960, the largest Puerto Rican population by far was in New York State, with 642,000. This was followed by New Jersey, with 55,000.

Just one decade later, New York was still the leader, with 917,000 Puerto Ricans, but its growth rate (42 percent) was far behind that of New Jersey, where the Puerto Rican population grew by at least 150 percent.

Migration to the United States Mainland

There were relatively few Puerto Ricans on the United States mainland before World War II, mainly because the Department of the Interior's effort for job opportunities. As of 1940, only about 10,000 Puerto Ricans lived on the mainland, and 85 percent of them were clustered in New York City, the most common point of travel between the United States and the island.

The postwar economic boom started near migration within the United States. Blacks and whites moved from the farm regions of the South to the industrial centers of the Midwest and Northeast. Puerto Ricans were part of that huge wave of migration in search of better jobs. In many cases, relatives from farms and factories in New Jersey, New York, Illinois and Connecticut came to the island and convinced Puerto Ricans to migrate north in order to meet the growing demand for manpower.

Between 1940 and 1950, the Puerto Rican population on the mainland more than doubled, to 301,000. (This included 250,000 native-born Puerto Ricans and 75,000 children born on the United States mainland to Puerto Rican parents.)

Between 1950 and 1960, the mainland Puerto Rican population grew by more than half a million, to 813,000. (This included 612,000 persons born in Puerto Rico and 213,000 born on the United States mainland.)

\* An "estimate" according to the dictionary definition of "one who estimates" is a country to which immigrants are coming. A "figure" is a number which is not subject to change.

\* By March 1973, the figure was conservatively estimated at 1.55 million by the United States Bureau of Census. Even this figure has been challenged as too low, because of undercounts in urban "inner cities."

## PROFILE OF PUERTO RICANS IN NEW JERSEY

According to the 1970 United States Census, New Jersey had a population of 7.1 million persons, including 310,476 "persons of the Spanish language." Of these, the Census Bureau counted 135,676 Puerto Ricans, including 53,424 persons born on the mainland.\*

These figures are very conservative. The Census Bureau itself has admitted to a serious undercount among minority groups, but has not speculated on the size of the Puerto Rican undercount. The Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey--after contacting public officials and planning officers in municipal offices throughout the state--has gathered strong statistical evidence that Puerto Ricans were undercounted by "no less than 40 percent" in the 1970 Census. Therefore, a closer approximation of New Jersey's Puerto Rican population in March 1969 (when the Census was taken) would be 226,124 persons.

On the average, the Puerto Rican population of New Jersey has grown by 5 percent annually, with an extra 2 percent increase due to in-migration of Puerto Ricans from Puerto Rico, New York City, Philadelphia and elsewhere. Based on these projections, there would be 339,344 Puerto Ricans in New Jersey in 1975. By the end of the decade, there will be an estimated 450,000 Puerto Ricans living in New Jersey.

It should be kept in mind, then, that Puerto Rican population figures mentioned on subsequent pages are based on the 1970 undercount by the Census Bureau. Even with the limitations of the Census Bureau count, its figures are useful as a large statistical "sampling" in discussions of median age, education, income, unemployment, etc.

According to the 1970 Census, the state's largest Puerto Rican community was in Newark (27,443), followed by Jersey City (16,194), Paterson (11,927), Hoboken (10,047), Passaic (6,826), Perth Amboy (6,606) and Camden (6,526). In 1970, the Census counted at least 49 towns in New Jersey with 100 or more Puerto Ricans, and 15 towns with 1,000 or more. (See Table 2) On a county basis, the largest group of Puerto Ricans is in Hudson County (32,563), followed by Essex (29,274), Passaic (19,656), Middlesex (11,333) and Camden (7,479). (See Table 3)

Although Puerto Ricans represent about 2 percent of New Jersey's population, we are a strong, growing minority force in towns such as Hoboken (22 percent of the population), Perth Amboy (17 percent), Passaic (12.4 percent), Vineland (9.9 percent), Dover (9.7 percent), Paterson (8.2 percent), Newark (7.1 percent), Camden (6.3 percent), Jersey City (6.2 percent) and Lakewood (6.2 percent). Since the Census Bureau has admitted to an undercount of Puerto Ricans and other minorities in 1970, these figures are quite conservative, and could easily be increased by 40 percent or more.

### Age

The issue of "thorough and efficient" education is crucial to Puerto Ricans, because we are a very young community. While the median age of all New Jerseyans is 30.2 years, Puerto Ricans in New Jersey have a median age of only 18.9 years. More than 65,000 of the 135,000 Puerto Ricans in this state are under age 18. More than 21,000 are under age 5. This means that better than half our people are of school age, or still have their school years ahead of them. While we represent 2 percent of the state's population, we have 3 percent of the children under age 18, and nearly 4 percent of the children under age 5. (See Table 4)

\* Of the remainder, 70,000 were of Cuban birth or descent and nearly 83,000 came from other Hispanic areas in the hemisphere, such as Mexico, the Dominican Republic and Central and South America.

More than 78 percent of Puerto Rican families in New Jersey have children under 18 (compared with only 53 percent of white families and 65 percent of black families).<sup>\*</sup> About 51 percent of our families have children under age 6, nearly double the statewide average. A "thorough and efficient" education affects virtually every Puerto Rican home in New Jersey.

### Employment, Income and Poverty

More than 41,000 Puerto Rican adults from New Jersey are employed. Nearly half (19,500) work in factories; another 4,800 persons are employed as craftsmen and foreman; 4,000 are in clerical jobs; 1,300 in sales; 1,100 as managers and administrators and 1,600 in professional or technical jobs.

A higher percentage of Puerto Rican males in New Jersey are either working or actively seeking work (82 percent), in comparison with whites (80 percent) or blacks (75 percent).

Despite these efforts, Puerto Ricans are unemployed at a rate more than double that of whites. Puerto Rican women have a lower labor force participation rate than white or black women, but much of this is due to the lack of daycare facilities for mothers of young children. (See Table 5)

Puerto Ricans in New Jersey are grouped into 30,344 family units, with a 1970 median income of \$5,789. This is barely half the median income of white families (\$10,157). While 4.8 percent of white families were below the poverty line, this was the case for 24 percent of Puerto Rican families. Despite this financial crisis, 8 of every 10 Puerto Rican families are making their own way (without even partial public assistance), in the face of low incomes, substandard housing, and other negative conditions. (See Table 6)

Although a proportionally higher number of Puerto Ricans and blacks are poor, the majority of those who are poor, and the majority of those who receive welfare assistance are white.

197,000 white families in New Jersey are poor or near-poor,<sup>\*\*</sup> compared with 77,969 black families and 17,652 Puerto Rican families.

About 52,000 white families in New Jersey receive some form of public welfare, compared with 31,587 black families and 5,988 Puerto Rican families.

In other words, about 1 of every 6 families in this state is poor or near-poor; a condition that crosses all racial and ethnic lines; a condition that demands the efforts of all racial and ethnic groups if it is to be resolved.

A "thorough and efficient" education is one of the key means to achieve socio-economic betterment for all New Jerseyans.

---

\* Throughout this document, we employ the terms Puerto Rican, black and white. Puerto Rico is a "polychromatic" society, composed of whites, blacks and many others of mixed racial heritage. Our Puerto Rican culture rejects divisions along racial lines. But we employ such terminology in order to demonstrate the differences in socio-economic status between Puerto Ricans, non-Puerto Rican blacks, and non-Puerto Rican whites.

\*\* "Near-poor" refers to annual earnings that are only 25 percent or less above the Federal poverty level.

## EDUCATION OF PUERTO RICANS IN NEW JERSEY

Puerto Rican male adults in New Jersey have completed a median of 8.4 school years (compared with 12.2 years for whites and 10.2 years for blacks; the figures are roughly similar for women of the three groups).

These figures do not adequately reflect the disparities in school achievement. More than 23 percent of Puerto Rican adults have completed less than 5 years of primary school (compared with only 4.3 percent of whites and 8.9 percent of blacks). Only 2 percent of Puerto Rican adults have completed college (compared with 12.5 percent of whites and 4.1 percent of blacks).

Among persons age 18-24 years old (relative newcomers to the labor force) only 28 percent of Puerto Ricans are high school graduates (compared with 68 percent of whites and 54 percent of blacks). In this age group, only 1 percent of the Puerto Ricans hold college degrees (compared with 8 percent of whites and 2 percent of blacks). (See Table 7)

Enrollment figures in New Jersey schools for 1970 suggest that Puerto Ricans will lag far behind in education for years to come, unless the system is dramatically improved. In the age 7-15 bracket, enrollment of Puerto Ricans compares favorably with that of whites and blacks (all three groups achieve 90 percent or better enrollment). But far fewer Puerto Ricans are enrolled in pre-school programs, or remain in school once they reach age 16. Somehow, the system turns them off. For example, in the age 16-17 bracket, 93 percent of whites and 84 percent of blacks remain in school, but only 71 percent of the Puerto Ricans are enrolled. In the age 18-19 bracket, 60 percent of the whites, 45 percent of the blacks and only 37 percent of the Puerto Ricans remain in school. (See Table 8)

Among males, age 16-21, an alarming 46 percent of Puerto Ricans are not in school and do not hold high school diplomas, compared with 11 percent of whites and 26 percent of blacks. (See Table 9)

A 1972 study of several New Jersey school districts, conducted by the Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey, suggests that the school system is failing not only Puerto Ricans but all groups. In grade 1, 62 percent of the Puerto Rican children were reading below their grade level (compared with 38 percent of blacks and 7 percent of whites). In grade 6, 80 percent of Puerto Rican children were reading below grade level (compared with 51 percent of blacks and 48 percent of whites). While the Puerto Ricans were worst off, the results indicate a regressive education for all three groups. (See Table 10)

As for the future, it appears grim. For example, the educational objectives of Puerto Rican fifth and sixth graders in New Jersey are "frightening," according to the Puerto Rican Congress. Its study indicates that 1 of every 5 Puerto Rican children in grades 5 and 6 are already "programmed for failure, as dropouts." In response to the question "Mark the highest grade you want to finish in school," an encouraging 62% said "college" and another 17.5% said "grade 12." But 5.1 percent said "grades 10 or 11", 5.8 percent said "grades 8 or 9" and 9.5 percent were apparently resigned to "grades 6 or 7."

The public school system may not be the sole factor in such a marked degree of under-motivation, but it must accept part of the guilt.

Certainly, these figures and data show that New Jersey today is not providing a "thorough and efficient" education for Puerto Rican children.

## A "THOROUGH AND EFFICIENT" EDUCATION

What is a "thorough and efficient" education?

Ever since the New Jersey Supreme Court mandated that the legislature should address this issue, we have seen numerous attempts to define "thorough and efficient."

The legislature's Joint Education Committee reported in June 1974 that a "thorough and efficient" system of free public schools should "provide all children in New Jersey, regardless of socio-economic status or geographic location, the educational opportunity which will prepare them to function politically, economically and socially in a democratic society to the extent of their individual talents and abilities."

Dr. Gordon Ascher, acting deputy education commissioner, put it more succinctly, saying: "a thorough and efficient system of education provides *means*, according to *needs*, for the efficient achievement of stated *outcomes*." (our italics)

The New Jersey Education Reform Project of the Greater Newark Urban Coalition states that the goals of a "thorough and efficient" education should be:

That no group of children, distinguishable by race, sex, locality, ethnic background, religion or economic status, shall consistently perform below the state average on measurements of specific skills or characteristics.\*

The Puerto Rican community agrees with these objectives (particularly with the need to measure achievements). But we believe it would be useful to see how these goals are articulated by Puerto Ricans themselves.

A survey was taken of New Jersey's Puerto Rican residents by the Puerto Rican Congress. Respondents were asked to rank 21 "educational goals" in order of importance, and then to evaluate the performance of the public school system in achieving these goals. The complete list is contained in the appendix (See Table 11), but here are the first 6 of the 21 priorities, all of which were subscribed to by 80 percent or more of the persons polled:

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Performance by the Schools</u>
1.....	Gain a general education.....	5
2.....	Get along with people with whom we live and work.....	6
3.....	Good character and self-respect.....	7
4.....	Develop skills in reading, writing, speaking and listening in English.....	3
5.....	Understand and appreciate Puerto Rican culture.....	20
6.....	Develop skills in reading, writing, speaking and listening in Spanish.....	21

\* The specific skills or characteristics that should be measured, according to the New Jersey Education Reform Project, are: reading comprehension, computational skills, mathematical comprehension, spoken comprehension, written comprehension, listening comprehension, decision-making, recall, self concept and drop-out rate.

As we can see, these goals are both practical and eminently humanistic. But there is a marked disparity between what the Puerto Rican people want and the type of education being delivered. The 5th highest priority (supported by more than 80 percent of those surveyed) is to understand and appreciate their own culture. Yet, the public schools, as they perceive it, rank this item next-to-last in a series of 21 items. The 6th highest goal is to develop skills in Spanish. Yet the public schools rank last in efficiency in satisfying this need.

In the words of Doctor Ascher, are the schools responding to the "needs" or "stated outcomes" of the Puerto Ricans in New Jersey? Obviously not.

We are not discussing here the problem of a tiny minority whose needs are being overlooked. According to the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, at least 30 New Jersey school districts have significant Spanish-speaking populations (5 percent or more of the total population).\*

More than half the people in West New York, Union City and Hoboken are Spanish-speaking. Nearly half of those in Perth Amboy are Spanish-speaking. Roughly 1 of every 5 persons in school districts such as Dover, Vineland, Elizabeth, Paterson, Weehawken, Passaic and Woodbine is Spanish-speaking. In Newark, Camden and Jersey City, the ratio is about 1 in 6.

Based on such data, it is clear that the present system of monolingual/monocultural education is not only deficient in the pedagogical sense, but it is also undemocratic.

---

\* The HEW figures count only Puerto Ricans and Cubans, and do not include Spanish-speakers from Latin America, or Spain.

## PRIORITY NO. 1:

### A "NEEDS" APPROACH TO FINANCING EDUCATION

In discussing the issue of financing New Jersey's public schools, we must first ask ourselves: what is the cost of not providing a "thorough and efficient" education for our children?

What is the long-range financial cost in terms of unemployment and welfare payments, losses from crime and vandalism, and expensive "rehabilitation" programs? What is the financial cost in reduced revenues from income tax, based on the higher salaries that could be earned by a well-trained labor force? What is the social cost in terms of human misery?

Money alone cannot guarantee a "thorough and efficient" education. But without adequate funding, even the best-conceived programs are doomed to failure.

Without adequate funding, we cannot rebuild schools in decaying cities such as Paterson (where buildings erected in the 1880's do not meet state standards for lighting and safety equipment). We cannot offer needed training programs in Camden (where 287 of 945 teachers have substandard teaching certificates). We cannot remedy such crises as we find in Jersey City, where first grade students took tests and were found to be at the "national norm," but by the 7th grade fell below the "national norm."

For these reasons, we support the stand of the NJEA and other groups that statewide improvements must be made in physical plant facilities, in materials and equipment, and in limiting student-teacher ratios to levels that permit maximum individual attention to students.

#### Allocation of Funds

Merely increasing the budget for public school education, however, will not remedy the state's crisis, unless funds are allocated on the basis of needs.

The State Supreme Court, for example, has recognized the "need for additional dollar input to equip classes of disadvantaged children for equal educational opportunity." Indeed, the entire thrust of the lawsuit which brought to light the issue of "thorough and efficient" was that funds are not now being allocated on the basis of need.

Which brings us to the question of "weighting." The most widely discussed formula for "weighting" allocations of school funds is to provide higher amounts of money per pupil at the junior high level, and even higher amounts in senior high school (with some additional "weighting" added for factors such as children from welfare families, or for children with language or other learning handicaps).

The Puerto Rican community disagrees with this system of financial "weighting," because it ignores the real needs of our children. It is not only prejudicial to Puerto Ricans, but to all groups, because it will reinforce a sense of elitism in New Jersey.

As stated before, we are a very young community. More than 65,000 of the 135,000 Puerto Ricans in New Jersey are under age 18. About one-third of our children under age 18 are under 5 years old. About 7 percent of our children under age 18 are under 1 year old, while only 3.7 percent are 18 years old. (See Table 12) If we truly believe in the democratic principle that each child is as important as every other child, we should first take into account the relative population "weight" of each age group in the Puerto Rican community. According to the 1970 census, Puerto Rican youngsters in New Jersey were divided by age as follows:

Age Group

Number of Children

Under age 5 .....	21,940
Age 5-9 .....	20,258
Age 10-14 .....	16,061
Age 15-18 .....	10,158

As we can see, the bulk of our children are at pre-school or primary school ages. Both in real and relative terms, we feel that it is crucial to devote maximum resources to the pre-kinder and primary grades.

Based on a "needs" approach, we see that Puerto Rican children are "hurting" at both the entry level and in the upper grades. Comparative enrollment figures are as follows:

<u>Age Groups</u>	<u>% Enrollment of:</u>		
	<u>Whites</u>	<u>Blacks</u>	<u>Puerto Ricans</u>
5-6	81.0	79.0	69.0
7-13	98.0	96.0	93.0
14-15	97.0	93.0	90.0
16-17	93.0	84.0	71.0

How can Puerto Ricans support a system of "weighting" that favors junior and senior high school students, when more than one-fourth of our children have already dropped out, due to inadequate attention in the earlier grades?

There is abundant scientific data available to prove that the earliest years of a child's life are most crucial in his or her formation. If there is to be a system of "weighting" by grade level, common sense dictates that greater emphasis should be given to the pre-kinder and primary grades, where it is still possible to rescue our children from dropping out.

Any other system, we feel, violates the spirit of "thorough and efficient" and is unconstitutional. We shall challenge vigorously in the courts any system of "weighting" that favors junior and high school students at the expense of those in the earlier grades. We feel confident that the courts will recognize the common sense basis of our argument.

(Another aspect of proper allocation of funds, based on a "needs" approach, is discussed in the section devoted to "Priority No. 5" concerning measurement of students' aptitudes and achievement.)



## ESTABLISHMENT OF BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL PROGRAMS

Discussions of bilingual/bicultural education should not be confined to the Puerto Rican or Spanish-speaking residents of New Jersey.

More than 2.1 million of New Jersey's residents are foreign-born or of foreign parentage (perhaps an ever larger amount are third and fourth-generation "ethnics"). More than 1.2 million New Jerseyans (about 17 percent) speak a mother tongue other than English.

This includes more than 500,000 persons whose mother tongue is Italian, 214,000 whose mother tongue is Polish, 268,000 German, 118,000 Yiddish, and many thousands of others who speak French, Russian, Portuguese and numerous other languages. (See Table 13)

We believe it is a meaningful coincidence that 1.38 million New Jerseyans are poor or near-poor (in comparison with 1.2 million whose mother tongue is not English), and that 966,000 of those at the lowest end of the economic ladder are whites. There is, we believe, a strong possibility that many (if not most) of the poor or near-poor whites are "ethnic Americans," whose upward socio-economic mobility has been hampered by problems of language and cultural adjustment.

We believe that such facts should be considered by those "ethnic Americans" who enjoy middle-class status and--with reference to Hispanics and other minorities--say: "We suffered and made it, why can't they?"

How many, indeed, of these "ethnic Americans" have had the good fortune to "make it"? How many have had their goals frustrated by a society, and a school system, that functions on the basis of "sink or swim," and forces them to discard their native language and heritage? How many more of these "ethnic Americans" could have "made it" had the public schools offered them an education that took into account their special language and cultural needs?

To those who say: "We suffered and made it, why can't they?" we respond: "There must be a better way." Based on the philosophy of those who insist that all newcomers to the United States should suffer the painful process of acculturation, one could make a good case for eliminating the Salk vaccine. After all, thousands of adults are alive today, without benefit of immunization against polio. Why not eliminate Social Security pensions, unemployment benefits, unions? After all, many of our forefathers did without such "luxuries."

We say that those Americans who did without advances in medicine, health and social justice paid too high a price. We refuse to force our children to pay that price. The public school system of New Jersey must be one that responds to changing needs, to better ways of achieving people's goals.

We Puerto Ricans believe that our American society is not a "melting pot," but a conglomeration of cultural communities. Our schools must reflect this cultural pluralism. This is no call for separatism. We believe that all Americans should live in harmony, should share national goals, standards and allegiances, but from within the spheres of their own native heritage, which adds meaning and richness to their lives.

## Place of Birth as a Factor

Perhaps the most compelling evidence that language and cultural heritage affect socio-economic mobility is the fact that Puerto Ricans born on the United States mainland are doing better than migrants born on the island.

United States-born Puerto Ricans earn more money, are less likely to be unemployed, or poor, or on welfare, and live in better housing. About 10 percent are employed in professional or technical jobs, compared with only 3 percent of migrants. (See Table 14)

United States-born Puerto Ricans have a median of 11.1 years of education (close to the national average, compared with 8.1 years for migrants; more than 42 percent of United States-born Puerto Ricans have graduated from high school, compared with 20 percent of the migrants. (See Table 15)

In New Jersey's public schools, at every level, Puerto Rican children born in the United States have higher enrollments than Puerto Rican migrant children living here. For example, more than 90 percent of the United States-born males, age 14-17, are still in school, compared with only 75 percent of the migrant males. At age 18-24 (the college years) more than 37 percent of the United States-born males are enrolled in school, compared with only 12 percent of the migrant males. (See Table 16)

How can we account for such disparities? Here are two groups of children from the same national ethnic group - 15,361 born in Puerto Rico and 26,074 born in the United States - with different levels of achievement. Obviously, cultural and linguistic barriers hamper the success of the migrant children.

There is a growing body of evidence. A study of Puerto Ricans in Vineland, New Jersey \* shows that "the more recently a family has arrived in Vineland, the greater the rate of school dropouts." Those heads of households arriving since 1964 had 36.1 percent of their children drop out from school. Those arriving between 1956 and 1963 had an 18.4 percent dropout figure. The most prevalent reason given by the children for dropping out was that their school was "not made interesting." Another study concludes that relatively few Puerto Ricans are in high school because the schools have avoided their language, and they begin to view their native Spanish as a "liability."\*\*\* Another study warns that the schools, in ignoring Spanish, cut off major communications with children, and by rejecting what the child is, encourage them to become insecure, introverted, or aggressive and antisocial.\*\*\*

The Puerto Rican Congress surveyed 10,000 Puerto Rican children in New Jersey in 21 school district (grades 5,6,8,9,11 and 12) and found that the language used at home "most of the time" by 82.6 percent of the elementary level students was Spanish.

---

\* SORA (Spanish Organization for Research and Action) Report on Puerto Rican Community of Vineland, New Jersey, March 28, 1970, 174 pp.

\*\* A. Raisner. "New Horizons for the Student of Spanish-speaking backgrounds." High Points, 1966, 48, 19-23.

\*\*\* T. Horn. "Three methods of developing reading readiness in Spanish-speaking children in first grade." The Reading Teacher, 1966, 20, 38-42.

How has the state of New Jersey responded to this reality? The New Jersey Welfare Division now provides welfare forms and information booklets in Spanish. There is also mandatory hiring of bilingual case and intake workers in local field offices. Bilingual education, however, has not been put into practice. It would appear that New Jersey is more interested in facilitating welfare than in educating people, to help them remain off welfare.

On January 21, 1974, the United States Supreme Court (in *Lau vs. Nichols*) held unanimously that local school districts receiving Federal funds (almost every school district in New Jersey is affected) must take affirmative steps to overcome the language deficiencies of non-English speaking children.

New York City has already mandated programs of bilingual education, and the idea is receiving growing support across the nation.

In Illinois (where there are many Puerto Rican and Mexican-American school children), a study concludes that "the schools appear to be violating the rights of students to an education because of their cultural and linguistic characteristics." The study found: "consistent underestimation of Latin students' abilities through cultural and linguistic bias in testing and placement"; "denial of opportunity for adequate bilingual/bicultural instruction to 36,000 Latinos for whom English is a second language"; "faulty communication between Latinos and all levels of the school system"; "actual regression in achievement among Latin students, far below city-wide norms"; "increasing alienation of students, parents and Latino community leaders from the educational institutions"; "existence of a large 'dropout' population which was forced to choose between the schools and the streets, and, in effect, had no choice."\* Such a report offers haunting echoes of the crisis in New Jersey.

However it appears that, at last, there is significant support for bilingual education in New Jersey. On January 19, 1974, the NJEA Delegate Assembly gave its support to a statewide program of bilingual education that would establish such services in all districts where there are 20 or more pupils of limited English-speaking ability in any one language classification.\*\* (See text appended.)

Also this year, both houses of the New Jersey legislature approved an act "providing for bilingual education programs in the public schools" (which to date has not yet been signed into law by the Governor). This proposed law has some limitations, we believe, but is nevertheless a significant step forward. (See text appended) If such a law is not approved, the Puerto Rican Consortium will explore the possibility of court action, based on the precedent of the United States Supreme Court case (*Lau v. Nichols*).

### The Basic Elements of Bilingual/Bicultural Education

The Puerto Rican Consortium believes that all children whose English-language deficiency prevents them from effectively taking part in the learning process, and who can more effectively participate in Spanish, should receive the following services:

---

\* Illinois State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. "Bilingual/Bicultural Education-- A Privilege or a Right?" May 1974. 117 pp.

\*\* New Jersey Education Association. "Bilingual Education." Policy statement by NJEA Delegate Assembly, January 19, 1974. 6 pp.

1. A planned, systematic program designed to develop the pupil's ability to speak, understand, read and write the English language. (This will enable the pupil to overcome linguistic barriers both in the school and the general society.)
2. Instruction in substantive courses--math, science, social studies, etc.--in Spanish. (This will keep the pupil "current" in terms of curriculum knowledge, enabling him/her to switch over to English-language courses in those subjects when he/she attains proficiency.)
3. Reinforcement of the pupil's linguistic abilities in Spanish. (This will help the pupil to remain or become bilingual--a definite asset--rather than give up one language while acquiring another.)
4. Instruction in the history and culture of the pupil's (or the pupil's parents) native land. (This will reinforce the pupil's sense of self, and roots, which is an essential part of any "well-rounded" individual.)

Such a four-part program is in keeping with the goals of the Puerto Rican community, which views the learning of English as essential, but also wants its children to retain the traditional language and culture.

The "bicultural" aspect of such a program should not be overlooked, or underestimated. As F. M. Cordasco has noted, the American school has "developed in the child a haunting ambivalence of language, of culture, of ethnicity, and of personal self-affirmation. It held up to its children mirrors in which they saw not themselves, but the stereotyped middle class, white, English-speaking child who embodied the essences of what the American child was (or ought to be). In the enforced acculturation, there was bitterness and confusion.\*

All curriculum materials used in New Jersey (not only those used in bilingual programs) should be scrutinized for their content, to insure that negative stereotypes are eliminated. A New Jersey student should know, on the basis of public school instruction, that America is a land of newcomers. A pupil in Essex County should be taught, for example, that one-third of the 930,000 residents of his/her county speak a language other than English as their mother tongue? that the county has 280,000 residents of "foreign stock." Our school curriculum should reflect the cultural diversity of New Jersey's people. More attention should be given to the veritable treasure chest of cultures embodied in New Jersey's people (Hispanic, African, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, German, Russian, etc.) How many children, for example, have even the vaguest notion of the ethnic history of their own hometown, and of the contribution of each new wave of immigrants to the town's resources? Our children should not (as is often the case today) be conditioned by the schools to reject (even despise) the culture and language of their parents.

### Setting up Bilingual/Bicultural Programs

In establishing bilingual/bicultural programs on a statewide basis in New Jersey, we should profit from the experience gained here and elsewhere. Since 1969, there have been ten small, Federally funded pilot projects in New Jersey. The successes and limitations of these projects should be examined. There should be realistic timetables. Some aspects of bilingual education may be possible to establish immediately. Others will require planning and development. Too much hurry means that programs may be ill-conceived, inadequately staffed.

---

\* F. M. Cordasco. "The challenge of non-English-speaking children in American schools." School and Society, 1968, 96, 198-201.

This will be prejudicial to the development of all bilingual programs (Critics, for example, will point to the flaws and insist that "it can't work".)

Today, at least 39 municipalities in New Jersey have large enough Puerto Rican populations to warrant bilingual/bicultural programs.

It may prove difficult to staff and train personnel for all these programs simultaneously, and to provide them with adequate materials, guidelines, etc. But there are certainly enough human and material resources now to put some programs into effect immediately. One approach would be to immediately designate a few elementary, junior high and senior high schools as Pilot Projects for bilingual/bicultural programs. Such pilot projects could demonstrate to visiting personnel from other schools the means of developing, implementing and operating the program. They could also be used as training centers. Experiences in these pilot projects could be documented and widely disseminated, offering a growing body of empirical data.

### Shortcomings of Proposed Bilingual Education Act

Although the Puerto Rican Consortium supports New Jersey's proposed bilingual education act (because it promises considerable improvement of the present situation), we wish to go on record as being opposed to its limitations:

1. The act limits participation of each student in the bilingual program to 3 years. Why? It appears to us that the 3-year limit was an arbitrary decision, without sufficient pedagogical evidence. We know of cases where Spanish-speaking children have become English-dominant in one year, but others have taken much longer. We believe that this part of the act should be amended to say "at least 3 years," and that final decisions should be made on the basis of testing each child in his/her language proficiency. Also, does the 3-year limit mean that, after that date, the pupil shall cease to receive reinforcement in his/her native Spanish, and shall cease to receive instruction in the "history and culture of the country, territory or geographic area which is the native land of the parents"? If so, this is clearly unfair and inadequate.

2. The act makes no provision for testing or evaluating the success or failure of bilingual education programs.

### PRIORITY NO. 3:

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TO RECRUIT AND TRAIN PUERTO RICAN AND OTHER HISPANIC PERSONNEL FOR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS IN TEACHING AND RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES (GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, HEALTH AND NUTRITION, PSYCHOLOGY, ETC.)

According to the State Department of Education's figures for 1972, about 6 percent of New Jersey's pupils come from non-English speaking backgrounds. However, of the 89,610 professional personnel in the educational system, only one-half of one percent (450) were from those non-English speaking groups.

The Puerto Rican Consortium does not propose rigid "quota systems" that would mandate the hiring of personnel from specific ethnic groups, but we do believe that the situation described above is not only unfair, but inimical to the goal of a "thorough and efficient" education. Affirmative action must be taken to remedy such an imbalance.

Affirmative action must be taken not only for working age persons, but at the student level, to encourage more minority persons to enter professional fields.

For example, of 200 Puerto Rican high school students interviewed by the Puerto Rican Congress, only 23 percent said they had received any counseling data or help from their school counselors. Only half said they were even able to see a counselor if they so desired. 84 percent of these students said they had never read a college catalogue, despite the fact that 67 percent indicated they hoped of attending college.

Despite such inadequate counseling help, the number of Puerto Ricans attending New Jersey colleges has tripled between 1968 and 1972. About 7,000 Puerto Ricans are enrolled in undergraduate courses in the state's 57 public and private institutions.\* Many of these students come from poor homes. Many suffer from inadequate academic, primary and secondary school training. There is a high drop-out rate, due to financial and academic problems.

However, a growing number will graduate each year. Programs must be developed to (1) get more Puerto Rican students into college and (2) to motivate them, while in college, to pursue careers where they can improve their own socio-economic status, and also employ their skills in assisting other children of Puerto Rican origin.

In summary, we recommend the following plan of action in order to properly staff New Jersey's bilingual/bicultural programs:

Personnel in bilingual/bicultural programs should be fluent in the Spanish language, and be able to fully comprehend and express themselves in written Spanish; they should possess requisite content and knowledge skills in the substantive courses to be taught; they should be capable of reading, writing and speaking English, but a so-called "foreign accent" in English shall not be a deterrent, so long as they are able to communicate with pupils in English.

---

\* While Puerto Ricans represent about 2 percent of New Jersey's population, we still represent less than 1 percent of the college enrollment.

In order to obtain such personnel, the school system should:

1. Develop and implement programs to retain personnel who possess content and pedagogical skills to become fluent in a second language, to enable them to participate in the program.
2. Develop and implement an intensive, ongoing affirmative action program to recruit bilingual personnel from within and without the school system.
3. Create a bilingual licensing program, with enough personnel "lines" to fulfill program needs.
4. Develop and implement programs designed to train personnel who do not possess bilingual licenses, to prepare them for taking licensing examinations.
5. Schedule such examinations frequently, and grade them promptly.

**PRIORITY NO. 4:**

**CONTINUOUS, REGULAR EVALUATION OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT  
IN ORDER TO MEASURE HOW "THOROUGH AND EFFICIENT" AN  
EDUCATION IS BEING PROVIDED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.**

This item is listed as the fourth of our priorities, but it is as important as any of the others.

Gearing up for a "thorough and efficient" education will require the expenditure of millions of dollars. We do not want to waste precious tax revenues (much of which is provided by Puerto Rican workers) on programs that don't work. Nor do we want to short-change our children with programs that don't work.

One of the strengths of American industry is its pragmatic approach to problem-solving. The bottom line (profit) defines the success of an approach. We recognize that it is no simple matter to determine a "bottom line" in the field of education, where so many intangibles are involved. But the attempt must be made to develop accurate means of measurement.

The New Jersey Supreme Court, in its mandate, says that if for any reason a local school district "falls short" in providing a "thorough and efficient" education, "the obligation is the state's to rectify it." How are we to know if a given district "falls short" unless we measure results?

Therefore, we endorse the statement of the New Jersey Education Reform Project that:

While defining a 'thorough and efficient' education in process terms may serve a useful management function, unless the definition incorporates, on a statewide basis, the measurement of output as a means of determining what one has learned after completing the education process, it cannot claim to be a reasonable response to the court's directive.

We believe that the concept of measurement is essential to the spirit of the Supreme Court mandate. And we believe this so strongly that we are prepared to take this issue to court if it is not so included.

Part of the measurement process is to establish a baseline for comparison. We suggest the following procedure on a statewide basis:

1. Establish and implement a method to identify and classify all children who are Spanish-speaking or Spanish-surnamed. This method shall, among other things, identify those children whose English-language deficiencies prevent them from effectively taking part in the learning process. This method will identify the children according to their ability to speak, read, write and comprehend both English and Spanish. The evaluation of a child's reading ability should include an assessment of reading skills in both English and Spanish.
2. Periodically (at least once a year) each child who is Spanish-speaking or Spanish-surnamed should be so identified and classified.
3. A child who enters the public school system at the beginning or during the school year, and who is Spanish-speaking or Spanish-surnamed, should be identified no later than the first full week after enrollment.



4. The above data should be accessible (through the local school district or the State Department of Education) to parents' groups, community groups, and other organizations involved in improving New Jersey's public education.

It is important that the testing methods and instruments used in measuring pupils' abilities in language and substantive subjects be subject to review, for possible cultural bias, to enhance their accuracy.

Once such baselines are established for new students, there should be periodic evaluation of their skills attainment.

We recognize the views of teachers in New Jersey, who have voiced apprehension over the concepts of "measurement," or "accountability." And we recognize that part of this apprehension is directly related to legitimate desires for job security.

But again we refer to the history of American private industry. Over the years--taking into account union contracts, the rights of workers with relation to job security, seniority and status--our nation's industry has managed to be flexible in its deployment of human resources, in order to reap steady profits.

We are confident that adequate, fair systems of measurements can be developed, which will help to reap a "profit," by providing a "thorough and efficient" education for New Jersey's children.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL DIVISION  
WITHIN THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHICH  
WILL BE INVOLVED IN THE POLICY-MAKING PROCESS IN  
TERMS OF MONITORING PROGRAM QUALITY, TEACHER  
TRAINING, DEVELOPING BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL MATERIALS,  
AND ENCOURAGING PARENTAL-COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT.

The mere establishment of a "State Advisory Committee on Bilingual Education," as provided for in the proposed bilingual education act, is not enough to insure proper implementation of such a program.

An advisory committee does just that, it advises. But there is a need for much more. There is an obvious need for a "focal center" to adequately develop and implement all the details of a statewide bilingual/bicultural program. An advisory committee is not equipped to carry out continuous research, to develop materials, to assist in personnel training and retraining, to devote itself fulltime to the myriad details involved.

The question of parental-community involvement, for example, is vital. A 1971 study found that only 4 percent of the parents of Puerto Rican students in Newark attended PTA meetings regularly, mainly because they "didn't feel comfortable in an English-speaking atmosphere."\* A statewide poll of Puerto Rican families by the Puerto Rican Congress found that nearly half the parents of Puerto Rican students had never attended a PTA meeting. How does one reach these parents? How does one involve them in their children's education? To date, the schools have been unsuccessful. A Bilingual/Bicultural Division, with proper resources, could make tangible improvements, by working with local school districts and community groups, and by making unilateral approaches to the parents, in their own language.

In numerous ways, a Bilingual/Bicultural Division could serve as an effective liaison between the schools and the community, to insure that curriculum content, materials, and training programs are relevant to the needs of the community.

---

\* H. A. Hidalgo. The Puerto Ricans in Newark, New Jersey. Newark: Aspira Inc. of New Jersey, 1971.

## SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL READING

There are numerous studies available on bilingual education and on the educational problems faced by Puerto Ricans in New Jersey and elsewhere in the United States. Among those we particularly recommend are:

. Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey. The Puerto Rican Experience; An Educational Research Study. Chapter II: The Educators. 1974. 50 pp.

. Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey. Final Report on Needs Assessment of the Processes, Programs and Services Used to Enroll Spanish-Speaking Students in Higher Education in New Jersey. 1974. 56 pp.

. United States Commission on Civil Rights. Public Education for Puerto Rican Children in New York City. February 1972. 90 pp.

. United States Government Printing Office. Hearings Before the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. Part 8--Equal Educational Opportunity for Puerto Rican Children. November 23, 24 and 25, 1970. 1970. pp. 3683-3973.

. United States Government Printing Office. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. January 1970. Vol. 1, 292 pp. Vol. 2, 328 pp.

**TABLE 1**

**PUERTO RICANS IN THE UNITED STATES\***

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total**</u>	<u>% Increase</u>	<u>% of Total in NYC</u>	<u>Born in P.R.</u>	<u>Born in U.S.**</u>
1910	1,513	-	36.6	1,513	-
1920	11,811	680.6	62.3	11,811	-
1930	52,774	346.8	-	52,774	-
1940	69,967	32.6	87.8	69,967	-
1950	301,375	330.7	81.6	226,110	75,265
1960	887,662	194.5	69.0	615,384	272,278
1970	1,429,396	61.0	56.8	783,358	646,038

\* 1960 data based on "Puerto Ricans in the United States," United States Census of 1960, PC(2)1D, Table A, p. viii. 1970 data from "Persons of Spanish Ancestry," United States Census of 1970, PC(SI)-30, February 1973, Table I, p. 1.

\*\* Census reports do not list Puerto Ricans born in the United States between 1910 and 1940. Therefore, the total of those "born in Puerto Rico" is given in this table as the complete total. Third-generation Puerto Ricans-children of parents born in the United States-are apparently not included in these tables, since the census takers usually count only those persons born in Puerto Rico, or persons of Puerto Rican parentage.

**TABLE 2**

**New Jersey Cities & Towns with 100 or more Puerto Ricans**  
(based on 1970 census)

Place	Total Population	Black	Puerto Ricans
Asbury Park	16,532	7,044	169
Atlantic City	47,835	21,014	681
Bayonne	72,719	3,070	684
Belleville	34,667	894	195
Bergenfield	33,267	n.a.	262
Bloomfield	51,997	823	134
Bridgeton	20,435	2,731	363
Camden	102,551	40,128	6,526
Clifton	82,437	266	374
Carteret	23,152	775	669
Cliffside Park	14,024	n.a.	141
Dover	15,039	n.a.	1,472
East Orange	75,419	40,110	278
Elizabeth	112,720	17,389	3,351
Englewood	25,004	8,208	154
Fair Lawn	38,029	n.a.	146
Fort Dix	26,239	4,205	740
Fort Lee	30,631	n.a.	216
Freehold	10,545	1,803	128
Hackensack	35,897	6,008	245
Hammonton	11,464	n.a.	629
Harrison	11,800	n.a.	239
Hoboken	45,390	1,860	10,047
Irvington	59,727	2,294	802
Jersey City	260,549	55,005	16,194
Kearny	37,624	n.a.	147
Lakewood	17,874	3,456	1,122
Linden	41,405	5,329	164
Lodi	25,188	n.a.	441
Long Branch	31,774	5,210	751
McGuire A.F.B.	10,933	1,472	126
Morristown	17,662	3,994	250
Newark	382,374	207,302	27,443
New Brunswick	41,862	9,504	1,481
Old Bridge	25,176	n.a.	358
Passaic	55,124	9,861	6,826
Paterson	144,835	38,819	11,927
Perth Amboy	38,813	2,757	6,606
Plainfield	46,862	18,745	579
Pleasantville	13,812	4,563	127
Rahway	29,102	3,904	207
Red Bank	12,847	3,228	262
Sayreville	32,508	n.a.	141
Somerville	13,652	1,394	306
Tenafly	14,827	n.a.	132
Trenton	104,521	39,193	2,932
Union City	58,537	472	3,114
Vineland	47,696	3,059	4,734
West New York	40,666	372	1,167

Note: "n.a." under column for blacks in some cities indicates that data was not available. Tables used indicated only black populations of 400 persons or more.

These city-by-city figures are very conservative. The Puerto Rican Congress has gathered strong evidence that Puerto Ricans in New Jersey were undercounted by "no less than 40 percent" during the 1970 census.

Source: 1970 U.S. Census. *General Social and Economic Characteristics, New Jersey*

**TABLE 3****Population by Counties  
New Jersey - 1970**

<u>County</u>	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>Blacks</u>	<u>Puerto Ricans</u>
Atlantic	175,043	30,349	2,627
Bergen	898,012	25,049	3,918
Burlington	323,123	28,170	2,685
Camden	456,291	51,769	7,479
Cape May	59,554	4,702	371
Cumberland	121,374	16,562	5,522
Essex	929,984	279,068	29,274
Gloucester	172,681	14,407	966
Hudson	609,261	61,358	32,563
Hunterdon	69,718	1,223	215
Mercer	303,968	49,970	3,419
Middlesex	583,812	25,755	11,333
Monmouth	459,378	38,044	3,857
Morris	383,454	8,415	2,801
Ocean	208,470	6,323	2,487
Passaic	460,782	49,998	19,656
Salem	60,343	9,233	315
Somerset	198,372	7,088	825
Sussex	77,528	*	171
Union	543,116	60,786	4,892
Warren	73,879	716	300

\* under 400 blacks in Sussex County.

Source: 1970 U.S. Census. *General Social and Economic Characteristics, New Jersey, Table 119.*

**TABLE 4****New Jersey, Population  
Statewide total for 1970**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Puerto Rican birth or parentage</u>
Total, state	7,168,164	6,362,337	769,245	135,676*
Under 18 years	2,390,943	2,055,048	323,947	65,559
Median age	30.2	31.4	22.9	18.9
Males	3,466,530	3,085,745	363,587	67,534
Under 18 years	1,219,106	1,050,343	162,763	33,043
Median age	28.8	29.8	21.2	18.6
Females	3,701,634	3,276,592	405,658	68,142
Under 18 years	1,171,837	1,004,705	161,184	32,511
Median age	31.5	32.9	24.2	19.2
Urban residents	6,373,264	5,612,178	728,277	130,153

Source: 1970 U.S. Census. *General Social and Economic Characteristics, New Jersey, Table 48, p. 32-223.*

\* The correct figure, according to research by the Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey, should be 226,124 Puerto Ricans.

**TABLE 5****Employment,  
New Jersey, 1970**

	All	White	Black	Puerto Rican
Males, 16 years & older	2,378,876	2,151,631	215,570	36,871
percent in labor force	79.6	80.1	74.9	82.1
percent unemployed	3.1	2.8	6.0	6.0
Females, 16 years & older	2,656,488	2,382,628	259,935	38,133
percent in labor force	42.5	41.5	51.8	37.1
percent unemployed	5.0	4.7	7.3	9.9

Source: U. S. Census 1970. *General Social and Economic Characteristics, New Jersey, Table 53, p. NJ 32-233.*

**TABLE 6****Income & Poverty  
New Jersey, 1969**

	All	White	Black	Puerto Rican
Number of households	1,976,797	1,774,229	193,233	30,610
Median income, families and unrelated individuals	\$9,675	\$10,157	\$6,027	\$5,789
Percent of families receiving public assistance	4.6	3.1	18.3	20.0
Percent of families with income below the poverty line	6.1	4.8	18.9	24.3

Sources: U. S. Census 1970. *General Social and Economic Characteristics, New Jersey, Table 57, p. NJ 32-241. Table 58, p. NJ 32-243.*

**TABLE 7**

Percent by level of  
school completed  
New Jersey — 1970

	Total	White	Black	Puerto Rican
Persons 25 years old and over	4,056,606	3,676,734	359,390	50,911
Less than 5 years elementary school	4.7	4.3	8.9	23.4
Less than 1 year high school	28.0	27.2	36.0	59.7
4 Years high school or more	52.5	54.1	36.2	20.4
4 years college or more	11.8	12.5	4.1	2.0
Median school years completed	12.1	12.1	10.5	8.3
Persons 18-24 years old	720,615	630,555	85,908	19,211
4 years high school or more	66.3	68.0	54.0	28.8
4 years college or more	7.4	8.0	2.0	0.5

Source: 1970 U.S. Census. New Jersey. Table 51. Page NJ 32-229.

**TABLE 8**

School Enrollment  
New Jersey — 1970

	Total	White	Black	Puerto Rican
Percent enrolled, 3-35 years old	55.5	56.0	52.5	43.5
3 and 4 years old	14.2	13.5	17.5	7.5
5 and 6 years old	81.1	81.4	78.8	69.4
7 to 13 years old	98.1	98.4	96.3	93.5
14 and 15 years old	97.1	97.6	93.6	90.1
16 and 17 years old	92.1	93.1	84.7	71.3
18 and 19 years old	58.0	59.9	44.9	37.2
20 and 21 years old	30.8	33.1	14.8	7.3
22 to 24 years old	13.1	14.0	6.1	3.6
25 to 34 years old	5.8	6.0	4.4	2.1

Source: 1970 U.S. Census. New Jersey. Table 51. Page NJ 32-229.



**TABLE 9**

**Males 16 to 21 Years old  
Not Attending School  
New Jersey — 1970**

	Total	White	Black	Puerto Rican
Total number	115,289	95,964	18,717	4,354
Not high school graduate	44,553	35,376	9,884	3,398
% of all males, age 16-21	13.3	11.6	25.7	46.2
Employed, or in Armed Forces	28,029	23,189	4,612	2,351
Unemployed, or not in labor force	16,524	11,187	5,272	1,047
High school graduate	70,736	61,588	8,833	956
Employed or in Armed Forces	58,336	51,781	6,293	770
Unemployed or not in labor force	12,400	9,807	2,540	186

Source: 1970 U. S. Census, *New Jersey*, Table 51, Page NJ 32-229.

**TABLE 10**

**Percent of Students in Selected  
New Jersey School Districts Reading  
Below Grade Level, By Ethnicity  
and Grade, 1972**

Grade	% Puerto Ricans	% Blacks	% Continental Whites
1	62	38	7
2	68	47	20
3	75	58	36
4	60	53	41
5	73	78	34
6	80	51	48

Source: *Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey*

**TABLE 11**

**Survey of Puerto Ricans in New Jersey on  
Priority of Educational Goals vs. Perceived School Performance Ranked**

<u>Educational Goals</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Performance</u>
- gain a general education	1	5
- get along with people with whom we live and work	2	6
- good character and self respect	3	7
- develop skills in reading, writing, speaking and listening in English	4	3
- understand and appreciate Puerto Rican culture	5	20
- develop skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening in Spanish	6	21
- understand ideas of health and safety	7	9
- develop pride and feeling of self worth	8	14
- manager of money, resources	9	13
- develop desire for learning now and in the future	10	10
- information to make job selection	11	15
- get along with people who think, dress, and act differently	12	11
- practice skills of family living	13	16
- understand world changes	14	8
- skills for a job	15	12
- appreciate culture in the world	16	17
- examine and use information	17	18
- learn to be good citizens	18	4
- use leisure time	19	19
- practice democratic ideas and ideals	20	2
- appreciate U. S. culture	21	1

Source: *Congreso Boricua de N.J. Puerto Rican Congress of N. J., 222 West State Street, Trenton, N.J. 08608. (609) 989-8888*

**TABLE 12**

**Young Puerto Ricans  
in New Jersey, 1970**

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of persons age 18 and under</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of persons age 18 and under</u>
Under 1 year	4,762	6.9	11 years	3,194	4.6
1 year	4,298	6.3	12 years	3,092	4.5
2 years	4,244	6.2	13 years	3,114	4.5
3 years	4,372	6.4	14 years	2,927	4.3
4 years	4,264	6.2	15 years	2,714	3.9
5 years	4,345	6.3	16 years	2,556	3.7
6 years	4,436	6.5	17 years	2,356	3.4
7 years	4,054	5.9	18 years	2,532	3.7
8 years	3,654	5.3	Under 5 years	21,940	33.3
9 years	3,769	5.5			
10 years	3,734	5.4	18 years & under	68,417	100.0

\*Those under age 18 comprise 48.1 percent of the entire Puerto Rican population in New Jersey.

Source: *1970 U.S. Census. Puerto Ricans in the United States, PC(2)-1E, Table 2, p. 24*

**TABLE 13**

**Mother Tongue of  
New Jersey Residents, 1970**

<u>Native-born residents</u>		<u>Foreign-born residents</u>	
English	4,907,855	English	91,844
French	29,708	French	14,737
German	178,652	German	90,826
Polish	173,106	Polish	41,578
Russian	20,367	Russian	12,305
Yiddish	93,040	Yiddish	25,350
Italian	385,420	Italian	118,303
Spanish	165,586	Spanish	92,482
Number of New Jersey residents with mother tongue other than English	1,216,500	Percentage of New Jersey residents with mother tongue other than English	16.9

Source: 1970 U.S. Census. General Social and Economic Characteristics, New Jersey. PC (1)-C32. Table 49, p. 225.

**TABLE 14**

**Selected Economic Characteristics of  
Puerto Ricans in New Jersey, 1970, by Place of Birth**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Born in Puerto Rico</u>	<u>Born in U. S.</u>
Median income of males age 16 & up	\$5,234	\$5,238	\$5,642
% unemployed	6.0	6.0	5.5
Median income of females, age 16 & up	\$3,050	\$3,046	\$3,288
% unemployed	9.9	10.4	6.6
Employed males, age 16 and up in professional - technical jobs	28,080 1,025	25,377 759	2,703 266
Employed females, age 16 and up in professional - technical jobs	12,824 648	10,996 473	1,828 175
Number of families	30,344	28,247	2,097
Median income	\$6,473	\$6,387	\$7,858
% families beneath poverty level	24.3	24.8	16.5
% families living in own house	19.5	18.7	29.2
Median value of homes	\$16,600	\$15,500	\$25,000

Source: 1970 U. S. Census. Puerto Ricans in the United States. PC (2)-1E. Tables 6, 7, 9.

**TABLE 15**

**Years of School Completed,  
Puerto Ricans in New Jersey,  
1970, By Place of Birth**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Born in Puerto Rico</u>	<u>Born in U.S.</u>
Persons, age 25 and older	51,690	47,450	4,240
no school years completed	3,383	3,017	366
completed 8th grade	6,738	6,382	356
completed high school	7,958	6,798	1,160
completed college	1,060	744	316
Median school years completed	8.3	8.1	11.1
% who graduated high school	20.6	18.7	42.1

Source: 1970 U.S. Census. Puerto Ricans in the United States. PC(2)-1E. Table 4, p. 37.

**TABLE 16**

**School Enrollment of Puerto Ricans  
in New Jersey, 1970, by Place of Birth**

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Born in Puerto Rico</u>	<u>Born in U.S.</u>
Enrolled in school, age 3-34	41,435	15,361	26,074
Nursery school	449	95	354
Kindergarten	3,341	637	2,704
Elementary	29,611	10,412	19,199
High School	6,781	3,512	3,269
College	1,253	705	548
% enrolled in school, age 3-34	43.4	27.4	66.2
age 3 - 4	7.4	6.8	7.6
age 5 - 6	69.6	62.7	71.6
age 7 - 13	93.6	91.7	94.5
age 14 - 17:			
Male	82.0	75.2	90.6
Female	80.3	73.9	88.4
age 18 - 24			
Male	15.8	12.0	37.5
Female	11.3	8.8	26.4
age 25 - 34	2.1	1.4	9.6

Source: 1970 U.S. Census. Puerto Ricans in the United States. PC(2)-1E. Table 4, p. 37.