

LOST STORIES OF TRAINING HEAD START TEACHERS: THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA, A FEDERAL PROGRAM, AND MEANINGS OF RACE

by

AMANDA NOELLE INGRAM

NATALIE ADAMS, COMMITTEE CHAIR

W. ROSS BRYAN

PHILO HUTCHESON

STEPHEN TOMLINSON

VINCENT WILLIS

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2018

Copyright Amanda Noelle Ingram 2018
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the partnership between the University of Alabama and Project Head Start from 1965 to 1975. Head Start was a War on Poverty program that sought to provide preschool education to poor children, first through a summer program, and later through a yearlong school program. Project Head Start created a need for trained early childhood educators. In the rush to launch the program in mere months, universities planned training programs across the country to prepare teachers for the first Head Start program. The University hosted the second largest training in the country with teachers in attendance from Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, and Georgia. From June to July 1965, the University of Alabama trained over 1,700 teachers during three separate one-week sessions hosted at four sites. While the Office of Economic Opportunity specifically designed Head Start to address poverty, race played an unmistakable role in the program. Launched after the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Head Start was designed at the federal level to be a completely racially integrated program. While this lofty goal was not achieved, especially in the initial launch of the program, the aim of desegregation was realized in the teacher-training program at the University of Alabama. Through archival research and oral history, this study primarily focused on the Head Start teacher-training programs at The University of Alabama that were interracial programs at a time when widespread desegregation had yet to reach either the University or city. This study also investigated the initial implementation of Head Start in Tuscaloosa in 1965. In contrast to the teacher-training program that occurred on campus, the town's Head Start operated as a completely segregated program illustrating the persistence of segregation in the South and

underscoring the significance of the desegregated program that occurred at the University. The partnership between the University and Project Head Start extended through the 1970s and contributed to desegregation of the campus Child Development Center.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to all of my family, friends, faculty, colleagues, and classmates who supported me throughout the writing process.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CAP	Community Action Program
CCOHA	Columbia Center for Oral History Archives.
CDA	Child Development Associate
CDGM	Child Development Group of Mississippi
HEW	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
IQ	Intelligence Quotient
KKK	Ku Klux Klan
OEO	Office of Economic Opportunity
NAACP	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
NEA	National Education Association
NIEER	National Institute for Early Childhood Education Research
NUEA	National University Extension Association
SGA	Student Government Association
SULSC	Syracuse University Library Special Collections
WSHSC	W. S. Hoole Special Collections

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my family for supporting me through this venture. Adam Ingram has been my rock through my entire PhD journey but particularly through the dissertation process. He not only logistically made it possible for me to write while being a mom to a toddler, he also listened to my ramblings about the myriad of historical points of interest I stumbled across along the way. My parents, Donna and Cliff Wallace, have been amazingly supportive and rockstar proofreaders. Thank you for not being afraid to redline my work and point out the places where no one but me knew what I was talking about. Nana Wallace also provided some long stretches of childcare that allowed me to finish my schoolwork. Thank you to Nana (Robin Ingram) and Kelly (Varnell) for taking Andrew on camping adventures to give me some weekends to write. Thank you to all of my other family members who ask interested questions about my writing and progress. I am so incredibly thankful to have such an amazing family.

I appreciate my classmates for all of their support and words of encouragement. In particular, thank you to Dr. Laura Sanders, Keely Latopolski, Travis Railsback, and Mollie Tinney for our Sunday afternoon writing group. This group helped me finish while staying sane and kept me company during my epic spring break writing session. In particular, I want to thank Laura Sanders for being with me every step of the way through the pursuit of my PhD. From calming my nerves before my very first day of class to commiserating over challenging courses, I loved having one my best friends with me through this entire process. Every time I doubted if I could finish, she encouraged me to keep going.

I want to express my gratitude to my chair, Dr. Natalie Adams. In spring 2016, I had finished coursework and comps but was lost and unsure of what I wanted to pursue for my dissertation research. I heard about a class that Dr. Adams was teaching about segregation, desegregation, and the resegregation of the South. Through the coursework and assignments, I stumbled across my dissertation topic and have been immersed in it ever since. Thank you, Dr. Adams, for nudging me along, answering my questions, and assuring me that all the parts and pieces would eventually come together. To Dr. Philo Hutcheson, thank you for introducing me to the topic of educational history many years ago and bringing your expertise to my committee. I have appreciated your insights into historical research as well as the introduction to HES and SHOES. To Dr. Tomlinson, thank you for asking challenging questions and providing me feedback within the dissertation process as well as at SHOES. I appreciated your encouragement to clearly define my topic and narrow it to a dissertation-appropriate size in order to finish sometime this decade. To Dr. Vincent Willis, thank you for agreeing to serve on my committee and offering encouragement about working in academia. The conversation we had when I asked you to be on my committee has stayed with me and encouraged me. To Dr. Ross Bryan, thank you for hiring me almost 12 years ago to come work at The University of Alabama. I never thought I would stay long enough to get my degree from here and, without your support, I probably would not have. Thank you for the dissertation intervention during one of my lost moments a couple years ago as well as the pep-talk breakfasts and coffees since then. There is no way I would be where I am now without you.

Librarians are such a vital part of the historical research process. Kevin Ray at the Hoole Special Collections Library has helped me on numerous “goose chases”. The librarians at Syracuse Special Collections have been invaluable resources as I researched their collections

from a distance. Liza Talbot, Allen Fisher, and Barbara Cline at the President Lyndon B. Johnson Library have been key in helping me fill in some gaps in my research. I have a newfound appreciation for the dedication that archivists have to maintaining vital historical documents.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2 THE ORIGINS OF PROJECT HEAD START.....	14
CHAPTER 3 HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AND TUSCALOOSA.....	45
CHAPTER 4 1965 SUMMER HEAD START TEACHER-TRAINING PROGRAM.....	81
CHAPTER 5 BEYOND THE SUMMER OF 1965: CONTINUED PARTNERSHIPS.....	114
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION.....	138
REFERENCES.....	155
APPENDIX A IRB DOCUMENTATION.....	167

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In evaluating the orientation plan for teachers of Project Headstart the most impressive and, to me, a lasting value which the University of Alabama provided both trainees and faculty was not in a program structure nor subject content. It was the opportunity for people of two races to live and work together in harmony and respect in their mutual interest and concern for young children and in the desire to provide improved opportunities for children to grow and develop.

—Lola Emerson, Child Welfare League

I think the nation should be informed of the wonderful way in which the two races have worked together in this workshop, working to raise the standard of living for both races.

—Anonymous Head Start Trainee, June 1965

For three weeks in the summer of 1965, future Head Start teachers came to the University of Alabama for orientation and training. A training event on a college campus is typically not historically noteworthy. However, Head Start, a new federal anti-poverty initiative, was designed to be a completely desegregated program. As such, the teacher-training sessions would also be desegregated. The University of Alabama served as the second largest Head Start training site in the United States with over 1,700 Head Start teachers, both black and white, in attendance. In 1965, racial violence was still common across the state of Alabama. Organizing and peaceful protesting for voting rights, often led to police violence and even death. On February 18, 1965, in Marion, Alabama, police brutally attacked civil rights protestors. That night, one protestor, Jimmie Lee Jackson, was shot and killed by police. On March 7, 1965, a civil rights march from Selma to Montgomery was met with violent resistance from law enforcement in what is now known as Bloody Sunday. Two days later, James Reeb, a white minister from Boston working with the civil rights movement, was attacked in Selma and died shortly thereafter. Later that

month, on March 25, 1965, Viola Liuzzo, a white woman from Detroit, was shot and killed by Klansmen while driving marchers between Selma and Montgomery. Consequently, the Head Start training organizers were nervous about bringing such a large group together to both live and learn. However, no racial incidents were reported to mar the trainings. In fact, both administrators and attendees touted it to be a racially harmonious time that brought them hope for the future of race relations. The training program would also serve as the beginning of a longstanding partnership between The University of Alabama and Project Head Start that would lead to the desegregation of the campus Child Development Center as well as special credentialing programs and course offerings designed specifically for Head Start teachers.

The existence of the Head Start training program on the campus of The University of Alabama is not insignificant. The University of Alabama had desegregated two years prior after Governor George Wallace's failed stand at the schoolhouse door. Tuscaloosa was also home to the Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan (KKK). Racial tensions across campus and within Tuscaloosa were still high. Only 50 black students were enrolled across all three campuses in 1965 when the Head Start teacher training program brought approximately 1,000 black Head Start teachers to campus.¹ The partnership with this federal program added to the on-going desegregation story that was being written at The University of Alabama.

The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) launched Head Start in 1965 to provide preschool education for the nation's poorest children. The program was initially designed to be a

1. In 1965, The University of Alabama had the Tuscaloosa campus as well as extension centers in Montgomery, Gadsden, Huntsville and Birmingham. It would not be until 1969 that the University of Alabama, Birmingham and University of Alabama, Huntsville would be founded as separate institutions under one board of trustees. In a letter from Frank Rose to David Nevin dated February 4, 1965, Rose mentions that there are now 50 black students across all three campuses and one faculty member at the Medical College. Record group 006, box 027, location 084-086, W.S. Hoole Special Collections, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL. Referred to hereafter as WSHSC. In a separate letter to David Nevin, Frank Rose estimates that the make-up of the Head Start training participants was approximately 50%-60% black. Frank Rose to David Nevin, July 16, 1965, record group 006, box 027, location 084-086, WSHSC.

comprehensive, summer program to prepare poor children for school in the fall. Created after the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Head Start was intended to be a completely integrated educational program. Given that widespread desegregation had yet to reach the South, this was an extremely ambitious goal. The scope and scale of Head Start was also extremely ambitious. The first summer program was planned in less than six months and reached 3,000 communities and over 560,000 children.² In order to reach this large number of children, 41,000 staff members had to be hired.³ The program's integration goals necessitated both black and white teachers to be hired to staff the centers. Training these teachers was a monumental undertaking. The federal government contracted with the National University Extension Association (NUEA) to facilitate Head Start trainings on 118 college and university campuses across the nation.⁴

The purpose of this study was to examine the Head Start teacher-training program that occurred at The University of Alabama in the summer of 1965 along with the continued educational partnerships between the University and Head Start through the 1970s. I cover the routine details of the programs but focus on the race relations of the participants and the significance of race in the planning processes. Additionally, I explore the way that the partnership between The University of Alabama and Head Start led to the desegregation of the campus Child Development Center.

2. Russell H. Cort, William D. Commins, Kenneth L. Deavers, Ruth Ann O'Keefe, and James F. Ragan, Jr., *Results of the Summer 1965 Project Head Start* (May 9, 1966). Prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Planning Research Corporation, I-17.

3. *Ibid.*, I-17.

4. *Ibid.*, I-12.

Literature Review

Head Start has been the focus of considerable scholarly research, particularly its origins and the national implementation.⁵ Historians have primarily focused on Head Start at the federal level even though the program was implemented at the community level. Most state-specific research regarding the history of Head Start has focused on Mississippi.⁶ Extensive research has also been conducted about the effectiveness of Head Start. Many studies have been conducted to either document the positive effects on children or to document a so-called fade-out effect among Head Start children.⁷ Debates have raged as to whether or not the fade-out effect is valid or if it is fair to blame Head Start for the impact that subpar schooling has on children later in life.⁸

5. Edward Zigler and Susan Muenchow, *Head Start: The Inside Story of America's Most Successful Educational Experiment* (New York: Basic Books, 1992); V. Celia Lascarides and Blythe F. Hinitz, *History of Early Childhood Education* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 401-460; Edward Zigler and Sally J. Styfco, eds. *The Head Start Debates* (Baltimore, MD: P.H. Brookes, 2004); Maris Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2005); Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco, *The Hidden History of Head Start*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); Elizabeth Rose, *The Promise of Preschool: From Head Start to Universal Pre-Kindergarten* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 13-42; Gretchen Aguiar, "Head Start: A History of Implementation." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2012.

6. There is brief mention of Head Start in Susan Youngblood Ashmore, *Carry it On: The War on Poverty and the Civil Rights Movement in Alabama, 1964-1972* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2008), 73-79. The Child Development Group of Mississippi has been covered more extensively by historians than any other state's program in large part due to the very public dispute groups had with Sargent Shriver.

7. "The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development." Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Ohio University, 1969. Referred to hereafter as the Westinghouse Report; Walter Williams and John W. Evans "The Politics of Evaluation: The Case of Head Start," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 385, (September 1969): 118-132; Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start: The Inside Story of America's Most Successful Educational Experiment*, 56-75; Zigler & Styfco, *The Hidden History of Head Start*, 68-78. Roberta Weisberg examines the way that direct instruction was used specifically in Southern districts like Tuscaloosa to combat the fade-out effect. See Roberta Weisberg, "Direct Instruction: Multiple Views of its Implementation as a System wide Reading Program in a Southern City," PhD diss., The University of Alabama, 1998.

8. Valerie Lee and Susanna Loeb, "Where to Head Start Attendees End Up? One Reason Why Preschool Effects Fade Out," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 17, no. 1 (Spring, 1995): 62-82; Janet Currie and Duncan Thomas, "School Quality and the Longer-Term Effects of Head Start," *The Journal Of Human Resources* 35, no. 4 (2000): 755-774; Diana Slaughter-Defoe and Henry H. Rubin, "A longitudinal case study of Head Start eligible children: Implications for urban education," *Educational Psychologist* 36, no. 1 (2001): 31-44; Steven W. Barnett and Jason T. Hustedt, "Head Start's lasting benefits," *Infants & Young Children: An Interdisciplinary Journal Of Early Childhood Intervention* 18, no. 1 (Jan-March 2005): 16-24; Edward Zigler, Bonnie Gordic, and

However, little research has been conducted about the 1965 teacher training programs that were a key component to the inaugural program's implementation. For example, in Jon Hale's research on the connection between Mississippi Freedom Schools in 1964 and birth of Head Start in 1965, he pays little attention to the teacher training aspect of the Head Start program.⁹ In one article, Hale briefly highlights that "Head Start teachers enrolled in adult education programs in institutions that had only just opened their doors after the push to integrate public schools."¹⁰ Beyond that, the teacher-training program is not discussed. In Crystal Sanders' award-winning book about the Child Development Group of Mississippi (CDGM), she mentions the CDGM orientation but does not cover The University of Alabama training provided to the majority of the Mississippi Head Start teachers that summer.¹¹ Sanders does, however, mention the various universities that began to offer the Child Development Associate (CDA) credential to Head Start teachers in the 1970s.¹² In Michael Gillette's oral histories about the War on Poverty, Head Start is covered in two chapters.¹³ In one chapter, the founders of the program recall the concerns about staffing the program in such a short timeframe.¹⁴ Jule Sugarman, one of the founders of Head Start, remembered reaching out to universities to help with the massive

Sally Styfco. "What is the Goal of Head Start? Four Decades of Confusion and Debate," *NHSA Dialog* 10, no. 2 (2007): 83-97.

9. Jon N. Hale, *The Freedom Schools* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016). For specific coverage of Project Head Start, see 186-194.

10. Jon N. Hale, "The Struggle Begins Early: Head Start and the Mississippi Freedom Movement," *History of Education Quarterly* 52, no. 4 (November 2012): 534.

11. Crystal Sanders, *A Chance for Change: Head Start and Mississippi's Black Freedom Struggle* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 55-58. According to NUEA records, no college of university in Mississippi worked with them to offer the 1965 summer trainings. The University of Alabama sites hosted nearly as many Mississippi teachers as Alabama teachers.

12. *Ibid.*, 104-106.

13. Michael Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty, Launching the War on Poverty: An Oral History* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010), 259-280 and 318-336.

14. *Ibid.*, 267-272.

undertaking of training all of the new staff.¹⁵ The implementation of the training and the racial composition of the programs is not covered.

Edward Zigler authored and co-authored several histories of the implementation of Head Start and each includes a brief mention of the teacher training programs that preceded the first summer program in 1965.¹⁶ In Zigler's coverage of the teacher training, he focuses on the rushed nature of the program as well as the sheer volume of staff that required training. Historians Maris Vinovskis and Elizabeth Rose both give a brief mention of the need to train the teachers since they were accustomed to working with older children during the year.¹⁷ They also offer some critique to the strategy employed by the OEO to hire so many teachers so quickly with only six days of training. Some historians have addressed the on-going training of Head Start teachers as well as the increased career opportunities Head Start provided within the field of early childhood education.¹⁸

The Head Start teacher-training program hosted at The University of Alabama is essentially missing from the literature about the University. Earl Tilford briefly mentions the summer 1965 program in a footnote of his book, *Turning the Tide: The University of Alabama in the 1960s*, but it warrants only a sentence. This is understandable since this program was a fleeting moment in history that occurred during the summer months. However, within this moment lies an interesting story about interracial collaboration around the common goal of

15. Ibid., 268.

16. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start: The Inside Story of America's Most Successful Educational Experiment*, 36-47; Zigler & Styfco, *The Hidden History of Head Start*.

17. Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 87-93; Rose, *The Promise of Preschool: From Head Start to Universal Pre-Kindergarten*, 19-22.

18. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start: The Inside Story of America's Most Successful Educational Experiment*, 36-47; Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 87-93; Zigler & Styfco, *The Hidden History of Head Start*, 41; Rose, *The Promise of Preschool: From Head Start to Universal Pre-Kindergarten*, 19-22.

helping children in poverty regardless of race. The 1965 summer training also played a role in the larger desegregation story of the University as it was the first time that hundreds of black people would be on campus as part of a desegregated conference.

Methods and Methodologies

This dissertation utilizes archival research and oral history. Primary source documents were obtained from the Hoole Special Collections at The University of Alabama as well as the NUEA Records at Syracuse University and the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library and Museum in Austin, Texas. Archival sources included training manuals, program evaluations, letters, government press releases, memos, and public records. Within the Hoole Special Collections, materials were collected from University Records archives as well as the papers of Frank Rose, president of The University of Alabama from 1958 to 1969 and the papers of Lister Hill, Alabama senator from 1938 through 1968. Additional information was drawn from the campus newspaper archives as well as local and national newspaper coverage.

Archival research is a generally accepted historical research method. However, the archives do contain gaps and missing information. Not all documents about the Head Start training program at The University of Alabama were retained to be added to the archives.¹⁹ Memos and letters may have been discarded as inconsequential during or immediately after the implementation of the project. Complaints or criticisms may have been thrown in the trash by the administrator who received them.²⁰ In the moment that something occurs, those involved may or

19. Ketelaar refers to this as “an anticipation of the future.” Eric Ketelaar, "Tacit Narratives: The Meanings of Archives," *Archival Science* 1, no. 2 (January 1, 2001): 133.

20. Schwartz and Cook point out that some gaps are accidental and others intentional. Administrators from the past may shape future perceptions by omitting items. Archivists may make decisions about what to include or not include in a collection in order to influence how a particular figure or event is perceived. Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, "Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory," *Archival Science* 2, no. 1-2 (2002): 1-19.

may not consider the event to be something significant that might one day need to be part of the historical record.²¹ At the time the Head Start training program was happening on campus, we do not know what the faculty, staff, and administration thought about the program. They may or may not have seen it as an historic event that would be important to future generations. For example, the University desegregation events from both 1954 and 1964 were recognized in the moment as important historical moments and copious records were retained. The desegregation of the Child Development Center was possibly not recognized at the time as historical and thus few records were kept.

Knowing that the archives would not hold a complete account of what occurred, oral histories were also conducted in order to fill the gaps or supplement the archival records.²² Oral history was also used to "corroborate or discredit other sources of information" as part of a triangulation process.²³ The interviews specifically focused on gaining more information about the Head Start teacher-training program and the desegregation of the Child Development Center in 1966.²⁴

This study examined the period of time between 1965 and 1975. Due to the amount of time that has passed, using oral history was challenging. Five staff and administrators involved in

21. Ketelaar refers to this as "an anticipation of the future." Eric Ketelaar, "Tacit Narratives: The Meanings of Archives," 133.

22. William Cutler, pioneer in using oral history in educational history, argued that oral history in education could help "fill information gaps in written record" as well as "help the historian to understand the atmosphere or milieu" of the times. William Cutler, "Oral History—Its Nature and Uses for Educational History," *History of Education Quarterly* 9 (Summer 1971), 186.

23. Ibid. As Jack Dougherty eloquently puts it, "the stories we hear are not merely anecdotes but rich sources with which we may better understand the significance of the past." Jack Dougherty, "From Anecdote to Analysis: Oral Interviews and New Scholarship in Educational History," *The Journal of American History*, no. 2 (1999): 722.

24. Linda Shopes talks about the way that oral histories are fundamentally documentary in intent and allow us to record how the interviewee "remembers and renders" an event. See Linda Shopes, "Insights and Oversights: Reflections on the Documentary Tradition and the Theoretical Turn in Oral History," *The Oral History Review* 41, no. 2 (2014): 267.

the 1965 Head Start teacher-training program were identified and interviewed between September 2017 and January 2018.²⁵ In September 2017, I conducted an interview with Lucy Deason who served as an instructor for the trainings as well as a small group facilitator. That month, I also interviewed Elizabeth Kent who served as the teacher for the Child Development Center when they integrated the five-year-old class. She also assisted with the Head Start trainings in 1966. In December 2017, I interviewed Charles Adams, the conference coordinator for the Head Start trainings at The University of Alabama. In January 2018, I interviewed Carroll Tingle who most recently worked as the Chair and an Assistant Professor for Child Development and Family Life at the University of Alabama. She was involved with the implementation of the Child Development Associate (CDA) credential as well as site visits to Head Start centers in the 1970s.

Unfortunately, none of the teacher trainees were able to be interviewed. Given that 73% of participants in the 1965 program were over the age of 31, it is unsurprising that research led to an overwhelming number of obituaries. A list of Tuscaloosa Head Start teachers for the summer of 1965 was located in a *Tuscaloosa News* article from June 14, 1965.²⁶ In searching for these 14 people to interview, 10 obituaries were located. Two phone numbers were located for the four remaining teachers. I made contact only one of the former teachers who said she would consider talking with me but she failed to respond to subsequent calls. I left messages for the final teacher but no contact was made. Not having the current perspectives of the trainees obviously affects

25. One participant who was interviewed has early stages of dementia and her interview was not able to be used for the project though she did share some historical photographs and paperwork from the Child Development Center that influenced my understanding of it.

26. Paul Davis, "Nearly 100 Negroes Ask to Enter White Schools," *Tuscaloosa News*, June 14, 1965.

the story that I am able to tell about what occurred. In order to compensate for the missing voices in this study, I relied heavily upon qualitative responses to questionnaires distributed during the trainings to gain the participants' perspectives of their experiences.

Oral history always brings into question the accuracy of memory, and the passage of over 50 years calls into question whether or not the information obtained was “distorted or contaminated by the passage of time.”²⁷ Narrators may have struggled to remember specific details or may have forgotten some instances altogether.²⁸ Interviewees' memories have also been shaped over time as they have re-remembered or re-told the stories. Jack Dougherty argues, “Oral interviews about the past are inherently influenced by the historical conditions of the present. All of the components...reflect an indelible sign of the times.”²⁹ What I as the researcher brought to the interviews was influenced by my present understandings about the incidents that occurred in the past. Similarly, interviewees are remembering the past through the lens of the present. The language they used was likely not the language they would have used in the historical time when the events discussed occurred. Their current understanding of Head Start, the Civil Rights Movement, and desegregation influenced their recollections of the Head Start teacher training sessions. Dougherty follows up his earlier statement with the caveat that “this does not imply that our studies are flawed. To the contrary, the very process of doing oral history offers additional clues for interpreting how we understand the past from our present-day

27. Ronald Grele, “Oral History as Evidence,” in *Handbook of Oral History*, 82.

28. For more about remember and telling, see Antoinette Errante, “But Sometimes You're Not Part of the Story: Oral Histories and Ways of Remembering and Telling,” *Educational Researcher* 29, no. 2 (2000): 16-27.

29. Jack Dougherty, “From Anecdote to Analysis,” 716. Carloline Eick expresses similar sentiments pointing out that, “oral historians use the past to shape the present, and in turn use encounters performed in the present to bring light to the past.” See Caroline Eick, “Oral Histories of Education and the Relevance of Theory: Claiming New Spaces in a Post-Revisionist Era,” *History of Education Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (2011): 158-183.

perspective."³⁰ The influence that the present has on these interviews does not negate their importance. However, it is important to recognize the ways that the present shapes memory and remembering.

Just as with all historical research, the historical narrative that I have created is based on materials that are incomplete. Triangulation was employed wherever possible to try to reveal multiple perspectives on the events that occurred. This was sometimes not possible due to the loss of living participants, absence of materials available in the archives, or scant news coverage. No research method can claim complete access to one complete and accurate truth. As with all research methods, archival research and oral history are incomplete and imperfect. Nevertheless, they can contribute to an increased understanding about contemporary historical events.

Chapter Organization and Overview

This dissertation exists at the intersection of two important events—the desegregation of The University of Alabama and the creation of the national Head Start program. The desegregated Head Start teacher-training program is part of the larger desegregation story of The University of Alabama. It was a brief moment in time on the University campus in which harmonious racial relations prevailed despite recent racial tensions on campus, in the town, and in the state of Alabama. The teacher-training program was also an integral part of how Head Start was able to launch in the summer of 1965. Without campuses like The University of Alabama stepping up to participate in this very last-minute and rushed partnership with the federal government, a half a million children would not have had access to Head Start in 1965. In order to fully understand this intersection, one has to understand the two roads and how they

30. Dougherty, “From Anecdote to Analysis,” 716.

converged. This dissertation will cover the beginnings of Head Start, the desegregation of The University of Alabama, and the moments when these two histories merged in the summer of 1965.

Chapter 2 introduces the War on Poverty and Project Head Start. Head Start was not originally included in the Economic Opportunity Act but was added when Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) officials realized that none of their programs addressed the needs of children in poverty. Head Start was announced in February 1965 and launched that summer. Program planners had to contend with an abbreviated planning period as well as a dearth of early childhood educators. Head Start was also intended to be a fully integrated program, which led to many challenges, especially across the Southeast where desegregation was not widespread.

Chapter 3 provides the historical context for both The University of Alabama and Tuscaloosa in the 1960s. The University had a failed desegregation attempt in 1956. In 1963, the University was successfully desegregated but not before the governor followed through with his campaign promise to stand in the schoolhouse door in protest. Tuscaloosa was home to Robert Shelton, Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, which caused the desegregation of local restaurants and businesses to be met with white resistance and racial tensions. This chapter will also touch on President Frank Rose and his pursuit of federal dollars during the 1960s that likely impacted his decision to allow the University to participate in the Head Start training program.

The fourth chapter provides in-depth coverage of the Head Start teacher-training program that occurred in the summer of 1965. The Department of Child Development and Family Life at The University of Alabama was a leader in the Southeast which made it uniquely qualified to provide training to Head Start staff who were unfamiliar with early childhood education. Extensive curriculum was established to familiarize participants with basic tenants of early

childhood education as well as the special needs of children living in poverty. The program planning was a complicated logistical feat due to large numbers of participants and the hurried nature of the program. In evaluations of the training program, race was covered extensively. The race relations of trainees as well as coverage of the topic of race during the training was a notable aspect of the training to attendees, outside consultants, and University staff.

The fifth chapter examines the continued partnerships between Head Start and The University of Alabama through the 1970s. The University continued its involvement with Head Start first through evaluation and research of the program and later through continued training of Head Start staff. After 1965, longer, more in-depth trainings were provided to Head Start staff and eventually the University began to offer coursework to Head Start teachers seeking their Child Development Associate (CDA) credential.

This dissertation concludes with a closing discussion about the current state of Head Start and the epilogue to the desegregation story of The University of Alabama. Head Start has been a contested program since its inception and questions about the quality and consistency of the program persist to present day. The desegregation of The University of Alabama is a long narrative, and this event is only one small piece of that larger story that in some ways continues into present day.

CHAPTER 2

THE ORIGINS OF PROJECT HEAD START

The War on Poverty

Project Head Start developed out of President Johnson's War on Poverty. During the January 8, 1964 State of the Union address, President Johnson declared,

Many Americans live on the outskirts of hope—some because of their poverty, and some because of their color, and all too many because of both. Our task is to help replace their despair with opportunity. This administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America.¹

At the forefront of this war on poverty was the Economic Opportunity Act. Passed in August 1964, this legislation specifically outlined youth programs, urban and rural community action programs, agencies to address rural poverty, work experience trainings, the establishment of small business loans, and the creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to oversee all the new initiatives.² The newly created OEO reported directly to the office of the president.

The youth programs included the Job Corps, work-training programs, and the Federal Work-Study program. The Job Corps sought to train young, poor men and women to grant them

1. Lyndon B. Johnson, State of the Union address. To access the transcript or view the complete address, see The University of Virginia Miller Center website (<https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/january-8-1964-state-union>).

2. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Public Law 88-452. National Archives and Records Administration, Office of the Federal Register. Accessed from <https://catalog.archives.gov/id/299896>. For a comprehensive overview and analysis of the War on Poverty and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 see Henry Aaron, *Politics and the Professors: The Great Society in Perspective* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1978); David Zarefsky, *President Johnson's War on Poverty: Rhetoric and History* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1986); Barbara C. Jordan and Elspeth D. Rostow, *The Great Society: A Twenty-Year Critique* (Austin, TX: Lyndon B. Johnson Library, 1986); Michael Katz, *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare* (New York, Pantheon, 1989); Michael Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty, Launching the War on Poverty*; Robert F. Clark, *The War on Poverty: History, Selected Programs, and Ongoing Impact* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2002); Annelise Orleck and Lisa Gayle Hazirjian, eds., *The War on Poverty: A New Grassroots History, 1964-1980* (Athens: University of Georgia press, 2011).

access into the workforce.³ The OEO established Job Corps camps in both cities and rural areas, and young people were sent to these camps to receive vocational training and work experience. Many projects emphasized natural resource conservation and collaborated with the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the Park Service. The youth work training programs also served to create jobs for unemployed and underemployed young people in the community to provide them job training and skills. It included programs that incentivized young people to stay enrolled in high school and gain vocational skills. Federal Work-Study provided part-time employment for poor college students to help their families fund higher education. The federal government provided universities with federal funds to employ low-income students, which in turn allowed them to pay their tuition and housing fees.

The Community Action Program (CAP) served to support any program that “provides services, assistance, and other activities of sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward elimination of poverty.”⁴ CAP grant recipients varied dramatically between rural and urban communities, as well as in different regions and included programs such as food pantries, job training, senior centers, healthcare assistance, and other social welfare organizations. Local organizations could apply for funds to create new programs or support existing initiatives that

3. For more information about the Job Corps program see V. Lane Rawlins, “Job Corps: The Urban Center as a Training Facility,” *Journal of Human Resources* 6, no. 2 (Spring 1971): 221-235; Sar A. Levitan and Benjamin H. Johnston, *The Job Corps: A Social Experiment that Works* (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1975); Peter Schochet, John Burghardt, and Shenna McConnell, “Does Job Corps Work? Impact Findings from the National Job Corps Study,” *American Economic Review* 98, no. 5 (2008): 1864-1886.

4. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. For more information about Community Action Programs, see Carolyn Harmon, “Was Head Start a Community Action Program? Another Look at an Old Debate,” in *Head Start Debates*, Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco, eds. (Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004), 85-101; Paul Peterson, “Forms of Representation: Participation of the Poor in the Community Action Program,” *American Political Science Review* 64, no. 2 (June 1970): 491-507; Peter Eisinger, *The Community Action Program and the Development of Black Political Leadership* (Madison: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin, 1978); Noel Cazenave, *Impossible Democracy: The Unlikely Success of the War on Poverty Community Action Programs* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007); Beverly Bunch and Dalitso Sulamoyo, *Community Action Leaders: Rooting out Poverty at the Local Level* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2017).

could help combat poverty in their area. The program focused on allowing local control over federal dollars in an effort to address the “root causes” of poverty instead of only its effects.⁵ This provision of the Economic Opportunity Act also included an adult basic education program intended to provide basic literacy skills to poor adults to improve their position in life. These programs had local oversight and control.

The Economic Opportunity Act also specifically outlined programs to address poverty in rural areas. These included grants and loans to small farmers as well as farm cooperatives in order to improve the lives of the rural poor.⁶ Seasonal and migrant workers were identified as needing aid in the form of sanitary housing, daycare, and education. However, specifics of how this aid would be provided were not outlined. Small business loans were included with the idea that the poor should be empowered to start small businesses to assist not only themselves, but also contribute to their local economy. Loans for up to \$25,000 could be granted with the possible provision that the grantee complete management training courses.⁷

Prior to Johnson, poverty had not even been publicly discussed at length by previous presidents and “before 1964, the word *poverty* had not appeared even in the index of either the *Congressional Record* or the *Public Papers of the Presidents*.”⁸ However, the origins of the War

5. Scott Stossel, *Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver* (New York, NY: Other Press, 2011), 357. Shriver likened the CAPs to local boards of education that would have the ability to operate independent from local political and governmental agencies. The thought was that local control through CAPs would allow for flexibility to meet the specific needs of the poor in any community.

6. Alabama was the site of one of the controversial farming cooperatives, the Southwest Alabama Farmers' Cooperative Association (SWAFCA). The white community and farmers resisted the ability of black farmers to create a farming cooperative. Allegations of communism within SWAFCA plagued the OEO. For a more detailed discussion of SWAFCA, see Ashmore, *Carry it On*.

7. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

8. Stossel, *Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver*, 334. Many cite the publication of Michael Harrington's book in 1962 as a turning point in public perceptions about poverty or at least as the beginning of poverty being discussed in public forums. Michael Harrington, *The Other America: Poverty in the United States* (New York: MacMillan, 1962).

on Poverty trace back to John F. Kennedy's presidency. Early in Kennedy's administration, he focused on other priorities, especially international relations. By 1963, he began to consider introducing poverty programs the following year.⁹ Kennedy had established an informal committee to begin studying poverty and possible programs to assist those living in poverty. Walter Heller, chair of Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, led this committee. In November 1963, Kennedy told advisors "the time has come to organize a national assault on the causes of poverty, a comprehensive program, across the board."¹⁰ After Kennedy's assassination on November 22, 1963, Heller recalled being concerned that President Johnson would abandon the ideas for the poverty program. To Heller's surprise, Johnson was enthusiastic about the ideas and wanted concrete plans to announce at the beginning of 1964. In December, the informal committee presented the idea of pilot projects to Johnson who rejected them as being far too conservative and limited in scope.¹¹ Johnson argued that they needed to commit fully to the poverty programs in order for them to be effective and thus wanted to forgo the pilot programs in favor of a full nationwide launch.

When the committee presented the idea for the CAP, Johnson was hesitant for a few reasons. First, at the core of CAP was local control, which was a hard sell to federal bureaucrats and politicians. The CAP was also unprecedented because it allowed non-governmental agencies access to the federal poverty dollars. Additionally, it would not have the broad, sweeping results that would allow for quick and positive publicity. A multitude of smaller projects simply would not make the same splash that Johnson wanted to make with the poverty programs. James

9. Stossel, *Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver*, 339.

10. Arthur Schlesinger, *One Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), 1012. For more about how Kennedy influenced the War on Poverty see also Carl M. Brauer, "Kennedy, Johnson, and the War on Poverty," *Journal of American History* 69, no. 1 (June 1982): 98-119.

11. Stossel, *Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver*, 343.

Sundquist, a member of the original War against Poverty Task Force, explained that they continued to push for CAP because they believed that the country could not “have an unconditional war on poverty” and determine for the entire nation a limited number of programs to focus on and then “tell all the mayors and county commissioners and civil leaders to go back and wait—they could fight their war on poverty later.”¹² The task force recognized the complexities of poverty and the variations that existed between different communities. There could not be a one-size-fits-all solution if they truly wanted to win this war. Their arguments eventually convinced President Johnson who agreed to include CAP in the Economic Opportunity Act, albeit reluctantly.

Instead of housing the new poverty projects in an existing department such as Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), Johnson decided to start the new Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and enlisted Robert Sargent Shriver to be the director.¹³ Shriver had previously launched and directed the Peace Corps, an international service program for young adults, typically recent college graduates.¹⁴ The Peace Corps was a new initiative that was a popular government program, especially among young Americans. Although this program began during the Kennedy administration, it was strongly supported by Johnson even when he was still Vice President.¹⁵ Shriver’s success in that venture, along with his political connections, made him an appealing nominee to President Johnson.¹⁶ Shriver quickly pulled together a task force to

12. Oral history with James Sundquist in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 84.

13. Oral history with Sargent Shriver in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 31.

14. For more about the Peace Corps see Brent Ashbranner, *A Moment in History: The First Ten Years of the Peace Corps* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971); Gerard Rice, *The Bold Experiment: JFK’s Peace Corps* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985); Zane Reeves, *The Politics of the Peace Corps and VISTA* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1988).

15. Stossel, *Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver*, 450-451.

16. Sargent Shriver was married to Eunice Kennedy, sister of John F. Kennedy. The Kennedy connection was politically expedient to President Johnson after John F. Kennedy’s assassination as he sought to establish his

create a comprehensive poverty plan that would not just distribute money to the poor, but also attempt to change the circumstances of those living in poverty through the creation of jobs, training programs, and social programs.

Poverty Program Needs a Head Start

The War on Poverty did not initially include Project Head Start. The federal government had a surplus of the War on Poverty dollars because many communities were suspicious of the CAP structure and subsequently unwilling to seek out the available grant money.¹⁷ This surplus of funds jeopardized the War on Poverty programs and the OEO worked to develop additional poverty programs. The initial Economic Opportunity Act passed in 1964 but did not list Head Start or any similar preschool programs. In fact, Head Start was not listed in the legislation until 1966, almost a full year after the first summer program had been planned and completed.

The idea for Head Start originated when Shriver and his team reviewed demographic information about the poor in the United States and were shocked to learn that almost 15 million of the country's poor were children.¹⁸ Shriver recalls sitting in the meeting where he learned this information and realized "if we have a war against poverty and we don't have programs specifically aimed at children, nobody can say we're having a war to help the most numerous victims of poverty."¹⁹ Paired with this realization was the knowledge that children were more

credibility as the new president. For a detailed biography of Sargent Shriver see Stossel, *Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver*.

17. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 3. The CAP structure was new and unfamiliar causing some confusion about how to access the funds. Additionally, some early CAP grantees in New York were accused of communism, undermining the local government, and mishandling funds which made other organizations even more cautious about pursuing the funds.

18. Ibid.

19. Oral history with Sargent Shriver in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 265.

“appealing victims than their parents.”²⁰ Many communities and agencies resisted many of the War on Poverty efforts because the poor were seen as lazy and unworthy of help.²¹ Children, on the other hand, were construed as innocent and deserving of assistance. This made Head Start more palatable to politicians and provided ample opportunity for positive press coverage that could combat some of the more negative news stories about the War on Poverty. President Johnson was particularly receptive to the idea of Project Head Start. He had previously been a public school teacher in rural Texas and seen the impact education could have on poor children.²²

Dr. Robert Cooke, chief of pediatrics at John Hopkins Medical School, convened an interdisciplinary task force to plan a program that would assist children in poverty.²³ In February 1964, the task force issued the Cooke Report, which called for the immediate implementation of a summer program that could eventually grow into a yearlong program that would address the educational, nutritional, and medical needs of children in poverty.²⁴ Referencing recent work undertaken by the Ford Foundation, the report claimed that comprehensive programs for young children in poverty had the ability to “improve both the child’s opportunities and achievements.”²⁵ The task force suggested that the need was so urgent that a summer program

20. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 4.

21. For a more detailed discussion about the “undeserving poor” see Katz, *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare*.

22. Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 280. Richmond reminisced on an interaction with President Johnson at the screening of the short film *Pancho* about one of the poster children of Head Start. Richmond remembered Johnson turning to him “with tears in his eyes [saying] ‘this is all of what I used to see when I was teaching school down there in south Texas.’”

23. Oral history with Robert Cooke in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 262.

24. “Recommendations for a Head Start Program” by a panel of experts chaired by Dr. Robert Cooke, Johns-Hopkins University, February 19, 1965. Accessed from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/cooke-report.pdf> Referred to hereafter as the Cooke Report.

25. Ibid. For more information about the Ford Foundation program, see Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 9.

should be launched that same year despite having less than five months to plan and implement a nationwide program. The Cooke Report also called for a small-scale implementation to ensure consistently high quality programs. For Shriver and the OEO, the request for urgency outweighed the caution against launching many programs of inconsistent quality and they ignored the task force's recommendation. Edward Zigler, one member of the task force, recalled expressing concern to Jule Sugarman, one the creators of Head Start, about the large-scale implementation. Sugarman responded, "of course, we'll fund some bad programs. But after the program is implemented we'll shut down any programs that are bad and shift the funds to better programs."²⁶

From the Cooke Report, plans for Head Start emerged. Sargent Shriver sent letters to senators notifying them that Head Start would be the newest weapon in the War on Poverty. He explained that it would be a "nationwide pre-school program...aimed to improve [children's] health and physical abilities, develop their self-confidence, provide a range of classroom and field trips, [and] establish joint activities with their parents."²⁷ Shriver included an information packet which further outlined goals of the programs. Head Start was designed to be a holistic children's preschool program that provided children with more than just opportunities to prepare for school. The program emphasized the development of social skills, confidence, and verbal skills. Additionally, parental and family engagement was encouraged with the goal of

26. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 41. Polly Greenberg argued that no early childhood education expert or consultant thought such a widespread launch was a good idea. Most believed that a small, experimental program was the best way to start in order to ensure consistent quality. See Polly Greenberg, "Three Core Concepts of the War on Poverty: Their Origins and Significance in Head Start," in *Head Start Debates*, Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco, eds. (Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004), 64.

27. Sargent Shriver to Lister Hill, March 5, 1965, Lister Hill Papers, OEO Files, Box 670-378, Location 068-068, WSHSC.

“strengthening the family’s ability to relate positively to the child and his problems.”²⁸ Head Start was also designed to include a social service component in order to address children’s basic needs including food, clothing, and housing by connecting the families to existing social services agencies in the communities.

The Economic Opportunity Act called for the CAP to be “developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served.”²⁹ This idea was carried forward in the planning for Head Start. The Cooke Report called for parental involvement on a number of levels including gaining input from parents as the programs were being planned and developed.³⁰ The report also explicitly called for the hiring of parents to assist as teacher aides or to work as custodians, maintenance staff, and cooks. Hiring parents gave the communities Head Start served the opportunity to contribute ideas to the program, increase the staffs’ understandings of those they served, and furnish paychecks for the poor. Giving jobs to parents created the opportunity to provide the entire family with a *head start*.

Health and nutrition were also key components of the program. Head Start centers provided two warm meals each day to the children they served because “inadequate diet saps their energy.”³¹ In addition to providing meals, parents were instructed on nutrition in order to encourage them to serve well-balanced foods at home. Health screenings, immunizations, dental,

28. The Cooke Report.

29. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

30. For more about the impact of parental participation in Project Head Start, see Elizabeth Rose, “Poverty and Parenting: Transforming Early Education’s Legacy in the 1960s,” *History of Education Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (May 2009): 222-234.

31. “The first step...on a long Journey,” Congressional Presentation, April 1965, Office of Economic Opportunity, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

and eye exams were also vital components of the program.³² Dr. Julius Richmond, national director of Project Head Start in 1965, argued that for poor children, “health services are usually inadequate, immunizations are frequently incomplete, and physical problems may go uncorrected, thus handicapping the child in his adaptation to school.”³³ Teaching children was not enough. Head Start provided opportunities for improved health and nutrition that would prepare them to be successful later in life. Through Head Start, one-third of participating children were diagnosed with some type of medical condition and over 75 percent of those diagnosed were treated.³⁴

In the 1960s, the age at which children started public school varied among states. Kindergarten was not widespread in the United States and over 50 percent of children started school at first grade.³⁵ The initial summer program targeted children who would be starting school the next year so some programs enrolled four-year-olds while others enrolled five-year-olds. Richmond remembered “feeling that if we were going to impact on the children with a carryover to the school years, that it would be better if there were not a gap between the time they were in the program and the time in the school.”³⁶ Jule Sugarman explained that the goal of the program was to intervene early enough to “make it possible for him to achieve his maximum potential in later life. It was only in part a school readiness program, but really, I preferred the

32. The Cooke Report.

33. Dr. Julius Richmond, Director, Project Head Start. In An Invitation to help Project Head Start, 1965, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

34. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 83.

35. Oral history with Julius Richmond in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 269. Only 16 states offered statewide kindergarten at this time. Some urban areas outside those states also had public kindergarten programs. Greenberg, “Three Core Concepts of the War on Poverty,” 62.

36. Oral history with Julius Richmond in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 269

term ‘a life readiness program.’”³⁷ Head Start was touted as a revolutionary preschool program aimed at addressing the needs of the whole child.

While Head Start was perceived as new and radical for its time, historian Maris Vinovskis points out that early childhood education had been attempted in the United States beginning in the 1820s and 1830s.³⁸ At this time, infant schools for “slum children” were in place across many American cities to educate children and provide childcare that would allow their mothers to work.³⁹ Funded through philanthropies and tax dollars, the programs faced a sharp decline after skeptics attacked the programs on two fronts. First, programs were critiqued for undermining the family structure and displacing home as the central learning environment for young children. Second, critics suggested that early childhood education was too strenuous for the growing mind and early childhood education was “damaging young children by early excessive intellectual training.”⁴⁰ These programs were not only completely abandoned, but forgotten by most.

A few experiments in early childhood education were underway in the 1960s including the Ford Foundation and Perry Preschool Program, which the Head Start planning committee examined. Both projects focused on providing preschool education to poor children. Unlike Head Start, these programs were smaller demonstration and research projects. The Ford Foundation had small, preschool centers in various urban areas in 1963.⁴¹ High Scope sponsored the Perry

37. Oral history with Jule Sugarman in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 271.

38. Maris Vinovskis, “Early Childhood Education: Then and Now,” *Daedalus* 122, no. 1 (Winter 1993): 151-176. Children living in poverty in urban centers were referred to as “slum children” and specifically sought out to participate in these childcare programs.

39. *Ibid.*

40. *Ibid.*, 158.

41. Zigler & Muenchow, 9.

Preschool Program in Ypsilanti, Michigan, and tracked students into adulthood to measure the impact of preschool education on children.⁴² Perry Preschool also had a far larger budget than Head Start allowing program planners to keep class sizes to approximately 12 children with two teachers.⁴³ The small class sizes and low teacher-to-student ratio allowed for more individualized attention, a less restrictive classroom environment, more individualization, and more complex play than Head Start.⁴⁴ Both projects influenced the planning of Head Start despite being funded more generously and including better-trained teachers.⁴⁵

Summer of 1965: Planning and Concerns about Quality

The OEO developed and implemented Head Start in a surprisingly short window of time. Julius Richmond recalled that the OEO did not make the decision to host the summer 1965 program until February of that year. The OEO sent out announcements in March and sites were given six weeks to apply. That left the OEO only six weeks to review applications. Richmond explained that they “had to keep thinking of how we could get those communities that needed the programs the most and had the least capacity to write an application into the program.”⁴⁶ The architects of Project Head Start did not want the bureaucratic process to prevent any poor communities from having the opportunity to participate in the program. In order to encourage participation, the OEO paid for federal interns to visit the 300 poorest counties in the country to help community leaders write their applications. Over 100 college interns worked on this project

42. Zigler & Muenchow, 192; Vinovskis, “Do Federal Compensatory Education Programs Really Work? A Brief Historical Analysis of Title I and Head Start,” *American Journal of Education* 107, no. 3 (May 1999), 196.

43. Barbara Bowman, M. Suzanne Donovan, and M. Susan Burnes, *Eager to Learn: Educating our Preschoolers* (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2001), 144.

44. *Ibid.*, 145.

45. Vinovskis, “Do Federal Compensatory Education Programs Really Work?” 196; Bowman, et al., *Eager to Learn*, 145.

46. Oral history with Julius Richmond in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 266.

for over a month and, consequently, 225 of the 300 poorest counties from across the country conducted a summer Head Start program in 1965.⁴⁷

In order to process the applications quickly, OEO hired local substitute teachers, an educated, underemployed work force that could be used for temporary labor. The OEO received and processed 3,300 applications that year and funded 2,700 programs in both urban and rural communities.⁴⁸ In the end, approximately 580,000 children were served in the first summer Head Start program.⁴⁹ To accomplish this feat, a great deal had been invested in Head Start. Shriver explained that “by the time the program was finished, about the thirty-first of August, we had put in somewhere between \$50 million and \$70 million into that program. Now, that is an incredible story in recent government.”⁵⁰

In the rush to get the Head Start program launched in mere months, the OEO staff was challenged by the concern that programs would not all meet the same level of quality. The Cooke Report specifically cautioned against low quality programs, calling for the OEO to “avoid financing programs which do not have at least a minimum level and quality of activities from each of the fields of effort.”⁵¹ Despite these warnings, the OEO pushed forward with a large nationwide implementation of Head Start. Jule Sugarman explained that they launched implementation knowing that the quality would not be consistent. In addition to the rushed nature of the program, Zigler and others noted that the “OEO had placed too much emphasis on the goal of providing jobs for low income parents at the expense of the quality of the children’s

47. Ibid., 267.

48. Ibid., 267.

49. Stossel, Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver, 425.

50. Oral history with Sargent Shriver in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 280.

51. The Cooke Report.

program.”⁵² Many Head Start scholars critiqued both the rushed nature of the program and the use of parents in the classroom as teachers aides arguing that many programs were never brought up to a consistently high level.⁵³ While the quality and preparedness of teachers varied, the OEO suggested that it could overcome this through an investment in teacher training. The OEO also tried to address the variations in quality by creating a technical assistance corps of trained early childhood educators to be used as consultants through the planning and implementation of the Head Start training process.⁵⁴

IQ and Program Effectiveness

Most studies about Head Start aimed to measure program effectiveness. Zigler, Gordic, and Styfco point out that measuring program effectiveness is complicated given the numerous and broad goals of the program.⁵⁵ Initially, intelligence quotient (IQ) tests were used to assess the impact of Head Start on poor children. While the Cooke Report did not specifically list raising IQ as a goal of the program, ideas about the malleability of IQ influenced the decision to initiate Project Head Start. A Kennedy Foundation program that specifically worked with children with cognitive delays found that early interventions could raise IQs by 10 to 15 points.⁵⁶ This research ran counter to the prevailing idea of the time that IQ was genetic and set at birth. Shriver was familiar with that project and thought that if early intervention could provide such dramatic increases for children with cognitive delays, surely it would help increase IQs for poor

52. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 45.

53. See Jeanne Ellsworth and Lynda Ames, *Critical Perspectives on Project Head Start* (Albany, NY: State University Press, 1998) and Peggy Sissell, *Staff, Parents, and Politics in Head Start* (New York, NY: Falmer Press, 2000).

54. Oral history with Jule Sugarman in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 268.

55. Zigler, Gordic, & Styfco, “What is the Goal of Head Start,” 83.

56. *Ibid.*, 86. See also Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 5.

children.⁵⁷ In addition to the work of Susan Gray at the Ford Foundation, the work of Joseph Hunt and Benjamin Bloom in the early 1960s influenced the decision to launch Project Head Start.⁵⁸ Both Hunt and Bloom found that the environment a child was exposed to early in life influenced intellect; Bloom found that there was a “critical period” around age four that necessitated that interventions happen as early as possible.⁵⁹

Optimism around the elasticity of IQ led to expectations that Head Start could dramatically increase the intelligence of poor children. Subsequent research after the first Head Start program did show that the program had a positive impact on children’s IQ scores.⁶⁰ However, subsequent research documented that gains provided by Head Start faded over time.⁶¹ The most notable and well-publicized study was released by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation in 1969 which documented that children who participated in Head Start did not show any appreciable difference in intelligence or school readiness based on multiple standardized tests.⁶² This study dovetailed with an article released by scholar Arthur Jensen which stated that IQ was fundamentally genetic and environment had no lasting impact.⁶³ The Westinghouse Report recommended that summer Head Start be phased out completely and additional research be conducted on yearlong Head Start programs.⁶⁴ While the methods of the

57. Oral history with Shriver in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 260. Shriver was familiar with this work because of his wife, Eunice Kennedy Shriver’s involvement with the program.

58. Zigler, Gordic, & Styfco, “What is the Goal of Head Start?” 87.

59. Ibid.

60. Eisenberg and Conners. *The Effect of Head Start on Developmental Processes*. Office of Economic Opportunity, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, DC, 1966.

61. Zigler, Gordic, & Styfco, “What is the Goal of Head Start,” 88; Vinovskis, “Early Childhood Education: Then and Now.”

62. The Westinghouse Report.

63. Zigler, Gordic, & Styfco, “What is the Goal of Head Start?” 89.

64. The Westinghouse Report.

study were later challenged, the idea that there was a fade-out effect persisted in popular understandings of Head Start.⁶⁵ The Westinghouse Report resulted in negative media coverage of Head Start and threatened its very existence.

When Zigler took over the program in 1970, he shifted the emphasis away from IQ gains to goals of social competence.⁶⁶ He argued that the planning committee never intended the program to be about IQ, but that Shriver and the media latched onto that idea, subsequently setting Head Start up for failure. Social competence became an ambiguous and hard to measure goal that was later replaced by school readiness, an equally imprecise goal.⁶⁷ In 1976, a Consortium on Longitudinal Studies examined the impact of Head Start on poor children and found that children who participated in Head Start were more likely to be in the right grade for their age and less likely to be in special education.⁶⁸ Later, short-term longitudinal studies found that children who participated in Head Start experienced positive health outcomes and were more likely to be current on their immunizations than other children.⁶⁹ A long-term longitudinal study of girls who had participated in Head Start showed that by age 22, there were significantly higher high school graduation rates and GED obtainment rates and significantly lower arrest and incarceration rates among program participants as compared to girls who did not attend Head Start.⁷⁰ Negative press coverage from earlier studies, however, was difficult to overcome, and

65. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 62. See also Barnett & Hustedt, "Head Start's Lasting Benefits."

66. Zigler, Gordic, & Styfco, "What is the Goal of Head Start," 89.

67. *Ibid.*

68. *Ibid.*

69. Barnett & Hustedt, "Head Start's Lasting Benefits," 17.

70. *Ibid.*, 20.

the effectiveness of Head Start would continue to be called into question by both academia and the media.

Poverty, Public Relations, and Deficit Language

Public relations were a hallmark of the War on Poverty programs and Head Start was no exception. President Johnson faced re-election and had little time to establish himself and step out of the shadow of Kennedy. The OEO programs were not universally popular, and both Johnson and Shriver knew they needed to be proactive about the press coverage they received. The OEO's press releases were often filled with war analogies that outlined upcoming battles and described OEO officials as "poverty warriors" and Shriver as their "field general."⁷¹ When President Johnson officially announced Head Start, he referred to the project as "a new warfront on poverty" aimed at preventing children from being "forevermore poverty's captives."⁷² War themes, popular at the time, permeated official press releases as well as newspaper stories about OEO programs.

Shriver hired former corporate public relations executives such as Herbert Kramer to be the Director of Public Affairs. Using skills gained from working for Travelers Insurance, Kramer set out to maintain consistent media coverage through expected press releases and press conferences as well as novel approaches such as the publication of comic books and even a rock-n-roll television special.⁷³ Press conferences often included celebrity appearances from a range

71. Erwin Knoll and Jules Witcover, "Maximum feasible publicity: The War on Poverty's campaign to capture the press," *Columbia Journalism Review* (Fall 1966): 33.

72. Lyndon B. Johnson, Head Start Announcement, White House, May 18, 1965. Accessed from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/about/ohs/history/timeline>.

73. Knoll & Witcover, 34. Herbert Kramer would later leave the OEO and take a position in public relations at American Airlines. The rock-n-roll television special, "It's What's Happening, Baby" was a prime time variety show filled with popular artists from the day and included frequent encouragements from the DJ and other the celebrities for young people to pursue education and employment. The program received immediate criticism from Republicans. For more about Republican response see "Dropout TV Show Irks Republicans," *New York Times*, June 30, 1965.

of television, sports, and news icons. Many reporters had an OEO news beat and published War on Poverty stories regularly. OEO persistently provided the press with positive stories and access to information about the war's wins.

Since Head Start involved children, Shriver wanted a more “feminine” way to launch the program in order to appeal to women voters.⁷⁴ He enlisted Lady Bird Johnson to assist with the official Head Start announcement during a White House tea. The first lady was enthusiastic about the program writing in her diary “the Head Start idea has such *hope* and challenge.”⁷⁵ Shriver and Sugarman also enlisted other government officials’ wives to be involved in publicizing the program. A group of congressional wives spent hours calling local leaders in the poorest communities across the nation to sponsor Head Start programs and solicit for volunteers.⁷⁶ The goal was for Head Start to generate strong positive press to combat the increasingly negative coverage of the War on Poverty programs.⁷⁷ The First Lady also contributed text to the pamphlets and materials sent to communities to solicit their participation in Project Head Start. One pamphlet opens with a statement from Mrs. Johnson: “Project Head Start is the most exciting, productive, and practical project any government can embark on.”⁷⁸

Despite the OEO essentially having a public relations firm within its office, in 1966, Shriver worked with the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) to help with public relations stories about Head Start. Holmes Brown had left his role at OEO to work in corporate

74. Stossel, *Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver*, 423.

75. Claudia Johnson, *A White House Diary, Lady Bird Johnson* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1970), 219.

76. Ziegler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 33.

77. Stossel, *Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver*, 423. Shriver felt that involving politicians’ wives would increase coverage about Head Start in the society pages, which might combat the negative front-page headlines about the OEO.

78. An Invitation to help Project Head Start, 1965, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

public relations and was tasked with overseeing the PRSA project. The OEO picked four cities—New York, Atlanta, Cleveland, and Los Angeles—to run pilot publicity programs with the goals of “selling the program to the middle and upper classes and the business community, and recruitment of children and volunteer workers”⁷⁹ The OEO continually struggled with public relations because it had generated starkly different messages for different audiences. The recruitment of the poor was necessary but often those messages were minimized in an attempt to gain middle class buy-in regarding the poverty programs.

Head Start provided rich public relations materials—children. Photos of children and stories about children made for positive press at a time when other OEO programs were being routinely criticized on the front pages of the newspaper. Unlike their parents, children in this program were seen as innocent victims of poverty who deserved a *head start* in life. Head Start was “a publicist’s dream come true. The program serves young children who are picturesque in their innocence.”⁸⁰ While other OEO programs came under fire for spending funds on less “worthy” poor people, Head Start became a popular initiative that essentially became the poster child for the War on Poverty.⁸¹

The publicity campaigns targeted at middle class voters often relied on cultural deficit rhetoric. Speaking about the PRSA Head Start project, Brown stated that one of their goals was “to convince the various communities that there really are a lot of poor people in any community

79. Philip Dougherty, “Advertising: Helping the Head Start Project,” *New York Times*, November 13, 1965.

80. Kathryn Kuntz, “A Lost Legacy: Head Start’s Origins in Community Action,” in *Critical Perspectives on Project Head Start: Revisioning the Hope and Challenge*, 1.

81. Senator Lister Hill received numerous letters complaining about the way the War on Poverty dollars were being spent. For example, there was a firestorm over a Harlem Theater program run by LeRoi Jones that received antipoverty funds. Many of Hill’s constituents believed the program was “communist” and a “Negro hate group.” See Gordon Faulkner to Senator Hill, December 3, 1965, OEO files, box 670-378, location 068-068, Lister Hill Papers, WSHSC.

and hundreds of 5-year-olds whose parents have psychologically abandoned them.”⁸² Children were portrayed as unfortunate victims of their parents’ circumstances. Parents were portrayed as being incapable of providing children with the necessary conversation and stimulation to prepare them for school. A Head Start pamphlet sent to communities across the country starts with a quote from First Lady Johnson explaining that Head Start is a program that will “reach out to one million young children, lost in a gray world of poverty and neglect, and lead them into the human family.”⁸³

The First Lady’s comments were not unique. Newspapers, magazines, and short films discussed poor children and their circumstances in ways that portrayed their lives as sad and dismal. For example, the National Education Association (NEA) journal describes a hypothetical poor child’s home as “one drab room, crowded with people but devoid of toys, crayons, books, or magazines” while posing the question “how can such children, from families at the bottom of the economic ladder, take the pre-steps necessary to learning in school?”⁸⁴ Official OEO publications expressed similar sentiments. Poor children were presented as “cheated from the beginning. Their imaginations are stunted. Some have never drawn with a crayon or cut paper with scissors or gone to the zoo or seen flowers in a garden.”⁸⁵ In her plea for local support of Head Start, First Lady Johnson explains why children so desperately need a Head Start: “Some don’t know even a hundred words because they have not heard a hundred words. Some don’t

82. Dougherty, “Advertising: Helping the Head Start Project.”

83. “An Invitation to help Project Head Start,” 1965, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

84. *The NEA Journal*, October 1965, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

85. “The first step...on a long Journey,” Congressional Presentation, April, 1965, Office of Economic Opportunity, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

know how to sit in a chair because they don't have so much as a chair.”⁸⁶ She catalogues poor children's deficiencies to justify the necessary interventions that Head Start could provide. In doing so, she creates a monolithic caricature of poor child that was continually reproduced in the media.

Shriver employed similar rhetoric in his speeches across the country to various organizations. In 1966, he frequently told the story of the teddy bear and the rat. The previous summer during eye exams administered through Head Start, pictures were used to test children's eyesight, including a picture of a teddy bear. According to the story, “some 40% of the children in Project Head Start identified that teddy bear as a rat.”⁸⁷ To Shriver, this perfectly illustrated one purpose for Head Start—to expose children to new things and ideas in order to expand their perceptions of the world. Shriver continued on to say, “We're working for the day when no four-year-old or five-year-old American girl or boy—black, yellow, white—speaking Spanish, English, or Hawaiian—will look at the picture of a teddy bear and say: That's a rat.”⁸⁸ The teddy bear represented something essential to the American childhood. A child who does not recognize a teddy bear is alien to middle class Americans. Shriver's message was clear: Head Start was necessary to provide these children with the cultural experiences and understandings of the rest of the country.

Some of the original creators of Head Start recognized that rhetoric of deficit and deprivation could be problematic. Zigler, a member of the panel of experts that authored the

86. “An Invitation to help Project Head Start,” 1965.

87. Sargent Shriver address to the Yale Law School Association, New Haven, CT, April 29, 1966. Transcript accessed from <http://www.sargentshriver.org/speech-article/address-to-the-yale-law-school-association-1966>. Shriver recounted a version of the teddy bear rat story during at least 7 speeches between April 1966 and May 1967.

88. *Ibid.*

Cooke Report, recalled balancing the risk of stigmatizing poor children and families with justifying the need for the program. According to Zigler, the group realized that it:

couldn't have it both ways; if the children to be served by Head Start had not suffered any deprivation, there was no real rationale for the program. But at the same time I had to admit that the very term "cultural deprivation" was a misnomer. How could anyone be deprived of a culture? All one could be deprived of was the culture that someone else though should be the norm.⁸⁹

In an attempt to address these concerns, the drafters of the Cooke Report included a few caveats about the poor. One stated, "It should be recognized that children of the poor do not represent a homogeneous group. Rather these children differ greatly in the diverse patterns of strengths and weaknesses which characterize their behavior."⁹⁰ According to Zigler, these specific sentences were included in an attempt to balance out some of the cultural deprivation stereotyping that could occur from reading their report. Despite this small nod to understanding the poor as a complex, heterogeneous group, cultural deficit thinking and language tended to permeate discussions of Head Start both within the OEO and in the press.

Head Start, Race, and Illusions of Integration

While the War on Poverty and Project Head Start set out explicitly to address issues surrounding social class, race was a prominent and consistent theme. The same year that the Economic Opportunity Act passed, another momentous piece of legislation was passed—the Civil Rights Act of 1964.⁹¹ One stipulation of the Civil Rights Act was that there could be no discrimination in any program receiving federal funds. In case additional clarity was needed, on January 9, 1965, Chapter X was added to Title 45 of the Economic Opportunity Act specifically

89. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 21.

90. The Cooke Report.

91. To view the complete text of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, see <https://catalog.archives.gov/id/299891>.

outlining that any program receiving funds through OEO must uphold the Civil Rights Act of 1964.⁹² Head Start was thus planned at the federal level to be a fully integrated program that had racial diversity among staff, teachers, and students. The OEO communicated with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) that “Project Head Start... will be operated strictly on a non-discriminatory basis as regards race. I hope you will give appropriate encouragement to needy parents and children in your area to participate in this program without regard to race, color, or religion.”⁹³

The significance of the OEO's effort to run Head Start as an integrated program cannot be overstated. Public school systems, especially in the South, resisted integrating the existing public school systems. The first *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling in 1954 did not result in immediate desegregation of the nation's schools.⁹⁴ The following year, the court ruled in *Brown II* that schools should be integrated with "all deliberate speed" but still provided no timeline or framework for that process.⁹⁵ Despite *Brown II*, segregation in the South persisted, and by 1964, 98% of southern black children still attended all-black schools.⁹⁶ In the border states, 43% of black children attended all-black schools.⁹⁷ By December of 1965, less than one percent of black

92. *The Federal Register*, 30(6), January 9, 1965. Accessed from <http://cdn.loc.gov/service/11/fedreg/fr030/fr030006/fr030006.pdf>

93. Letter from Samuel Yette, Special Assistant to the Director of OEO to Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary for the NAACP, May 10, 1965. Papers of the NAACP, Office of Economic Opportunity antipoverty and community action programs papers. Accessed from <https://congressional.proquest.com/histvault?q=001486-020-0788>

94. *Brown v. Board of Education*, (347 U.S. 498), 1954.

95. *Brown v. Board of Education*, (349 U.S. 294), 1955.

96. Elizabeth Cascio et al., “From *Brown* to Busing,” *Journal of Urban Economics* 64, (2008), 296-325. Southern states included in this figure are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. Texas and Mississippi were not included due to incomplete data.

97. *Ibid.* Border states included Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, Washington, DC, and West Virginia.

students in Alabama attended schools with white children.⁹⁸ Integration was still far from being a reality in many states, making OEO's goal quite ambitious.

As a new program, there were not black Head Start schools and white Head Start schools that needed to be merged. In theory, according to the OEO, this should have allowed Head Start to open in the summer of 1965 as an integrated program serving all children in poverty.

Richmond explained that the framers of Head Start idealistically believed they could run an integrated program because "in contrast to the public schools, which historically had patterns set, we could learn from what had developed by way of segregation and try to minimize that."⁹⁹ The OEO sent letters to the NAACP assuring it that "the anti-poverty programs under the Office of Economic Opportunity will be implemented 'within the letter and spirit of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.'"¹⁰⁰ School desegregation across the South was implemented through both federal mandates and federal funds. Federal court orders required that schools desegregate. At the same time, an influx of federal funding became available for schools but required that the schools be desegregated. Similarly, the OEO programs came with substantial federal dollars which also served as an incentive for local programs to comply with the desegregation edicts. The OEO more strictly enforced the desegregation orders than the public school systems, leading to inconsistency between federal agencies in which "the Office of Education requires only that public schools make a start toward teacher integration this year; in contrast, the Office of Economic Opportunity is demanding full faculty integration in its pre-school Project Head

98. "Survey of School Desegregation in the Southern and Border States 1965-66," A Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, February 1966. Accessed from <https://www.law.umaryland.edu/marshall/usccr/documents/cr12sch611.pdf>

99. Oral history with Julius Richmond in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 328.

100. Letter from Shriver to Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary for the NAACP, March 30, 1965, Papers of the NAACP, Office of Economic Opportunity antipoverty and community action programs papers. Accessed from <https://congressional.proquest.com/histvault?q=001486-020-0788>.

Start."¹⁰¹ Feeling hopeful about the impact of these federal funds, a *Los Angeles Times* reporter wrote in May 1965 that “the Yankee dollar promises to bring more integration in a shorter time than all the federal court decrees since the 1954 desegregation decision” and that “President Johnson's poverty program is spawning biracial committees in areas that heretofore have rigidly held the segregation line. Integrated programs for children and adults are planned for all states of the Deep South.”¹⁰²

Despite the optimism expressed by Richmond and others, the OEO tried to address some of the racial segregation that was predicted to occur in some southern Head Start centers. The OEO sent letters to the NAACP to request assistance in reviewing applications from southern towns, specifically some ““problem communities” that they “would like to confidentially send you the details on these communities and enlist your help in developing information on them.”¹⁰³ The letter further explains that while each grant recipient must sign “civil rights compliance papers,” the OEO was well aware that this would not guarantee full cooperation or compliance.¹⁰⁴ The OEO attempted to proactively address potential segregation issues that might arise within specific towns. However, the program was planned in such a limited time that it was difficult to fully investigate and ensure that all programs were being implemented in compliance with the Civil Rights Act.

101. Jonathan Spivak, "Integrating Welfare: Alabama Case Points up Federal Dilemma on Enforcement," *Wall Street Journal*, October 21, 1965.

102. Jack Nelson, "U.S. Funds for South May Push Integration," *Los Angeles Times*, May 16, 1965.

103. Letter from William Haddad, Acting Assistant Director of OEO to Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary for the NAACP, April 14, 1965, Papers of the NAACP, Office of Economic Opportunity antipoverty and community action programs papers. Accessed from <https://congressional.proquest.com/histvault?q=001486-020-0788>

104. Ibid.

While the OEO set out for Head Start to be a completely integrated program, the reality was much different. In June 1965, as most Head Start centers were just beginning their operations, Shriver commented “a few grantees appear to be planning programs which are not consistent with the principle of equal treatment.”¹⁰⁵ Richmond recalls staff from the Office of Civil Rights reviewing applications and determining from the city bus maps that a given town intended to run a segregated program. While the OEO tried to address these issues prior to the launch of these Head Start programs, in the South many programs were segregated. In many towns, Head Start ended up being a predominantly black program. Richmond explained,

There was a sincere effort to get the poor white community to participate, but the climate of the times was such that there was no way poor white people were going to participate in a program that was predominantly black down there. So we never could quite turn that around until school integration really started to take hold in the South.¹⁰⁶

Richmond blamed the unwillingness of whites to participate in the program on the perceptions that Head Start was a black program. Those perceptions had a basis in reality. Many Head Start sites, especially in the South, were planned to take place in towns’ all-black elementary school buildings.¹⁰⁷ A study conducted by the United States Commission on Civil Rights found that in the summer of 1965 almost 70 percent of southern black children who participated in Head Start were in segregated programs.¹⁰⁸ Through these site selections, the planning and implementation of the program created the idea that it was specifically for poor, black children. White families

105. “Project Head Start Cautioned on Bias,” *New York Times*, June 21, 1965.

106. Oral history with Julius Richmond in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 321.

107. United States Commission on Civil Rights, “Title VI...One Year After: A Survey of Desegregation of Health and Welfare Services in the South,” 1966, Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, Civil Rights during the Johnson Administration, 1963-1969, Part I: The White House Central Files. Accessed from <https://congressional.proquest.com/histvault?q=001341-002-0745>

108. *Ibid.* The Commission’s study included 8 southern and border states—Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas.

were apparently reticent to send their children to black schools even if it meant denying them a Head Start.

Over 80 percent of summer Head Start programs operated out of public school buildings not used during the summer months.¹⁰⁹ Shriver actually preferred this arrangement because it allowed them to “to make efficient use of tax-supported school facilities; to provide summer jobs for teachers; and to find a way to introduce poor preschool children to the school environment during the summer before their first year of school.”¹¹⁰ However, the use of public school buildings was problematic in that it reinforced existing segregated educational patterns within the communities. The Commission on Civil Rights found that “the utilization of normally segregated school buildings for Head Start projects resulted in a program conducted primarily within the segregated educational framework which is prevalent throughout the South” and that “no project in a Negro school was integrated in more than a token fashion”¹¹¹ The use of public school buildings may have been an expedient way to launch Head Start when there was little time to plan the program but it essentially ensured that segregated programs would be established, especially in the South.

The largest Head Start grantee, the Child Development Group of Mississippi (CDGM), resisted the push to host Head Start in public school buildings.¹¹² The CDGM “received a grant

109. Zigler & Muenchow, *Head Start*, 174.

110. *Ibid.*, 6.

111. “Title VI...One Year After: A Survey of Desegregation of Health and Welfare Services in the South,” 1966, 37.

112. For a detailed account of the CDGM, see Polly Greenberg, *The Devil Has Slippery Shoes: A Biased Biography of the Child Development Group of Mississippi* (Washington, DC: Youth Policy Institute, 1990); John Dittmer, *Local People: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Mississippi* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 363-388; Amy Jordan, “Fighting for the Child Development Group of Mississippi: Poor People, Local Politics, and the Complicated Legacy of Head Start,” in Annelise Orleck and Lisa Gayle Hazirjian, eds., *The War on Poverty: A New Grassroots History, 1964-1980* (Athens: University of Georgia press, 2011): 280-307; Jon Hale, “The Struggle Begins Early: Head Start and the Mississippi Freedom Movement;” Crystal Sanders, “More than Cookies and Crayons: Head Start and African American Empowerment in Mississippi, 1965-1968,” *Journal of African American*

in May 1965 to establish 85 centers in 45 counties to serve 6,000 children.”¹¹³ The CDGM sought to avoid undue influence by white superintendents who were at that time generally not seen as friends of the black citizens of Mississippi. Local civil rights activists in Mississippi were frustrated by the initial Head Start applications submitted to the OEO from their state because “many of these applications showed evidence that the applicants cleverly planned to maintain segregation by hiring black workers for white Head Start centers and employing them in positions where they would not work with children.”¹¹⁴ CDGM wanted to see black teachers and teacher aides not just black custodians and cooks. As a result, CDGM planned Head Start in a more grassroots way that truly sought to achieve the OEO mandate of “maximum feasible participation” of the poor.¹¹⁵

The CDGM was plagued with controversy and political entanglements with Mississippi’s segregationist senators and ultimately the OEO. Senator John Stennis adamantly opposed CDGM and investigated them for “fiscal mismanagement and ‘black militancy’” in Congressional hearings.¹¹⁶ Mississippi governor Paul Johnson accused CDGM of being involved in the anti-war movement and wrote to the president complaining,

While Mississippi boys are dying in the defense of the freedom of others in South Vietnam, a federal agency, Office of Economic Opportunity, grants American dollars to an organization that has openly opposed America’s policy in South Vietnam and urged Negroes to ignore Selective Service calls.¹¹⁷

History 100, no. 4 (Fall 2015): 586-609; Sanders, *A Chance for Change: Head Start and Mississippi’s Black Freedom Struggle*.

113. Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 97.

114. Sanders, 37.

115. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

116. Sanders, “More than Cookies and Crayons.”

117. Quoted in Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 97.

Senator Stennis and Governor Johnson continued to pressure Sargent Shriver to defund CDGM and in 1966 the OEO revoked their funds due to fiscal mismanagement.¹¹⁸ The grant was eventually restored but at a far lower amount.¹¹⁹

Ironically, the CDGM was so completely successful in meeting the idealistic goals of the OEO that the program inevitably faced backlash. CDGM empowered poor, black people to be leaders in their communities through Head Start. Consequently, the CDGM was “too successful in restructuring civic life” and provided educational opportunities outside the white power structure, which fundamentally threatened white supremacy.¹²⁰ However, the CDGM was an exception, rather than the rule, and most Head Start programs struggled with the OEO’s integration mandates and with ensuring meaningful involvement from the poor the program served.

Teacher Training

In addition to facing problems with integration, the OEO also had to overcome the challenge of staffing the first summer Head Start program. Kindergarten was not widespread at that time and preschool was practically unheard of. Because it was a summer program, the OEO was able to utilize school teachers who were often unemployed or underemployed during the summer months. Richmond explained that once they were recruited, public school teachers would need to be provided with “some short, intensive course to bring them up to speed to working with younger children.”¹²¹ Richmond believed that the first program would have been far less successful as a yearlong program because the scope and scale would have been difficult

118. Ibid., 98.

119. Ibid.

120. Sanders, “More than Cookies and Crayons,” 590.

121. Oral history with Julius Richmond in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 272.

to manage, especially with no pool of teachers to tap into. After the rise of Head Start and other preschool programs, early childhood education programs at colleges and universities began to expand along with increasing job opportunities.

Sugarman recalls being asked how they were going to train so many Head Start staff since they knew there were not enough trained early childhood educators. In a staff meeting, he had an epiphany that universities could train them. In late March, the OEO “sent out a telegram...to some 200 universities, saying, ‘Please come talk to us about a training program.’ Strangely enough, they did!”¹²² The OEO would not be able to coordinate with each university individually so it contracted with the National University Extension Association (NUEA), the coordinating body for university extension programs, to organize the teacher-training offerings across the country.¹²³ Negotiations between the OEO and the NUEA began in late February and an agreement was signed at the end of March 1965, only two months prior to the start of the first training session.¹²⁴ When OEO established the contract with NUEA, “the number of teachers estimated to participate in the program was 12,000. In the end, 29,933 professional staff members were trained. This was one of the major logistic feats accomplished for the summer Project Head Start.”¹²⁵ To prepare for the summer of 1965, 118 institutions in 49 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico provided training for Head Start staff.¹²⁶

122. Oral history with Jule Sugarman in Gillette, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 268.

123. Russell Cort, et al., *Results of the Summer 1965 Project Head Start*, I-12; Stanley Drazek, “Training 30,000 Head Start Teachers,” *School and Society* 94, no. 2274 (March 1966): 130-131.

124. Drazek, 130.

125. Cort, et al., I-13.

126. The NUEA Spectator: Bulletin of the National University Extension Program, 1965, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

The OEO not only needed to hire and train enough Head Start teachers to staff the summer Head Start centers, they also needed to make sure that teachers were representative of the communities they served. Running desegregated centers was a priority and "one means of encouraging integration was to require that staff personnel of both Negro and white races be included in every center. The staffing pattern became the crux of compliance for the summer's program."¹²⁷ Consequently, the teacher-training sessions would be required to operate as desegregated programs. In the South, this was still a controversial proposal and not all southeastern institutions chose to participate in the Head Start teacher-training program. The University of Alabama opted to host the training sessions and ended up providing Head Start training to over 1,700 participants, both black and white, over the course of three weeks making it the second largest training program in the country.¹²⁸ This undertaking was just the beginning of a longstanding partnership between The University of Alabama and Project Head Start.

127. Cort, et al., I-13.

128. Dick Looser, "Head Start'—A Chance at the Future," *Tuscaloosa News*, March 2, 1966; Louie R. Davis and Jacqueline Davis, "Head Start' Key in Poverty Fight," *Tuscaloosa News*, February 24, 1966; "UA Trains 1700 Teachers for Project Head Start Here," *Crimson White*, July 1, 1965.

CHAPTER 3

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AND TUSCALOOSA

The 1965 Head Start training program brought a large-scale desegregated program to The University of Alabama campus at a time when widespread desegregation had yet to occur. Head Start had revolutionary goals about integration which extended to the teacher training programs that occurred on university campuses across the country. The salience of race in Project Head Start and the Head Start teacher training program necessitates an examination of the racial history of both The University of Alabama and in the city of Tuscaloosa. The racial context of The University of Alabama began before the first building on campus was even built.

Established in 1831, “one of the University’s first acts after it was chartered in the 1820s was the purchase of a human being, Ben, to prepare the ground for the new school.”¹ Enslaved people continued to be on campus to provide labor for the institution ranging from the construction of buildings to serving the president and his family. Early students of the University came from wealthy, plantation-owning families who relied on slavery to sustain their wealth. In 1845, The University of Alabama student body came from families that owned, on average, between 36 and 43 slaves.² This very affluent group relied heavily on the institution of slavery and capitalized on the racist ideologies that perpetuated it. Twenty years later, the Civil War ravaged the University

1. Alfred Brophy, “Overcoming at the University of Alabama,” *Alabama Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law Review* 1, no.1 (2011): 18. For more about the interconnectedness of slavery and institutions of higher education, see Craig Steven Wilder, *Ebony & Ivory: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America’s Universities* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2013).

2. Royal Dumas, “My Son and My Money Go to the University of Alabama: The Students at The University of Alabama in 1845 and the Families That Sent Them,” *Alabama Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law Review* 1, no. 1 (2011): 77.

campus destroying all but a handful of buildings, physically marking the changing racial structures in Alabama.³ After the end of the Civil War, the University continued to retain black workers on campus, now in service roles. It would take almost one hundred years for the University to admit the first black student.

Desegregation before the Stand at the Schoolhouse Door

In 1952, Autherine Lucy and Pollie Ann Myers, two black female students, inquired about admission to The University of Alabama and were assigned residence hall rooms and given applications by university officials who were unaware that the two women were black.⁴ Once administrators learned of their race, the university administration tried to return their deposits and redirect the two women to different universities. Lucy and Myers remained committed to attending The University of Alabama, though, which led to a three-and-a-half year legal fight that the two women eventually won. The timing of the court decision made it impossible for Lucy and Myers to enroll for the fall so they planned to register for the spring.

A few short days before enrolling, the University notified Myers that she was not eligible for attendance because “her conduct and marital record have been such that she does not meet the admissions standards of the University.”⁵ Myers had become pregnant prior to marriage, a moral infraction used previously to deny university admission. The University knew it could use this to deny her admission and waited until she and Lucy were set to enroll hoping the decision

3. James Sellers, *History of The University of Alabama* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1953), 286.

4. For a complete account of Autherine Lucy and Pollie Ann Myers attempts to desegregate the University of Alabama see E. Culpepper Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door: Segregation's Last Stand at The University of Alabama* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2007), 3-113 and B.J. Hollars, *Opening the Doors: The Desegregation of The University of Alabama and the Fight for Civil Rights in Tuscaloosa* (Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 2013), 9-49.

5. Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door*, 54.

would deter Lucy from enrolling alone.⁶ Lucy persevered, though, and remained committed to attending the University.

The night before Lucy was set to be the first black student to register for classes at The University of Alabama, four crosses were burned across campus bringing the total that week to eight.⁷ Lucy was undeterred and showed up to campus on February 1, 1956, to register, pay her tuition, and enroll in classes. While there were no incidents on campus that day, many white students were offended by what they perceived to be Lucy's pretentiousness.⁸ Due to car troubles, Lucy was driven to registration in a Cadillac. Not knowing what was appropriate to wear, Lucy had come to register in her Sunday finest. Unsure of whether the University would accept a check, Lucy paid for her classes in cash. These minor details along with university administrators bringing Lucy to the front of the registration line, led white students to claim that Lucy acted as if she were better than they were.⁹ While there was no violence on registration day, the talk about Lucy around campus was not positive.

After enrolling in classes, the University informed Lucy that she would not be permitted to live on campus because her presence on campus "might endanger the safety or result in sociological disadvantage of the students."¹⁰ After receiving the news that the University would not allow her to reside on campus, Lucy told reporters she had paid her room reservation deposit

6. Ibid.

7. "Four Crosses Burned on UA Campus," *Tuscaloosa News*, February 1, 1956.

8. Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door* and Hollars, *Opening the Doors*.

9. Ibid.

10. Bill Gibb, "Trustees Order No-Room Action," *Tuscaloosa News*, February 1, 1956.

and expected to have a space on campus.¹¹ However, Lucy was never given the opportunity to fight to live on campus and her focus shifted to being able to peacefully attend classes.

On the first day of classes, the *Tuscaloosa News* reported that a cross had been burned at Dean Adam's home the previous evening bringing the total for the week to thirteen.¹² Despite that news, the paper also led with a headline "Campus Curious, Calm as Negro Starts Class."¹³ The desegregation of The University of Alabama (UA) campus, however, would be anything but calm. The next day's headline, "1,200 Student Stage Midnight Demonstrations" shows a sharp contrast to the day before.¹⁴ Despite a second article titled "Negro Student Says UA Students were Friendly," conflict was unfolding on campus.¹⁵ Friday's midnight demonstration consisted of university students as well as some townspeople. The rally began with a cross burning in the center of campus followed by marchers chanting "keep Bama white" as they made their way to the president's mansion. President Carmichael, however, was not home.¹⁶ No damages were reported that evening, and no one was injured.

The next evening, Saturday, February 4, a second rally quickly turned riotous. After a basketball game, students, as well as community members, gathered at Denny Chimes, a university landmark central to campus. Participants escalated from mocking passing motorists to engaging in violence when they saw "a Negro man driving into town alone" and "one student jumped atop his car, stomping the top with his feet. Other students broke window glasses and

11. Ibid.

12. "Cross Burns at Home of Dean Adams," *Tuscaloosa News*, February 3, 1956.

13. Bill McEachern, "Campus Curious, Calm as Negro Starts Class," *Tuscaloosa News*, February 3, 1956.

14. Bob Kyle, "1,200 UA Students Stage Midnight Demonstration: Cross burns in Center of University Ave," *Tuscaloosa News*, February 4, 1956.

15. "Negro Student Says UA Students were Friendly," *Tuscaloosa News*, February 4, 1956.

16. Kyle, *Tuscaloosa News*, February 4, 1956.

kicked dents in the cars side.”¹⁷ The crowd marched once again to the president’s mansion where President Carmichael came outside to address the group. His attempts to calm the crowd were unsuccessful and most could not even hear him over the sounds of the crowd. The situation had spiraled out of the University’s control and “Lucy became the spark that relit the Klan’s crosses, their flames sending smoke signals to segregationists throughout the state.”¹⁸ The enrollment of Autherine Lucy at The University of Alabama rallied white segregationists, the White Citizens’ Council, and the Klan into action.¹⁹ Despite the events of the weekend, the University failed to adequately prepare for Lucy to return to classes the next week.

On Monday, February 6, Lucy was driven to campus from Birmingham to attend classes. She successfully attended her nine o’clock a. m. class, but while in class, the mob began to grow in size and intensity. Shouts of “lynch the nigger” and “keep Bama white” rang out while Lucy attempted to focus on her first class of the day.²⁰ When administrators started to walk Lucy to her next class, the crowd swarmed them. An angry crowd of over 500 white Tuscaloosa residents descended upon her, “yelling racial epithets and pelting Lucy with eggs and gravel.”²¹ Vice President Jefferson Bennett and Dean of Women Sarah Healy quickly escorted her to a car and successfully delivered her to her second class. This would be the last class she attended. Once

17. Bill Gibb and Stroube Smith, “Patrol Slips Lucy Away from Mob: Apparent Ruse Thwarts Crowd,” *Tuscaloosa News*, February 6, 1956.

18. Hollars, *Opening the Doors*, 22.

19. White Citizens’ Councils were groups of white segregationists who began to organize after the passage of *Brown v. Board of Education* to oppose the desegregation of public schools. Unlike the Klan, they were met openly, primarily employing boycotts, economic pressures, and propaganda to achieve their goals. For more detailed information about the White Citizens’ Councils, see Neil McMillen, *The Citizens’ Council: Organized Resistance to the Second Reconstruction, 1954-1964* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971).

20. Frye Gaillard, *Cradle of Freedom: Alabama and the Movement that Changed America* (Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 2004), 41.

21. Simon Wendt, “God, Gandhi, and Guns: The African American Freedom Struggle in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 1964-1965,” *Journal of African American History* 89, no. 1 (2004): 38.

again, a mob cornered her and she remained sequestered in a conference room for hours while Bennett and Healy waited for an opportunity for them to quickly depart campus. Finally, after lunch they were able to escape campus in a patrol car.²² Riots continued on campus that evening and the university eventually responded by temporarily suspending Lucy from campus.²³

Buford Boone, publisher of the *Tuscaloosa News* at the time, wrote a Pulitzer Prize winning editorial regarding Lucy's attempt to enroll at the University.²⁴ Responding to a letter to the editor, Boone expressed the gravity of the situation in Tuscaloosa:

Many of our people...talk about the principle of segregation when we here in Tuscaloosa are under court order to admit Negro students to the University. I don't believe you have brought yourself up to face the current issue, which in our case got down to the simple decision of whether we were going to admit a Negro girl or kill her.²⁵

The first attempt at desegregating the University did not just meet with resistance; it met with violence that could have led to the death of Autherine Lucy. In the end, the University suspended Lucy; the justification administrators provided was that the suspension was for her own safety. After filing a lawsuit seeking readmission to the University, she was expelled for making inflammatory statements against the University.²⁶ Despite the efforts of NAACP lawyer,

22. Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door*, 77.

23. *Ibid.*, 79.

24. Buford Boone published "What A Price for Peace" in the *Tuscaloosa News* on February 7, 1956, which was reprinted in papers across the country. He received letters from around the world in response to his editorial that condemned the University's response to the violence on campus in both support and condemnation of his editorial stance. For more about Buford Boone see Gene Roberts and Hank Klibanoff, *The Race Beat; The Press, The Civil Rights Struggle, and the Awakening of a Nation* (New York: First Vintage Books, 2006), 132-138; Katie Cole, "Buford Boone: To Stand on Principle," *Alabama Heritage* 85 (Summer, 2007): 4-6.

25. Buford Boone to Kenneth Roberts, March 26, 1956, Buford Boone Papers, WSHSC.

26. In a December 4, 1965 letter from Frank Rose to David Nevin, Rose asserts that "Autherine Lucy accused the Board of Trustees of conspiring with the mob, which is absolutely false, and she, too, was expelled. This was upheld by the federal courts." Record group 006, box 027, location 084-086, WSHSC.

Thurgood Marshall, Lucy was not allowed to return to campus until her expulsion was lifted in 1988.²⁷

In 1965, almost a decade after the expulsion of Autherine Lucy, President Frank Rose wrote to David Nevin, *Life* magazine reporter and friend of the president of the university, reflecting on his conversations with Vice President Jefferson Bennett about Lucy's attempt to desegregate The University of Alabama campus. Rose explained, "This was the first Federal Court enforced student on a deep south university, and no one in the administration, faculty or student body ever thought that there would be any serious reaction to enrolling Autherine Lucy."²⁸ In retrospect, it seems surprising that the university administration did not foresee any objection to Lucy's enrollment. At the time, though, they had no template with which to work in response to desegregation. Rose argued "there having been no experience with riots at any university on the enrollment of a Negro, there was no preparation made to secure the student or the campus from outside agitators."²⁹ Almost ten years after the riots, which eventually resulted in the suspension and eventual expulsion of Autherine Lucy, Rose pointed to outside agitators as the cause of the problems at the university campus.

27. Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door*, 260. Three years after her expulsion was lifted, Autherine Lucy Foster graduated from UA with her Master's degree. In 2013, the Autherine Lucy clock tower was dedicated in honor of Lucy's first attempt at desegregating the UA campus. It stands in the Malone Hood Plaza outside of Foster Auditorium. In 2017, an historical marker was erected outside of Graves Hall to document Autherine Lucy Foster's brief enrollment and the subsequent violence on campus that resulted in her expulsion.

28. Frank Rose to David Nevin, December 4, 1965. David Nevin was a reporter for *Life* magazine who became friends with Frank Rose while conducting research for a book about the desegregation of southern universities. Nevin and Rose wrote each other frequently throughout the 1960s. Nevin never completed his original project but later wrote *The Schools that Fear Built* about segregationist academies in the South. The book, co-authored with Robert Bills, was sponsored by the Lamar Society. Dr. Frank Rose was a part of the research team that contributed to the book. For more, see David Nevin and Robert E. Bills, *The Schools that Fear Built: Segregationist Academies in the South* (Washington, DC: Acropolis Books, 1976).

29. Ibid.

Malone and Hood Pass Through the Schoolhouse Door

In 1963, seven years after Lucy's enrollment and subsequent suspension and expulsion, Vivian Malone and James Hood gained admission to The University of Alabama.³⁰ This time, university administrators were more prepared for what was to come. They had learned not only from Lucy's enrollment but also from the violence and deaths that occurred at the University of Mississippi with the enrollment of James Meredith in 1962.³¹ The November before Malone and Hood would enroll at The University of Alabama, appeals began for peace on campus in the face of inevitable desegregation. Responding to the violence at the University of Mississippi, Melvin Meyer, the editor of the campus newspaper, the *Crimson White*, wrote an editorial criticizing Governor Barnett for his handling of James Meredith's enrollment in Mississippi. Because of the editorial, Meyer received threatening calls demanding that he leave town now before he left "in a pine box."³² A cross was burned on the lawn of his fraternity house and eventually additional security was provided for his protection.³³ Even prior to the admission of Malone and Hood, the University and Tuscaloosa community had begun to lay the foundation for the desegregation of campus. The community did not want a repeat of the violence that occurred with Lucy's enrollment.

30. For a complete account of the stand at schoolhouse door, see Harry J. Knopke, Robert Norrell, and Ronald W. Rogers, eds. *Opening Doors: Perspectives on Race Relations in Contemporary America* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1991), 40-63; Culpepper Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door*, 145-257; Hollars, *Opening the Doors*, 53-116.

31. On September 30, 1962, a riot broke out after James Meredith, a black student, enrolled at the University of Mississippi. Two men were killed. For news coverage see Lewis, Anthony, "Mississippi: Broader Impact of the Crisis," *New York Times*, October 7, 1962. For a complete account see William Doyle, *An American Insurrection: James Meredith and the Battle of Oxford, Mississippi, 1962* (New York: Doubleday, 2003); Charles W. Eagles, *The Price of Defiance: James Meredith and the Integration of Ole Miss* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009); James Meredith and William Doyle, *A Mission from God: A Memoir and a Challenge for America* (New York: Atria Books, 2012).

32. Claude Sitton, "Alabamans Act to Bar Violence at University," *New York Times*, November 24, 1962.

33. Ibid. Sitton insinuates that local KKK Imperial Wizard, Robert Shelton, may have been behind the threats and cross burning.

George LeMaistre, president of the City National Bank of Tuscaloosa, spoke at a community meeting, warning local businesses of the negative consequences of violence, stating, “what happened in Mississippi does not have to happen again—it would be tragic to think we learned nothing from the first incident.”³⁴ A few months prior to desegregation, in February 1963, *Life* magazine covered the state of desegregation across southern universities and stated that despite Governor George C. Wallace’s vows to block desegregation, The University of Alabama was working to ensure a peaceful process. At that time, “three Negro applications to attend the University of Alabama [were] pending, the lieutenant governor, the attorney general, the alumni council, and the board of trustees are on record as determined that what happened in Oxford, Miss. Won’t happen in Alabama.”³⁵ Unlike its first attempt at desegregation, the campus and community prepared early and thoroughly for the impending enrollment of black students at the University. The administration took measures to close the campus to outside agitators and put measures in place to prevent any mob violence.³⁶

While Malone and Hood did not face the violence Lucy experienced, their admission was met with a high level of drama that played out on television screens nationwide. Governor Wallace had made a campaign promise to uphold segregation throughout the state of Alabama, and he was not going to allow black students to enroll without taking a stand.³⁷ The now

34. Ibid.

35. “Quiet Progress in the South,” *Life*, February 8, 1963, 4.

36. In advance of the enrollment of Malone and Hood, the *Crimson White* published the campus “ground rules” which included no cars or bicycles on campus, showing student ID to get on campus, a curfew, and a restriction on loitering in groups larger than three. Lonnie Falk, “All-Out Peace Effort Sees Campus Guarded,” *Crimson White*, June 9, 1963.

37. For more information about George Wallace see Stephan Leshner, *George Wallace: American Populist* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1994); Dan. T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995); Jeff Frederick, *Stand up for Alabama: Governor George Wallace* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2007).

infamous stand at the schoolhouse door that occurred in front of Foster Auditorium on June 11, 1963, was not an impromptu action on the part of Governor Wallace. Rather, multiple discussions with Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach preceded the day's theatrics. Wallace was not willing to stand down, though, and insisted on a public confrontation.³⁸ He stood at a podium in front of Foster Auditorium and gave a speech declaring "the unwelcomed, unwanted, unwarranted, and force-induced intrusion upon the campus...offers a frightful example of the oppression of the rights, privileges, and sovereignty of this state by officers of the federal government."³⁹

At the conclusion of his remarks, Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach declared that "those students will remain on this campus. They will register today. They will go to school tomorrow."⁴⁰ Wallace continued to stand defiantly. University officials took Hood and Malone to lunch and checked them into their residence halls to keep them away from Wallace and his posturing. General Graham of the National Guard approached Wallace stating that it was his "sad duty" to ask him to step aside.⁴¹ Wallace read a second prepared statement, lamenting the federalization of the Alabama National Guard and urging Alabama citizens to "remain calm and restrained" despite the "Federal interference."⁴² After his brief remarks, he stepped aside and departed.⁴³ Immediately, Malone and Hood entered Foster Auditorium to register for classes.

38. Claude Sitton, "Governor Leaves But Fulfills Promises to Stand in Door and to Avoid Violence," *New York Times*, June 12, 1963.

39. "Wallace's Statement at Foster," *Tuscaloosa News*, June 11, 1963.

40. Sitton, "Governor Leaves But Fulfills Promises to Stand in Door and to Avoid Violence."

41. *Ibid.*

42. Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door*, 230.

43. According to Jeff Frederick, Wallace "bragged to anyone within earshot that he singlehandedly prevented violence in Tuscaloosa with his stand in the schoolhouse door. Wallace later claimed...that [he] devised something akin to a master strategy that placed him front and center in order to keep the Klan distanced and violence

Days after the successful desegregation of campus, *Life* magazine printed a story praising President Frank Rose for his efforts to ensure a calm and peaceful desegregation. A few days prior to the enrollment of Malone and Hood, Rose is quoted saying "when the enrollment of a Negro student comes...this university will use every resource at its command to maintain law and order. I will not let my university be sacrificed to violence."⁴⁴ Rose was able to live up to this promise and, despite Governor Wallace's grandstanding, the day's events were relatively uneventful. Writing a few months after the stand, *New York Times* reporter Gertrude Samuels commented, "what was noteworthy about the enrollment was that it was peaceful. Not so much as a catcall marred the serenity of this tree-shaded campus known to Alabamians as the Capstone—the summit."⁴⁵

The day after the stand at the schoolhouse door, a third black student, Dave McGlathery, enrolled at The University of Alabama Huntsville center. Governor Wallace did not stand in any doors that day, and the enrollment was both uneventful and peaceful which was not surprising since it was not the state flagship university.⁴⁶ Samuels visited The University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa and talked with a number of white students to understand their attitudes about desegregation. Many students seemed resigned to the inevitability of desegregation. One student openly supported it but asked that her name be withheld from the story that she claimed

minimized. According to his interpretation, Wallace knew he could not forestall desegregation, but he wanted to ease the sense of defeat of the traditionalists." Frederick, *Stand up for Alabama: Governor George Wallace*, 62.

44. "Nation's Crisis Crowds in on One Man," *Life*, June 14, 1963, 77.

45. Gertrude Samuels, "Alabama U.: A Story of 2 Among 4,000," *New York Times*, July 28, 1963.

46. Charles Padgett, "'Without Hysteria or Unnecessary Disturbance': Desegregation at Spring Hill College, Mobile, Alabama, 1948-1954," *History of Education Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 167-188. Padgett points out that desegregation occurred uneventfully at Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama in 1954, two years before the violence erupted at The University of Alabama and nine years before The University of Alabama finally desegregated. White resistance to desegregation was most prominent at southern flagship institutions. Smaller institutions were more able to quietly and peacefully desegregate.

“illustrates that there is still fear of retribution—from the White Citizens Council and the Ku Klux Klan in this town.”⁴⁷

The 1963-1964 academic year, following the stand at the schoolhouse door, was not without its own drama. That fall, the Homecoming theme was B.O.M.B. (Bama Orbits Maroons Blasted) which was in particularly poor taste given the recent bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham that killed four young girls and injured many others.⁴⁸ The theme also unwittingly foreshadowed a series of bombings on campus the following month, the first of which was near Mary Burke Hall where Vivian Malone was residing.⁴⁹ The bombings increased tensions on campus, though a month later it was determined that some National Guardsmen had set off the bombs in order to extend their deployment to campus.⁵⁰ Later that year, the University cancelled a scheduled performance by black singer Louis Armstrong for mysterious reasons that many, including the student newspaper, believed was due to racial tensions on campus.⁵¹ In a private letter, University president Frank Rose argued that cancelling the Armstrong concert was in line with a series of decisions in which the University, “refused to let the students bring in any

47. Samuels, “Alabama U.: A Story of 2 Among 4,000.”

48. Alabama was playing Mississippi State for the Homecoming game and their colors are Maroon and White. An editorial in the *Crimson White* questions how disrespectful such a theme might look to the rest of the country. “Bomb?” *Crimson White*, October 31, 1963. For more about the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church bombing that killed Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, Cynthia Wesley, and Addie Mae Collins, see Gaillard, 193-206; Frank Sikora, *Until Justice Rolls Down: The Birmingham Church Bombing* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1991); Diane McWhorter, *Carry Me Home: The Climactic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution* (New York: Touchstone, 2001); T.K. Thorne, *Last Chance for Justice: How Relentless Investigators Uncovered New Evidence Convicting the Birmingham Church Bombers* (Chicago: Chicago Review Press, 2013).

49. “Blast Rocks Campus Area,” *Tuscaloosa News*, November 16, 1963; “Students Urged to Stay Away from Bomb Areas,” *Crimson White*, November 21, 1963.

50. Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door*, 249.

51. “The Right Time.” *Crimson White*, December 3, 1964. Ray Charles was also scheduled to come to campus to perform but his visit was cancelled due to a recent drug arrest. The editorial staff at the *Crimson White* understood why the administration would cancel Charles’ visit but felt that the cancellation of Armstrong’s performance was without merit and was solely due to fears over racial tensions on campus.

outsiders that might stir up trouble until after next Fall. Such people as Louis Armstrong, Robert Kennedy, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, and other have wanted to come, but we feel our best interests will be served by our present program and plan."⁵² Rose and other university administrators proceeded cautiously with university events to avoid any problems or scandals.

Despite successfully enrolling, James Hood left the University after only two months due to an "emotional conflict" and an attempt to "avoid a complete mental and physical breakdown."⁵³ Hood wrote a guest editorial for the *Crimson White* that was widely reprinted in papers across the state. While the editorial was well received on the University campus, the black community was less enthusiastic about the content that was critical of some aspects of the Civil Rights Movement.⁵⁴ Three weeks after the editorial ran Hood spoke at a rally in his hometown of Gadsden, Alabama, where he made several statements that would cause repercussions at the University including allegations that the University was "trying to trick him into being expelled" and that he never actually wrote the guest editorial.⁵⁵ In the end, Hood decided to leave the University before he was asked to leave.⁵⁶ Malone's time at the University was much more successful than Hood's, and she graduated in spring of 1965. When asked by a *Crimson White* reporter about her time at Alabama, Malone replied "I've not really had an unpleasant

52. Frank Rose to William Jones, December 18, 1964, Frank Rose Papers, record group 006, box 026, location 084-086, WSHSC.

53. Fred Powledge, "Friends Say Emotional Conflict Caused Hood to Leave Alabama," *New York Times*, August 16, 1963.

54. In the editorial, Hood wrote, "the whole idea of protest has gotten off course. I think it has become a matter of excitement rather than conviction for most Negroes." He calls for less protests and more education as the solution to the question of civil rights. James Hood, "Needed More Students, Less Pickets," *Crimson White*, June 23, 1963.

55. "Hood's Editorial," *Crimson White*, September 26, 1963.

56. Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door*, 245. Arthur Shores sent a letter to the university stating that Hood had doctor's orders to withdraw. The board accepted his withdrawal and did not pursue any further disciplinary action.

experience.” She noted that her “stay here might have been socially abnormal, but not abnormal academically.”⁵⁷

In the summer of 1963, after the enrollment of Malone and Hood, the Ku Klux Klan continued to grow in numbers and strength across the South. The *New York Times* estimated that the Klan had experienced a revival with numbers increasing “from 35,000 to 60,000” due to a “manifestation of white reaction to the Negro drive for equality.”⁵⁸ As the black community fought for civil rights, the Klan was used to fight back. Tuscaloosa had a strong Klan presence with the Imperial Wizard, Robert M. Shelton, residing in town.⁵⁹ The desegregation of the University may have occurred but racial violence was just beginning to intensify in Tuscaloosa.

After the Stand: Civil Rights in Tuscaloosa 1964-1965

The enrollment of Malone and Hood at The University of Alabama did not mark the end of the quest for civil rights in Tuscaloosa.⁶⁰ The black community had previously protested separate seating and unfair treatment on city buses.⁶¹ In the spring of 1962, Reverend Willie

57. Billie Blair, “On the Whole It’s Been Quite a Happy Year for Me,” *Crimson White*, June 17, 1965.

58. Claude Sitton, “Once More—The K.K.K.,” *New York Times*, August 11, 1963.

59. Ibid. David Cunningham describes Shelton as “the most influential KKK leader of the civil rights era” in *Klansville, U.S.A.: The Rise and Fall of the Civil Rights-Era Ku Klux Klan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), ix. Patsy Sims devotes a whole chapter to Robert Shelton in *The Klan* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996), 89-113. For more about the Ku Klux Klan and racial violence in the South see Michael R. Belknap, *Federal Law and Southern Order: Racial Violence and Constitutional Conflict in the Post-Brown South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987) and Wayne Greenhaw, *Fighting the Devil in Dixie: How Civil Rights Activists Took on the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama* (Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2011).

60. For a detailed account of the fight for civil rights in Tuscaloosa see Hollars, *Opening the Doors*, 117-221. For more comprehensive coverage of the Civil Rights Movement across Alabama see David J. Garrow, *Protest at Selma: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Voting Rights Act of 1965* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978); Howell Raines, *My Soul is Rested: Movement Days in the Deep South* (New York: Penguin, 1983); David J. Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* (New York: William Morrow, 1986); David J. Garrow, *The Montgomery Bus Boycott and the Women Who Started It: The Memoir of Jo Ann Gibson Robinson* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987); Jimmie Lewis Franklin, *Back to Birmingham: Richard Arrington, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1989); Hugh Davis Graham, *The Civil Rights Era: Origins and Development of National Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

61. “Stillman Students Beaten, Gassed,” *The Student Voice* 3, no. 2 (June 1962).

Herzfeld explained that “students at Stillman College...were restless” and when they were asked to give up their seats on the bus for white passengers, they refused.⁶² After they got off the bus and found a ride with a friend, the students were chased down by a “mob” who “kicked and beat the students, slapped one college coed, and sprayed ‘some kind of burning gas’ into the car.”⁶³ Reverend Herzfeld attributed this bus incident to the first anti-segregation organizing in Tuscaloosa; the Tuscaloosa Citizens for Action Committee formed consisting of community and church leaders seeking to address unjust treatment of black citizens in Tuscaloosa.⁶⁴ Herzfeld was the initial leader of the group, which was organized not only to respond to the community’s issues with the buses but also to address “other areas of citizenship, education, and the struggle for human dignity.”⁶⁵

Local activity waned until the opening of the new federal courthouse in downtown Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in April 1964. In advance of its opening, a bi-racial committee met with city commissioners and were told that there would be no segregated bathrooms or water fountains in the new building.⁶⁶ When the building opened, the black community was dismayed to see segregated bathrooms and signs posted. Some have speculated that the intention was never to have separate bathrooms. However, in advance of Governor Wallace coming to dedicate the

62. Willie Herzfeld, oral history conducted by Harvey Burg, 8. Civil Rights in Alabama Project: Oral History, 1964. Columbia Center for Oral History Archives. Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Columbia University, New York. Referred to hereafter as CCOHA.

63. “Stillman Students Beaten, Gassed.”

64. Herzfeld, 10.

65. Ibid., 11. The Tuscaloosa Citizens for Action Committee started in 1962 in response to the bus issues. The committee sought to address these and other concerns of the black community, but the group quickly disbanded. It was revitalized in 1964 in response to additional issues the black community was facing in Tuscaloosa.

66. Ibid., 25. George LeMaistre also explained in his oral history that local officials had agreed that there would not be segregated bathroom signs in the new courthouse. George LeMaistre, 9. Oral history conducted by Harvey Burg, CCOHA.

building, some of his most ardent supporters added the signs at the last minute.⁶⁷ Regardless of how the signs came to be in the building, they contradicted earlier agreements, and the black community responded with direct action.

T.Y. Rogers was the pastor at First African Baptist Church in Tuscaloosa. Martin Luther King, Jr., sent him to lead the church and assist with the local civil rights struggle.⁶⁸ Rogers explained "we knew also that by marching we could dramatize to the city the needs of Negroes and use it as a rallying point to crystallize our effort and to involve as many other Negroes as possible."⁶⁹ Before the demonstration, Rogers consulted with local police to learn about the rules and ordinances in order to avoid violence. However, Rogers notes that violence is what they faced. During the march to the courthouse to protest the discriminatory bathroom signs, a prepared statement was about to be read on the front courthouse steps when the police attacked saying "'move, nigger,' and started beating."⁷⁰ According to Rogers, those marching were beaten with fists and cattle prods. While Rogers expected there to be arrests that day, they were told "we ain't gonna arrest you. We're just going to beat you."⁷¹ Rogers suggests that the incident at the courthouse served to galvanize the movement in Tuscaloosa because many "did not believe that the whites in Tuscaloosa would take such a stand, that they would actually beat Negroes in the

67. LeMaistre, 9. LeMaistre also noted that there no signs over the water fountains in the new courthouse but only on the bathrooms, which contributed to his belief that the signs were a last-minute addition to the building in honor of Governor Wallace's visit.

68. T.Y. Rogers, oral history conducted by Harvey Burg, CCOHA.

69. *Ibid.*, 22.

70. *Ibid.*, 25.

71. *Ibid.*, 26.

streets."⁷² Despite the violence on the University campus in 1956, Rogers genuinely believed that the black community in Tuscaloosa had a strong relationship with the white community.

The violent confrontation on the courthouse steps brought the community together in a shared sense of outrage. More people began to attend meetings to plan additional demonstrations. At the same time, school ended for the summer, freeing more young people to participate in daytime marches. Demonstrators continued protesting both the courthouse signs and the violent treatment. Some demonstrations were met with violence including one on June 5, 1964, in which “pellets, from either a sling or an air rifle, struck one person on the arm, another on the shoulder, and a third on the ankle” as they were demonstrating against racial segregation.⁷³ Oil of mustard was also squirted on 40 demonstrators earlier in the week, and two white men had been arrested in conjunction with that incident.⁷⁴

Describing this series of demonstrations, Reverend Rogers said, "We marched, and they permitted us to march, until finally they said, 'no more marching. You've had oil of mustard squirted on you, you've been shot with pellet guns. The situation is too dangerous. We're doing it for your protection, so don't march anymore.'" ⁷⁵ Rogers and the community argued that they should not be asked to stop; in their minds, those who were perpetuating the violence against them should be stopped, not the marches.⁷⁶ Leaders coordinated another march to start at the First African Baptist Church and end at the courthouse. That day, Tuesday, June 9, 1964, became known in the Tuscaloosa African American community as “Bloody Tuesday” after police used

72. *Ibid.*, 27.

73. “3 Negro Pickets Struck by Pellets in Alabama,” *New York Times*, June 6, 1964.

74. *Ibid.*

75. Rogers, 43.

76. *Ibid.*, 44.

violent force to abruptly end the march.⁷⁷ Police used fire hoses on demonstrators along with clubs and cattle prods. Additionally, police officers threw tear gas into the First African Baptist Church where many had taken refuge.⁷⁸ In the end, nearly 100 protesters were arrested and 33 were sent to the hospital due to injuries they sustained from police.⁷⁹

Conflicting stories exist regarding the June 9, 1964, protest and the subsequent police response. Local news coverage of the events cited authorities who claimed “they resorted to tear gas only after fire hoses failed to break the back of the outburst, which lasted about 45 minutes. At the height of the violence, chairs, water pitchers, vases and other objects were hurled from the church.”⁸⁰ Those in the church claim that they only began throwing items out the windows in order to get fresh air after the police used the tear gas.⁸¹ The *Tuscaloosa News* published close-up photos of the broken stained glass windows as proof that those in the church threw items out first, but there is no way to know at what point during the melee the photo was taken.⁸²

David Nevin wrote to Dr. Frank Rose a few weeks later on June 22, 1964, and asked about Bloody Tuesday. He expressed his disappointment at the event saying he “was sorry to see the flare-up in Tuscaloosa.... That business of fire hoses and tear gas through the church window sounded grim. Surely the people inside weren’t causing trouble outside.”⁸³ Rose replied, informing Nevin “our situation in Tuscaloosa has quieted down and there is a fifty-member bi-

77. Tommy Stevenson, “Tuscaloosa’s Bloody Tuesday,” *Tuscaloosa News*, February 22, 2009.

78. “Ban Defied, Marching Negroes, Police Clash,” *Tuscaloosa News*, June 9, 1964.

79. “Negroes to Chart Strategy,” *Tuscaloosa News*, June 10, 1964; “Police Use Tear Gas to Drive Negroes from Alabama Church,” *New York Times*, June 10, 1964.

80. “Police Use Tear Gas to Drive Negroes from Alabama Church.”

81. *Ibid.* See also, Rogers, 47.

82. “Negroes to Chart Strategy,” *Tuscaloosa News*, June 10, 1964.

83. David Nevin to Frank Rose, June 22, 1964, record group 006, box 012, location 084-081, WSHSC.

racial committee working out some of the problems that existed.”⁸⁴ He then defended the local police response agreeing that “the church incident was terrible, but some of the young Negroes were throwing chairs, vases, and parts of pews that they had torn up out the windows, along with some mustard gas” perpetuating the story that the protestors started the violence.⁸⁵ Rose continued, saying “I still do not think this was any reason to shoot a fire hose into a church, but in moments of tensions I suppose these things get out of hand.”⁸⁶ Rose also mentioned in the letter that despite the violence in Tuscaloosa, things on campus were going smoothly, and “we now have sixteen Negroes enrolled—three on the main campus this summer and eight coming in September. We have had no problems whatsoever, and the Negroes assure us that they are happy and treated equally.”⁸⁷ The national spotlight on racial injustice had shifted from the campus to the community, and Dr. Rose seemed to believe that black students on campus were not impacted by the events unfolding in town.

After the events of Bloody Tuesday, the black community feared attacks from the Ku Klux Klan. Church members from the First African Baptist Church guarded Reverend Rogers’ home, but no attack materialized.⁸⁸ Rogers felt as if “Tuscaloosa was on the verge of a racial explosion” since they had reached an impasse with the white community.⁸⁹ Soon after, on June

84. Frank Rose to David Nevin, June 25, 1964, record group 006, box 012, location 084-081, WSHSC.

85. Ibid.

86. Ibid.

87. Ibid.

88. Homer Bigart, “Negroes Protect Home of Leader,” *New York Times*, June 13, 1964.

89. Rogers, 50.

26, a federal judge ordered that the signs in the courthouse be removed citing a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.⁹⁰ Five days later, the signs came down.⁹¹

One day later, on July 2, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 passed, and the black community across the South immediately set out to test whether local officials would enforce desegregation.⁹² On Sunday, July 5, a group of black citizens sought to attend a movie at the Bama Theater in Tuscaloosa. They successfully gained entrance to the theater but were taunted as they entered. After the movie, they found that their vehicles had been “damaged, windows smashed, glass put under tires, paint scratched, and all four tires on one auto were punctured.”⁹³ James Jaquith, professor at the University, was with the group that integrated the theater. He recounted that it was his car that had all of the tires slashed and oil of mustard had been squirted on the interior. As he left the theater, someone shouted to him "that was a very expensive movie ticket."⁹⁴ Jaquith had previously been involved with the civil rights movement in Tuscaloosa and believed the white crowd recognized his car because of his attendance at some of the mass meetings. He attempted to report the vandalism to the police, but they would not take his report.⁹⁵

Two black men also ate lunch at the local Morrison’s Cafeteria that same day. While they successfully integrated the lunch counter, they were met with violence after they left lunch and

90. “Remove Signs, County Ordered,” *Tuscaloosa News*, June 26, 1964.

91. “Signs Removed on Restrooms at Courthouse,” *Tuscaloosa News*, July 1, 1964.

92. “Scattered Civil Rights Violence Erupts: Few Incidents Crop Up Here,” *Tuscaloosa News*, July 6, 1964.

93. *Ibid.*

94. James Jaquith, 19. Oral history conducted by Harvey Burg, CCOHA.

95. *Ibid.* Jaquith felt that his car was known to the KKK and white segregationists because he had attended some mass meetings at the churches about desegregation.

were “accosted by a group of white men.”⁹⁶ One of the black men pulled out a knife and a white man pulled a gun but no shots were fired and no one was injured. On Monday, July 6, the theaters in Tuscaloosa began admitting black patrons for the first time.⁹⁷ Two days later, on July 8, at Druid Theater “more than 300 whites hurled bottles, bricks, and stones at the building, breaking a plate glass window,” eventually causing police to intervene and use “tear gas and fire hoses” to break up the white mob.⁹⁸ The next evening, the mob violence continued after the rumor spread that actor, Jack Palance, had gone to the movies with a black woman.⁹⁹ Only part of the rumor, however, was correct; Jack Palance was in town visiting extended family and had gone to the movies, but he was there with his wife and children.¹⁰⁰ He was in no way involved with desegregating the theater. While Palance and his family were escorted safely from the theater, their rental car had its tires slashed, severely damaging the vehicle.¹⁰¹ This incident garnered more national media coverage that caused further embarrassment for Tuscaloosa.

It was not until January 1965 that most of the restaurants in Tuscaloosa were desegregated.¹⁰² Fifteen restaurants resisted integration when the Civil Rights Act passed in July; these restaurants were later charged by the U.S. Department of Justice Department for failing to desegregate. A day after the news broke that restaurants in town had desegregated, Dick Gregory, a comedian, and a group of local black community members were turned away from

96. “Scattered Civil Rights Violence Erupts: Few Incidents Crop Up Here,” *Tuscaloosa News*, July 6, 1964.

97. “Police Quell Angry Whites Outside Integrated Theater,” *New York Times*, July 10, 1964.

98. *Ibid.*

99. Rex Sanders, “Actor’s Visit in City Cut Short by Violence,” *Tuscaloosa News*, July 10, 1964.

100. “Curfew is Imposed in Tuscaloosa, Ala.,” *New York Times*, July 11, 1964.

101. *Ibid.*

102. “Tuscaloosa Cafes Integrate,” *New York Times*, January 20, 1965.

Garner's Restaurant where they were told that reservations were required.¹⁰³ Robert Shelton, Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, was dining at the restaurant when these individuals were turned away. Reports from the next evening showed that the group denied entrance the day before were able to dine at Garner's the next evening.¹⁰⁴ To make sure there were no further incidents, the chief of police and 30 officers were nearby. Gregory reported that "he thought the desegregation drive here had progressed well and he praised the police for 'doing their job.'"¹⁰⁵

Some in the white community criticized the immediate testing of the Civil Rights Act and asked why the black community in Tuscaloosa did not give whites time to get used to the idea and allow for more gradual integration. T.Y. Rogers explained their previous response to the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling:

In 1954, the Supreme Court said that discrimination and segregation in public schools is un-Constitutional. We slept too long, hoping that the white man would integrate the schools. I remember I was in college at the time, and the general feeling was, 'It's here now. We have it. This fight is over. All that we have to do is go.'...Johnson's signing this bill today; it's got to work tomorrow. We can't sleep on the job now. Because if we take it for granted that the bill will become a reality, we are mistaken.¹⁰⁶

More than ten years after *Brown v. Board of Education*, schools across the South were still not integrated. The court decision was a moment of hope for the black community, but it eventually dissolved into disappointment as white resistance to desegregation continually delayed full implementation of the ruling. Rogers and the black community feared a repeat of the *Brown* decision and acted quickly to ensure that the tenets of the Civil Rights Act were enacted immediately.

103. "Tables are Reserved," *New York Times*, January 21, 1965.

104. "Dick Gregory is Served," *New York Times*, January 22, 1965.

105. Ibid.

106. Rogers, 52.

School Segregation in Tuscaloosa

In 1965, school desegregation had yet to fully materialize in Tuscaloosa. As with most school systems across the South, segregation was still alive and well despite the 1954 and 1955 *Brown v. Board of Education* rulings. In 1963, *Lee v. Macon County Board of Education* sought to allow for the admission of black students to formerly all-white schools in Alabama.¹⁰⁷ As a result of *Lee*, the first black students were able to enroll in previously all-white Alabama schools in 1963.¹⁰⁸ Despite the *Lee* ruling, widespread desegregation was slow to come to Tuscaloosa. In 1965, only one hundred black students sought admission to white schools in Tuscaloosa.¹⁰⁹

It would take another year for the board to hire black teachers at the previously all-white schools. Despite Governor Wallace's proclamation that desegregation was against state law, local boards opted to desegregate in accordance with federal guidelines. In the fall of 1966, the county school system hired two black teachers—one at Holt High School and one at Tuscaloosa County High School.¹¹⁰ The city school system also hired one black teacher at Verner Elementary and one at Tuscaloosa High School.¹¹¹ Desegregation of the faculty in the Tuscaloosa city and county schools initially went smoothly with no violence. However, two hundred members of the white community in nearby Northport, Alabama, staged a march to protest the addition of these two black teachers to the county schools.¹¹² A representative for the

107. *Lee v. Macon County Board of Education*, (267 F. 458), 1967.

108. "Birmingham School Integrated," *The Tuscaloosa News*, September 4, 1963.

109. Paul Davis, "Nearly 100 Negroes Ask to Enter White Schools," *Tuscaloosa News*, June 14, 1965. An exact racial breakdown of the Tuscaloosa schools for 1965 is unavailable. However, in the 1960 census, 28.7% of the total population in Tuscaloosa was reported to be non-white. U.S. Census, 1960, Alabama General Population Characteristics, Table 13. Accessed on February 18, 2018 from <https://www.census.gov/prod/www/decennial.html>.

110. Paul Davis, "Wallace Order Sparks Worry Here," *Tuscaloosa News*, September 11, 1966.

111. "Mix Issued not Discussed at School Board Meeting," *Tuscaloosa News*, September 13, 1965.

112. Davis, "Wallace Order Sparks Worry Here"; "Whites in Northport, Ala., Protest School Integration," *New York Times*, September 11, 1966.

group claimed that the county board had made the decision to desegregate the faculty in a backroom deal that was kept secret until the last possible moment.¹¹³

Governor Wallace ordered that steps previously taken to desegregate schools be reversed. He introduced a new freedom of choice plan that allowed children to switch teachers if their assigned teacher was of a different race.¹¹⁴ The state provided funds to help pay for additional teachers that would be needed to allow for this racial realignment to take place. Specifically, Wallace demanded that teachers be reassigned to “schools of their own race and at the same time to transfer pupils who had been integrated under a quota or percentage formula.”¹¹⁵ Wallace threatened to involve the police if necessary to uphold the recent state law that prohibited schools from complying with federal school desegregation guidelines. He also promised state funds to compensate for any loss of federal funds that resulted from not complying with the federal government. Wallace specifically named Holt and County High Schools in his tirades against desegregation.¹¹⁶

Tuscaloosa County quickly requested and received funds to hire two new white teachers to allow students to switch out of the classes taught by the two black teachers recently assigned to predominantly white schools in the area.¹¹⁷ Concerned about both the protest and Governor Wallace’s interventions, the two black teachers left after four days.¹¹⁸ The federal government intervened at the schools, and the two black teachers returned after a weeklong hiatus prompting

113. “Marchers Vow to Continue Mix Battle,” *Tuscaloosa News*, September 11, 1966.

114. “Wallace Orders all Teachers Shifted to Schools of their Race,” *New York Times*, September 10, 1966.

115. “Alabama Pupils to Get a Choice of Teachers,” *New York Times*, October 27, 1966.

116. Davis, “Wallace Order Sparks Worry Here.”

117. “Alabama Pupils to Get a Choice of Teachers.”

118. “Fail to Report at Holt, County: Negro Teachers Pull Out,” *Tuscaloosa News*, September 12, 1966.

additional marches and protests from some white citizens of Tuscaloosa County.¹¹⁹ The road to desegregation in both Tuscaloosa City and County schools would be long and troublesome. In response to desegregation mandates, school systems across Alabama employed freedom of choice plans that allowed students to choose the school they would like to attend. These plans only succeeded in achieving token desegregation and there continued to be “racially identifiable schools” throughout Tuscaloosa.¹²⁰ Lawsuits continued well into the 1970s, and full integration in Tuscaloosa would not occur at the high school level until 1978.¹²¹ When the federal desegregation order was lifted in 1999, Tuscaloosa city high schools were reorganized in a way that led to the eventual re-segregation of the city.¹²²

The racial history and context of The University of Alabama and Tuscaloosa provides the backdrop for the first Head Start teacher-training program that occurred in 1965 and is part of what made the implementation of the program so significant. In a town that housed the Imperial Wizard of the KKK and the institution in which the governor stood in the schoolhouse door to protest racial desegregation, the Head Start teacher-training program brought black and white teachers together around the common goal of educating young children in poverty.

Frank Rose and the Federal Government

It is unclear how or why The University of Alabama became the second largest Head Start teacher-training site in the nation and even more difficult to determine the motives of the

119. “Negro Teachers to Return to White Schools Here,” *Tuscaloosa News*, September 14, 1966; “Parents March Again Here to Protest School Mixing,” *Tuscaloosa News*, September 18, 1966.

120. *Lee v. Tuscaloosa City School System*, (576 F. 2d 39), 1978.

121. In 1969, 100 systems were added to the original *Lee v. Macon County* case that began in 1963. Tuscaloosa was one of the districts added. After complete desegregation had still not occurred in Tuscaloosa, a later case *Lee v. Tuscaloosa* was brought to the courts in 1978.

122. Nikole Hannah-Jones, “Segregation Now,” *ProPublica*, April 16, 2014. For more about the re-segregation of Southern schools through the re-drawing of boundary lines, see Erika Wilson, “The New School Segregation,” *Cornell Law Review* 102, no. 1 (Nov. 2016): 139-210.

institution or the administrators. What is clear is that the University made an effort to not only participate in the program but also to accommodate a large number of trainees on very short notice. The willingness of the institution to host this large-scale summer training program is surprising since Head Start was a federal initiative. During the 1960s, most southern states did not have strong working relationships with the federal government. The War on Poverty planning committee had concerns that “local governments in the South might decide not to participate in the program.”¹²³ In fact, those on the War on Poverty planning committee were so concerned that southern governments would resist working with the federal government that the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) established provisions allowing local non-profit organizations to seek federal grants in case southern legislators would not.¹²⁴ Despite the tensions between the federal government and the South, Dr. Frank Rose, the president of The University of Alabama, actively courted a relationship with the White House and persistently sought federal dollars.¹²⁵

The University of Alabama President Frank Rose had an interest in the War on Poverty initiatives before Head Start was even created. On October 15, 1964, Rose wrote to President Johnson to inform him that a University of Alabama committee convened regarding the War on Poverty.¹²⁶ In the letter, Rose explained,

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 will provide the opportunity for many to be able to work and live in decency and with dignity. The need for this opportunity is particularly

123. Oral history with Frederick Hayes in Gillete, *Launching the War on Poverty*, 86. Hayes was a member of the War on Poverty task force.

124. Ibid.

125. For a more comprehensive analysis of Frank Rose and his presidency at UA, please see Lawrence Faulkner, “Frank Rose and the Influences on his Administrative Leadership” (PhD diss., The University of Alabama, 2015). Frank Rose is also covered in detail in Earl Tilford, *Turning the Tide: The University of Alabama in the 1960s*, (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2014).

126. Frank Rose to Lyndon Johnson, October 15, 1964, WHCF, Subject File WE, Box 34, LBJ Library.

important in states such as Alabama. The University feels very deeply its responsibility to help assure the successful implementation of the programs provided for by this Act.¹²⁷

Rose expressed active support for the new federal programs while seeking ways to involve the University. Rose's initiative in regards to the poverty programs is somewhat surprising given the contentious relationship between the South and the federal government at the time. Despite the general hesitation of the South to collaborate with the federal government, Rose went out of his way to seek an opportunity to become involved with the War on Poverty.

President Rose attached a thirty-page report to his letter to President Johnson detailing the ways in which the University was currently supporting anti-poverty programs and outlining ways that efforts could be expanded to encompass more goals of the Economic Opportunity Act. The report stated,

If the "war" on poverty is to be won, there is no alternative but to provide and make accessible adequate education and training whenever and wherever needed. To do so is a responsibility of all. Institutions of higher education have special obligations and resources for both service and leadership essential to the attainment of these needs.¹²⁸

President Rose outlined current initiatives at The University of Alabama ranging from student aid that allowed students with financial need to attend the university to student volunteer opportunities that assisted those in poverty. The report emphasized the role that the College of Education had in training the state's teaching force which in turn educated the state's children, creating a pathway out of poverty. Additionally, the low cost and no cost medical care offered through the Medical Center in Birmingham was underscored as well as the mental health, speech, and hearing services provided in Tuscaloosa. Finally, President Rose highlighted

127. Frank Rose to Lyndon Johnson, October 15, 1964, WHCF, Subject File WE, Box 34, LBJ Library.

128. The Role of the University of Alabama in the Nation's Effort to Eliminate Poverty, October 14, 1964, WHCF, Subject File WE, Box 34, LBJ Library, 1.

research initiatives that sought to understand the causes of poverty, the sociology of poverty, and connections between mental health and poverty.

Beyond the current services and initiatives, the report specified, “The University is prepared to provide additional programs and services specifically aimed toward improving economic well-being and health.”¹²⁹ Rose proposed assistance with the Job Corps, Work Training Program, and Community Action Programs through the use of university facilities as well as through staff training, counseling, technical assistance, and consultation services. Furthermore, he expressed university plans to “participate to a maximum degree” in the Federal Work Study program including “active recruitment of students from low-income families who otherwise would not attend college and the development of a program in connection with outside public and non-profit organizations.”¹³⁰ University administrators made it very clear that they were interested in assisting with the Economic Opportunity Act initiatives in whatever way possible.

On October 30, 1964, Rose received a response to his letter to President Johnson from Ralph Dungan, special assistant to the President, with appreciation for the University’s efforts and their willingness to partner with the federal government on the OEO projects.¹³¹ Dungan also forwarded Rose’s letter to Sargent Shriver for review. Shriver responded, “we feel that the University of Alabama can provide valuable intellectual and professional skills in serving the state of Alabama in an attack upon poverty” and that they would work with the University on developing any future programs.¹³² In a letter from Frank Rose to Sargent Shriver dated

129. *Ibid.*, 2.

130. *Ibid.*, 25.

131. Ralph Dungan to Frank Rose, October 30, 1964, WHCF, Subject File WE, Box 34, LBJ Library.

132. Sargent Shriver to Ralph Dungan, October 28, 1964, WHCF, Subject File WE, Box 34, LBJ Library.

February 12, 1965, Rose thanked Shriver for meeting with him and a team from the University to discuss the Economic Opportunity Act and the University's interest in various programs.¹³³ Dr. Rose had traveled to Washington, D.C. with George Croker, Director of Contract and Grant Development, Dr. Alex Pow, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Dr. Joseph Volker, Director of the Birmingham campus medical center.¹³⁴ The delegation met with federal officials in order to discuss a range of federal funding opportunities for the University.

Despite the tense relationships between the South, specifically the state of Alabama, and the federal government, Frank Rose historically had a strong relationship with the White House. Federal officials enlisted his help during the desegregation battle with Governor Wallace, which allowed him to establish a relationship with President Kennedy. In his history of The University of Alabama in the 1960s, Earl Tilford argues, "Rose was politically adroit. After the death of President Kennedy, he needed to build a relationship with President Lyndon Johnson, with whom he had no close ties...Frank Rose, a classic progressive, intended to capitalize on the significant educational component inherent in Johnson's vision for America."¹³⁵ Rose saw the Economic Opportunity Act as an opportunity to strengthen ties with the federal government.

Dr. Rose had one White House connection to help him gain an audience with President Johnson. Douglass Cater, special assistant to the President of the United States, was married to Libby Anderson Cater, a University of Alabama alumna and the first female Student Government Association president.¹³⁶ Rose invited Libby Anderson Cater to several speaking

133. Frank Rose to Sargent Shriver, February 12, 1965, record group 006, box 029, location 084-087, WSHSC.

134. Ibid.

135. Tilford, *Turning the Tide*, 67.

136. Ibid.

events on campus. He also invited her and her husband to the Rose's Lake Martin house for a visit.¹³⁷ In the spring of 1965, Cater and Rose wrote to each other frequently and eventually set up a meeting between Rose and President Johnson, which occurred on May 25, 1965.¹³⁸ The details of the meeting are sparse but it was the first of several visits that Rose took to the White House in 1965.¹³⁹

Rose saw the War on Poverty as an opportunity to establish inroads with the new President, which could ultimately benefit the University. He likely recognized that the OEO had a significant amount of federal funding available which could potentially bolster the University's budget. In February of 1965, Rose wrote to a friend, David Nevin:

I have just returned from Washington and found that the University of Alabama is held in the highest regard by all of the government agencies and the White House. I found not only an interest in what we are doing, but a great deal of excitement and assurance from everyone that they were willing to put millions of dollars into the expansion of our programs.¹⁴⁰

A few months later, in another letter dated August 25, 1965, Rose informed his friend David Nevin, "It must be kept confidential, but President Johnson has informed me on three visits to the White House and by letter that he intends to put millions of dollars into the University of

137. Frank Rose to Douglass Cater, June 1, 1965 and Frank Rose to Douglass Cater, October 27, 1965, record group 006, box 025, location 084-086, WSHSC. On June 1, Rose offered to send the University plane to get the Cater family to come to Lake Martin for a visit. On October 27, Rose thanks Cater and his family for coming to the Lake Martin for a visit.

138. Frank Rose to Douglass Cater, April 21, 1965, April 28, 1965, and May 3, 1965. Douglass Cater to Frank Rose, April 24, 1965 and April 30, 1965. Record group 006, box 025, location 084-086, WSHSC. Frank Rose met with President Johnson for a 15 minute, "Off Record" meeting on May 25, 1965. Lyndon B. Johnson Daily Diary, May 25, 1965, accessed from the LBJ Library online archives, http://www.lbjlibrary.net/assets/lbj_tools/daily_diary/pdf/1965/19650525.pdf

139. Douglass Cater to Frank Rose, June 3, 1965, record group 006, box 025, location 084-086, WSHSC. Cater writes, "I am delighted that the interview with the President went off so well" but provides no details about their discussion.

140. Frank Rose to David Nevin, February 4, 1965, record group 006, box 027, location 084-086, WSHSC.

Alabama to help us become one of the great universities of America."¹⁴¹ Rose's efforts to establish a positive relationship with President Johnson paid dividends for the University.

The University of Alabama end-of-year reports to the Board of Trustees from 1964 through 1966 emphasized the expansion of funding sources beyond state appropriations. Dr. Rose first mentions the influence of federal funds in his 1963-1964 report to the Board of Trustees. He writes, "This has been another very highly successful year in the securing of financial assistance from outside sources of support of our educational endeavors....By far, most of these receipts were from federal government sources" though he also acknowledges the receipt of funds from businesses, private donations, and the Alabama government.¹⁴² In the President's 1964-1965 Report to the Board of Trustees, President Frank Rose proposes a \$75 million master plan. Rose explains, "The remarkable fact about this is that the funds are available to us through the Stand Bond Issue, Federal matching funds, Federal agency gifts and debt retirement loans."¹⁴³ Rose recognized that funding sources would be key to making improvements to both The University of Alabama's physical campus and academic programs.¹⁴⁴ Rose begins his 1965-1966 report by expounding on the increase in the number and quality of scholars at the University, which contributed to a positive reputation across the nation. He

141. Frank Rose to David Nevin, August 25, 1965, record group 006, box 027, location 084-086, WSHSC.

142. 1963-1964 Report of the president of the UA to the Board of Trustees. May 1964, record group 006, box 001, location 103-059, WSHSC.

143. 1964-1965 Report of the president of the UA to the Board of Trustees. May 1965, record group 006, box 001, location 103-059, WSHSC. The state bond issue referenced in the report was for \$116 million and passed in 1965 by the legislature. The University of Alabama received almost \$10 million of the funds and was able to leverage federal matching programs to further increase the money to use for new construction and infrastructure expansion. For more about the Bond Issue see "University of Alabama Main Campus and Centers," Undated report, record group 006, box 025, location 084-086, WSHSC.

144. Ibid.

attributes this increasing institutional quality to "the increasing support at the State, Federal, and corporate levels that allows us to compete with good salaries for important positions."¹⁴⁵

Despite strained relationships between the South and the federal government, Frank Rose continued to be a supporter of President Johnson. Tensions had also emerged between the academic community and President Johnson in the mid-1960s due to the war in Vietnam. University students and faculty across the country were among the first to criticize America's involvement in Vietnam.¹⁴⁶ Student demonstrations were beginning on campuses, and university faculty across the country were hosting teach-ins about the war.¹⁴⁷ Despite the growing distance between other universities and the White House, Frank Rose continued to be a supporter of the President.¹⁴⁸ On November 2, 1965, Frank Rose wrote to Jack Hines, president of Hines Realty Company in Brewton, Alabama, and reported that he had attended a White House dinner the previous month along with about one hundred other leaders from across the country.¹⁴⁹ The visit he was likely referring to was held on September 16, 1965, when Rose attended a White House dinner with the President, members of the President's Cabinet, and a variety of businessmen from across the country.¹⁵⁰ Rose recounted that he had the opportunity to speak at the dinner where he expressed his complete support for the President and his foreign policy after which time he "received a standing ovation, and the President on several occasions since has expressed

145. 1965-1966 Report of the president of the UA to the Board of Trustees. May 1966, record group 006, box 001, location 103-059, WSHSC.

146. Kenneth Heineman, *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era* (New York: New York University Press, 1993).

147. *Ibid.*

148. Tilford, *Turning the Tide*, 88.

149. Frank Rose to Jack Hines, November 2, 1965, record group 006, box 026, location 084-086, WSHSC.

150. Note from Janet Bowen to Mrs. Roberts with list of dinner attendees, September 15, 1965, appointment file, Box 22, LBJ Library. The White House event was a "dinner and exchange of views and ideas with other leaders of this country." Rose was one of about a dozen educators on the guest list of nearly 100 men.

his personal gratitude to me.”¹⁵¹ Rose actively cultivated his relationship with President Johnson and was outspoken in his support of the President’s policies.

The University of Alabama’s active participation in the training of Head Start teachers seemed to assist President Rose in continuing his relationship with the White House. Charles Adams, Conference Coordinator for the Head Start teacher-training program, recounted a story about President Johnson inviting Frank Rose to the White House for a dinner specifically because “the University had done more than any other Southern university in Project Head Start training.”¹⁵² While Rose attended several White House functions in Fall 1965, no specific documentation exists regarding the specific reasons for the invitations. On December 20, 1965, Rose and his wife, Tommye, attended a White House diplomatic dinner for Dr. Ludwig Erhard, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany.¹⁵³ Adams had heard that while at the White House, the First Lady spoke with Dr. Rose and thanked him for all that the University had done to assist Project Head Start. As the story goes, Mrs. Johnson said that they knew that “Alabama does not like Lyndon” but they wanted to show their appreciation for the University’s assistance.¹⁵⁴ Dr. Rose “was always ready on his toes. He invited her to be a speaker at a conference we’d already planned” and had already scheduled a keynote speaker.¹⁵⁵ On December 23, 1965, Rose wrote to Mrs. Johnson thanking her for speaking with him and apologizing if he was “presumptuous in taking advantage of [her] hospitality to invite you to

151. Frank Rose to Jack Hines, November 2, 1965.

152. Charles Adams (Director of Conference Activities at The University of Alabama), interview by author, Tuscaloosa, AL, December 2017.

153. Lyndon B. Johnson Daily Diary, December 20, 1965, accessed from the LBJ Library online archives, http://www.lbjlibrary.net/assets/lbj_tools/daily_diary/pdf/1965/19651220.pdf

154. Interview with Adams.

155. Ibid.

speak at the University of Alabama.”¹⁵⁶ In the letter, he reiterated the details on the invitation and his excitement that she may come to campus. Mrs. Johnson accepted the invitation and came to the campus to speak at the Leadership Conference of Women hosted by The University of Alabama on February 25, 1966.

The conference was titled “Women and the Changing Community” and speakers addressed topics such as “Alabama in Transition,” “American Women in the 1960s,” “New Tools for Working on Community Problems,” and “What You Can do for Your Community.”¹⁵⁷ Throughout her address, Mrs. Johnson discussed the role of women in influencing history. She argued, “historians have not always recognized the contributions women have made in the cultural, spiritual, and intellectual development of our country. From their demands for better homes, their insistence on improved education...and their abiding sense of justice and morality, the women of America have been a powerful force in the enrichment of our society.”¹⁵⁸ Mrs. Johnson further discussed various crises faced by the country including Vietnam and poverty. The majority of the First Lady’s speech emphasized the importance of the poverty programs in providing increased opportunities for those in need. She also expounded upon the importance of education to improve society as a whole. Mrs. Johnson called upon those at The University of Alabama to not only obtain a college education but also become leaders in their communities to help address problems within society.

156. Frank Rose to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, December 23, 1965, record group 006, box 026, location 084-086, WSHSC.

157. Conference program for “Women and the Changing Community: A Conference on the Responsibilities and Opportunities of Alabama Women in the 1960s,” February 25-26, 1966, record group 006, box 008, location 084-080, WSHSC.

158. Johnson Speech, February 25, 1966, record group 006, box 008, location 084-080, WSHSC.

While on campus for her speaking engagement, the First Lady toured the campus, including the Child Development Center, where she saw Head Start teachers conducting classroom observations. She remarked, “Dr. Rose, it seems, has a contract to train the Head Start [teachers] not only in Alabama, but in several adjoining states that have not been so quick to seize Federal Opportunities in this line.”¹⁵⁹ The University’s willingness to actively participate in Project Head Start was noteworthy to the First Lady. She articulated a distinction between The University of Alabama and institutions in neighboring states that were more reluctant to participate in this federal initiative.

Mrs. Johnson commented multiple times on Dr. Rose’s willingness and even eagerness to partner with the federal government. Reflecting on her meeting with Dr. Rose, the First Lady said, “I was enormously impressed with him—the soft spoken, able, assured, tough man, who kept up the closest kind of liaison with the federal government, to immediately get for his University any programs, grants, or help being offered.”¹⁶⁰ Later in her journal entry, the First Lady again mentioned Rose’s pursuit of federal funds stating, “it became more and more apparent to me that Dr. Rose somehow manages to run the University without being too beholden either to the Alabama legislature, or appropriations. This is partly solved by the tenacity and intelligence with which he searches out every Federal source of aid.”¹⁶¹ Dr. Rose recognized that federal dollars could greatly benefit the University and allow for growth regardless of the state budget. Subsequently, he was supportive of the University’s participation in programs such as Project Head Start and other War on Poverty initiatives. This led to The

159. Transcript of Mrs. Johnson’s audio diary for February 25, 1966, LBJ Library, 4.

160. *Ibid.*, 5.

161. *Ibid.*, 7.

University of Alabama hosting a large, desegregated group of Head Start teachers at a series of summer training programs in the summer of 1965.

CHAPTER 4

1965 SUMMER HEAD START TEACHER-TRAINING PROGRAM

The University of Alabama was one of 118 institutions to offer a training program in the summer of 1965 that prepared teachers for the inaugural Head Start program. In the summer of 1965, the University hosted the second largest training in the country with teachers in attendance from Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Tennessee, Louisiana, and Georgia.¹ From June to July 1965, The University of Alabama trained over 1,700 teachers during three separate one-week sessions hosted at four sites.² The main campus coordinated all of the sites, which included the campuses in Tuscaloosa, Montgomery, Huntsville, and Birmingham. University administrators were proud to be a part of the new Head Start program. In the University's 1964-1965 annual report to the trustees, the School of Home Economics pronounced: "This is the time when national attention is focused on the child and his family, especially in disadvantaged areas, and the Child Development Department is taking leadership in providing training for personnel to work with young children, in the program called 'Headstart.'"³

1. Proposed Head Start Training, February 1966, record group 018, box 020, Location 084-066, WSHSC. For news coverage see Dick Looser, "'Head Start'-A Chance at the Future," *Tuscaloosa News*, March 2, 1966; Louie R. Davis and Jacqueline Davis, "'Head Start' Key in Poverty Fight," *Tuscaloosa News*, February 24, 1966; "UA Trains 1700 Teachers for Project Head Start Here," *Crimson White*, July 1, 1965. According to NUEA records, the University of Tennessee hosted the largest Head Start training that summer. The desegregation history of the University of Tennessee was notably different than many other southern, flagship institutions. A peaceful and uneventful desegregation of campus occurred in 1961. The Tuskegee Institute, now Tuskegee University, was the only other Alabama college or university to offer a training program.

2. Proposed Head Start Training, February 1966.

3. 1964-1965 Report of the president of the UA to the Board of Trustees. May 1965, record group 006, box 001, location 103-059, WSHSC, 47.

The Child Development program at The University of Alabama had a positive reputation within the region making it a strong candidate to help with Head Start training. In 1931, the School of Home Economics began offering the first child development classes on campus, which prompted the opening of a nursery school program on the first floor of Doster Hall, an academic building on campus.⁴ Six years later, in 1937, the University constructed the first building to “provide laboratory facilities for observation and development.”⁵ The University offered the first graduate programs in Child Development in 1940. In 1942, the nursery school expanded to offer the first infant laboratory in the nation that many experts in the fields of psychology, sociology, and child development visited.⁶ In the 1960-1961 end-of-the-year report, Dr. Rose mentions that funds were available and plans were being made to build a new child development center.⁷

The University of Alabama Department of Child Development and Family Life was a leader in the state for child development. Beginning in 1959, the department jointly sponsored the Alabama Association on Children under Six conference with the Alabama State Department of Pensions and Securities.⁸ In 1963, the Department also began to host the Alabama Preschool Institute.⁹ By 1965, the “department annually provide[d] information, in-service training, and guidance to three hundred preschool teachers in Alabama and in neighboring states.”¹⁰ The Department’s focus on preparing nursery and preschool teachers across the state and region

4. Press Release, U of A News Bureau, November 20, 1961, record group 18, box 008, Location 084-062, WSHSC.

5. Ibid.

6. U. of A. News Bureau, February 24, 1966, record group 018, box 020, location 084-066, WSHSC.

7. Report of the President of the University of Alabama to the Board of Trustees for the year 1960-1961, The University of Alabama Digital Collections, accessed from <http://purl.lib.ua.edu/115754>.

8. Proposed Head Start Training, February 1966.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

established The University of Alabama as a competitive candidate to host the 1965 teacher-training program.

Demographic Composition of the Trainees

The Head Start participants who came to The University of Alabama in the summer of 1965 were a diverse group. A range of demographic characteristics and educational experiences were represented. Information about trainees was gathered through questionnaire responses gathered at each site. At the conclusion of each week-long training session, trainees were asked to complete a 48-item questionnaire about their experiences during the week. The questionnaires were provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and returned to Washington, D.C. after they were completed.¹¹ The University returned the questionnaires from the first week of training to the OEO prior to tabulating the responses so no data are available from that week.¹² The purpose of the questionnaire was primarily to gauge the effectiveness of the training program. Included in the survey were basic demographic questions about trainees' gender, age, educational level, and work experience.¹³ During the second week, 752 questionnaires were completed, and 428 questionnaires were received during the third week.

Based on the training questionnaires from the second and third training sessions, 88 percent of trainees were teachers and 1 percent of participants were social workers, nutritionists, or nurses.¹⁴ Other paid professionals comprised 8 percent of participants; these individuals were likely Head Start center directors or other administrators. Twelve volunteers also attended the

11. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 14.

12. Ibid.

13. NUEA Management Center Staff Orientation and Training Program Project HEAD START Trainee Questionnaires, 1965, record group 60, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

14. Ibid.

training sessions. Approximately 73 percent of trainees were over the age of 31. University staff expressed reservations about the considerable number of attendees over the age of 45.¹⁵ Specifically, concerns were raised about the “energy level, the ability to adjust to the needs of young children, the ability to participate as vigorously as necessary in the programs, and the general health of the older teacher, especially if female, as these may be years of adjustment to physical changes which are frequently accompanied by some stress.”¹⁶

A small number, only 13 percent, were under the age 25, and 14 percent were between 26 and 30 years old. Approximately 90 percent of trainees were females. Race was not a category on the questionnaires so no definitive numbers on the racial composition of the training programs exist. According to a letter from Dr. Rose, president of The University of Alabama, trainees were “50 to 60%... Negro.”¹⁷ The racial composition of the program in and of itself was radical given the racial climate at that time in Tuscaloosa and on campus as discussed in previous chapters.

Generally, participants were a very well-educated group. Only a small percentage, less than 2 percent, had only a high school education.¹⁸ Nine hundred thirty-eight respondents reported having a bachelor’s degree, 219 had a master’s degree, and five had doctoral degrees. Despite the high level of educational degree attainment among trainees, concerns were raised about the “great differences in the level of educational achievement.”¹⁹ Specifically, University faculty commented on the grammar, speaking, and writing skills of trainees.²⁰ Participants were

15. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 14.

16. Ibid.

17. Frank Rose to David Nevin, July 16, 1965, record group 006, box 027, location 084-086, WSHSC.

18. NUEA Management Center Staff Orientation and Training Program Project HEAD START Trainee Questionnaires, 1965.

19. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 14.

20. Ibid.

also overwhelmingly experienced teachers. Twenty-four percent of teachers had over 20 years of teaching experience, and 29 percent had between 10 and 20 years of experience. Only 10 percent of participants had no teaching or supervisory experience.

Over 95 percent of trainees were certified or credentialed teachers. Approximately 30 percent of participants had some experience teaching preschool, though numbers of years or types of experiences were not specified. Thirty-eight percent of participants reported attending a child study conference or workshop in the past. About 25 percent of trainees reported having no experience working with groups of children from conditions of poverty. Thirty-three percent of trainees had one to ten years of experience working with children in poverty, and 42 percent had over ten years of experience.

Program Planning and Curriculum Development

As with all Head Start training programs across the nation, The University of Alabama developed the training program in mere months. On February 27, 1965, the National University Extension Association (NUEA) sent a memo to all of its member universities notifying them about Project Head Start and the opportunity to host a training program for staff.²¹ S. J. Drazek, President of the NUEA, appealed to NUEA institutions to participate since many had “the capability, the resources and the flexibility to help OEO in this important endeavor. The challenge is great, the need is real and our contribution should be of great social significance.”²² The memo outlines the quick timeline including an orientation session on March 15 and 16, 1965, and a weeklong conference in March or April to train the trainers.²³ A follow-up memo

21. S.J. Drazek, President of NUEA to NUEA Deans, Directors, and Board Members, February 27, 1965, record group 60, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

was sent on March 5, 1965, reminding universities about the opportunity to learn more about the Head Start training program at the conference that month.²⁴ Elizabeth Carmichael, professor in Home Economics, called the OEO on March 24, 1965, and spoke with OEO representatives about the details and purpose of the program. She noted from this call that Head Start sought to “treat the child as a whole and not provid[e] nursery care only...This is one of three major opportunities under OEO.”²⁵ The NUEA contacted The University of Alabama again by telegram on March 25, 1965, regarding the opportunity to help train some of the 12,000 Head Start staff members during six-day training sessions throughout the summer even if they missed the meeting earlier that month.²⁶ The telegram also invited two staff members to attend the upcoming conference in April at the expense of Head Start.²⁷

It was not until April 6, 1965, that the University decided to send three staff members to Maryland to attend the NUEA meeting from April 9-12, 1965.²⁸ Dr. Croker, Director of Contracts and Grants, Dr. Joseph Rowland, Department of Child Development and Family Life Director, and Mr. David Kieselbach, Director of Conference Services at the Huntsville campus, attended the conference to learn more about Head Start and determine the University’s next steps. The conference provided staff with more specific details about the goals of Head Start and the expectations for the training programs. Curriculum was introduced along with some of the

24. S.J. Drazek, President of NUEA to NUEA Deans, Directors, and Board Members, March 5, 1965, record group 60, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

25. Elizabeth Carmichael to Dean Bills, Dr. George Campbell, and Dean Neige Todhunter, March 24, 1964, record group 60, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

26. Telegram from S.J. Drazek to Dean Morton, Extension Division of the University of Alabama, March 26, 1965, record group 60, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

27. Ibid.

28. Report, June 21, 1965. record group 018, box 020, Location 084-066, WSHSC. Dr. Jacqueline Davis was also supposed to be in attendance but became ill while in Washington, D.C.

materials that would be utilized during the trainings. Upon their return, a meeting was convened on April 17, 1965. The Child Development and Family Life Department decided that it was a worthwhile project for University participation. Subsequently, the hurried application and planning processes began.

On June 5, 1965, only two days before the first training began, Dr. McGlamery, Department Head for Sociology and Anthropology at The University of Alabama, attended a meeting in New York City where information about Head Start research and testing was shared.²⁹ Since the meeting was conducted the day before the first scheduled training session at UA, the information about research and testing was not presented in the first training session. At the conclusion of the training program, representatives from The University of Alabama reported that they found the June 5 meeting helpful because it “stimulated confidence in the care with which a difficult but crash program was being launched.”³⁰ Despite the hurried nature of the program, the OEO was planning for evaluation of its effectiveness, which reassured University officials about the future of the endeavor.

A great deal of confusion existed during the training planning process. Weekly if not daily changes to both the schedule and trainee numbers came in from the NUEA, the organization that was coordinating the trainings with the federal government. Initially, the NUEA told The University of Alabama to expect 200 trainees. However, that number continued to climb until the start of the program when nearly eight times as many trainees were expected.³¹ On May 3, 1965, Robert Pitchell, National Program Director for the Head Start training, wrote to

29. Report, June 21, 1965, 3.

30. Participating Institutions' Evaluation, NUEA Staff Orientation and Training Program, July 9, 1965.

31. Report, June 21, 1965.

Dr. Croker, Grants Coordinator, notifying him of the enrollment of 600 trainees and thanking him for exhibiting flexibility in the changes resulting from “unforeseen state and regional needs of trainees and [Child Development Centers].”³²

Less than a month before the first training, on May 12, 1965, a telegram arrived notifying staff to expect 1,500 trainees.³³ Changes continued to come from Washington, D.C.; the OEO canceled and rescheduled the third training several times due to concerns about insufficient funding.³⁴ The initial training was supposed to occur on June 14 but the University received a telephone call from Washington, D.C. on April 27 requesting that this training be moved up to June 7.³⁵ In the end, three separate one-week training sessions occurred in Tuscaloosa and Montgomery beginning June 7 and ending June 26, 1965. Birmingham and Huntsville hosted two separate one-week sessions beginning June 7 and ending June 19, 1965. Across all sites, 534 trainees participated in the first week of training, 780 trainees attended the second week, and 435 trainees participated in the final week.³⁶ At final count, 1,749 Head Start teachers and staff were trained at The University of Alabama.³⁷

The University quickly pulled together staff and resources to conduct the trainings. George Croker was named the Training Director, and he coordinated directly with the OEO and

32. Robert Pitchell to George Croker, May 3, 1965, National University Extension Association (NUEA) Records, Syracuse University Library Special Collections, Syracuse, New York. Referred to hereafter as SULSC.

33. Telegram from Robert Pitchell to George Crocker, May 12, 1965, SULSC.

34. Report, June 21, 1965.

35. *Ibid.*, 3.

36. Participating Institutions' Evaluation, NUEA Staff Orientation and Training Program, July 9, 1965.

37. Most press releases and reports reported 1500 or more than 1500 participants. The final figure of 1,749 was provided to the NUEA in the final Evaluation of the program as well as in the University end of the year report. See 1965-1966 Report of the president of the UA to the Board of Trustees. May 1966, record group 006, box 001, location 103-059, WSHSC, 45.

NUEA about the program details.³⁸ Dr. Joseph Rowland was the project director, and he oversaw the implementation of the trainings at the four sites. Dr. Croker and Dr. Rowland identified site leaders for each of the four campus centers and began planning the curriculum. Given the short time frame in which the program was planned, the University understandably had a difficult time recruiting staff to serve as trainers and facilitators. Specifically, administrators were concerned that they were not able to be adequately selective in choosing staff.

Furthermore, the short timeline prevented training staff from being properly oriented and prepared for the program. Some trainers were experts in their subject areas but not engaging presenters, and several discussion facilitators expressed discomfort with the flexible format.³⁹ More time to select and train the trainers could have prevented some of these problems. Despite these challenges, The University of Alabama listed its staff as one of the main strengths of the program in its final evaluation of the training.⁴⁰ University officials were particularly proud of the extensive syllabus and training manual assembled for teacher trainees.

A tremendous amount of work went into planning this large-scale training program in less than two months. In addition to staffing the event, the University had to coordinate accommodations and meals for out-of-state participants. Most of the participants stayed on-campus during their six days of training.⁴¹ Across all four sites, 79 percent of participants stayed on-campus during the trainings.⁴² At the Tuscaloosa site, this number was higher with 94 percent

38. Administrative Staff for Project Head Start Staff Training Program, June 7-26, 1965, SULSC.

39. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, record group 60, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

40. Participating Institutions' Evaluation, NUEA Staff Orientation and Training Program, July 9, 1965.

41. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 1.

42. NUEA Management Center Staff Orientation and Training Program Project HEAD START Trainee Questionnaires, 1965.

of trainees staying on campus. However, trainees were not able to all stay in the same dormitory on the main campus, likely due to the late planning, which caused logistical challenges during the training.⁴³ Moreover, due to the rushed nature of the program, advance registration was not available. The University did not know the specific identities of trainees, only that a certain number would be arriving from any given Head Start site.⁴⁴ Consequently, participants had to register on-campus where University staff made housing assignments and distributed materials. Trainees had very little information in advance about the plans for the week, which caused confusion about where to check-in and what to expect during the training. Due to confusion about travel reimbursements and trainee per diem checks, some participants did not get their checks on-site as anticipated or received them on the weekend or after hours when banks were already closed.⁴⁵

Additionally, Charles Adams, Conference Activities Coordinator, recalled having problems with participant registration. Many of the black teachers did not want to provide their addresses for the registration forms because they were suspicious about how the information would be used and to whom it might be given. Adams reflected that “coming from say X town in Mississippi, not knowing where people lived was part of the thing they had to do to survive....It was survival. You know, it was horrible times.”⁴⁶ Adams called the student worker office and inquired if a black summer worker could come over to assist with the registration. A young, black man came to help and convinced the teachers to provide their information on the

43. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965.

44. *Ibid.*, 15.

45. *Ibid.*, 16.

46. Interview with Adams.

registration forms.⁴⁷ Overall, communication with trainees prior to their arrival was insufficient and the registration process was challenging.

The NUEA required that each training program include at least 36 hours of training, half of which was required to be small group activities and discussions that involved no more than 25 participants in each group.⁴⁸ Each training session had to include six days of classroom training spanning six to eight hours per day as well as the assignment of outside readings.⁴⁹ Reading rooms were set up for trainees to read assigned materials. Additionally, the federal government provided films for sites to screen as part of the training curriculum. Prescribed topics included orientation to Head Start, overview of child development centers, sociology of the disadvantaged, relationships with social service agencies, medical components of the program, the educational program, parent involvement, coping with problem situations, and testing.⁵⁰ While the training sites were required to cover the designated topics, the specific structure and sequencing was left to the discretion of individual sites.

The focus of the curriculum was twofold: introduce teachers to appropriate preschool curriculum and familiarize them with the needs of the poor child. The Head Start training manual for The University of Alabama program explained that while many participants were likely trained teachers, they may not have any experience with preschool education, and it was vital

47. Ibid. Adams recounted that the young man that was sent to help was George Curry, recent valedictorian from Druid City High School. After graduating from Knoxville College, Curry would go on to write for *Sports Illustrated*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Chicago Tribune* and later became editor in chief for the magazine *Emerge*. He was active in the Civil Rights Movement. While I could not confirm that it was in fact Curry, he did reference working on The University of Alabama's campus as a teenager in the cafeteria in an article he wrote in 2005. For more on George Curry, see William Grimes, George Curry, Journalist with a Mission to Serve Black Readers, Dies at 69," *New York Times*, August 22, 2016.

48. Ibid.; Project Head Start University of Alabama Staff Training Program Manual, 1965, record group 018, box 020, Location 084-066, WSHSC.

49. Participating Institutions' Evaluation, NUEA Staff Orientation and Training Program, July 9, 1965.

50. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 14.

that Head Start have “preschool curriculum—not a watered down first grade or third grade curriculum.”⁵¹ A vital part of that curriculum was “offering [children] experiences adapted to what is known about growth needs at each age level. It provides for emotional, social, intellectual, and physical development.”⁵² The training materials state that Head Start teachers should provide children with a warm, nurturing environment that provided small class sizes and allowed for plenty of individual attention. Additionally, children should have the freedom to choose from a variety of enriching activities to develop their social, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills.

The University of Alabama had a strong Child Development and Family Life program that included a Child Development Center on campus that served as a learning laboratory for both undergraduate and graduate students.⁵³ During the Head Start trainings, trainees were able to tour the Child Development Center to see what a research-based program looked like, including the classroom layout and educational materials.⁵⁴ During the first training session, the visit to the Center was optional. However, the visit was so well received that it was added to the training schedule for the next two sessions. Since it was a late addition to the training schedule, the tours did not occur when children were present. Trainees were given the opportunity to visit again, though, on their lunch breaks to observe the Child Development Center in operation.⁵⁵

51. Project Head Start University of Alabama Staff Training Program Manual, Project Head Start 5.

52. *Ibid.*, Child Development Center 2.

53. Proposed Head Start Training, February 1966.

54. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 5.

55. *Ibid.*

In addition to touring the Child Development Center, trainees listened to two lectures, attended five workshops, and viewed several films about child development.⁵⁶ Specific topics included equipment and supplies, the purpose of a child development center, planning group and individual activities, language stimulation, and sensory experiences.⁵⁷ Lists of supplies and materials, including suggestions for improvising playground equipment, were provided to trainees.⁵⁸ Suggested preschool curriculum was also included. The curriculum focused on balancing individual and group activities in order to help with socialization skills that did not overwhelm the children. Teachers were instructed to provide sensory experiences with paints, clay, bubbles, and water. Imaginative play was also encouraged, and recommendations included puppets, dress up areas, a housekeeping corner, and blocks.⁵⁹ Linguistic development was particularly emphasized among trainees. Teachers were reminded to narrate activities and name even commonplace activities or items in order to help with language development. The training manual also recommends that teachers set up listening centers where students can listen to a variety of sounds and perhaps even record and listen to their own voices. In evaluating the program, administrators found that some of the content overlapped between sessions, there was not enough time to cover all of the material, and additional topics such as children's literature, dramatic play, music, and creative activities should be added to future trainings.⁶⁰

56. Ibid., 4.

57. Ibid.

58. Project Head Start University of Alabama Staff Training Program Manual, Equipment 1.

59. Ibid., Learning Environment 15.

60. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 4.

The curriculum included two lecture sessions specifically on poverty as well as two films and one discussion group.⁶¹ Dr. Harold Nelson, associate professor of sociology and anthropology presented the first lecture, “Poverty, Values, and Social Structure,” which focused on a general overview of poverty in the United States as well as information about the demographic characteristics of the poor.⁶² This training session also detailed historical and current charity and welfare programs designed to address the needs of those in poverty. Dr. Donal Muir, assistant professor of sociology, presented the second lecture, “Poverty and the Individual,” which focused on the sociological view of poverty and included sessions on culture, cultural relativity, and the subculture of poverty.⁶³ This second session closed with information about principles and examples of how the poor could be re-socialized back into the general culture. The lectures resulted in “wide discussion and interest, particularly in terms of possible changes this program might bring about in society and individuals.”⁶⁴

Additional training sessions were offered to familiarize Head Start teachers with a variety of social service programs that serve the needs of the poor. During the first training week, the information was presented via one lecture, one discussion group, and one film. The strategy for presenting the material was changed in the second two trainings; a team presented the information and fielded questions from the audience along with the screening of a film.⁶⁵ Several types of social service agencies and their philosophies were introduced to trainees. Programs ranged from those that served individuals or families in the “normal zone” to those that

61. *Ibid.*, 2.

62. Project Head Start University of Alabama Staff Training Program Manual, 1965.

63. *Ibid.*

64. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 3.

65. *Ibid.*, 3.

addressed the needs of people in the “dysfunctioning zone” or even those with “mental illness.”⁶⁶ Because Head Start children lived in poverty, there was an increased chance they would require more “comprehensive health, medical, psychological, and social work services.”⁶⁷ Head Start teachers were encouraged to utilize the social service agencies that existed within their communities to help address the needs of both the children and families they served. The limitations of these services and the gaps that may exist within different communities were also addressed in the training. Social services were identified in the training evaluation as needing improvement in the future. Recommendations were made to have guest speakers from relevant social service agencies along with better, more informative films.⁶⁸

Information about the health component of Head Start comprised one full day of training.⁶⁹ A medical team consisting of a doctor, county health official, dentist, public health nurse, nutritionist, and social worker presented the content of the health training. Training topics varied from familiarizing teachers with the specific roles of public health workers to preventing accidents or illnesses in their programs to recognizing health concerns. The health-related materials in the training manual were extensive. Teachers were provided guides for observing their students’ health in terms of general health, behavior, eyes, ears, mouth and teeth, skin and scalp, and orthopedics.⁷⁰ Educational information about nutrition was presented to give guidelines for serving food at the Head Start centers and for teachers to assist children and

66. Project Head Start University of Alabama Staff Training Program Manual, 1965, Social Service 9.

67. *Ibid.*, Social Service, 6.

68. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 3.

69. *Ibid.*, 4.

70. Project Head Start University of Alabama Staff Training Program Manual, 1965, 26.

families with information about healthy eating habits. In the final evaluation of the training program, administrators communicated that the medical component was confusing and not presented in the most effective way possible.⁷¹ Course material was duplicated throughout the sessions and not all presenters were skilled speakers.

Challenges arose with both the curriculum and the materials provided by the OEO for use in the training program. The program had too much content for a six-day training. Consequently, some sessions were rushed and did not go into adequate depth on the topic. Administrators expressed concerns that real, lasting learning could result from such a short training.⁷² Recommendations were made for future programs to shorten the time spent on less vital topics and to allow for longer, more in-depth discussions about the most critical topics, such as early childhood development and poverty. Participant fatigue was also a concern raised, and it was suggested that more breaks be included especially in between lecture-style sessions. The University proposed longer training programs and follow-up trainings for the future in order to address some of these concerns.

The development of the syllabus and materials was rushed and consequently needed editing and refinement.⁷³ Some materials had errors and others lacked appropriate citations. Books that were planned to be utilized in the training arrived late or never at all. Training materials were initially ordered for only 400 but, as the participant numbers grew, there was no time to increase the orders. In the end, some materials only went to Head Start directors to share with their staffs. A number of films were provided to all training sites for use during the Head

71. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 4.

72. *Ibid.*, 12.

73. *Ibid.*, 7.

Start training. The topics of the films varied from an introduction to the War on Poverty and Head Start to the needs of the poor child. However, films were not shipped to campus until right before the training making it difficult to effectively integrate them into the lessons.⁷⁴

Furthermore, University officials struggled with some of the films that focused exclusively on the experiences of the urban poor. Most participants in The University of Alabama program would be serving more rural areas and the content of the films did not resonate with them.⁷⁵

Trainees' Evaluation of the Program

On the training questionnaires completed at the end of the weeklong program, 69 percent of participants reported that the training program prepared them very well for their role in Head Start for the coming summer.⁷⁶ The remaining 31 percent reported that it prepared them adequately, and only one respondent reported that the program prepared them inadequately.⁷⁷ Eighty-four percent of trainees expressed that the length of the training was just right while 7 percent indicated that it was too much and 8 percent reported that it was too little.⁷⁸ Seventy-nine percent of participants thought the number of lectures was adequate, 19 percent expressed that there were too many, and only 2 percent indicated that there were too few.⁷⁹ Eighty-four percent of trainees noted that there were the right number of seminars, 3 percent suggested there were too many, and 13 percent indicated that there were too few seminars.⁸⁰ Seventy-nine percent of

74. Ibid., 9.

75. Ibid.

76. NUEA Management Center Staff Orientation and Training Program Project HEAD START Trainee Questionnaires, 1965.

77. Ibid.

78. Ibid.

79. Ibid.

80. Ibid.

respondents reported the time allotted for question and answer periods was sufficient, 3 percent expressed there was too much time, and 17 percent noted there was not enough time devoted to allowing them to ask questions.⁸¹ When asked if adequate time was allotted to have discussions with other trainees outside of class sessions, 73 percent of respondents said there was enough time, 2 percent reported there was too much time, and 25 percent responded there was too little time.⁸²

In evaluating the specific topics covered in the training, participants gave the highest ratings to the sessions that covered the daily details of a child development center. Almost 90 percent of trainees identified the content as very good.⁸³ Most trainees, 84 percent, also rated the trainings on recognizing and dealing with children’s problem behaviors as very good.⁸⁴ These workshops included information about responding to aggressive behavior, withdrawal, or issues with eating or toileting. Lectures about the learning and development of four- and five-year-old children also received a positive evaluation from 82 percent of participants.⁸⁵ Information about poverty was also highly rated. Eighty-three percent of trainees rated the lectures about “special problems of deprived children” as very good, and 81 percent rated the sessions about poverty in society as very good.⁸⁶

Topics regarding social services and medical care tended to receive lower scores in trainee evaluations. For the lectures about problems faced by social service agencies, 45 percent

81. Ibid.

82. Ibid.

83. Ibid.

84. Ibid.

85. Ibid.

86. Ibid.

of respondents rated the content as fair or poor.⁸⁷ Thirty-four percent of trainees rated sessions regarding medical care and referral procedures as fair or poor.⁸⁸ Forty-four percent of respondents indicated that the content regarding “teaching parents to plan and prepare nutritious meals” was fair or poor, and 5 percent indicated that the topic was not covered at all during their trainings.⁸⁹ Recordkeeping in a child development center also received low scores with 45 percent of trainees evaluating the content as fair or poor and 7 percent reporting that topic as not covered.⁹⁰ Three percent of trainees responded that they were not trained on conducting orientation sessions for volunteers or parents, and 45 percent rated the coverage of the topic as fair or poor.

Trainees had an opportunity at the end of the questionnaire to provide comments about the training course. The staff who tabulated the questionnaires determined that 91 percent of these comments were about the “satisfactory” nature of the program.⁹¹ Not all of these comments, however, were included in the summary of responses. Some comments focused on the organization and execution of the program. One trainee noted, “the organization was fantastic” and another praised the “practical help, ideas, and information given.”⁹² Other comments focused on the content of the training sessions. One trainee enthusiastically stated, “I sincerely believe that this training course was more beneficial in one week than a six weeks course in Early Childhood Education at Johns Hopkins University.”⁹³ Another trainee echoed

87. Ibid.

88. Ibid.

89. Ibid.

90. Ibid.

91. Ibid.

92. Ibid.

93. Ibid.

this statement saying, “I received more from this training than I have gotten from a year of college work.”⁹⁴ Another theme in the questionnaire comments was that trainees gained an appreciable understanding of children in poverty. One commented, “I have greater insights in how to work with deprived children to give them a feeling of security and belonging,” and another stated, “The training course has developed within me a real interest to understand and help those children who are deprived, so they may develop into happy individuals.”⁹⁵ Most critical comments focused on the brevity of the training session given the significant amount of content. One trainee expressed disagreement “with some sociological concepts put forth” but followed up with praise for the general content and the implementation of the training.

In addition to responses to the training questionnaires, some participants followed up to the program with letters or even reports. The Head Start staff from the South Panola Head Start Center in Batesville, Mississippi, wrote to Lucy Braswell, Assistant Coordinator of the training program, to update her on their Head Start center. These staff members explained that administrators originally scheduled only five teachers for their site but after enrollment at their center reached 250, they were able to expand their teaching staff to 13.⁹⁶ Teachers who attended the training at UA shared their materials with the new teachers and helped to provide them with the instruction they missed on campus. The teachers expressed that their “stay there was quite an experience and very much enjoyable....it was a pleasure having you and other staffers as instructors and counselors. We are grateful for the chance of attending and shall forever

94. Ibid.

95. Ibid.

96. Sadie Cunningham, Mardes Battle, Vernice Exhols, Doris James, and Helen Johnson to Lucy Braswell. August 20, 1965, record group 60, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

remember the days spent there."⁹⁷ Another teacher, Frances Davis, from Horn Lake, Mississippi, wrote to Elizabeth Carmichael to share that she was "overjoyed with the splendid work that you and your staff did in orienting Project Head Start."⁹⁸

The Pass Christian, Mississippi Head Start center prepared a report about their summer Head Start program to defend the program. Center administrators prefaced the report by stating "The Project has grown very dear to the hearts of the staff....In the final evaluation let it be said our mistakes were honest, our efforts sincere, and our results beneficial to a great society of a better America."⁹⁹ Eighteen of the Pass Christian Head Start teachers attended the Head Start staff-training program hosted by The University of Alabama at the Montgomery site. They reported that the training "was well-organized and the entire staff at this Montgomery Center are to be congratulated for their fine effort."¹⁰⁰ The report also states that the teachers left the training with a broader understanding of Head Start as well as the aims of preschool programs. Given the rushed nature of the planning process, participants overwhelmingly praised both the curriculum and the logistics of the training programs.

Race

All Economic Opportunity Act programs were required to also meet the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which specified that any program receiving federal funds could not discriminate on the basis of race. Therefore, the OEO planned Head Start to be a completely desegregated program. The OEO expected that the Head Start centers would have a student

97. Ibid.

98. Frances Davis to Elizabeth Carmichael, received June 16, 1965, record group 60, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

99. A Brief Resume (including the Purposes, Aims, Ideals, Methods, Results, and Evaluation) Project Head Start, Pass Christian, Mississippi, 65HS-5134, record group 60, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

100. Ibid.

composition that reflected the racial composition of the cities and towns they served. In addition to including students from both races, the program called for the teachers and staff at Head Start centers be desegregated as well. As a result, the teacher-training programs would be desegregated and specifically called upon to treat all participants fairly regardless of race.¹⁰¹

Lucy Deason, Assistant Coordinator of the 1965 program, explained that violence in Alabama regarding civil rights was widespread and people came to the training “with fear and trembling” because the Head Start program was so revolutionary in its aims for integration.¹⁰²

Charles Adams, Conference Activities Coordinator for the summer training, was also apprehensive about the racial make-up of the program. He recalled being nervous about the “atmosphere that I was bringing in hundreds of black students” and wanting to ensure that the teacher trainees did not encounter any negative incidents while on campus.¹⁰³ Adams decided that it was important that the black Head Start teachers look like they belonged on campus so he “got extra-large red and white University of Alabama nametags” for participants to wear and “the biggest red and white notebooks that we could find so they could have that under their arms.”¹⁰⁴ Adams said he felt compelled to mark participants as part of The University of Alabama in order to prevent any problems or confrontations with white students, staff, or community members.

101. The training sites were sent non-discrimination agreements to sign that stated “the subcontractor shall not discriminate on the grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin in matters affecting the trainees.” Purchase order from NUEA to UA, May 4, 1965, SULSC.

102. Lucy Deason (Instructor of Home Economics Child Development and Family Life at The University of Alabama), interview by author, Tuscaloosa, AL, September 2017.

103. Interview with Adams.

104. Ibid.

Deason recalled that the first day of the training program “the seating pattern when people came was as segregated as you can imagine.”¹⁰⁵ The program was almost an even mix of black and white participants, and they initially self-segregated during the trainings. Deason remembered a moment when the instructors split the trainees into groups by county to plan for the health component of the program. A group of participants both black and white were clustered together earnestly discussing how they were going to cope with the school nurse in their area as she was senile. Deason recalled how moments like these began to transform the auditorium. By the end of the week, “the seating pattern in the auditorium changed. By the end of the week, it was a very integrated seating pattern. I think it was one of the first times that people, black and white, with similar interests had gotten together with a common purpose and had seen each other as equals.”¹⁰⁶ The time participants spent together in the intensive, one-week training pushed them to interact with those who were racially different from them as they prepared for the upcoming Head Start programs.

Similar sentiments were expressed in the training questionnaires completed by trainees at the conclusion of the program. One trainee expressed, “I think the nation should be informed of the wonderful way in which the two races have worked together in this work shop; working to raise the standard of living for both races.”¹⁰⁷ In the evaluation of the Head Start staff training program, a “Negro director from Mississippi” reported that “his group of teachers were courteously received not only on the Tuscaloosa Campus, but in the community as well... This

105. Interview with Deason.

106. Ibid. While talking, Deason became obviously emotional and had tears in her eyes. Antoinette Errante points out that often, in oral history, "meaning has been reduced to their transcribable elements." The emotion of that moment of the interview goes beyond what can be transcribed and conveyed in a quote. Errante, "But Sometimes You're Not Part of the Story," 25.

107. Trainee Questionnaires, 1965.

week, all that's happened has been wonderful.”¹⁰⁸ Despite the racial issues evident throughout the South at the time, the summer training was surprisingly incident free. In the report about Head Start prepared by the staff of the Pass Christian, Mississippi center, program administrators stated, “It should also be mentioned that the Negro members of our staff stated they had never been treated better than they had been treated in Montgomery.”¹⁰⁹ Mr. Adams recalled asking a black participant about her experience on-campus, especially with the white, University students who were on-campus for summer school. She responded that she felt quite welcome and that she had even asked a white “student where was the Morgan Building (Morgan Hall), and he took [her] right straight to the front door.”¹¹⁰ The final program evaluation echoed these sentiments, quoting a participant as saying, “You know, everyone is being so nice. There hasn't been anything unpleasant.”¹¹¹

Lola Emerson of the Child Welfare League served as an outside consultant for the training program at The University of Alabama. She reported that the most value was derived not from the content taught but in the “opportunity for people of two races to live and work together in harmony and respect in their mutual interest and concern for young children and in the desire to provide improved opportunities for children to grow and develop.”¹¹² The desire to help poor children appeared to transcend the racial barriers of the time, at least while the trainings were in session. Emerson's experience at The University of Alabama left her with an optimism for the future of Head Start and early childhood education in the region.

108. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 20.

109. A Brief Resume of Project Head Start, Pass Christian, Mississippi, 65HS-5134.

110. Interview with Adams.

111. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 19.

112. Lola Emerson to Elizabeth Carmichael, July 9, 1965, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

The University of Alabama prepared an Evaluation of Project Head Start Staff Training Program in which an entire section was devoted to “Negro-White Harmony” proclaiming:

In many ways, this was an experimental and pioneering program in Negro-white relations. Many whites and Negroes were participating in educational and social activities together for the first time. This provided an opportunity for members of both races of similar educational level to be together in a learning, talking, interacting situation. There was no one incident to mar the relationships that developed during this period. This program might well set the stage for more harmony between the races when many public schools are integrated for the first time this Fall.¹¹³

The training program left many with a sense of hope for the future of race relations. A large group of teachers working together across racial lines at this time was not a common occurrence. Trainees reported that their positive experiences with teachers of the other race would help them not only in their role as a summer Head Start teacher but also when they returned to their usual classroom assignment in the fall.¹¹⁴ Working across racial lines during the training brought recognition of the importance of interracial collaboration in other areas. A black participant brought up the need for more black citizens to vote and white participants spoke up in agreement.¹¹⁵ Through discussions like these, “the need for more cooperation and joint responsibility in community needs was clearly pointed out and accepted.”¹¹⁶ Many of the participants bonded with each other across racial lines over the challenges of working in poor, rural communities.

Despite the reports of smooth race relations among trainees, the program failed to plan for formal and specific discussions about race or teaching in a desegregated classroom. The final evaluation of the program reflected this oversight stating, “it might have been wise to include a

113. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 18.

114. *Ibid.*, 20.

115. *Ibid.*

116. *Ibid.*

discussion on Negro-white relations in the program. This subject came up in the discussion groups and in informal discussions, but was not included in the formal portion of the program.”¹¹⁷ Race understandably came up in the discussions, but neither the OEO nor the UA faculty planned intentional lessons in advance to address race directly. Head Start was designed to be a desegregated if not integrated program but the decision was still made to not actually address race in the teacher trainings.

Despite not planning specific lessons or workshops about race, training planners did anticipate that the topic of race might arise during training sessions, specifically in the form of racial misunderstandings. In an instruction sheet for training site coordinators, one of the outlined responsibilities included “be prepared for emergencies such as: speaker or discussion leader fails to arrive, illness in group, racial misunderstanding.”¹¹⁸ Race was on the minds of the training planners even if they did not plan workshops to openly address the topic. Site coordinators were cautioned that racial misunderstandings were possible and they should be prepared to respond accordingly. If any such misunderstandings arose, there is no record in the evaluation of program or trainee questionnaire responses.

According to Deason, one reason for the success of the program was that the upper administration of the program was also desegregated:

One of the best blessings we had with that program was Emma Henderson who had the child development program at Stillman. She was a wonderful, warm person and she already had a close friendship with Dr. Davis and Dr. Rowland....And, so our teaching

117. Ibid., 18.

118. Instructions for Center Personnel: Instructions for Coordinator of Head Start Project, undated, record group 018, box 020, Location 084-066, WSHSC. This document is not well labeled and it is unclear if it was prepared by University of Alabama, NUEA, or OEO staff.

group was an integrated group and we had close feelings for each other already so there was modeling even in that aspect.¹¹⁹

From the training manuals, it appears that Emma Henderson was not on staff until February 1966. She attended the 1965 program as a trainee and likely did have an established relationship with Dr. Davis and other faculty as she had been involved in childcare within Tuscaloosa since 1954 when she opened the first licensed daycare in Tuscaloosa.¹²⁰ It is possible that Deason was recalling the positive interactions University staff had with Henderson during the trainings as well as later trainings in which Henderson was actually on staff.¹²¹ From the staff listing, it appears that the instructional and administrative staff from the program were exclusively white faculty and staff from The University of Alabama.¹²² Having Emma Henderson as an attendee could have positively contributed to the racial dynamics of the trainings, but the staff listing shows that it was by no means a truly integrated program.

On one evaluation, a staff member commented, “I wonder if when the public understands what this program will mean—an equal chance for all—will they be willing to pay the price, to give up their favored position. The greatest opposition found in the communities is likely to come from those who really understand what the consequences of Head Start can be.”¹²³ This staff member astutely recognized that Head Start was a radical idea. Helping children may be an

119. Interview with Deason. In March 2017, *The Crimson White* ran a story about Emma Henderson being one of the first African American faculty and staff members at The University of Alabama. Will Jones, “A life worth recognizing: The Story of Emma Henderson,” *Crimson White*, March 2, 2017.

120 Jones, “A Life Worth Recognizing” and Jamon Smith, “Funeral is Saturday for Education Pioneer who Opened First Licensed pre-K Program in Tuscaloosa,” *Tuscaloosa News*, September 26, 2014. In the early 1970s, Henderson would go on to be the first black president of the Alabama Association for Young Children.

121 The first mention of Emma Henderson on staff was in a February 24, 1966, press release. She was identified as the director of Stillman College Kindergarten and was one of nine staff members named. U. of A. News Bureau, February 24, 1966.

122. Project Head Start University of Alabama Staff Training Program Manual, 1965, record group 018, box 020, Location 084-066, WSHSC.

123. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965, 19.

easy concept to rally around in theory, but truly leveling the playing field and giving all children equal access to education would continue to be a divisive concept in reality. This discord was illustrated by the racial roadblocks that Head Start implementation faced both in Tuscaloosa and across the South.

Tuscaloosa's White Children Refuse a Head Start

While the training program on campus provided an example of interracial harmony, down the street in Tuscaloosa that same summer, the federal government chastised the Tuscaloosa Head Start program for operating a segregated program.¹²⁴ This problem was not unique to Tuscaloosa. Many Head Start programs opened and operated two segregated facilities, or no white children enrolled so they were exclusively black Head Start centers.¹²⁵ Tuscaloosa was not the only city in Alabama where race factored into the implementation of Head Start.¹²⁶ By the end of the summer of 1965, programs across the Southeast were under fire for not complying with the Civil Rights Act.¹²⁷ In Alabama, 44 of the 53 programs had some level of segregation, and at least one county was being threatened with litigation.¹²⁸ Sargent Shriver, director of the OEO, expressed concern about several Alabama programs in which funds were temporarily withheld because the programs were “not conducted in accordance with the civil rights provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act.”¹²⁹

124. “Nelson Defends ‘Head Start’ Program Here.” *Tuscaloosa News*, July 15, 1965. The Tuscaloosa City Schools hosted two Head Start sites in 1965. No programs were operated in Tuscaloosa County.

125. Aguiar, “Head Start: A History of Implementation”; Davis, “‘Head Start’ Helping Deprived Tots Here.”; Eve Edstrom, “Citing Head Start Bias, U.S. Withholds Grants,” *Los Angeles Times*, September 24, 1965.

126. “Project Head Start Cautioned on Bias.” *New York Times*, June 21, 1965.

127. Aguiar, “Head Start: A History of Implementation”; Kelley, “Thornton Explains Actions in Operation Head Start.”; Steif, “Shriver Faces Choice on Head Start Funds,” *The Albuquerque Tribune*, August 28, 1965.

128. Ibid.

129. Pete Kelley, “Thornton Explains Actions in Operation Head Start,” *The Florence Times*, October 3, 1965. Funds were temporarily withheld in Mobile and Florence.

In Tuscaloosa, all 300 children enrolled in Head Start during the summer of 1965 were black and “no white children [were] enrolled. Several white parents expressed interest in the program, but declined to allow their children to enroll in the formerly all-Negro schools.”¹³⁰ The Tuscaloosa City Education Superintendent, Dr. Nelson, denied that there were issues of racial discrimination explaining, “the centers are located in formerly all-Negro schools since the schools are located in areas where the demand for the program was the greatest and in areas where most of the children live.”¹³¹ Nelson suggested that the use of the historically all-black school as a site for the Head Start program caused white families to refuse to send their children. He claimed this was out of the school board’s control and that it was not the intention for the Tuscaloosa Head Start to be a segregated program.¹³² As mentioned in Chapter 2, the Commission on Civil Rights found that communities that hosted Head Start in a formerly black public school building practically guaranteed that the center would enroll only black children.¹³³

In 1966, the Community Council of Tuscaloosa County applied as the grantee and named Tuscaloosa City Schools as the “delegate agency” to run the Head Start centers.¹³⁴ They requested to run four sites, doubling the number of locations from the previous summer.¹³⁵ All sites would once again be in Tuscaloosa City School buildings—three formerly all-black schools

130. Paul Davis, “‘Head Start’ Helping Deprived Tots Here,” *Tuscaloosa News*, June 27, 1965. See also “Study Shows Racism in Ala. ‘Head Start,’” *Chicago Defender*, July 24, 1965.

131. “Nelson Defends ‘Head Start’ Program Here.”

132. *Ibid.*

133. United States Commission on Civil Rights, “Title VI...One Year After: A Survey of Desegregation of Health and Welfare Services in the South,” 37.

134. Roy Bain, “Head Start Nemesis: Integration,” *Tuscaloosa News*, June 19, 1966.

135. Dick Looser, “‘Head Start’—A Chance at the Future,” *Tuscaloosa News*, March 2, 1966.

and one predominantly white school. Tuscaloosa County Schools once again declined to participate in the program.

When Tuscaloosa applied for the 1966 summer Head Start grant, the OEO expressed concerns over the documented segregation that occurred the previous year.¹³⁶ Tuscaloosa had to outline a plan to demonstrate how they would prevent the previous year's segregation from occurring again. Consequently, in 1966, a white school was added as a Head Start site, and the district agreed to allow half of the Head Start teachers to be black at that site.¹³⁷ However, school officials would not agree to having at least three white Head Start teachers assigned to the three predominantly black school sites.¹³⁸ The *Tuscaloosa News* reported that "school officials decided they could accept the operation of the program under these requirements."¹³⁹ The OEO thus denied their grant application because "the staff pattern for the centers in your proposed program is discriminatory and segregated."¹⁴⁰

Additionally, the OEO expressed significant concerns about the recruitment of children for the Head Start sites. The OEO posited that the planned "recruitment efforts are not designed to reach members of all eligible groups equally effectively and to make it clear that the program will be operated in a completely nondiscriminatory and unsegregated manner."¹⁴¹ Tuscaloosa school officials argued that it was not their job to "go out and try to find white children to attend"

136. Roy Bain, "Head Start Program Out," *Tuscaloosa News*, June 9, 1966.

137. Bain, "Head Start Nemesis."

138. *Ibid.*

139. *Ibid.*

140. James Heller, Assistant General Counsel for OEO to Community Council of Tuscaloosa County, June 12, 1966. Lister Hill Papers, OEO files, Box 670-378, location 068-068. WSHSC.

141. *Ibid.*

the Head Start centers being housed in the predominantly all-black schools.¹⁴² The OEO came to Tuscaloosa to examine the boundary lines that had been drawn for each Head Start site and accused Tuscaloosa of gerrymandering the district lines in order to avoid integration.¹⁴³ This, in conjunction with the staffing patterns, made it impossible for the OEO to approve their Head Start grant proposal.

The Community Council of Tuscaloosa County sent a letter to Senator Lister Hill on June 28, 1966, expressing disappointment with the decision and frustration with the late timing of the notification.¹⁴⁴ Because the organization was not notified about the denial until June, no appeal was possible. J. Clemson Duckworth, president of the Community Council of Tuscaloosa County, delivered the news that Head Start was denied funding to the board of directors on June 8, 1966. He explained that the Head Start program “became related to the ‘Big Problem’” and the “schools were not in a position to do more.”¹⁴⁵ The “Big Problem” was desegregation, and Duckworth argued that Head Start should not be mired in that controversy since “there is no quality of teaching problem, no bright vs. less bright children problem, none of the basic problems of school integration.”¹⁴⁶ Duckworth expressed concern about poor children being “caught in the crossfire” since Head Start “was a great help last year to children from homes of the economically poor or homes of poor opportunity.”¹⁴⁷ He maintained that their agency and

142. Ibid.

143. Ibid.

144. Lawrence Shuman to Lister Hill, June 28, 1966, Lister Hill Papers, OEO files, Box 670-378, location 068-068. WSHSC.

145. “Remarks made to the Board of Directors of the Community Council of Tuscaloosa County, Inc. on June 8, 1966, by J. Clemson Duckworth, President, concerning Headstart.” Attachment enclosed within letter from Shuman to Hill, June 28, 1966.

146. Ibid.

147. Ibid.

program should remain outside the desegregation problems that the school systems were facing. However, the issues that plagued the desegregation of public schools in Tuscaloosa and across the South spilled over into the implementation of the Head Start program.

The Commission on Civil Rights studied segregation and desegregation in Head Start sites during the summer of 1965.¹⁴⁸ Alabama was not one of the states that the Commission staff visited. However, the Alabama Council on Human Relations studied the racial composition of the Head Start centers in Alabama and found that “enrollment in most Alabama centers examined was not found to be integrated except in a token fashion.”¹⁴⁹ Alabama was not alone in this failure to desegregate. Across southern states, the Commission on Civil Rights examined “13 communities in eight Southern and border States, involving 70 projects in as many centers. Of this total number, more than half, or 37, had an exclusively Negro enrollment and nine had an exclusively white enrollment.”¹⁵⁰ Despite very ambitious goals to offer completed integrated programs, Head Start faced many of the desegregation struggles that plagued the public school systems.

A local news report aptly noted, “One of the ironies of the federal government’s programs is that while the University of Alabama is one of the largest Headstart teacher training centers in the Southeast, the community of Tuscaloosa was unable to have a Headstart program approved this summer.”¹⁵¹ The problems faced by Tuscaloosa in its implementation of Head Start underscore the significance of the success that occurred on campus. Despite the segregation

148. United States Commission on Civil Rights, “Title VI...One Year After: A Survey of Desegregation of Health and Welfare Services in the South.”

149. *Ibid.*, 31.

150. *Ibid.*, 31.

151. Roy Bain, “30-Day Extension: Poverty War Grant Okayed,” *Tuscaloosa News*, June 22, 1966.

of Tuscaloosa's Head Start program, the University's inaugural training program had been desegregated and racially harmonious. The Head Start training program that occurred in the summer of 1965 was new and innovative. It represented the beginning of a partnership between the University and the federal government in support of Project Head Start. The willingness of the University to participate in a training that would bring hundreds of black teachers to campus, even if only for a summer program, illustrates the progression of the larger desegregation story at The University of Alabama. The program was significant not only for the University but was also indicative of a larger movement within the field of early childhood education across the country. As Head Start grew, the demand for trained early childhood educators also expanded. Great attention was paid to what went well during the program and what could be improved for the future. The summer training program would serve as the foundation of a longstanding partnership between Head Start and The University of Alabama.

CHAPTER 5

BEYOND THE SUMMER OF 1965: CONTINUED PARTNERSHIPS

The Head Start teacher-training program that occurred at The University of Alabama in the summer of 1965 impacted both the campus and surrounding communities. The University successfully hosted a large-scale, desegregated event on campus with few or no racial incidents.¹ This was a positive step in the larger desegregation story of the campus. The teacher-training program also helped the University gain favor with the federal government. Because The University of Alabama was willing to host such a large training program, Head Start centers across the Southeast were able to have well-trained teachers during Head Start's first summer. Teachers traveled from five different states to attend the training sessions hosted by the University. Since most of these individuals were public school teachers with little to no experience with preschool-aged children, the training program equipped them with the fundamentals of working with young children, specifically those living in poverty.

The summer of 1965 started a longstanding partnership between The University of Alabama and Project Head Start. The initial program had many successes but also faced challenges. One of the first outgrowths of the summer training program was new research and evaluation of Project Head Start by the University. The Department of Child Development and

1. Both the archives and the oral history accounts present a very rosy picture of the race relations during the teacher training. As Dougherty cautions, this may be an example of "euphoric recall" in which the "good times" are recalled more readily than the challenges. Additionally, it is possible that any negative comments or complaints were not retained for the archival record. The information in both the archives and the oral history narrative were consistently positive, but I think it is important to recognize research factors that could contribute to this narrative. For more about euphoric recall and the problematizing of archival records see Dougherty, "From Anecdote to Analysis," Ketelaar, "Tacit Narratives," and Schwartz & Cook, "Archives, Records, and Power."

Family Life quickly sought to evaluate both the teacher-training program that had just occurred as well as what was occurring at the actual Head Start centers across Alabama. The department also recognized the expansive research opportunities that Head Start would provide its faculty and students.

Additionally, University faculty and staff knew that no matter how well executed, a six-day program would never be sufficient to adequately train someone to be an early childhood educator. Consequently, the University planned expanded training programs and professional development opportunities for Head Start Teachers. As the Head Start program shifted from a summer program into a yearlong offering, staffing patterns changed and subsequently the training needed to change as well. Existing teachers could no longer be relied upon to staff Head Start centers, and frequently newly hired Head Start teachers did not have any college education. The University of Alabama continued its commitment to Head Start by first providing more in-depth trainings and eventually through college courses sponsored by the Child Development Associate (CDA) credential program. This chapter will outline The University of Alabama initiatives that developed from the first summer training program. These initiatives include evaluation and research projects as well as continued training and development opportunities culminating in the CDA credential.

Evaluation and Research

The University continued its partnership with Project Head Start through assessments of both the teacher-training program and the implementation of the Head Start curriculum. In evaluating the 1965 training, The University of Alabama acknowledged that trainings were planned too quickly and were too short to adequately train teachers who had little or no

experience with early childhood education.² Dr. Jacqueline Davis, faculty member in child development, participated in the summer 1965 training program as a symposium facilitator and small-group discussion leader.³ She and her husband, Dr. Louie Davis, professor in education, published an article in the *Tuscaloosa News* in February 1966 about Head Start and the role it was playing in the War on Poverty.⁴ These faculty commended the efforts and ideals of Head Start but criticized the implementation of the program at some centers. Davis and Davis note in their article the “purpose of Head Start programs is not to teach first grade to disadvantaged children,” but unfortunately, some locations perceived the purpose of Head Start to be “an early version of first grade.”⁵ During her visits to sites across the state of Alabama, Dr. Jacqueline Davis found that some Head Start teachers did not adequately grasp some of the basic concepts of early childhood education and instead relied on their experience teaching older children. The classrooms ran more like first grade classrooms and were not developmentally appropriate for the children they were serving. However, the founders of Head Start never intended for the summer program to be an early start to first grade education. Nevertheless, “in some communities...the basic child development orientation of the Head Start Program appeared to have eluded the understanding and grasp of local leaders and planners.”⁶ The Davises claim that the 1965 summer training program at The University of Alabama was “recognized as one of the

2. Evaluation of the Head Start Staff Training Program, 1965. Dr. Jacqueline Davis was a staff member involved in the 1965 teacher-training program. She described the training program as a “crash program.” Davis and Davis, “ ‘Head Start’ Key in Poverty Fight.”

3. Administrative Staff for Project Head Start Staff Training Program, Box 27, SULSC.

4. Davis and Davis, February 24, 1966.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

most outstanding in the nation” but that did not negate the fact that it was a quickly planned, short orientation to early childhood education.⁷

The Davises’ observations about The University of Alabama training program and the quality of teaching within Head Start centers across the state were consistent with national trends. According to historian Maris Vinovskis, the quality of Head Start classrooms across the country was inconsistent and “variations in quality between summer and year-round programs were especially evident.”⁸ The summer programs relied heavily on elementary and high school teachers who gave up their summer vacations to work in Head Start. Nationally, over two-thirds of the agencies administering summer Head Start programs were schools, and public school teachers comprised the majority of the professional staff.⁹ However, year-round programs could not rely on public school teachers to staff their centers and “in the full-year programs of 1965-66 and 1966-67, only about one-third of Head Start delegate agencies were schools, and fewer teachers participated.”¹⁰ The strategy for training Head Start teachers had to be adapted to address the changing composition of the teaching staff.

Immediately after the summer training program concluded, on July 2, 1965, staff at The University of Alabama proposed a follow-up program to evaluate the effectiveness of the teaching and curriculum that the summer Head Start children were receiving.¹¹ The University of Alabama staff from the Department of Child Development and Family Life argued that the University was uniquely qualified to conduct these evaluations across the state of Alabama since

7. Ibid.

8. Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 95.

9. Ibid., 95.

10. Ibid., 95.

11. Report, “Values of a Follow-Up Program for Project Head Start,” July 2, 1965, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

they were experts in their field.¹² The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the National University Extension Association (NUEA), however, only charged The University of Alabama with training the Head Start staff. University faculty wanted to do more, though, to ensure that Head Start centers were truly meeting the needs of the children they served. The Department of Child Development and Family Life sent faculty and staff to visit Head Start sites across the state beginning in July 1965.¹³ Through these visits and evaluations, the University recommended more training for both Head Start teachers and volunteers.

The Department of Child Development and Family Life also proposed exploring the expansion of Head Start beyond a summer program into a nine-month educational program.¹⁴ The faculty argued that deprived children could benefit from a more extensive, in-depth preschool experience that extended beyond one summer.¹⁵ The University of Alabama staff noted that Head Start showed great potential to improve the situation of children in poverty but one summer of training would never be enough. They were not alone in this assessment and “from the beginning, many early childhood educators and policy makers doubted an eight-week summer program would be sufficient to effect lasting change among the impoverished.”¹⁶ Even President Johnson recognized the need for the expansion of the program, and in August 1965 he recommended Head Start be extended to a year-round program beginning as early as that fall in

12. Ibid.

13. Report, “Values of a Follow-Up Program for Project Head Start,” July 2, 1965.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 93.

some areas.¹⁷ The University of Alabama proposed conducting further research on the impact of Head Start on children in order to help justify the expansion of the program.

The University recognized that their continued involvement in Head Start could be helpful for the Department of Child Development and Family Life. Head Start classrooms provided ample research opportunities. Several graduate students conducted research studies comparing the educational outcomes of Head Start students with those who were not involved in the program. In 1967, two graduate students conducted their master's theses research on the effectiveness of Head Start.¹⁸ Mrs. Stanley Goldstein examined personality test scores and Lauren Stapp studied reading and language achievement.¹⁹ Both students specifically studied "culturally deprived children" comparing a group that attended summer Head Start and a group that did not.²⁰ Both found that Head Start had a positive effect on children's educational outcomes.²¹ Diane Faulk conducted a third research study in 1968 about the effectiveness of the summer Head Start program in Tuscaloosa.²² She compared the reading and language development of second graders. Half of her participants attended the summer Head Start program in 1965, and half were eligible to attend but did not. Faulk found that the highest scores were achieved by Head Start children. Additionally, Head Start children were more likely to perform

17. *Ibid.*, 93.

18. U. of A. News Bureau, June 7, 1967, record group 018, box 008, location 084-062, WSHSC.

19. *Ibid.* There was no mention in the press release of Mrs. Goldstein's first name.

20. *Ibid.*

21. *Ibid.*

22. U. of A. News Bureau, August 19, 1968, record group 018, box 008, location 084-062, WSHSC.

at grade level in reading and language.²³ The University issued press releases for all of these studies touting the effectiveness of the Head Start program.²⁴

Additionally, the Department of Child Development and Family Life recognized that Head Start could lead to the expansion of their department as new early childhood education jobs were created. The University called for more research to “determine future services and courses of study that the University of Alabama might offer for the advancement of early childhood education.”²⁵ The rapid growth of Head Start led to an increased demand for trained personnel especially as the program began to expand to yearlong programs that could no longer utilize public school teachers on summer break. Early childhood education was becoming a more viable career path. Consequently, The University of Alabama had the potential to “attract additional students” to campus through the expansion of its early childhood education program.²⁶

Additional Training and Professional Development

Through the University’s evaluation of the Head Start teacher-training program, it was clear that more professional development would be needed for teachers who completed the weeklong trainings at the beginning of the summer. The Department of Child Development and Family life proposed that the University should provide “assistance, reinforcement, and support to the staff” in Head Start centers through consultations and in-service professional development opportunities.²⁷ Department officials requested additional staff and resources to provide continued support for Project Head Start. Once the Head Start centers were open and operational,

23. Ibid.

24. U. of A. News Bureau, June 7, 1967; U. of A. News Bureau, August 19, 1968.

25. U. of A. News Bureau, June 7, 1967.

26. Ibid.

27. Report, “Values of a Follow-Up Program for Project Head Start,” July 2, 1965.

the University sent staff to visit Head Start centers across the state of Alabama to provide additional on-site training and resources.²⁸ The OEO did not require or even request these visits, but the Child Development and Family Life faculty were passionate about Project Head Start and knew that well-trained teachers would be key to its success.²⁹ Knowing the summer training was too short, they sought to supplement the provided training with on-site workshops and consultations that allowed Head Start teachers to receive additional training and resources without ever leaving their community.

Lucy Deason was involved in the initial 1965 summer training program but continued her involvement as a Head Start trainer for many years. She recalled that she and other faculty and staff would not only conduct trainings on the University campus but also traveled extensively.³⁰ Lucy Deason recollected travelling to Head Start sites in both Alabama as well as neighboring states. She explained “we would fly to Atlanta and then generally we went to Florida, Georgia, or South Carolina. Part of this was because the University knew different people in SAEYC (Southern Association for the Education of Young Children).”³¹ Deason remembered conducting repeated large-scale trainings as Head Start grew. She expressed a belief that there were likely others in these states with the skills and abilities to conduct these trainings but “sometimes you may look more official if you come from away instead if you were the local folks.”³² Mrs. Deason also recognized that there was a consistent need for a large number of personnel to

28. U. of A. News Bureau, February 24, 1966, record group 018, box 008, location 084-062, WSHSC.

29. Report, “Values of a Follow-Up Program for Project Head Start,” July 2, 1965.

30. Interview with Deason.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid.

facilitate the various sessions, so other states may have just needed supplemental staff to assist them in meeting the demands in their states.

The summer of 1965 was only the beginning of staff training and professional development opportunities provided to Head Start teachers by The University of Alabama. In 1966, the University offered training programs to fill the gaps in the previous training and provide Head Start teachers and administrators with a more comprehensive understanding of early childhood education. The 1966 summer Head Start program grew nationally by 13,000 children requiring even more trained teachers than the prior year.³³ By this time, a base of trained teachers could be called upon for the second summer of Head Start, so the total number of teachers requiring training was not nearly as dramatic as the first summer.

Beginning in February 1966, The University of Alabama hosted three eight-week training sessions.³⁴ These sessions were much smaller than the previous summer with approximately 50 participants from across the Southeast in each session.³⁵ All of the training occurred at the Tuscaloosa campus with Dr. Joseph Rowland, Department Head for Child Development and Family Life serving as the program director.³⁶ During each session, "Headstart teachers [underwent] daily classwork, observation, discussions and practice work to equip them to provide pre-school training in health services, social services and basic educational skills for children of low-income families."³⁷ Trainees typically spent 20 hours per week in class as well as five hours per week observing either at the Child Development Center on campus or at a local

33. Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 94.

34. 1965-1966 Report of the president of the UA to the Board of Trustees. May 1966, record group 006, box 001, location 103-059, WSHSC, 45.

35. U. of A. News Bureau, February 1, 1966, record group 018, box 020, location 084-066, WSHSC.

36. *Ibid.*

37. U. of A. News Bureau, February 24, 1966, record group 018, box 020, location 084-066, WSHSC.

preschool.³⁸ A University of Alabama press release explained, "their experience is being broadened in current sessions by observation and participation in the University's Child Development Center laboratories. They are working with pre-school children ages two and one-half to six years."³⁹ The remainder of the time was spent in discussion groups or on field trips to children's programs across the state in order to observe high functioning early childhood education centers.⁴⁰ After the rushed one-week programs from the previous summer, the University had the opportunity to provide more in-depth training and coursework for future Head Start teachers. These upgrades were intended to ensure that Head Start centers would offer a more consistent, experience-based curriculum to preschoolers rather than an early first grade education.

The training program was federally financed and participants received stipends of \$75 per week that would also be used to cover room and board during their two months stay.⁴¹ Information about the participants of these expanded trainings is limited. During the March session, reports indicate that attendees were from Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee.⁴² Participants included a combination of teachers "on a leave of absence from their teaching positions; some are unemployed presently but will begin work with Head Start programs in their communities, and others include directors or staff members of Head Start programs in their communities."⁴³ Public school teachers were still involved in Head Start but staffing was starting

38. Dick Looser, "'Head Start'—A Chance at the Future," *Tuscaloosa News*, March 2, 1966.

39. U. of A. News Bureau, February 24, 1966, record group 018, box 020, location 084-066, WSHSC.

40. Dick Looser, March 2, 1966; "Special Student to Work with Preschool Children," *Anniston Star*, April 7, 1967.

41. *Ibid.*

42. *Ibid.*

43. *Ibid.*

to expand beyond this population, especially for year-round programs.⁴⁴ In attendance at the March 1966 session was Ray Fernandez, Head Start center director from Pass Christian, Mississippi.⁴⁵ Fernandez had attended the 1965 summer training but came back for further training along with eleven of his staff members. Fernandez reflected on the importance of Head Start stating, “you can see benefits daily as children go along with the training. In some of the children, we found teeth so bad they couldn’t eat. We found children with eye problems...children with no shoes.”⁴⁶ One teacher he brought with him was Murray Creshon who was attending because she had experience teaching older children but had never worked with preschool aged children. She hoped that the training would equip her to effectively teach small children living in poverty.⁴⁷

In May 1966, The University of Alabama received a Head Start training grant of \$64,633 from the OEO to “conduct a special training program for Head Start teachers.”⁴⁸ The training would include ten instructors and another fifty trainees that were Head Start teachers in either Alabama or Mississippi. The smaller training programs continued through that year and allowed Head Start teachers to receive more individualized attention. The University chose to use longer training sessions in 1966 instead of the rushed, one-week structure from the previous summer. The grant funding they received in 1966 allowed them to invest more heavily in the longer trainings and address deficiencies identified through the evaluation of the first trainings.

44. Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 99.

45. Dick Looser, March 2, 1966.

46. *Ibid.*

47. *Ibid.*

48. Memo, May 4, 1966, Lister Hill Papers, OEO files, box 670-378, location 068-068, WSHSC.

In 1967, the University once again offered three one-week training sessions to prepare for summer Head Start.⁴⁹ It is unclear why the University shifted away from the longer, eight-week trainings and back to the six-day sessions. Summer Head Start enrollment was down significantly from 1966 with only 466,000 children signed up for Head Start compared to 573,000 the previous year.⁵⁰ This drop in participation likely decreased the need for as many new teachers to be trained. Subsequently, the number of teacher trainees decreased significantly in size from the first summer training in 1965. Approximately 175 teachers attended each training session, primarily from Alabama and Mississippi.⁵¹ Dr. Rowland was once again the director of the program, and he continued to advocate for the Head Start program as a way to give poor “children the experiences they need to close the gap between themselves and their middle-class classmates.”⁵² As with the 1965 training, the University faculty and staff knew that a one-week training was not sufficient. This time, the faculty planned the follow-up trainings from the outset of the summer. After the trainings had concluded, while the Head Start centers were in operation, The University of Alabama “faculty members [went] to the different communities...for two 4 hour ‘in-service’ training programs with the personnel to help iron out any problems they are having.”⁵³

Nationally, the emphasis on training Head Start teachers continued into 1968. When Head Start was created, “In theory, the programs relied on high-quality teachers and small class sizes (one professional teacher for every fifteen children). In practice, of course, it was difficult

49. U. of A. News Bureau, June 3, 1967, record group 018, box 008, location 084-062, WSHSC.

50. Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 94.

51. U. of A. News Bureau, June 3, 1967.

52. U. of A. News Bureau, June 9, 1967, record group 018, box 020, location 084-066, WSHSC.

53. U. of A. News Bureau, June 12, 1967, record group 018, box 020, location 084-066, WSHSC.

to find enough well-trained educators.”⁵⁴ From the beginning, staffing Head Start centers adequately across the country was a concern. As Head Start expanded to offer year-round programs, staffing problems were amplified. The growth of Head Start from a summer program to a year-round program was gradual. By 1968, though, there were 218,000 children enrolled in year-round Head Start across the country.⁵⁵ In 1968, Head Start had “approximately thirty thousand paraprofessionals and thirty-nine thousand volunteers staffed year-round projects; an additional fifty thousand paraprofessionals and almost twice as many volunteers participated in the summer program.”⁵⁶ Training staff of this size was a significant undertaking. Despite lofty goals to adequately train all staff, less than a quarter of paraprofessional staff received any university-sponsored training.⁵⁷

Once again, the OEO looked to colleges and universities to help train staff. In August 1968, The University of Alabama received a \$66,000 Career Development grant from the federal government to fund the training of full-time Head Start teachers.⁵⁸ The grant included training for both professional and non-professional staff. Dr. Jacqueline Davis, associate professor of child development in the School of Home Economics, was selected to direct the program. Davis explained, “the career development of Head Start personnel is part of the general nationwide effort to train people for jobs that need to be filled and to upgrade the quality of performance of those already in working positions.”⁵⁹ The continued expansion of Head Start into year-round

54. Vinovskis, *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*, 95.

55. *Ibid.*

56. *Ibid.*

57. *Ibid.*

58. U. of A. News Bureau, August 5, 1968, record group 018, box 020, location 084-066, WSHSC.

59. *Ibid.*

programs had resulted in a demand for more trained early childhood educators. The days of utilizing elementary and secondary teachers on summer vacation to teach Head Start were gone. The grant outlined that two-thirds of participants trained at The University of Alabama be non-professional staff, such as teachers' aides, and the other third could be professional staff. Participating staff would be provided "academic training up to 60 semester hours of college level work."⁶⁰ The grant paid full tuition and fees for nonprofessional staff and half of the expenses for professional staff. Because of high demand in both Huntsville and Mobile, the first programs were offered at University of Alabama, Huntsville and Spring Hill College. The University of Alabama designated Spring Hill College as a sub-grantee and their faculty would teach the core course but "a member of the Capstone child development staff will go to Spring Hill to teach the early child development courses."⁶¹ The University of Alabama was the sole grantee in the state.⁶² Other southeastern institutions that received funding included University of Miami, University of Southwestern Louisiana, and Texas Woman's University.⁶³

The Expansion of the Child Development Center

A key component to the training that began in 1966 was the use of the campus Child Development Center. In 1966, an expansion to the Center allowed the addition of a five-year-old classroom laboratory.⁶⁴ Previously, the Center only served children four years or younger. The expansion was federally funded to specifically provide training for Head Start teachers.⁶⁵ The

60. Ibid.

61. U. of A. News Bureau, August 5, 1968.

62. Ibid.

63. Ibid.

64. U. of A. News Bureau, February 24, 1966, record group 018, box 020, location 084-066, WSHSC.

65. Carroll Tingle (Chair and Assistant Professor for Human Development and Family Studies at The University of Alabama interview by author, Tuscaloosa, AL, January 2018. Elizabeth Kent (Teacher, Child Development Center at The University of Alabama), interview by author, Tuscaloosa, AL, September 2017. Both

Child Development Center had two buildings, an infant laboratory, and a preschool center. Each featured "children's areas for creative expression, rest and dining, and well-equipped play yards."⁶⁶ The new five-year-old laboratory allowed Head Start teachers to unobtrusively observe a well-resourced and research-based preschool classroom through two-way mirrors in the classroom.

Elizabeth Kent was a teacher in the five-year-old classroom when it opened. She explained "every hour except from 11 to 12 on Friday I had 20 people watching every move I made. It was a little intimidating...I even changed wardrobes."⁶⁷ In February 1966, the First Lady came to The University of Alabama to speak at a women's leadership conference. While on campus, Mrs. Johnson toured the campus and specifically sought out the opportunity to visit the Child Development Center because of its connection to Head Start teacher training.⁶⁸ While at the Center, she had the opportunity to see the five-year-old classroom and witness firsthand "Head Start teachers...getting on-the-job training, so to speak, as well as regular students at the University, who are preparing to become teachers."⁶⁹ Both Mrs. Kent and Mrs. Johnson made a distinction between the "regular" students and the Head Start teachers. Mrs. Kent explained that

Tingle and Kent stated that the addition was specifically built for Head Start Teacher training. Tingle also stated that the expansion was federally funded for this reason. There is no confirmation in the archival records but in a history of the Department of Human Development and Family Studies provided to the author by the Child Development Center, it is stated that the First Lady came to visit the "federally funded south wing" where the "model Head Start teacher-training facility" was housed.

66. U. of A. News Bureau, February 24, 1966.

67. Interview with Kent. Mrs. Kent also pointed out that women could not wear pants at that time making the decisions about wardrobe and modesty more complicated.

68. Dick Looser, "Visiting First Lady Given Warm Welcome to City, UA," *Tuscaloosa News*, February 22, 1966. McLendon, Winzola, "Mrs. LBJ Talks Tolerance," *The Washington Post*, Feb. 26, 1966. In McLendon's article, she states that the visit to the Child Development Center was not on the First Lady's schedule but she specifically requested to see it.

69. Transcript of Lady Bird Johnson's audio diary for February 25, 1966, LBJ Library, 4. According to the *Tuscaloosa News* coverage, Dick Looser mentioned that the First Lady took time to speak "briefly to a group of Head start trainees who were seated in an adjoining observation room."

her “regular” students “interacted with the children and that was part of their grade” and the Head Start teachers “did not interact with the children, they just observed what we were doing.”⁷⁰

Mrs. Kent reported that involvement with the Head Start program prompted the Child Development Center at The University of Alabama to desegregate; consequently, her classroom had the first three black children at the center.⁷¹ The Head Start teachers who were observing at the Child Development Center were primarily black.⁷² At the time, Head Start was serving predominantly black children across Alabama. The faculty and staff working with the Head Start training program recognized that it was problematic that the model facility being used for teacher observations served only white children.⁷³ The decision was made to allow the first black children to enroll at the Child Development Center. One of the black children was the son of Mrs. Harris, a teacher’s aide who worked with Elsie Gribbin at Canterbury Episcopal Church.⁷⁴ The second black student was the child of a faculty member in the department of music at Stillman College. Mrs. Kent could not recall the family details about the third student, a little black girl who did not attend class on a regular basis. Mrs. Kent recalled wondering if “someone

70. Interview with Kent.

71. Interview with Kent.

72. Elizabeth Kent estimated that 90% of the Head Start teachers who were observing her classroom were black. Interview with Kent. Also, Carroll Tingle mentioned in her interview that she recalled seeing a photograph from when Lady Bird Johnson visited the Child Development Center. The addition was so new that the mirrored glass had not yet been installed. She commented on the rows of black faces looking into the classroom where Mrs. Johnson was visiting.

73. Interview with Kent.

74. Interview with Kent. Elsie Gribbin was involved in the Head Start teacher-training program in 1965 as a discussion group leader and symposium panel member. Elsie’s husband, Reverend Emmet Gribbin, was present during the violence surrounding Autherine Lucy’s enrollment on campus and was remembered as someone who was trying to deescalate the situation and prevent anyone from being injured. For more about Reverend Gribbin, see Clark, *The Schoolhouse Door*, 76-78.

had talked them into” sending her to the Child Development Center even though the family might not have been comfortable with the idea of her being there.⁷⁵

Kent recalled “the kids all got along. There were no problems with the children. They didn’t know there was any difference.”⁷⁶ Some of the parents were far less accepting of the new students. The Child Development Center accepted children in an even ratio from faculty, students, and the community. Kent expressed surprise that the college students with children enrolled at the center had the most issues with the desegregation. They were angry and wrote letters to the school, but none of them pulled their children out of the program.⁷⁷ Mrs. Kent remembered that part of their concern was that they had not been notified in advance that there would be black children in attendance. Elizabeth Kent was questioned by several of the college students about why she did not tell them and she responded that she “never let everybody know who was going to be there before,” so why would this be any different?

Besides the objections of some of the parents who were college students, the program itself ran smoothly. After the initial surprise faded, the remainder of the year was uneventful in the classroom. Outside the classroom, Mrs. Kent had a cross burned in her yard the year that she taught the desegregated class. Her youngest son went outside in the morning before school and saw the cross which “was about 3-4 feet high and it was painted white....It had burned its way down and a little bit of grass was burned, not much. Without any pomp and circumstance at all I just said we’ll go put this in the trash can.”⁷⁸ While she had no proof for why the cross was

75. Interview with Kent.

76. Ibid.

77. Interview with Kent. There are no archival records regarding the desegregation of the Child Development Center.

78. Ibid.

burned, she was convinced that it was the result of her involvement in the newly desegregated Child Development Center.

The Child Development Associate Credential

In July 1968, Dr. Jacqueline Davis commented that the “increase in the popularity of nursery school, day care, and kindergarten work...has brought about this movement to extend the educational ladder down to the three and four-year-old stage.”⁷⁹ Additionally, more programs were being developed to address the needs of “the disadvantaged, the physically and mentally handicapped children. This has brought about a trend to focus on the child from all areas to attend to his total needs.”⁸⁰ These efforts resulted in an increase in funding for early childhood education. Furthermore, programs like Head Start generated “an increase in the demands for trained people to carry out preschool programs.”⁸¹ Davis expressed concerns about the training and credentialing of preschool and Head Start staff. She argued for a certification process similar to that which existed for nurses or nurses’ aides.⁸²

Davis was not the only one with these concerns. Edward Zigler, federal official in charge of Head Start beginning in 1970, recalled talking with Jenni Klein, Head Start’s national education director, about ways to improve the quality of the Head Start teachers.⁸³ They decided that to have better teachers, they would need a comprehensive training program that would also allow trainees to observe and demonstrate key competencies.⁸⁴ From these conversations, the

79. U. of A. News Bureau, July 24, 1968, record group 018, box 008, location 084-062, WSHSC.

80. Ibid.

81. Ibid.

82. U. of A. News Bureau, July 24, 1968.

83. Zigler & Styfco, *The Hidden History of Head Start*, 143.

84. Ibid., 143.

idea for the Child Development Associate (CDA) credential was born. The CDA credential allowed Head Start teachers to “acquire competence in understanding and meeting children’s developmental needs through training and practical experience. The idea of the program grew out of a pragmatic concern, Head Start needed highly qualified teachers but there was not enough money to hire them.”⁸⁵ While early childhood education bachelor’s degree programs were becoming more common and growing in number, it was not realistic for all Head Start teachers and staff to obtain four-year degrees. National Head Start planners recognized that while “Head Start did employ many college trained teachers, the majority of the staff were poor and had children to support so the traditional college training was not a realistic option.”⁸⁶

In 1972, the CDA credential was devised and funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF).⁸⁷ The credential was “first administered and the credential awarded by a consortium of 10 leading national organizations that formed field evaluation teams to assess each candidate’s competency.”⁸⁸ The federal government worked with organizations such as the National Association for the Education of Young Children to create a system that would ensure Head Start teachers were adequately trained and qualified.⁸⁹ In 1975, several years after its inception, the first CDA was awarded.⁹⁰ The CDA was “largely based on individual competency, although

85. Ibid., 142.

86. Ibid., 142.

87. “History of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential,” from the Council for Professional Recognition, accessed from <http://www.cdacouncil.org/about/cda-credential/history> on March 2, 2018.

88. Zigler & Styfco, *The Hidden History of Head Start*, 144.

89. Greenburg, *The Devil Has Slippery Shoes*, 765.

90. “History of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential,” from the Council for Professional Recognition.

CDA candidates were expected to have taken some courses somewhere in subjects such as child development, [and] curriculum planning for early childhood education.”⁹¹ Initially awarded by a consortium, the credentialing program moved to Bank Street College from 1979 until 1985. In 1985, ACYF entered into a partnership with the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) to create the Council for Professional Recognition, which continues to administer the credentialing process through the present day.⁹² To date, over 420,000 CDA credentials have been issued to early childhood educators across the United States.⁹³

The University of Alabama participated in CDA credentialing by allowing Head Start teachers to take their coursework at the University. Head Start teachers would take courses about infant development, working with preschool children, and developing a portfolio.⁹⁴ Students living within a 50-mile radius would attend courses on campus. The University of Alabama faculty and staff also conducted site visits to provide additional training and to reach teachers who may have been beyond a reasonable commuting radius.⁹⁵ The final step in the credentialing process was direct observation of the teachers in their classrooms. A national representative

91. Greenburg, *The Devil Has Slippery Shoes*, 765.

92. “History of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential,” from the Council for Professional Recognition.

93. “About the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential,” from the Council for Professional Recognition, accessed from <http://www.cdacouncil.org/about/cda-credential/cda-credential> on March 2, 2018. For more about the history of the CDA and how it fits into the larger picture of early childhood education, see Betty Hutchison, “The Child Development Associate: Prototype for Early Childhood Educators,” *Educational Horizon* 70, no. 1 (1991): 41-48; Jean I. Layzer, Barbara D. Goodson, and Marc Moss, *Life in Preschool—Volume One of an Observational Study of Early Childhood Programs for Disadvantaged Four-Year-Olds* (Cambridge, MA: ABT Associates, 1993), 6-8; Sue Bredekamp, “25 Years of Educating Young Children: The High/Scope Approach to Preschool Education,” *Young Children* 51, no. 4 (1996): 57-61; Blythe Hinitz, “Credentialing Early Childhood Paraprofessionals in the United States: the Child Development Associate and other Frameworks,” *International Journal of Early Years Education* 6, no. 1 (1998): 87-104; Bowman, et al., *Eager to Learn: Educating our Preschoolers*, 261-305.

94. Interview with Tingle.

95. *Ibid.*

would visit the Head Start centers to observe the teachers and evaluate their effectiveness.⁹⁶ The CDA credential became “recognized as an indicator of teaching competency in 49 states and the District of Columbia.”⁹⁷

Dr. Carroll Tingle started working with Head Start teachers through several programs at The University of Alabama in 1974 beginning with the Head Start supplementary trainings. Eventually, she was charged with implementing the CDA credentialing process at the University. Because it was a competency-based credential, it showed that a teacher had “demonstrated [their] ability to teach young children in a group environment to a national team who is going to come and assess” each teacher’s skills.⁹⁸ The University remained involved in the program for a number of years. It had “a contract with each of those Head Start programs in the state to train so many teachers.”⁹⁹ In 1977, Iola Giles was the first Head Start teacher in Tuscaloosa to earn her CDA credential through The University of Alabama.¹⁰⁰ She expressed that she was proud to be the first since she was “the oldest worker in the Head Start program, and...that made [her] feel good too, since there were several younger people working toward” the credential as well.¹⁰¹ She took her courses in human development and child development through the University and then a team of four consultants evaluated a portfolio and observed her in the classroom to ensure that

96. Ibid.

97. Zigler & Styfco, *The Hidden History of Head Start*, 334.

98. Interview with Tingle.

99. Ibid.

100. Sally Tucker, “Iola Giles Works to Give Children a Better Background,” *Tuscaloosa News*, February 10, 1977.

101. Ibid.

she was capable of developing young children’s intellectual and physical abilities in a positive learning environment.¹⁰²

By 1992, The University of Alabama had “facilitated the credentialing of more than 770 childcare workers in 21 Alabama counties.”¹⁰³ Geraldine Walker, Head Start program director for Community Service Programs of West Alabama, began her career as a teaching assistant with Head Start. She received her CDA through The University of Alabama in 1980 which she said led to her career advancement by giving her “the leadership skills and enhanced [her] ability to work with people.”¹⁰⁴ Eddie Mae Brown, Head Start Parent Involvement Coordinator in Eutaw, Alabama, also received her CDA with the help of The University of Alabama. She started with Head Start as a volunteer and decided to pursue her credential at the University in 1976. Through her coursework, Brown noted that her skills and confidence had dramatically increased.¹⁰⁵

In 1990, the Head Start Expansion and Improvement Act required that by 1994, all Head Start classrooms have at least one teacher with a CDA credential.¹⁰⁶ Zigler critiqued this requirement, asserting that the CDA was a step on a “career ladder” not the “ultimate goal” for teacher training.¹⁰⁷ However, the requirement offered some level of standardization in the Head Start teacher training requirements. By 2007, over 70 percent of Head Start teachers had obtained an associate’s degree in early childhood education or a similar field. In 2008, Head Start began

102. Ibid.

103. “UA Offers Training for Child Care Professionals,” *Tuscaloosa News*, April 27, 1992.

104. Ibid.

105. Ibid.

106. Zigler & Styfco, *The Hidden History of Head Start*, 144.

107. Ibid.

offering educational grants to support Head Start teachers getting their bachelor's degrees.¹⁰⁸ By 2013, 66 percent of all Head Start teachers have at least a bachelor's in early childhood education or a similar degree.¹⁰⁹ Eventually, it became apparent to the University that the CDA credentialing process would be a better fit for the community college system and the program left The University of Alabama.¹¹⁰ Head Start teachers can still apply the coursework and credits they complete at The University of Alabama when they apply to the national credentialing office. However, the University no longer conducts site visits or holds contracts with Head Start to train their teachers.

The University of Alabama continues to offer coursework to Head Start teachers through the College of Human Environmental Sciences. The College currently offers a Bachelor's degree in Human Environmental Sciences, Human Development & Family Studies (Child Development Practitioner) that can be earned online. The program description states the "program is solely for those who work in Head Start agencies."¹¹¹ A unique feature of this specific online degree program is that it allows Head Start teachers or teacher aides to apply to have their prior work experience within Head Start applied as credit hours toward their degree. A scholarship is also offered through the College of Continuing Studies to cover the cost of one, three-hour course in

108. Office of the Administration for Children and Families Early Childhood Learning & Knowledge Center (ECLKC). Head Start Timeline. Accessed from <http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/hs/50th-anniversary/docs/hs-50th-timeline.pdf> on March 1, 2016.

109. Ibid.

110. Interview with Tingle.

111. "Overview - BS in Human Environmental Sciences Human Development and Family Studies (Child Development Practitioner)," The University of Alabama website, <http://bamabydistance.ua.edu/degrees/bs-in-hes-human-development-family-studies-major-with-a-concentration-in-child-development-practitioner-blended/index.php>

Early Childhood Education specifically for those working in Head Start facilities.¹¹² These programs are indicative of the residual partnerships between The University of Alabama and Project Head Start that began with the original Head Start training in the summer of 1965.

112. "College of Continuing Studies Application for Departmental Grant Early Childhood Education-Online," The University of Alabama website, <http://bamabydistance.ua.edu/docs/financial-aid-scholarships/early-childhood-education-grant-application-online-form.pdf>

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The partnership between The University of Alabama and Project Head Start is a small piece of the larger desegregation story of the University. The 1965 teacher-training program brought a large scale, desegregated training conference to the campus at a time when widespread desegregation had not yet occurred. While just a summer program, these training sessions offered hope for desegregation and interracial partnerships at a time when there were still widespread racial tensions in the South and particularly Alabama. The summer program also led to a long-standing partnership with Head Start that provided the Department of Family Studies and Child Life an opportunity to grow its programs and expand its outreach to the Alabama community. This partnership also ultimately led to the desegregation of the Child Development Center in 1966, which was yet another small piece of the University's larger desegregation story. The conclusion of this dissertation will provide a brief overview of the desegregation story at The University of Alabama as well as briefly discuss some current perspectives about Project Head Start before ending with final conclusions and recommendations for future research.

The University of Alabama Desegregation Story

Integration and desegregation are complex and contradictory processes. There is no way to determine how this story shaped future desegregation efforts at The University of Alabama. The Head Start teacher training was one small piece of the larger desegregation story of the whole campus. While it was an overall positive story in regards to race relations, the University would continue to grapple with the complicated process of desegregation for many years.

The desegregation story of The University of Alabama began in 1956 with Autherine Lucy's brief enrollment on campus. It would continue in 1963 with the successful enrollment of two black students. It would take time for black students to begin to participate more fully in campus life; however, the first phase of desegregation was increasing admission of black students to the University. At the time of the Head Start training, the University anticipated 50 black students would enroll in the fall semester across all three campuses. By 1966, 57 black students were on the Tuscaloosa campus of the University which represented only 0.6% of the campus student body.¹ By 1968, 117 black students were enrolled at the Tuscaloosa campus and 331 black students were enrolled across the three University of Alabama campuses.²

As black enrollment slowly increased, the social integration of black students into campus life also incrementally increased. The latter half of the 1960s saw increased involvement of black students in campus activities. The Afro-American Association was established on campus and became a voice for black students on campus. In 1968, Edward Nall, president of the Afro-American Student Association, became the first black member of the Student Government Association (SGA).³ In 1968, a black coach and a part-time athletics recruiter were hired in an effort to improve the recruitment of black athletes.⁴ Wendell Hudson joined the basketball team as the first black athlete on scholarship in 1969, and Wilbur Jackson played football under the legendary Bear Bryant beginning in 1971.⁵

1. Donal E. Muir and C. Donald MacGlamery, "Trends in Integration Attitudes on a Deep-South Campus During the First Two Decades of Desegregation," *Social Forces* 62, no. 4 (1984): 963-973.

2. Bailey Thomson, "UA Negroes Seek Education, Not Mixing Races," *Crimson White*, February 22, 1968.

3. Richard Miles, "House Seats Reps, Includes 1st Negro," *The Crimson-White*, March 9, 1967.

4. Ibid.

5. For more about the desegregation of The University of Alabama football team, see Don Yaeger, Sam Cunningham, and John Papadakis, *Turning of the Tide: How One Game Changed the South* (New York: Center Street Press, 2006).

The black student population was 1.8 percent in 1969 and over 10 percent by the end of the 1970s making it a decade marked by growth and changes.⁶ A series of firsts occurred throughout the 1970s. The first celebration of Black History occurred on campus in 1970.⁷ On November 17, 1973, Governor George Wallace crowned Terry Points, a black student, homecoming queen.⁸ The irony of Governor Wallace participating in the ceremony was not lost on many. The headline in the *Atlanta Daily World* summed it up nicely—“Queen’s Crowning Shatters ‘Segregation For Ever’ Vow.” Indeed, a great deal had changed since Wallace stood in the schoolhouse door ten years earlier. Wallace did choose to “forego the usual kiss for a handshake.”⁹ The *Crimson White* did not cover the historic event immediately after but the editorial staff offered “belated congratulations” a few weeks later, on December 3, 1973.¹⁰ The brief paragraph was less optimistic than other press coverage, criticizing the racial history of the University and suggesting “the situation has not changed so greatly.”¹¹ The article does concede that the crowning of Ms. Points may have indicated that “perhaps the light at the end of the proverbial tunnel is indeed in sight.”¹² The following year, in 1974, another first would occur

6. Muir & McGlamery, “Trends in Integration,” 971.

7. “Black History Day Slated,” *Crimson White*, February 9, 1970.

8. “Alabama U. Honors a Black,” *New York Times*, November 18, 1973; Judy Klemesrud, “From Homecoming Queen to New York Career Girl,” *New York Times*, May 31, 1974. Points was very positive about her experiences in the 1973 and 1974 interviews but in an interview conducted years later in 2001, Points recounted a few more negative incidents at the University including a white roommate moving out before Points could even finish unloading her personal belongings from her car. See Samory Pruitt, “A Reflection of Student Desegregation at The University of Alabama as Seen through the Eyes of Some Pioneering African American Students: 1956-1976.” PhD diss., University of Alabama, 2003, 103. Since Points, there have been five other African American homecoming queens.

9. James Evans, “Queen’s Crowning Shatters ‘Segregation For Ever’ vow,” *Atlanta Daily World*, November 23, 1973.

10. “Acceptance May be Just Ahead,” *Crimson White*, December 3, 1973.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.

when Brenda McCampbell Lyons became the first black cheerleader.¹³ Two years later, in 1976, Cleophus Thomas was elected to be the first black SGA president.¹⁴ This was a major first for the campus as the SGA had always enjoyed a great deal of power and prestige on campus.

As striking as these advances on campus may seem, racial incidents were still not uncommon. After the election of Thomas, multiple crosses were burned and students in white sheets marched down fraternity row.¹⁵ In many ways, Thomas's presidency marked a decline in race relations on campus. The 1980s were rife with racial conflict and incidents including the burning of a cross on the lawn of Alpha Kappa Alpha, a traditionally black sorority that had moved to a house on the white sorority row.¹⁶ However, through these times of racial conflict on campus, enrollment numbers remained steady from the late 1970s through the present, with black students consistently comprising between 10 percent and 12 percent of the student body.¹⁷

The racial composition of the University has continued to be a point of contention even into the present. The racial makeup of both the student body and faculty has been challenged both in court and by student protestors.¹⁸ Race relations have continued to be complicated and

13. Pruitt, "A Reflection of Student Desegregation at the University of Alabama," 88; Stephen Dethrage, "University's first black SGA president, trustee says diversity on campus still lacking," *Dateline Alabama*, March 7, 2013.

14. Glen Johnson, "Cleo Thomas Wins by a Wide Margin," *Crimson White*, February 10, 1976; "U. of Ala. Elects first Black Prexy of Student Body," *Atlanta Daily World*, February 13, 1976. The next black SGA president would not be elected until 2013. Cleo Thomas would go on to be the first black Board of Trustee member for The University of Alabama in 1983.

15. Chuck Whiting, "Crosses Burned After Election," *Crimson White*, February 10, 1976.

16. Steve Curwood, "Reports Point to Racism Across the Nation," *Daily News of Los Angeles*, December 25, 1986, News Section.

17. For more information about the racial demographics of The University of Alabama, see the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, <http://oira.ua.edu/factbook/reports/student-enrollment/fall-term/students-by-race-and-ethnicity>

18. In 1981, a lawsuit, *Knight v. Alabama*, was filed contesting the continued effects that segregation had on higher education in Alabama. The case would span almost 30 years and included million-dollar awards to Alabama State University and Alabama A&M enabling those institutions to expand programs and improve physical facilities. The *Knight* case also caused The University of Alabama and other PWIs to revisit their recruitment and admissions processes and scrutinize the numbers of black students enrolled in and graduating from the campus.

sometimes tense. Questions about the complete integration of black students into campus life are continuously raised. For example, in 2013, fifty years after the stand at the schoolhouse door, The University of Alabama was once again in the national press regarding race and desegregation. This time, the segregation in the Greek system, specifically sororities, was at the forefront of the discussion.¹⁹ Unfortunately, the University has also been plagued with incidents involving racist social media videos and graffiti illustrating that progress is still lacking regarding racial attitudes on campus.²⁰ From the failed first attempt to desegregate The University of Alabama to the present day racial incidents on campus, the University has a long and complicated racial history. This brief overview of the University's desegregation story and continued racial incidents underscores the significance of the university's willingness to host the initial 1965 training that brought so many black teachers to campus.

Present Day Perspectives on Project Head Start

Knight v. Alabama (787F), "Supp. 1030, 1048," *Northern District Alabama* 1981 and *Knight v. Alabama* (900F), "Supp. 272, 280," *Northern District Alabama* 1995. In 2015, students protested on campus and called for increased diversity on campus as well as for an increase in resources for underrepresented groups. Nick Privitera, "We Are Done Hosts Demonstration to Promote Change on Campus," *Crimson White*, November 19, 2015; Elizabeth Elkin, "Updated: We are Done Demands Equality on Campus," *Crimson White*, November 18, 2015.

19. After a sorority member went public with allegations that the recruitment process was racist due to advisors and alumnae unduly influencing the process, sorority recruitment was re-opened and 11 black students were issued bids to previously all white sororities. The story broke in the *Crimson White* and was then picked up by several national news outlets. For the original *Crimson White* article, see Abbey Crain and Matt Ford, "The Final Barrier: 50 Years Later, Segregation Still Exists," *Crimson White*, September 11, 2013. For national news coverage, see Campbell Robertson and Alan Blinder, "Sorority Exposes its Rejection of Black Candidate," *New York Times*, September 12, 2013; Kathy Lohr, "University of Alabama Moves to Integrate Greek System," *NPR*, September 18, 2013; Victor Luckerson, "University of Alabama Moves to End Segregated Sorority System," *Time*, September 16, 2013. In 2014, more black women were offered bids through the usual recruitment process. See Andy McWhorter, "Over 2,000 Women Receive Bids at Fall 2014 Bid Day," *Crimson White*, August 26, 2014.

20. Jake Howell, "UA Student Investigated for Racist Messages," *Crimson White*, March 19, 2017; Rebecca Rakowitz, "University Condemns Racist Graffiti Found in Residence Hall," *Crimson White*, October 24, 2017; Arielle Lipan, "UA President Denounces Another Racist Video," *Crimson White*, March 21, 2018.

Head Start now serves children ages three to five years old. The program is supplemented by Early Head Start which was first funded in 1995 and targets children ages three and under.²¹ In 2016, 1,608 Head Start programs enrolled 732,711 children, and 1,398 Early Head Start programs served 154,352 toddlers.²² Of the Head Start children served, 29 percent are black or African American, 28 percent white, 16 percent Latino or Hispanic, 10 percent multiracial, 5 percent part of an indigenous group, 2 percent Asian, and 11 percent unspecified or other.²³ The current annual funding for all Head Start programs and services is \$9.5 billion.²⁴ Nevertheless, Head Start continues to only reach a small fraction of the children eligible for services. Only 31 percent of eligible children were served by Head Start, and only 7 percent of eligible toddlers had access to Early Head Start.²⁵ Head Start currently employs 239,567 people through all of its programs across the United States.²⁶ Despite now requiring that lead teachers have a bachelor's degree, the average pay for Head Start teachers is only \$33,373, making it a less desirable career path for those with a college degree.²⁷ In fact, the average Head Start teacher makes approximately \$24,000 less per year than public elementary school teachers despite similar

21. "History of Head Start," Office of Head Start, An Office of the Administration for Children and Families, accessed on March 12, 2018 from <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ohs/about/history-of-head-start>

22. "Access to Head Start in the United States of America," National Head Start Association, accessed on March 12, 2018 from <https://www.nhsa.org/facts>.

23. "Head Start Program Facts," Head Start Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center. Accessed on March 12, 2018 from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/hs-program-fact-sheet-2016.pdf>

24. "Access to Head Start in the United States of America."

25. Ibid.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid. In Alabama, the average pay for a Head Start teacher with a bachelor's degree is only \$26,007.

educational backgrounds.²⁸ This underscores how persistently early childhood educators, especially within Head Start, have been undervalued and undercompensated.

It was not the purpose of this paper to conduct a complete history of the implementation of Head Start or to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. However, it is important to understand the larger context of Head Start and its enduring impact on early childhood education. In many ways, Head Start failed to live up to its own ideals in terms of both racial integration and academic gains. Head Start centers across the South failed to desegregate their inaugural programs, and segregation plagued some Head Start centers through the end of the 1960s. Additionally, while Head Start has been one of the most enduring War on Poverty programs, there continue to be debates regarding the effectiveness of the program.²⁹ Beginning with the Westinghouse Report, there have been continual claims that Head Start has not had a lasting impact on the children it served.³⁰ Yet, despite these claims, Head Start has both persisted and paved the way for increased early childhood education in the United States. It also created a number of new early childhood education jobs and increased demand for relevant training and degree programs.

The history of Head Start and the effectiveness of the program's implementation are particularly relevant today when public preschool programs are on the rise. Head Start laid the foundation for the expansion of kindergarten nationally and subsequently to the growth of public

28. Steven W. Barnett and Allison H. Friedman-Krauss, *State(s) of Head Start* (New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research, 2016), 6.

29. For more about the debates regarding the effectiveness of Head Start, see Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco, eds. *Head Start Debates*. (Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004).

30. Zigler has consistently argued that IQ gains were never the original goal of the program. He asserts that Head Start's goals have varied over time making it difficult to adequately gauge its effectiveness. Schrag, Styfco, and Zigler do a thorough job of outlining the recommendations from the original Cooke Report and comparing them to the stated and perceived goals of Head Start over the last 50 years. Rebecca Schrag, Sally Styfco, and Edward Zigler, "Familiar Concept, New Name: Social Competence/School Readiness as the Goal of Head Start," in *Head Start Debates*, Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco, eds. (Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004).

preschool.³¹ According to the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER), in 2016, preschool enrollment was at a record high with 1.5 million children enrolled, accounting for 32 percent of all 4-year-olds enrolled.³² This is double the number of children enrolled in public preschool just 15 years ago.³³ In some states, Head Start is part of the public preschool program, which has helped increase funding to those Head Start sites.³⁴ In 2014, the federal government began to offer federal preschool development grants for states to either start or grow their public preschool programs.³⁵ Eighteen states received a total of \$226 million of preschool grant money in the last three years.³⁶

Many of the conversations surrounding public preschool are very similar to historical discussions about Head Start. Concerns have focused on the quality of preschool offerings, especially between the different states. NIEER has established ten benchmarks to assist states that are launching or expanding their preschool offerings. In 2016, only six states met all ten of the benchmarks.³⁷ Seven states still do not currently offer any public preschool programs. Additionally, the amount of resources each state spends on preschool programs varies dramatically. Mississippi currently spends only \$1,787 per child enrolled in preschool while

31. Vinovskis, "Early Childhood Education: Then and Now," 151.

32. Steven W. Barnett, Allison H. Friedman-Krauss, G. G. Weisenfeld, Michelle Horowitz, Richard Kasmin, and James Squires, *The State of Preschool 2016: State Preschool Yearbook* (New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research, 2017), 8.

33. Ibid.

34. Barnett & Friedman-Krauss, *State(s) of Head Start*, 12.

35. "Preschool Development Grants," Early Childhood Development an Office of the Administration for Children and Families, accessed from <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ecd/early-learning/preschool-development-grants>

36. Ibid. In 2014, Alabama received one of the first grants for \$17.5 million.

37. Barnett, et al., *The State of Preschool 2016: State Preschool Yearbook*, 8. Alabama was one of the states that met all ten of the quality benchmarks in 2016.

states such as New Jersey spends \$12,424 per child.³⁸ Teacher-to-child ratios and teacher preparation are also topics of discussion within the universal preschool movement, just as they have been regarding Head Start. Finally, age appropriate preschool curriculum is still being debated today. Some early childhood educators express concerns about preschool programs moving into the public schools due to fears that they will be more academic than is developmentally appropriate for four-year-olds. NIEER emphasizes the importance of play within the preschool curriculum as well as language development, social development, and physical development.³⁹ These benchmarks remain consistent with the original aims of Head Start. A marked difference between Head Start and the new public preschool programs is that most public preschool programs require degreed and certified teachers with the same level of training and preparation as other public schoolteachers. Concerns about the training and education of preschool teachers will likely not be as central a focus as it was with Head Start. In time, we will know more about the effectiveness of the public preschool movement and its impact on Head Start.

Conclusions and Further Research

Autherine Lucy, Vivian Malone, and James Hood all opened the doors of The University of Alabama campus not only for future black college students but also for desegregated programs like the Head Start training. Most university desegregation narratives end with the enrollment of the first black students or possibly with the integration of the football team. Moments like the Head Start training are generally ignored in histories even though these moments in civil rights history were instrumental in advancing the teaching, service, and research missions at

38. Ibid., 26. Alabama spends \$4,290 per child, which is ranked 25th among all states and the District of Columbia.

39. Barnett, et al., *The State of Preschool 2016: State Preschool Yearbook*, 14.

universities. The Head Start training program also opened the doors of the campus Child Development Center to black children a few years before widespread desegregation occurred within Tuscaloosa schools.

In a letter regarding the 125th anniversary of the University, then president, Oliver Carmichael, wrote, "Teaching—Research—Service. These words define the mission of a great university."⁴⁰ He continued on to say "the execution of this mission by the University of Alabama is essential to the continued growth and development of our beloved state."⁴¹ The partnership between The University of Alabama and Project Head Start truly embodied this mission and did in fact contribute greatly to the state of Alabama. The University of Alabama provided a service to both the state of Alabama and neighboring states, especially Mississippi. Without the 1965 training program, it would have been almost impossible for Head Start to operate in Alabama or Mississippi. Within a very short time frame, the University provided over 1,700 Head Start staff with vital training and resources to launch a program that positively impacted children from the state and region. The service continued as the Child Development and Family Life staff visited Head Start centers around the state to provide additional training.

The University also recognized that Head Start provided ample research opportunities. Child Development graduate students visited Head Start centers and conducted research regarding the effectiveness of early childhood education interventions. Head Start centers provided rich research opportunities for the Department of Child Development and Family Life and a number of research studies and theses would utilize Head Start centers. The University

40. Letter from President Oliver Carmichael, University of Alabama to Friend, September 14, 1956. Hill Ferguson Papers, Box 106. Accessed from <http://acumen.lib.ua.edu/u0003/0000511/0000176/0001/?page=1&limit=40>

41. Ibid.

taught the first groups of teachers through trainings and workshops and would eventually enroll Head Start teachers in courses on campus as they sought their Child Development Associate (CDA) credentials. Head Start led to an increased demand for early childhood educators, and the University increased its offerings to educate this new cadre of preschool teachers. The Child Development Center expanded its offerings to five-year-old children and taught those children as well as Head Start teachers and The University of Alabama students who observed at the center. The University of Alabama Department of Child Development and Family Life had a strong regional and national reputation before it embarked on the partnership with Head Start. The department housed the first infant laboratory in the nation and was highly involved in the regional and national child development organizations. The partnership with Head Start only furthered the size and scope of the program as well as its positive regional and national reputation.

Hosting the desegregated Head Start training program was a sign of progress for The University of Alabama in regards to desegregation. Some southern institutions, including all of the colleges and universities in Mississippi, chose not to participate in the program. In many ways progress was behind the scenes, though, and not widely recognized on campus or in the community at the time. While both the *Crimson White* and the *Tuscaloosa News* ran stories about the program, both failed to mention the racial composition of the program. Administrators, such as Rose, were willing to move forward with plans to more fully desegregate campus but were not ready to make these steps public. In a letter dated February 4, 1965, Frank Rose wrote to his friend, David Nevin, about the desegregation progress across campus. He mentioned being approached about some national news stories, but registered wariness noting that it would “help

greatly nationally but could hurt us locally.”⁴² The conspicuous absence of the training program’s racial demographics from press releases and news coverage strongly suggest that administrators had similar feelings about the partnership with Head Start. President Rose may have been personally proud of the program, but he did not seek recognition for the program at the time because of potentially negative responses at the local level.

The initial program that brought both black and white teachers together on campus in 1965 is not only missing from historical news coverage but is also essentially missing from the literature about The University of Alabama. Earl Tilford mentions it in a single sentence in his book about the University in the 1960s. In Lawrence Faulkner’s dissertation about Frank Rose, he, too, mentions the program in a single sentence. The interactions that Frank Rose had with President and Mrs. Johnson were also not covered in the biography though Faulkner does cover Rose’s on-going efforts to secure more federal funding for the institution. There are several reasons that the program may not have received more than the single sentence mention within other scholarly work about The University of Alabama. The initial training was only a brief, summer program. Additionally, while it was significant that the University hosted a large-scale desegregated program on campus, attendees were not full-time, traditional students who were enrolling on campus. It was a sign of progress on campus with regards to desegregation but did not fundamentally alter the campus population. The subsequent desegregation of the Child Development Center was a more permanent change on campus, but this has actually received even less coverage within the literature.

The Head Start teacher training program is not only missing from The University of Alabama literature, it is also minimally covered in the literature about Head Start. Part of the

42. Frank Rose to David Nevin, February 4, 1965.

cursory coverage in the literature is likely due to how quickly the Head Start teacher model changed. The first summer, the OEO overwhelmingly utilized full-time public school teachers who were on their summer break. Community members were not extensively involved in teaching for Head Start, though some did serve as assistants, aides, cooks, and custodians for the program. Immediately following the 1965 Head Start program, there was a shift to involve more poor community members and Head Start parents in the program. As programs began to shift from summer to full year programs, elementary and secondary teachers could no longer be called upon to teach Head Start. In line with the goal of maximum feasible participation of the poor, many areas saw Head Start as not only an educational program for children but an employment opportunity for parents. This has been central to the Head Start debates that have persisted for decades. Some scholars and critics have argued that requiring college-educated Head Start teachers could have improved the programs quality from the start. This would have necessitated higher pay for staff that OEO was not willing or able to provide. Others, like Greenberg and Sanders, have focused on the opportunities employment with Head Start could offer the poor, especially parents of Head Start children.

Another reason that The University of Alabama and the Head Start literature may not cover the teacher training in depth is that there is a tendency for the literature to overlook or undervalue women's work. The child development program at The University of Alabama was housed in the School of Home Economics, which is largely associated with women and women's work. Polly Greenberg points out the ways that even the origins of Head Start illustrate a masculinist tendency.⁴³ Despite early childhood education always being a field dominated by

43. Polly Greenberg, "The Origins of Head Start and the Two Versions of Parent Involvement: How much Parent Participation in Early Childhood Programs and Services for Poor Children," in *Critical Perspectives on Head Start*, 63.

women, the initial OEO planning committee was comprised entirely of men. Eventually, three female consultants were included in the planning. The many female experts in early childhood education, kindergarten, and preschool were not included in the planning. In many histories about the beginning of Head Start, the all-male committee is the focus, not the local level implementation that primarily involved women. The majority of Head Start teachers were not only women but women of color, further marginalizing their experiences within the literature.

The experiences of Emma Henderson provide an interesting case in point. Records show that she began to serve as a staff member at The University of Alabama for the Head Start training programs beginning in February 1966.⁴⁴ However, she is not recognized as being part of the desegregation story at the University. Archie Wade is recognized as the first black faculty member at The University of Alabama beginning in 1970.⁴⁵ While Henderson was not a tenure-track faculty member, she still served in the role of instructor for the training program and is not mentioned in the desegregation story of the University. In 2017, Henderson's son presented the story of his mother to the *Crimson White* and an article was published highlighting her role at the University and in the Tuscaloosa community.⁴⁶ Two articles were published about Emma Henderson and in both, the University would not confirm or acknowledge Henderson's work at The University of Alabama. Her role as a black woman working in a child development program is ignored in the official University narratives.

44. Project Head Start, The University of Alabama Staff Training Program, 1966, record group 060, box 001, location 100-014, WSHSC.

45. Judah Martin, "Wade Honored as 1st Black Faculty Member On Campus," *Crimson White*, March 12, 2013.

46. Jones, March 2, 2017. Ron Henderson provided Jones with pay stubs showing that she earned \$150 per month for her work with the Head Start training program.

Historian Crystal Sanders spends a great deal of time focused on the women who were instrumental in the operation of Project Head Start in Mississippi.⁴⁷ She restricts her focus, though, to the grassroots level organizing that occurred there and overlooks the institutional response of some universities to Head Start. Given the way in which Mississippi Head Start existed completely outside the official power structures of the state, it is understandable that she would not spend her time covering the impact institutions of higher education had on Head Start. Similarly, Jon Hale's coverage of Head Start focuses on the grassroots efforts within Mississippi that were likely built on the foundations of the previous summer's Freedom Schools. Hale focuses on the suspicion that some grassroots organizers in Mississippi had about Head Start and its connections to the federal government. The Child Development Group of Mississippi hosted orientation sessions and trainings within the state. Hale points to the skepticism about institutional teacher trainings that had the potential to reinforce paternalistic narratives about poor children and their families.⁴⁸ In a separate article, Hale notes the significance of the black Head Start teachers entering previously all-white universities to receive Head Start training but spends very little time discussing this institutional level response to the program.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, the impact that The University of Alabama program had on the state of Mississippi and the Child Development Group of Mississippi is unmistakable. More than 585 Head Start teachers from Mississippi were given their initial training by The University of Alabama.⁵⁰ This institutional

47. Sanders, *A Chance for Change*, 73-106.

48. Hale, *The Freedom Schools*, 193-194.

49. Hale, "The Struggle Begins Early," 534.

50. Rosters for some of the sessions are missing from the archives. The June 21 session is specifically missing and thus the states of origin for those 242 teachers are missing.

involvement in Head Start does not fit into the grassroots narrative about the Child Development Group of Mississippi (CDGM) that both Sanders and Hale emphasize.

This dissertation seeks to bring to light a little known piece of The University of Alabama's history as well as highlight the importance of the Head Start teacher trainings, especially in the South. As evidenced by gaps in the literature, the history of Head Start teacher training is open for additional exploration and research. This study was confined to The University of Alabama but other southern institutions participated in the program. More research could yield information about the race relations on other campuses and the experiences of those participants. Additionally, it would be interesting to learn if other campus's child development departments continued their relationships with Head Start or were motivated to desegregate their campus child development centers as a result of the partnership with Head Start. Furthermore, this dissertation only briefly examined the Tuscaloosa Head Start center, and the desegregation problems it encountered. This story deserves further investigation. The segregation of Head Start centers across Alabama and the South was not unique, but it is largely missing from Head Start literature. Further study regarding segregation within southern Head Start centers is warranted.

Project Head Start has impacted millions of children. It all started in the summer of 1965 with the inaugural Head Start teacher training program. Despite the tumultuous racial times, The University of Alabama decided to participate in the desegregated program that would bring around a thousand black teachers to the University. It would also be the beginning of a longstanding partnership that continues to this day. Lucy Deason explained that being a part of the Head Start training was "one of the most significant joys of my life. I felt it was meaningful. I saw it change people in that week that Head Start started."⁵¹ Charles Adams expressed similar

51. Interview with Deason.

sentiments saying, “It was one of the major accomplishments of my career to be involved in Project Head Start.”⁵² They knew that it was an important moment in the history of both The University of Alabama and Project Head Start that deserves to be told.

52. Interview with Adams.

REFERENCES

Archival Sources

Buford Boone Papers. W.S. Hoole Special Collections. The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL.

Civil Rights in Alabama Project: Oral History, 1964. Columbia Center for Oral History Archives, Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Columbia University, New York.

Frank Rose Papers. W.S. Hoole Special Collections. The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Lister Hill Papers. W.S. Hoole Special Collections. The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Papers. Digitized archives hosted by ProQuest History Vault.
<http://proquest.libguides.com/historyvault/NAACP>

National University Extension Association (NUEA) Records, Syracuse University Library Special Collections. Syracuse, New York.

University Records Archives. W.S. Hoole Special Collections. The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Oral Histories

Adams, Charles. (Director of Conference Activities at The University of Alabama), interview by author, Tuscaloosa, AL, December 2017.

Deason, Lucy. (Instructor of Home Economics Child Development and Family Life at The University of Alabama), interview by author, Tuscaloosa, AL, September 2017.

Kent, Elizabeth. (Teacher, Child Development Center at The University of Alabama), interview by author, Tuscaloosa, AL, September 2017.

Tingle, Carroll. (Chair and Assistant Professor for Human Development and Family Studies at The University of Alabama), interview by author, Tuscaloosa, AL, January 2018.

Secondary Sources

Aaron, Henry. *Politics and the Professors: The Great Society in Perspective*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1978.

- Aguiar, Gretchen. "Head Start: A History of Implementation." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2012. Accessed April 15, 2016. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (UMI 3508961).
- Ashbranner, Brent. *A Moment in History: The First Ten Years of the Peace Corps*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971.
- Ashmore, Susan Youngblood. *Carry it On: The War on Poverty and the Civil Rights Movement in Alabama, 1964-1972*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2008.
- Bailey, Martha and Nicolas Duquette. "How Johnson Fought the War on Poverty: The Economics and Politics of Funding at the Office of Economic Opportunity." *The Journal of Economic History* 74, no. 2 (2014): 351-388. Accessed November 29, 2017. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4266933/>
- Barnett, W. Steven. "Does Head Start Have Lasting Cognitive Effects? The Myth of Fade-Out." In *The Head Start Debates*, edited by Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco, 221-249. Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004.
- Barnett, W. Steven and Allison H. Friedman-Krauss. *State(s) of Head Start*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research, 2016.
- Barnett, W. Steven, Allison H. Friedman-Krauss, G. G. Weisenfeld, Michelle Horowitz, Richard Kasmin, and James Squires. *The State of Preschool 2016: State Preschool Yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research, 2017.
- Barnett, W. Steven and Jason T. Hustedt. "Head Start's Lasting Benefits." *Infants & Young Children* 18, no. 1 (Jan.-March 2005): 16-24. Accessed October 15, 2017. <http://libdata.lib.ua.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rzh&AN=106406633&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Belknap, Michael R. *Federal Law and Southern Order: Racial Violence and Constitutional Conflict in the Post-Brown South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987.
- Bowman, Barbara T., M. Suzanne Donovan, and M. Susan Burnes. *Eager to Learn: Educating our Preschoolers*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2001.
- Brauer, Carl M. "Kennedy, Johnson, and the War on Poverty." *Journal of American History* 69, no. 1 (June 1982): 98-119. Accessed March 12, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1887754>
- Bredenkamp, Sue. "25 Years of Educating Young Children: The High/Scope Approach to Preschool Education." *Young Children* 51, no. 4 (1996): 57-61. Accessed March 1, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42727211>

- . "CDA at 25: Reflections on the Past and Projections for the Future." *Young Children* 55, no. 5 (September 2000): 15-19. Accessed March 4, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42725120>.
- Brophy, Alfred. "Overcoming at The University of Alabama." *Alabama Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law Review* 1, no. 1 (2011): 15-30. Accessed May 18, 2017. <http://www.heinonline.org.libdata.lib.ua.edu/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/alabercrl1&div=11>
- Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 498 (1954).
- Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955).
- Bulloch, Henry Allen. *A History of Negro Education in the South: From 1619 to the Present*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Bunch, Beverly and Dalitso Sulamoyo. *Community Action Leaders: Rooting out Poverty at the Local Level*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2017.
- Cascio, Elizabeth, Nora Gordan, Ethan Lewis, and Sarah Reber. "From *Brown* to Busing." *Journal of Urban Economics* 64, (2008): 296-325.
- Carter, Dan. T. *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995.
- Cazenave, Noel. *Impossible Democracy: The Unlikely Success of the War on Poverty Community Action Programs*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007.
- Charlton, Thomas, Lois Myers, and Rebecca Sharpless, eds. *Handbook of Oral History*. Plymouth, United Kingdom: Alta Mira Press, 2006.
- Clark, Culpepper E. *The Schoolhouse Door: Segregation's Last Stand at The University of Alabama*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2007.
- Clark, Robert F. *The War on Poverty: History, Selected Programs, and Ongoing Impact*. New York: University Press of America, 2002.
- Cole, Katie. "Buford Boone: To Stand on Principle." *Alabama Heritage* 85 (Summer, 2007): 4-6. Accessed January 16, 2018. *Literature Resource Center*, EBSCOhost.
- Cort, H. Russell, William D. Commins, Kenneth L. Deavers, Ruth Ann O'Keefe, and James F. Ragan, Jr. *Results of the Summer 1965 Project Head Start*. May 9, 1966. Prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Planning Research Corporation.
- Council for Professional Recognition. Accessed March 2, 2018. <http://www.cdacouncil.org/about/cda-credential/cda-credential>.

- Cunningham, David. *Klansville, U.S.A.: The Rise and Fall of the Civil Rights-Era Ku Klux Klan*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Currie, Janet and Duncan Thomas. "School Quality and the Longer-Term Effects of Head Start." *The Journal of Human Resources* 35, no. 4 (2000): 755-774. Accessed March 12, 2018. JSTOR Journals, EBSCOhost.
- Cuter, William. "Oral History--Its Nature and Uses for Educational History." *History of Education Quarterly* 9 (Summer 1971): 184-194. Accessed January 2, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/367594>
- Dittmer, John. *Local People: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Mississippi*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994.
- Dougherty, Jack. "From Anecdote to Analysis: Oral Interviews and New Scholarship in Educational History." *The Journal of American History*, no. 2 (1999): 712-723. Accessed January 2, 2018. JSTOR Journals, EBSCOhost.
- Doyle, William. *An American Insurrection: James Meredith and the Battle of Oxford, Mississippi, 1962*. New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- Drazek, Stanley. "Training 30,000 Head Start Teachers." *School and Society* 94, no. 2274 (March 1966): 130-131.
- Dumas, Royal. "My Son and My Money Go to the University of Alabama: The Students at the University of Alabama in 1845 and the Families that Sent Them." *Alabama Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law Review* 1, no. 1 (2011): 67-89. Accessed May 18, 2017. <http://www.heinonline.org.libdata.lib.ua.edu/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/alabrcrl1&div=11>
- Eagles, Charles W. *The Price of Defiance: James Meredith and the Integration of Ole Miss*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- Eick, Caroline. "Oral Histories of Education and the Relevance of Theory: Claiming New Spaces in a Post-Revisionist Era." *History of Education Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (2011): 158-183. Accessed January 2, 2018. Scopus®, EBSCOhost.
- Eisinger, Peter. *The Community Action Program and the Development of Black Political Leadership*. Madison: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin, 1978.
- Ellsworth, Jeanne and Lynda Ames, eds. *Critical Perspectives on Project Head Start: Revisioning the Hope and Challenge*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998.

- Errante, Antoinette. "But Sometimes You're Not Part of the Story: Oral Histories and Ways of Remembering and Telling." *Educational Researcher* 29, no. 2 (2000): 16-27. Accessed January 2, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1177053>
- Faulkner, Lawrence. "Frank Rose and the Influences on His Administrative Leadership" PhD diss., The University of Alabama, 2015. Accessed March 13, 2017. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (ProQuest Number 10006843).
- Franklin, Jimmie Lewis. *Back to Birmingham: Richard Arrington, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1989.
- Frederick, Jeff. *Stand up for Alabama: Governor George Wallace*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2007.
- Gaillard, Frye. *Cradle of Freedom: Alabama and the Movement that Changed America*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2004.
- Garrow, David J. *Protest at Selma: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Voting Rights Act of 1965*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- . *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference*. New York: William Morrow, 1986.
- . *The Montgomery Bus Boycott and the Women Who Started It: The Memoir of Jo Ann Gibson Robinson*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987.
- Graham, Hugh Davis. *The Civil Rights Era: Origins and Development of National Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Gillette, Michael. *Launching the War on Poverty: An Oral History*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. New York: Bantam Books, 1987.
- Goldfield, David. *Black, White, and Southern: Race Relations and Southern Culture 1940 to the Present*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990.
- Greenberg, Polly. *The Devil Has Slippery Shoes: A Biased Biography of the Child Development Group of Mississippi*. Washington, DC: Youth Policy Institute, 1990.
- . "The Origins of Head Start and the Two Versions of Parent Involvement: How Much Parent Participation in Early Childhood Programs and Services for Poor Children" In *Critical Perspectives on Project Head Start: Revisioning the Hope and Challenge*, edited by Jeanne Ellsworth and Lynda Ames, 49-72. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998.

- . “Three Core Concepts of the War on Poverty: Their Origins and Significance in Head Start” In *The Head Start Debates*, edited by Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco, 62-83. Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004.
- Greenhaw, Wayne. *Fighting the Devil in Dixie: How Civil Rights Activists Took on the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama*. Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2011.
- Hale, Jon N. “The Struggle Begins Early: Head Start and the Mississippi Freedom Movement.” *History of Education Quarterly* 52, no. 4 (November 2012): 506-534. Accessed March 12, 2018.
- . *The Freedom Schools*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.
- Harrington, Michael. *The Other America: Poverty in the United States*. New York, NY: MacMillan, 1962.
- Heineman, Kenneth. *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era*. New York: New York University Press, 1993.
- Heisner, Mary Jane and Amy R. Lederberg. “The Impact of Child Development Associate Training on the Beliefs and Practices of Preschool Teachers.” *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 26 (2nd Quarter, 2011): 227-236. Accessed March 4, 2018.
- Hinitz, Blythe. "Credentialing Early Childhood Paraprofessionals in the United States: The Child Development Associate and other Frameworks." *International Journal of Early Years Education* 6, no. 1 (1998): 87-104. Accessed February 25, 2018. Carfax Publishing. EBSCOhost
- . “Head Start: A Bridge from Past to Future,” *Young Children* 69, no. 2 (May 2014): 94-97. Accessed April 17, 2017.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/ycyoungchildren.69.2.94.pdf>
- Hollars, B.J. *Opening the Doors: The Desegregation of The University of Alabama and the Fight for Civil Rights in Tuscaloosa*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 2013.
- Hutchison, Betty. "The Child Development Associate: Prototype for Early Childhood Educators." *Educational Horizon* 70, no. 1 (1991): 41-48. Accessed February 1, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42925918>
- Isenberg, Joan P. "The State of the Art in Early Childhood Professional Preparation." Washington, DC: Commissioned paper for the National Institute on Early Childhood Development and Education, 1999.
- Johnson, Claudia. *A White House Diary, Lady Bird Johnson*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1970.

- Jordan, Amy. "Fighting for the Child Development Group of Mississippi: Poor People, Local Politics, and the Complicated Legacy of Head Start," in Annelise Orleck and Lisa Gayle Hazirjian, eds., *The War on Poverty: A New Grassroots History, 1964-1980*. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011), 280-307.
- Jordan, Barbara C. and Elspeth D. Rostow. *The Great Society: A Twenty-Year Critique*. Austin, TX: Lyndon B. Johnson Library, 1986.
- Katz, Michael. *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1990.
- Ketelaar, Eric. "Tacit Narratives: The Meanings of Archives." *Archival Science* 1, no. 2 (January 1, 2001): 131-141. Accessed January 2, 2018.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2FBF02435644>
- Knight v. Alabama* (787F). Supp. 1030, 1048 (Northern District Alabama 1981).
- Knight v. Alabama* (900F). Supp. 272, 280 (Northern District Alabama 1995).
- Knight v. Alabama* (476F). 20 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. C 264 (United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit 2007).
- Knoll, Erwin and Jules Witcover. "Maximum Feasible Publicity: The War on Poverty's Campaign to Capture the Press." *Columbia Journalism Review* (Fall 1966): 33-40. Accessed November 15, 2017.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cms&AN=16275495&site=ehost-live>.
- Knopke, Harry J., Robert Norrell, and Ronald W. Rogers, eds. *Opening Doors: Perspectives on Race Relations in Contemporary America*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1991.
- Kuntz, Kathryn. "A Lost Legacy: Head Start's Origins in Community Action" In *Critical Perspectives on Project Head Start: Revisioning the Hope and Challenge*, edited by Jeanne Ellsworth and Lynda Ames, 1-48. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998.
- Lascarides, V. Celia and Blythe F. Hinitz. *History of Early Childhood Education*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Layzer, Jean I., Barbara D. Goodson, and Marc Moss. *Life in Preschool—Volume One of an Observational Study of Early Childhood Programs for Disadvantaged Four-Year-Olds*. Cambridge, MA: ABT Associates, 1993.

- Lee, Valerie and Susanna Loeb. "Where Do Head Start Attendees End Up? One Reason Why Preschool Effects Fade Out." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 17, no. 1 (Spring, 1995): 62-82. Accessed March 12, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1164270>
- Leshner, Stephan. *George Wallace: American Populist*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1994.
- Levitan, Sar A. and Benjamin H. Johnston. *The Job Corps: A Social Experiment that Works*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- McMillen, Neil. *The Citizens' Council: Organized Resistance to the Second Reconstruction, 1954-1964*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.
- McWhorter, Diane. *Carry Me Home: The Climactic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution*. New York: Touchstone, 2001.
- Meredith, James and William Doyle. *A Mission from God: A Memoir and a Challenge for America*. New York: Atria Books, 2012.
- Mokrzycki, Paul. "After the Stand Comes the Fall." *The Alabama Review* 65, no. 4 (2012): 290-313. Accessed May 15, 2017. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/489815>
- Muir, Donal E. "The First Years of Desegregation: Patterns of Acceptance of Black Students on a Deep-South Campus, 1963-69." *Social Forces* 49, no. 3 (1971): 371-378. Accessed March 14, 2018. SocINDEX with Full Text, EBSCOhost.
- Muir, Donal E., and C. Donald McGlamery. "Trends in Integration Attitudes on a Deep-South Campus During the First Two Decades of Desegregation." *Social Forces* 62, no. 4 (1984): 963-973. Accessed March 14, 2018. Business Source Complete, EBSCOhost.
- National Head Start Association. "Access to Head Start in the United States of America. Accessed March 12, 2018. <https://www.nhsa.org/facts>
- Nevin, David and Robert E. Bills. *The Schools that Fear Built: Segregationist Academies in the South*. Washington, DC: Acropolis Books, 1976.
- O'Brien, Robert, David Connell, and James Griffen. "Head Start's Efforts to Improve Child Health." In *The Head Start Debates*, edited by Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco (Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004), 161-178.
- Office of the Administration for Children and Families Early Childhood Learning & Knowledge Center (ECLKC). Head Start Timeline. Accessed March 1, 2016. <http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/hs/50th-anniversary/docs/hs-50th-timeline.pdf>
- Orleck, Annelise and Lisa Gayle Hazirjian, eds., *The War on Poverty: A New Grassroots History, 1964-1980*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011.

- Padgett, Charles. "'Without Hysteria or Unnecessary Disturbance': Desegregation at Spring Hill College, Mobile, Alabama, 1948-1954." *History of Education Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 167-188. Accessed January 3, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/369825>
- Peterson, Paul. "Forms of Representation: Participation of the Poor in the Community Action Program." *American Political Science Review* 64, no. 2 (June 1970): 491-507. Accessed March 12, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1953845>
- Pruitt, Samory. "A Reflection of Student Desegregation at The University of Alabama as Seen through the Eyes of Some Pioneering African American Students: 1956-1976." PhD diss., University of Alabama, 2003. Accessed March 13, 2017. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (UMI 3115070).
- Raines, Howell. *My Soul is Rested: Movement Days in the Deep South*. New York: Penguin, 1983.
- Ramey, Craig T. and Sharon L. Ramey. "Early Educational Interventions and Intelligence: Implications for Head Start." In *The Head Start Debates*, edited by Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco (Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004), 3-17.
- Rawlins, V. Lane. "Job Corps: The Urban Center as a Training Facility," *Journal of Human Resources* 6, no. 2 (Spring 1971): 221-235. Accessed March 12, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/144919>
- Reeves, Zane. *The Politics of the Peace Corps and VISTA*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1988.
- Rice, Gerard. *The Bold Experiment: JFK's Peace Corps*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985.
- Roberts, Gene and Hank Klibanoff. *The Race Beat; The Press, The Civil Rights Struggle, and the Awakening of a Nation*. New York: First Vintage Books, 2006.
- Rose, Elizabeth. "Poverty and Parenting: Transforming Early Education's Legacy in the 1960s." *History of Education Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (May 2009): 222-234. Accessed March 12, 2018.
- . *The Promise of Preschool: From Head Start to Universal Pre-Kindergarten*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Sanders, Crystal. *A Chance for Change: Head Start and Mississippi's Black Freedom Struggle*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016.
- . "More than Cookies and Crayons: Head Start and African American Empowerment in Mississippi, 1965-1968." *Journal of African American History* 100, no. 4 (Fall 2015): 586-609. Accessed November 25, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/10.5323/jafriamerhist.100.4.0586.pdf>

- Sellers, James. *History of The University of Alabama*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1953.
- Schlesinger, Arthur. *One Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.
- Schochet, Peter, John Burghardt, and Shenna McConnell. "Does Job Corps Work? Impact Findings from the National Job Corps Study." *American Economic Review* 98, no. 5 (2008): 1864-1886. Accessed March 12, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29730155>
- Schwartz, Joan M. and Terry Cook. "Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory." *Archival Science* 2, no. 1-2 (2002): 1-19. Accessed January 2, 2018. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2FBF02435628>
- Shrag, Rebecca, Sally Styfco, and Edward Zigler. "Familiar Concept, New Name: Social Competence/School Readiness as the Goal of Head Start." In *The Head Start Debates*, edited by Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco (Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004), 19-25.
- Sikora, Frank. *Until Justice Rolls Down: The Birmingham Church Bombing*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1991.
- Sims, Patsy. *The Klan*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996.
- Sissel, Peggy. *Staff, Parents, and Politics in Head Start: A Case Study in Unequal Power, Knowledge, and Material Resources*. New York, NY: Falmer Press, 2010.
- Shopes, Linda. "'Insights and Oversights': Reflections on the Documentary Tradition and the Theoretical Turn in Oral History." *The Oral History Review* 41, no. 2 (2014): 257-268. Accessed January 2, 2018. ProjectMUSE, EBSCOhost.
- Slaughter-Defoe, Diana T., and Henry H. Rubin. "A Longitudinal Case Study of Head Start Eligible Children: Implications for Urban Education." *Educational Psychologist* 36, no. 1 (2001): 31-44. Accessed March 12, 2018. PsycINFO, EBSCOhost.
- Snider, Margaret Hardy and Victoria R. Fu. "The Effects of Specialized Education and Job Experience on Early Childhood Teachers' Knowledge of Developmentally Appropriate Practice." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (March 1990): 69-78. Accessed March 14, 2018. Scopus®, EBSCOhost.
- Stossel, Scott. *Sarge: The Life and Times of Sargent Shriver*. New York, NY: Other Press, 2011.
- "The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development." Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Ohio University, 1969. Accessed November 24, 2017. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED036321.pdf>

- Thorne, T. K. *Last Chance for Justice: How Relentless Investigators Uncovered New Evidence Convicting the Birmingham Church Bombers*. Chicago: Chicago Review Press, 2013.
- Tilford, Earl H. *Turning the Tide: The University of Alabama in the 1960s*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 2014.
- Vinovskis, Maris. "Early Childhood Education: Then and Now." *Daedalus* 122, no. 1 (Winter, 1993): 151-176. Accessed November 25, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/20027154.pdf>
- . "Do Federal Compensatory Education Programs Really Work? A Brief Historical Analysis of Title I and Head Start." *American Journal of Education* 107, no. 3 (May, 1999): 187-209. Accessed November 25, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1085662.pdf>
- . *Head Start: Preschool Education Policies in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Weisberg, Roberta. "Direct Instruction: Multiple Views of its Implementation as a System wide Reading Program in a Southern City." PhD diss., The University of Alabama, 1998. Accessed May 5, 2018. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (UMI 9920877).
- Wendt, Simon. "God, Ghandi, and Guns: The African American Freedom Struggle in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 1964-1965." *Journal of African American History* 89, no. 1 (2004): 36-56. Accessed December 15, 2016. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/4134045.pdf>.
- Wilder, Craig Steven. *Ebony & Ivory: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America's Universities*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2013.
- Williamson, Joel. *The Crucible of Race: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Williams, Walter and John W. Evans. "The Politics of Evaluation: The Case of Head Start." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 385, (September 1969): 118-132. Accessed March 12, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1037541>.
- Wilson, Erika. "The New School Segregation." *Cornell Law Review* 102, no. 1 (Nov. 2016): 139-210. Accessed March 15, 2018. Complimentary Index, EBSCOhost.
- Wolfe, Deborah P. "What the Economic Opportunity Act Means to the Negro." *The Journal of Negro Education* 34, no. 1. (Winter, 1965): 88-92. Accessed March 12, 2018. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29730155>
- Woodhead, Martin. "When Psychology Informs Public Policy: The Case of Early Childhood Intervention," In *The Head Start Debates*, edited by Edward Zigler and Sally Styfco (Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing Company, 2004), 27-43.

- Yaeger, Don, Sam Cunningham, and John Papadakis, *Turning of the Tide: How One Game Changed the South*. New York: Center Street Press, 2006.
- Zarefsky, David. *President Johnson's War on Poverty: Rhetoric and History*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1986.
- Zigler, Edward, Bonnie Gordic, and Sally Styfco. "What is the Goal of Head Start? Four Decades of Confusion and Debate. *NHSA Dialog* 10, no. 2, (2007): 83-97. Accessed November 1, 2017.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/15240750701491233?needAccess=true>
- Zigler, Edward and Susan Muenchow. *Head Start: The Inside Story of America's Most Successful Educational Experiment*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.
- Zigler, Edward and Sally J. Styfco, eds. *The Head Start Debates*. Baltimore, MD: P.H. Brookes, 2004.
- Zigler, Edward and Sally Styfco. *The Hidden History of Head Start*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

APPENDIX A IRB DOCUMENTATION



The University of Alabama
801 University Blvd
Tuscaloosa AL
TEL: 205 348 6457
FAX:

NOTICE OF APPROVAL FOR HUMAN RESEARCH

DATE: September 13, 2017
TO: Ingram, Amanda, College of Education
Major, Claire, Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies, Adams, Natalie, New College
FROM: Graham, Jeanelle, MPH, Research Compliance Specialist, NM Expedited
PROTOCOL TITLE: History of the partnership between Head Start and The University of Alabama
FUNDING SOURCE: NONE
PROTOCOL NUMBER: 17-09-479
APPROVAL PERIOD: Approval Date: September 11, 2017 Expiration Date: September 10, 2018

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects has reviewed the protocol entitled: History of the partnership between Head Start and The University of Alabama. The project has been approved for the procedures and subjects described in the protocol. This protocol must be reviewed for renewal on a yearly basis for as long as the research remains active. Should the protocol not be renewed before expiration, all activities must cease until the protocol has been re-reviewed.

If approval did not accompany a proposal when it was submitted to a sponsor, it is the PI's responsibility to provide the sponsor with the approval notice.

This approval is issued under University of Alabama's Federal Wide Assurance 00000647 with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP). If you have any questions regarding your obligations under Committee's Assurance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Please direct any questions about the IRB's actions on this project to:

Graham, Jeanelle

Graham, Jeanelle

Approval Period: September 11, 2017 through September 10, 2018
Review Type: FULLBOARD
IRB Number: 03

Informed Consent for a Research Study
History of the Partnership between Project Head Start and The University of Alabama

You are being asked to participate in a research study entitled "History of the Partnership between Project Head Start and The University of Alabama." Amanda Ingram, graduate student in the College of Education, is the lead investigator.

The study is being conducted to record an important part of Alabama and University of Alabama history. Head Start officially launched in 1965 as a summer program that served over 560,000 children nationwide. In the state of Alabama, over \$1.5 million was invested in serving 10,264 children at 245 sites. The University of Alabama hosted the second largest Head Start teacher training program in the summer of 1965, training over 1,500 teachers. At a time when desegregation was still not widespread in Alabama, the teacher training program was fully desegregated. The purpose of this oral history project is to learn more about the teacher training programs that occurred at The University of Alabama beginning in 1965 and how they contributed to a long term partnership between the University and Project Head Start. You are a very important part of that history because you were either an instructor, administrator, early childhood educator, or Head Start teacher during that time period and have first-hand knowledge about what happened.

The study is important because, unlike other aspects of the desegregation and racial relations at The University of Alabama during the 1960s, this program has not been well-documented, particularly from the perspective of those who were actually there. Your participation in this study will contribute to the history of both Project Head Start and The University of Alabama.

If you agree to an interview, you will be asked to do these things:

- schedule the interview at a time and place convenient for you
- answer a series of questions that will be asked of all participants
- give permission to audio record the interview
- give permission for the information from this interview, including your name, to be used in any material generated as a result of this research

Being in the study will take about one to two hours. There is no financial compensation for participating in the study. If you decided later that you do not want to be a participant in the study, you may withdraw from the study and your interview will not be used in any presentations or publications about this topic. You may at any time refuse to answer any of the questions.

There are no direct benefits to participating in the study; however, your stories about this time period will contribute to our understandings of what happened during Head Start teacher training program in the 1960s and how it contributed to a long standing partnership between Head Start and The University of Alabama.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 9/11/17
EXPIRATION DATE: 9/10/2018

There are no risks involved in participating in the study. If there is any information that you do not want included in the public presentation of the data, the investigator will respect your wishes. To protect your privacy, we will conduct the interview in a site of your choosing. Additionally, you may at any time refuse to answer any of the questions.

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board is a committee that looks out for the ethical treatment of people in research studies. They may review the study records if they wish. This is to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.

If you have questions about this study right now, please ask them. If you have questions later on, please call Amanda Ingram at 949-285-5365. If you have questions or complaints about your rights as a research participant, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066.

You may also ask questions, make a suggestion, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online there, or you may ask Amanda Ingram for a copy of it. You may also e-mail us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions.

I have read the consent form. The study has been explained to me. I understand what I will be asked to do. I freely agree to take part in it. I understand that my interview will be audio recorded and that my name will be referenced in the transcript and audio recording. I will receive a copy of this consent form to keep.

.....

Signature of Research Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
 CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 9/11/17
 EXPIRATION DATE: 9/10/2018