DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 697 UD 007 927

By-Havighurst, Robert J.

Metropolitanism and the Issues of Social Integration and Administrative Decentralization in Large Cities.

Pub Date Nov 68

Note-14p.; Address presented at a Special Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation (Teachers Coll., Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. July 10-12, 1968)

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80

Descriptors-Bus Transportation, *Decentralization, Housing Opportunities, *Metropolitan Areas, Negroes, Negro Students, School Districts, *School Integration, *Social Integration, Suburban Housing, Suburban Schools, Urban Schools

The factor of metropolitanism affects both the issues of desegregation and decentralization of public school systems. Metropolitanism will encourage social integration in two ways: (1) busing of inner city Negro students to suburban schools, and (2) development of open housing sentiments in the suburbs. The growth rate of non-whites in the suburbs will produce a "marked amount" of integration within the next decade. (NH)

Professor Robert Havighurst of the University of Chicago is somewhat more optimistic about integration prospects than others, as he focuses upon the two salient urban educational issues of social integration and administrative decentralization. He expects that the Black separatist movement, the strength of which in his judgment may be "over-estimated" and is found only in the ghetto where integration is most difficult to achieve, will "fade away very soon." Professor Havighurst predicts that the effective Negro leaders will work in cooperation with white leaders for integration in the schools. The emerging concept of metropolitanism, he contends, will encourage social integration in two ways. The busing of inner-city largely black children to suburban schools, one aspect of metropolitanism, is working "reasonably well" although it affects only a small fraction of inner-city youngsters. The second impact of metropolitanism, Professor Havighurst predicts, will be the growth of open housing "sentiment" in the suburbs, with a still relatively small but steady increase of non-whites taking up residence there. This growth rate will produce according to Professor Havighurst a "marked amount" of integration during the next decade.

METROPOLITANISM AND THE ISSUES OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE DECENTRALIZATION IN LARGE CITIES

Robert J. Havighurst
The University of Chicago

The two major educational issues in large cities today are those of social integration and administrative decentralization.

By social integration we mean the sharing of experience in school, church, government and occupation by boys and girls, and men and women, from the various racial and economic groups in the population. The purpose of this is to improve the quality of democracy in this country, and to increase the educational achievement of socially disadvantaged children.

By educational decentralization we mean two quite different things. We mean the reduction in size of the administrative district or unit of the big-city school system; and we mean the redistribution of the power to make important decisions and choices about the operation of schools, so as to give parents and citizens authority over

their local school. There is no clear connection between the two aspects of decentralization. For instance, an experiment in local community control of schools has been undertaken in three areas of New York City; but this experiment is only distantly related to the proposals for legislative action to divide the New York City school system into a number of separate--and relatively autonomous--school districts, each with some 50 schools.

Local community control of schools means some kind of local school board for a community of no more than 50,000 persons, with no more than 7 or 8 thousand school pupils. For a city of a million, there would be 20 or more local school boards or committees.

On the other hand, administrative decentralization into autonomous districts means the creation of school districts of 300,000 to 500,000 population, each with its own superintendent and school board. A city of a million could have two or three such districts, each the size of Omaha or Syracuse. This would be much too big to serve as a basis for true local community control of the schools. Its goal is to make the educational operations more efficient, more flexible, and less bureaucratic.

The issues of desegregation and decentralization of the public school systems of large cities are both affected by the emerging factor of metropolitanism. This term is a name for the growing significance in American society of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area--the area that

includes a large city and its suburbs. Most large cities are now the centers of business and industry for metropolitan areas that contain about twice the population of the central cities. That is, a city such as Chicago, or Detroit, or Los Angeles, or Kansas City, has a network of suburbs that are about equal in population to the central city itself. The entire metropolitan area is a cross-section of American urban society, with the various socio-economic and racial groups appearing quantitatively about as they are in the nation as a whole. But the central city has a relatively high proportion of poor people and of Negroes. The suburbs have a relatively high proportion of people with average and above average income and education, and of native-born whites.

Metropolitanism is a name for a way of looking at and thinking about the large cities and their suburbs. The metropolitan areas are seen as units for the purpose of planning the development of the metropolitan complexes of the future. Problems of traffic and transportation, air and water supply, electric power, police protection, and sewage disposal--as well as problems of government and education--are increasingly regarded as metropolitan area problems. Suburbs that were formerly choice residential areas are becoming old and obsolescent, and are given the urban renewal treatment. People of above average means are leaving the older suburbs, to go further out from the central city; or to return to the central city for modern semi-luxury housing and the other attractions of the large city.

School systems in the suburbs are affected by these population movements. More and more, the administrators of suburban school systems are joining the administrators of big city systems in planning for future cooperation.

Metropolitanism is also a name for a new kind of civic morality, which regards the entire metropolitan area as a civic responsibility of the citizens no matter where they live and vote in local elections.

Against this background of metropolitanism, it is useful to look at the problems and issues of social integration and decentralization in the school systems:

Desegregation and Metropolitanism

With the concentration of Negroes in the large cities--and generally in ghettos in these cities--it has become practically impossible to desegregate the elementary schools completely. Nevertheless, important amounts of desegregation can be achieved by school authorities who work intelligently and vigorously at this task. For example, in a big city in which 10 percent of Negro children are in schools containing at least 50 percent white children, it is generally possible to double this to 20 percent of Negro children attending integrated schools. A strong superintendent, backed by a determined school board, can accomplish this by working wisely with local communities at the periphery of the Negro ghetto, so as to stabilize existing integrated schools and to increase the numbers of integrated schools through the "magnet school" idea; and through Princeton Plan pairing or

clustering of schools.

It is even possible to use the evanescent "educational park" concept to increase integration in a big city. For example, Superintendent Redmond in Chicago has proposed to construct an educational park with a high school, middle schools and several elementary schools on a large area of urban renewal land near the University of Illinois campus in Chicago. This would become a model school, and would attract large numbers of middle-income white and Negro families to an area that can be rebuilt with middle-income housing--through private housing corporations and a limited amount of federal funds. This is financially feasible; whereas most educational park proposals for large cities have involved prohibitive expenditures, and can hardly be justified due to the existence of fairly modern neighborhood school buildings that could not be put to good use if their students were transferred to an educational park.

Metropolitanism will encourage social integration through the schools in two ways. First, there is the present movement in many areas for middle class suburbs to invite the central city to send disadvantaged children to their schools in limited but substantial numbers. The cost is usually borne by the central city school system, but it could easily become a charge on federal funds aimed at helping big cities solve their problems. This plan of busing inner-city children to suburban schools is working reasonably well. Though it can hardly affect more than a

small fraction of inner-city children, it has great symbolic value--as well as value for the children of all social classes who are served by the suburban schools.

Metropolitanism will also encourage social integration by the steady increase of non-whites taking residence in the suburbs; and by the growth of open housing sentiment in the suburbs. The growth rate of the non-white population in the suburbs is greater now than it is in the central cities. That is, the percentage of non-white people living in suburbs is increasing faster than the percentage of non-whites in central cities. The absolute numbers of non-whites residing in suburbs are still relatively small, but the rapid rate of growth will produce a marked amount of integration during the next decade.

The Black Separatist movement is seen by some people to be operating at present against the spread of integration; but its influence is relatively small. Black Separatism is strong only in the ghetto, where integration is most difficult to achieve, and its strength in the ghetto may be over-estimated. My expectation is that the separatist movement will fade away very soon; and that effective Negro leaders will work in cooperation with white leaders for integration in the schools along the lines described.

Decentralization and Metropolitanism

The term decentralization has two widely different meanings as it is applied to school systems in large cities. One meaning is the subdivision of a large district into

sub-districts which have a considerable degree of autonomy. The autonomy may consist of a separate Board of Education, a separate Superintendent and a separate legal entity. One proposal for New York City is to create 15 districts each with a superintendent and school board, and each autonomous in most matters.

In practice, the degree of autonomy is likely to be considerably less than that proposed for New York City. For example, Chicago created three associate superintendencies by dividing the district into three regions, and assigning major administrative autonomy to each region under the general superintendent and school board. Detroit created nine district superintendencies, each district having a considerable degree of autonomy under the central administration and school board.

These forms of decentralization illustrate the current effort by practitioners and researchers in the area of large city planning to find the optimal size unit for administration of civic and educational functions. These people generally agree that the unit should have between 200,000 and 500,000 population. A district this size could have all the special school services from preschool to community college. It could share in the financial base of the entire city or metropolitan area; and otherwise be quite separate, except for planning--and for such features as educational television, area theater, symphony and other cultural activities that can better serve

the entire metropolitan area.

Ideally, this self-governing unit of the large city should be almost a cross-section of the population of the metropolitan area, with rich and poor people, white and non-white, associating in school, government, business and cultural activities. But the present pattern of economic and racial segregation makes this extremely difficult to attain in most large cities. There is danger of creating school districts and local government districts in which the people are nearly all of one racial or economic group; thus creating barriers to social integration.

Decentralization of this first general type should be undertaken with great caution and flexibility. Generally there are two or three areas of 200,000 to 500,000 in a big city which already have a cross-section of the population. It would seem useful to try out decentralization in such areas; holding the process in abeyance in the rest of the city until urban renewal, city planning, and private and public housing development brings other sections into a condition where they more nearly represent a cross-section of the population.

The opposite of decentralization--consolidation of small units--seems destined to take place in suburban areas, but at a rather slow pace. If the optimal size unit in a metropolitan area is one of 200,000 to 500,000, it may be expected that suburban regional districts will be formed of this size, through voluntary cooperation of local government

and school districts. Such cooperation may be fostered by federal government grants under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as under state government policies for suburban development. This process will probably be slow, but the quality of education and government in the suburbs is not likely to improve very much under present conditions; while the central cities will renew themselves and become more attractive places for living as the suburbs grow old and obsolescent.

Let us turn now to the other form of decentralization--the creation of small, local, autonomous school units under the general supervision of the superintendent and school board of a large city. Examples of this are the three experimental situations in New York City. Each one centers around a middle school, and several elementary schools that feed into the middle school. A local School Council is elected in the area; this Council selects an Administrator, who has much more authority over his small district than is available even to a District Superintendent in the regular New York City system. The three areas are all in the inner city, though they differ somewhat in their ethnic and socio-economic composition.

Here, for the first time in large city school systems, the parents and local community leaders have a substantial voice in the operation of the school. The New York City Board of Education has general authority over these local districts, through the central office and district

superintendents. But the local School Council has been permitted to choose its own Administrator, outside of the list of principals and those who have passed the principals' examination. The Administrator and his Council have been relatively free to select school principals and to recruit and assign classroom teachers, partly because there were a number of requests for transfer out of these schools by teachers and principals who had been there before the experiment started.

Controversy has surrounded this experiment, and has been well publicised. Whatever happens should teach us important lessons about the possibilities of local self-government in disadvantaged areas of the big city. We may remind ourselves that in a middle-class community, the parents and community leaders exercise a great deal of informal control over their local schools. Through the Parents' Association, and through easy access to the central administration, they can complain about a school principal or teacher and produce changes. They are also likely to be consulted informally on the assignment of a new principal.

The move for local community control in slum areas, and racially segregated areas, is really an attempt by heretofore powerless groups to secure the same degree of control over their local schools as exists in practice for middle income groups.

Strong support is now being given, in various quarters, to the idea of self-determination for the poor

and the disadvantaged sections of the population. Out of this will possibly come some sort of system of local community school councils with considerable power to advise the school administration. Probably the actual control of appointment of personnel to the local school, and of the content of the curriculum, will remain in the hands of the administration of the city schools.

The difficulties and the conflicts that have occurred in the New York City experiment make it clear that this is a major problem for our society to solve--perhaps the critical problem in the evolution of America toward a truly integrated democratic society. This is a completely different problem from that of administrative decentralization of New York City into 15 or 30 autonomous districts of 50,000 pupils. Not until we get down to an area of 5,000 to 10,000 pupils can we speak realistically of local community control of the schools.

A rather different solution of the problem of local community control and participation has been worked out in Chicago, in the Woodlawn area, a segregated Negro area just south of the University of Chicago. Here has been created an advisory board to the Chicago School Board, consisting of equal numbers of people named by three parties: The Woodlawn Organization (a local community organization); the Chicago Public Schools; and the University of Chicago. This organization has the advantage of bringing the various interested parties into direct communication for cooperative

attack on problems; rather than confrontation in the press and the public view before they have a chance to work out their differences. It remains to be seen whether the local community representatives will be satisfied with this kind of arrangement.

Integration versus Decentralization

It is important to keep in view the basic conflict between decentralization of administration and decision-making power in a big city, and the goal of social integration in a city that is segregated by race and income. In order to increase social integration, there must be a central power working for integration against the segregative tendencies of decentralization. The further we go toward local community control of schools in the present big-city situation, the more difficulty we create for a policy of social integration. In the suburbs, there is too much local community control for the health of the whole metropolitan area.

A truly wise policy that guides educational development in the metropolitan area will seek a viable balance among three forces:

1. The drive for self-determination in matters of education and local government by the poor and the disadvantaged racial minorities.

2. The push for flexibility and innovation in the very large school systems.

3. The ideal of social integration of people of various racial and economic groups.