DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 995 UD 010 497

AUTHOR Gittell, Marilyn
TITLE The Community School in the Nation. Community Issues.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Queens Coll.
PUB DATE Feb 70
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS Boards of Education, City Problems, *Community Control, *Community Involvement, *Community Schools, *Decentralization, Demonstration Projects, Educational Finance, Experimental Schools, *Federal Programs, Minority Role, Private Schools, Public Schools, Suburban Schools, Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

The major stimulus of the community school movement is a general dissatisfaction with the existing public education system, the greatest thrust having come from the minority groups. The two major difficulties appear to be the creation of independent schools or districts under local community control, and the development of adequate funding resources once independence is established. All of the private community schools are facing financial crisis--Federal funds, though a source of potential support, are insufficient to satisfy expansion. Legislation in several states allowing state aid to private schools may ultimately provide the largest potential source. Both groups of community school activists--those who seek change in the system, and those who have abandoned the system--have been faced with great adversity in their cause; there is, though, a mounting commitment to the movement. The movement seriously questioned whether public school systems are effective. The movement fosters an attitude of public accountability for professional performance. Various groups no longer accept an arrangement whereby schools function isolated from the public, oblivious to its needs and demands. From the experience of community control schools, there exists only one of several possible future options--only city-wide total system reform offers a viable alternative. (RJ)

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE . . .

The Institute for Community Studies, Queens College, serves as a link between the urban university and the urban community. The Institute brings to bear the intellectual resources of the university to the problems of urban society, while bringing the urban community in touch with the world of the university.

As such, the Institute offers the urban community research and technical expertise. Within the university, the Institute offers educational programs in urban studies: Credit courses in urban affairs are sponsored by the Institute; as are adult education courses on topical urban issues. In addition, the Institute holds workshops in the community, university conferences on urban topics, and training programs for citizens.

The Institute publishes a monthly publication, COMMUNITY, reviewing current developments in urban studies, and occasional monographs, COMMUNITY ISSUES, analyzing topical urban issues.

At present, the Institute is the recipient of a Ford Foundation grant to provide technical services to demonstration school programs in community participation, while researching and evaluating those programs.

THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL IN THE NATION

by Marilyn Gittell

Feb '70

Dr. Gittell is Professor of Political Science, Queens College of the City University of New York and Director of the Institute for Community Studies. She has published five books, including *Participants and Participation: A Study of School Policy in New York City* (Praeger).

In a short time, the community school concept has provoked a wide variety of interpretations. What constitutes "a community school"? Definitions vary. Some consider a "community school" one which services the interests of the community in such areas as recreation and adult education. Others consider such a school to be governed and operated by and for the community. Essentially, a community school is one which is responsive to community needs and interests both in program and in structure. The schools and/or districts, therefore, characterized as "community schools" must combine educational and political criteria; particular stress is on parent participation in school governance combined with a strong orientation toward responsiveness to community needs.

The assumption of a community school system is that only in an improved environment can educational solutions be tried and tested fairly. Also, reform of the system toward greater community involvement increases educational alternatives offered, since one can presume a greater willingness to experiment. New lay participants provide a fertile source for ideas; and the system must respond to innovation and positive change to renew itself.

Thus, the overcentralization and bureaucratization of city school systems, and, their resultant failure to respond to mounting community needs stimulated the development of community schools. Ultimately, this bureaucratic stasis led to the transformation of the concept of community participation into what is now known as community control.

The community school movement also owes some of its impetus to Federal programs which encouraged parent participation in school policy making. Local parent governing councils were an integral part of Headstart and Follow-Through programs. Community directed projects—such as after school centers, adult education classes, and other compensatory programs—have often required community involvement in planning. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, for example, recommended the creation of citizen advisory councils to consider and review local policies under the provisions of the Act; Title I programs were to be approved by local community councils. The Model Cities legislation reinforced this concept by providing for community participation in its planning councils. It is not surprising, therefore, that the educational components of local Model Cities plans require some degree of community control of local schools.

Closely related to this general trend toward local control is the school decentralization reform movement in large cities. This reform movement is a by product of the dissatisfaction with educational systems which ignore local needs and interests. Still in its early stages, citizen demands for city-wide decentralization range from plans for an increased share of decision-making for the local neighborhood district to complete

separation of sections of the city into independent school districts under state supervision. The more extreme the conditions in a city and its ghetto neighborhoods, the more radical are the demands for change. Understandably, community groups in Harlem and Watts have pressed for complete independence from their city school systems. More modified arrangements are found in the three demonstration districts in New York City (Ocean Hill-Brownsville, Two Bridges, and the I.S. 201 Complex) and the Anacostia district in Washington, D.C., all of whom operate under the city board's of education. The Woodlawn district in Chicago and the Adams-Morgan school in Washington, D.C. represent efforts at creating a three way community- university-city structure in the operation of a community school. The latter are now, however, moving further toward more extensive community control while de-emphasizing the university role.

In the last two years, several large city school boards and state legislatures have considered city-wide decentralization (mainly involving a devolution of administrative power to local districts). The Michigan and New York legislatures enacted laws for Detroit and New York City school systems delegating increased powers to local districts. Both plans call for local school board elections within the city school district. In each case, professional educators defeated more radical plans entailing a greater delegation of powers to the local community. At present, the Massachusetts legislature is considering a bill enabling local control districts to be established in Boston and several other larger cities. In Washington, D.C. the Board of Education has been considering plans for some city-wide decentralization program to be effective within the next year.

In addition to state and city-wide efforts to achieve a greater degree of community involvement in schools, individual districts and school board members in many large cities have developed plans of their own. Under Model Cities legislation, formal plans in Philadelphia, Dayton and Gary create community control school districts. Unofficial arrangements in individual schools in Detroit, Philadelphia and New York City involve parents committees in the selection of programs and personnel. The Joan of Arc Complex in New York City elected its own unofficial local school board in 1968. In individual schools in cities throughout the country parent groups have demanded a role in the selection of a principal. Although not formally recognized as community schools or districts these efforts reflect the general thrust of the movement.

Suburban school districts are traditionally self-governing. Some interpreters of the scene point to them as models for community school districts in the city. The mere election of a local school board, however, should not be considered indicative of a community school project or even a community oriented school program. Direct parent participation in the policy process is the essence of the community school concept. And in suburban districts there may be little such emphasis compared to the inner city. In several minority group suburban areas, however, there is evidence of increasing interest in guaranteeing a more direct parent role in the policy process. Those districts would therefore, appropriately be considered a part of the community school movement within the public school system.

It is apparent that accumulated frustrations with city school systems and their general resistance to change has stimulated greater interest in the private community

controlled school concept. Throughout the country community groups are turning away from the public school system to the alternative of private community run schools. Because these efforts are centered in ghetto communities, funding often comes from public sources but the schools remain outside the public school system.

These two general categories of community schools are distinguished by their strategies. In the former, emphasis is on community schools as part of the existing public school system, offering an alternative to the traditional school concept. It may include individual schools but is more likely to be a school district within the city or suburban community. School reform is wholly dependent upon the system. The struggle is largely one of wresting policy power from the central system. The latter category establishes the private community school as an alternative to the public system and sets its own standards for reform.

Community Schools Within the System.

1) The City Experimental Community School.

Community control has become closely identified with city school decentralization. However, the two concepts should be distinguished. Although decentralization is a prerequisite for community control, it is possible to decentralize a city school system without any devolution of power to the local district. The Philadelphia Board of Education, for example, is committed to administrative decentralization, that is the superintendent and the board are willing to delegate powers to the district superintendents. However, there is no real commitment to a direct community role in the policy process. Plans for reorganization are centrally developed and centralized professional control is maintained. Community control would require a balance of power between professionals and parents in the policy process.

All of the community schools have elected local governing boards which include community representation. Although the extent of power exercised by the boards vary, their own emphasis has been on the selection of personnel and the development of their own programs. Community involvement in the schools is achieved through school board elections, extensive use of paraprofessionals and the development of programs and staff which reach out into the community.

In New York City, the decentralization movement has been intimately associated with community control. The impetus for the creation of community school districts in New York can be traced to the unsuccessful struggle for school integration. The concept of community control emerged during the summer of 1966, at Intermediate School 201 in East Harlem, in response to repeated frustrations in attempting to secure an integrated student body for the school. Community groups seriously objected to central board policies ignoring local interests and recommendations. The continued inability of these groups to influence the central bureaucracy and the Board of Education resulted in demands for some form of local control in several districts.

Three local demonstration districts were established in 1967, providing for increased parent representation and an undefined measure of local control. Each of the districts was located in ghetto areas; in East Harlem (I.S. 201 Complex); the Lower

East Side (Two Bridges Model School District); and in Brooklyn (Ocean Hill-Brownsville). In each, the district comprised an intermediate school (two in Ocean Hill- Brownsville) and 4 to 6 elementary schools. Planning grants provided by the Ford Foundation were used to establish election and governance machinery. Community groups sought cooperation with the union and the Board of Education early in the planning stage.

The community elected a local governing board in each district, originally composed of parent representatives from each school, community residents, teachers, and supervisory personnel. Activists from local poverty agencies in the community provided a core of leadership for the local boards. The boards presumed the power to initiate and implement new educational programs in their schools, although clear guidelines could not be agreed upon with the Board of Education. Guidelines outlining the role of the district boards prepared by the Board of Education contrasted sharply with demands by the districts for delegated powers. The districts sought control over personnel, budget, curriculum and school policy. The Board of Education considered local elections sufficient. Almost immediately after their creation, the United Federation of Teachers, the Council of Supervisory Associations and the Board of Education challenged attempts by the local district boards or their locally selected administrators to establish a direct policy role.

Frustrations multiplied in the first year of operation of the demonstration community control districts. This was particularly so in the Spring of 1968 when the Ocean Hill-Brownsville board transferred teachers involuntarily. The union responded by striking the district and ultimately all the city schools. The confrontation between the professionals and their labor allies and ghetto residents revealed the strong vested interest in maintaining the status quo of educational institutions. Subsequent state legislation in 1969 abolished the demonstration districts. The legislation called for the creation of not more than 32 local community districts with locally elected boards. These districts would have only limited discretion in school policy.

The politics of decentralization in New York reflects the alliances that are likely to develop in any city to prevent community control. Although the demonstration districts exercised some self-made power in the appointment of principals and teachers and in the development of new education programs, their challenge to the power structure, particularly to the school professionals resulted in legislative retrenchment.

From the reactions and responses observed in the three demonstration school projects in New York City it appears that even that limited experiment stimulated wider local participation. Election returns in governing board elections—although somewhat influenced by lack of publicity, the inability to attain registration lists from the Board of Education, and the community's lack of experience in conducting political campaigns—are higher than the responses in other local political elections in the same districts. Estimates of eligible parent voters who participated in the three districts were approximately 20 per cent in the 201 Complex, 30 per cent in Ocean Hill-Brownsville, and 50 per cent in Two Bridges. There are also indications of wider parent interest and involvement in school meetings and organizations in these communities. The recruitment of governing board members from low socio-economic status was another important accomplishment in the experiment. This experience suggests that low participation by level of income or socio-economic status reflects the failure of our political system to

provide the means for participation. Given a political structure with which the ghetto resident can identify and the delegation of effective power in decision making, his involvement is substantially increased.

In Washington, D.C. there are two community school projects in operation: the Anacostia school district and the Adams-Morgan school. The Anacostia district, which includes 10 schools, is located in the southeast portion of Washington. The project was run for a year by an elected planning council comprised of 28 parents, 10 teachers, 4 community residents, and 4 teenagers. In November, 1969, an official governing board was elected in the district. As yet it has no clearly defined powers. The district has chosen an administrator and is negotiating with the central board for a determination of their authority. With Federal funding they have initiated an extensive paraprofessional program and are developing a scheme for community organization and involvement in the district.

The Adams-Morgan Community school in Washington, D.C. predates the Anacostia experiment. The elected Community Board is composed of parents, community residents, and students. In the original plan for the school arranged by the D.C. Board of Education in 1967, Antioch College was a major participant. In fact, college faculty assigned to the school virtually controlled curriculum development and staff assignments in its first year. Almost immediately community residents and parents on the board demanded a greater role for themselves. The board hired its own principal and he has gradually assumed much of the power originally exercised by the college. A growing commitment to community control and independence of operation has led to new negotiations with the D.C. Board of Education for a greater share of policy-making powers. The union has agreed that supplemental contract negotiation with the school can be established.

Chicago offers an example of an early community control experiment. Woodlawn's experimental school district was developed with the help of university personnel. The governing board of the Woodlawn district operates three schools—the Wadsworth Elementary School, the Wadsworth Upper Grades Center and the Hyde Park High School—with a total of about 3,000 students.

The board has 21 members—seven appointed by the Chicago Board of Education, seven by the University of Chicago and seven by the Woodlawn Organization. Two teachers from each of its schools sit in on board meetings as advisors. Two student observers attend all board meetings. Each of the seven-member segments caucuses and casts one vote ,and no action can be taken without unanimous consent.

The legal authority of the Woodlawn Board comes from a memorandum of agreement signed between the local experimental board and the Chicago Board of Education in August, 1967. Under this agreement, the local board has full authority over all federal funds, it also controls its general financing, curriculum, teacher appointments, school programs and community relations.

Officially the Woodlawn group makes recommendations to the Board of Education; thus far, however, the Board of Education has acted positively to prior suggestions. The experimental board screened all teachers appointed to the schools. One attempt by the board to fire teachers was vetoed by the university representative. The experimental

board has hired a group of community agents who work not only in and through the schools, but directly with families of school children. Teachers' aides are hired from among community residents, many of them parents of children in the schools.

The movement for community control for inner city schools and districts gathered momentum in 1968 and 1969. In 1968 Michigan legislation was approved that does delegate certain powers to the regional districts. The City Board of Education is now preparing plans for implementation of the legislation. District lines are being drawn and guidelines for the delegation of some powers are being determined. Black community groups are concerned that sufficient powers be assigned to the regional district boards which are to be elected under the legislation. The union and professional groups of educators appear to be defending more centralized controls. Local administrators will continue to be chosen from a list of eligibles provided by central headquarters staff.

As indicated, the New York legislature approved a modified decentralization plan for New York City which will also be implemented this year. The Massachusetts legislature will vote on enabling legislation in 1970 for the creation of Community Control Districts in Boston. A subcommittee of the California legislature was assigned the task of preparing a plan for the city of Los Angeles. The New Jersey State Commissioner of Education has been developing a program for the creation of local districts in cities with state support.

One of the new stimulants to the community control movement likely to gain in importance in the next few years is the Model Cities program. In several cities its impact is already evident. In Dayton, Ohio, a community school district proposed for the West Dayton area became part of its Model Cities educational component. An election for a community board was held in March, 1969 in the ten local schools comprising the district. The Dayton Board of Education has indicated support of the concept but no clear outline of the relationship of the local board to the city board has been defined. Plans call for expanded local authority in personnel selection and budgeting but the actual delegation of power awaits further negotiation. Model Cities plans in Philadelphia and Gary, Indiana also stress expanded community involvement in the running of schools, however, no official action has yet been taken.

Several Follow-Through to Headstart schools, which have been developing throughout the country, can be classified as true community schools with emphasis on parent control. Although not an integral part of the public system many of them are dependent on these systems for support and delegation of powers. In East St. Louis, Missouri, Greeley, Colorado and Pulaski County, Arkansas these schools have created parent boards and developed programs for the early grades to be operated as community schools. Programs emphasize direct parent roles in adoption of policy and in the selection of personnel.

The most radical plan for community control in any city was presented in New York City and came from Harlem CORE. It called for an independent school district in Central Harlem to be established outside the city school system answerable only to the State educational authorities. Those who developed the plan claimed that a local district under the thumb of the city school system could never achieve meaningful independence and community control. A coalition of Harlem groups under the aegis

of the Independent Harlem School Board sought control of personnel, budget and curriculum. They wanted a district that would have the same status as the city district, operating under state rather than city guidelines. For two successive sessions the legislature allowed the bill to languish in committee.

2) Suburban Districts

Although some observers cited suburban school districts as models for local control of schools, in most cases, election of local boards of education and referenda on school budgets constitutes the full extent of local participation. Parent involvement is, in fact, often discouraged. Moreover, long term recontracting with school superintendents reinforces a monopoly of professional control. Some interesting developments, limited in number, suggest a different attitude emerging in several suburban districts, particularly in minority area suburban communities. Inkster, Michigan and Palo Alto, California, are worthy of citation as indicative of a suburban community school system.

Inkster is approximately 13 miles outside of Detroit and is a black community with a school population of 5,000. The seven member Board of Education is locally elected. A variety of committees have been organized on the school level to supplement board action and broaden the base of community participation. Parents, community residents, teachers, and board members, serve on policy making committees on administrative appointments, school planning and curriculum.

Ravenswood, an elementary school district within the larger East Palo Alto School District in Southern California includes ten elementary schools. Approximately 4,000 of the 5,600 students in the districts are black. The freeway divides the larger district into its racially and economically diverse elements and separates Ravenswood physically from the larger district.

The elected 5-member Ravenswood school board has fiscal and budget powers as well as control over curriculum and personnel. The board is elected in a non-partisan election. The selection of the superintendent of schools by the local board was the result of a five month nationwide search which was directed at finding an administrator sympathetic to local parent involvement. There is also a concerted effort to recruit black teachers from the South. A school-community counsellor program, funded under Title I, was designed to bring the community and the school closer together. The staff members act as liaison workers between their communities and schools and the program is staffed by outspoken members of the community. Three community groups have been formed which are actively engaged in focussing on conditions in the schools and seeking greater accountability to the community. These groups have provided a significant impetus for reorienting the district to local concerns and greater community involvement.

A Citizen's Advisory Committee was established by the Ravenswood Board composed of three people from each school in the district. The teachers send a representative from the elementary and secondary levels, whereas the board and the superintendent each have a representative in the committee as well. The committee is currently working on developing a new curriculum and plans to become more directly involved in an advisory capacity in other policy areas.

Activity in these two suburban districts suggests that in some minority group suburban areas at least dissatisfaction with schools has stimulated increased attention to more direct and more meaningful parent and community participation in the development of educational policy beyond the elected school board approach. Fundamental to the concept of parent involvement is the need to achieve accountability on the part of the professional staff. Frustration with practices and results in other communities may produce similar efforts in other suburban areas in the near future.

The Private Community School (An Alternative System)

An increasing number of school critics envision the private community school alternative to the public school system as the only viable solution to the urban education crisis. The number of schools in this category is increasing, especially as reform of large city school systems proves unattainable. In New York City, one experiment is particularly noteworthy—the East Harlem Block Schools. The East Harlem Block Schools was conceived by dissatisfied inner city parents who had positive experience in Headstart programs. Funds were provided under the poverty program and day care center project of New York State. It was started with 25 nursery age children and new classes have been added each year through the third grade. Currently, there are two nursery schools with three classes in each and two first grade classes in the third school. The schools are located in storefronts of middle and low-income housing projects.

The elected governing board makes all policy decisions, in such areas as fiscal affairs, planning, curriculum, and personnel appointments. Each month the classroom teachers meet with parents and encourage them to inquire about school programs and their child's work. Paraprofessionals used extensively in the classrooms are often parents. There is at least one Spanish-speaking adult in each classroom to satisfy the needs of the large Puerto Rican student population.

Community groups in Boston rejecting the public school system have set up three independent schools: The Roxbury Community School, The New School, and the Hyland Park Free School. State enabling legislation approved in 1969 facilitates the creation of independent school districts and the three schools are currently planning to form a federation.

The Roxbury Community School was started, three years ago, in the black section of Boston with 28 children in a living room. The Board is composed of parents, a Harvard professor, a businessman, and a suburban housewife. The school is supported by tuition, foundation grants, and other private sources. The Hyland Park Free School began in 1967 with approximately 30 parents who were dissatisfied with the public school system. The school is run by the School-Community Committee, which makes all school policy decisions; it is modeled after the British Infant School Open Integrated Day with non-graded classes. Presently there are 117 children in the school. The school is currently looking into the possibility of establishing a permanent tax-based funding arrangement. One of the educational innovations adopted by the Hyland Park School is the community, or non-certified teacher; these teachers hired on a 12 month basis are working toward certification. Both students and faculty are racially mixed; three fourth of the community have incomes below $1,000 per family member.

A large group of private community schools are also planned for West Philadelphia. The Mantua Planning Council hopes to establish 40 private school which will be in five clusters of eight schools each. Each cluster will have its own community board with the needs of the community given special attention. To date, the Mantua Powelton Mini School is the only school that has been established in the area. The school opened in September, 1968 under funds from the Rockefeller Foundation. Children were recruited from the public schools and there is now a student population of 115. Black culture is stressed in the curriculum and the general educational orientation is geared to learning by direct experience and participation. The Pennsylvania legislature approved legislation in 1968 which provides state aid for non-public schools and may well prove to be a major impetus for the development of additional private community schools.

Other independent community controlled schools have been organized in New York, Michigan and New Jersey and movement in this direction is discernible among community groups in other states. In all instances the organization of these schools reflects a loss of faith in public education to achieve a true community school concept. Certainly the effort and energy which must be invested in reform of inner city schools is discouraging too many. For those people the alternate or parallel system approach is far more appealing than constant battle with the city school system.

It is obvious from this summary of the community school movement that its major stimulus is a general dissatisfaction with the existing public education system. The greatest thrust has come from the minority group populations—the poorest served clientele of the system—although their children may comprise a majority of the school population. The two major difficulties appear to be the creation of independent schools or districts under local community control and the development of adequate funding resources once independence is established. All of the private community schools are facing financial crises. Federal funds supplied largely through Follow-Through programs are a source of potential support but insufficient to satisfy expansion. Day Care programs appear to be another potential area of support. Legislation in several states allowing for state aid to private schools may ultimately provide the largest potential source.

Both groups of community school activists—those who seek change in the system and those who have abandoned the system—have been faced with great adversity in their cause. Nevertheless, there is a mounting commitment to the movement. Public policies increasingly reflect the need to provide for a balance between public and professional roles. The movement seriously questioned whether public school systems are effective. Most important, this movement fosters an attitude of public accountability for professional performance. Throughout the country various groups no longer accept an arrangement whereby schools function isolated from the public and oblivious to its needs and demands. As a result the community school has emerged both informally and formally. In the last year for example, a national organization of community schools has been forged which may be an important instrument for communication and support for the community control movement. The National Association for Community Schools* may well be an active force in encouraging support for a greater community role in school policy formulation.

What can one conclude from the experience of community control schools so far? Evidently, there exists only one of several possible options for the future. The private parallel system will be short lived unless it is able, through special programs, to secure additional public funds. It is extremely unlikely that large investments can be made from the private sector to continue parallel systems. Only under the aegis of such programs as Headstart and Day Care can private schools survive over a long period of time. The likelihood, therefore, of wide scale school reform into a community school system by means of a private parallel system seems dim. The experience of demonstration school districts, such as those in New York City, suggests that city-wide decentralization is preferable. A strategy predicated on piecemeal "experimental model subsystems" appears doomed to fail. Too many successful experiments are abandoned callously. Experiments are never truly models in community control, and suffer the extra-political fate in large cities of potentially being victims of backlash. Only city-wide total system reform offers a viable alternative yet the political forces in opposition to such a thrust are strong.

***In June of 1969, representatives from twenty-three community schools met in Washington to form the National Association of Community Schools. The ostensible purpose of the organization was self-help, mainly through supplying technical assistance to one another and to disseminate mutual information regarding community schools. The new organization set up headquarters in Washington, drafted by-laws and filed incorporation papers. The likelihood is that the NACS will function as a pressure group. The new organization grew out of a survey begun by staff of the Institute for Community Studies in response to interest in community schools for such an organization and the organizing of the national planning conference was funded by the Taconic Foundation.

APPENDIX

The following list was compiled by Tim Parsons, Lorraine Maxwell and Trevor Walker as part of a survey sponsored by the Institute.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INDIVIDUAL

The Morgan School
1773 California Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 202/462-6110

The Morgan school is currently pressuring the District of Columbia Board of Education for a new school building, as well as for more policy-making powers. The Morgan staff is hired and fired by the School Community Board which is made up of mostly Black parents, young adults, teenagers and staff. Morgan has changed its staffing pattern; higher paid regular teachers have been replaced by a larger number of community teachers. The school will have a new director this year.

Newark, New Jersey
Springfield Avenue Community School
517 Springfield Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 201/824-4455

The Springfield Avenue School opened in January 1969 under joint control of the Newark Day Care Council and the Board of Education. Initiated by efforts of the community based Day Care Council, "establishment groups" gave their support only after the dynamic community leadership of Edna Thomas made it clear to the establishment that such a school could and *would* be a reality. First priority is given to children whose parents are in job training programs. The school has grades pre-k to second. The New Jersey State Department of Education has a share in developing the educational programs for the school.

Greeley, Colorado
Parent Implemented Follow-Through Project
Administration Building
811 15th Street
Greeley, Colorado

The Greeley Project is located in a public elementary school in a Mexican-American section of town. Planning, personnel selection and much of the budget is controlled bv a board elected by the parents. The City Board of Education has relinquished an unusually large amount of power to these mostly Mexican-American parents. There is a great emphasis on parent involvement in this Project. Doubling in size from the 40 kindergarteners enrolled last year, the project plans to add a grade each year.

Sayre Junior High School Committee
59th and Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

The Sayre Junior High School Committee in West Philadelphia is made up of Sayre parents and interested commu-

nity persons. The committee has been able over the past four years to effect a number of changes in this overcrowded school without the benefit of any official power. A reading and math tutorial and a Career Development lab are among the programs initiated by the Committee.

The Day School
Brenton Wood School
East Palo Alto, California

The school was founded in the 1966-67 school year by about 15 community residents and parents to provide interim tutoring services during a high school boycott. The school is presently run as a Saturday and evening tutorial with a great deal of stress on reading and black awareness. Within the next two years the board hopes to have its own building and sufficient funds to operate as a full time school.

DISTRICTS

I.S. 201 Community School District
103 East 125th Street
New York, N. Y. 212/427-0516

The I.S. 201 district is one of the demonstration districts set up in Spring, 1968. The Governing Board was elected by Blacks and Puerto Ricans in the East Harlem area, many of the parent representatives were previously active in the local poverty agencies.

Ocean Hill-Brownsville
Demonstration District
249 Hopkinson Avenue
Brooklyn, N. Y. 212/345-8118-9

Ocean Hill-Brownsville is a demonstration district located in a Black and Puerto Rican section of Brooklyn. Its Governing Board is also community based and community-elected. Last Fall, Ocean Hill was the center of attraction in the New York City teachers' strike. The United Federation of Teachers opposed the Governing Board's efforts to transfer teachers who the Board felt were inadequate. During the past year such programs as a bilingual program and Afro-American and Latin-American cultural centers have been set up. An At-Home Reading Program has also been established that utilizes parent volunteers and paid community workers.

Two Bridges Model School District
217 Park Row
New York, N. Y. 212/962-1410

This is the third of the demonstration districts. Elected at-large community delegates and parent representatives from each school compose the 10 member board. Additional teacher-staff representatives resigned more than a year ago. This district has unique problems due to the racial composition of the community, Chinese, Puerto Rican, Black and White. There are tri-lingual workshops to aid both parents and students. Community programs such as Operation Outreach help to encourage and train parents to be active in the schools and community life in general.

Inkster, Michigan
The Inkster School Board
Superintendent, Dr. Edward Fort
29115 Carlyle Avenue
Inkster, Michigan

The locally-elected Inkster School Board (6 Black and 1 white member) has full powers under Michigan law to run its schools. The Board involves the parents and the community in its decisions through the use of parent committees. Committee recommendations are used as a basis for some important Board decisions. Title III funds provide the support for a Child Development Center in Inkster which all kindergarten-age children attend. The center uses parent assistants and encourages experimental teaching methods. Due to the low income of most community residents, Inkster has been unable to raise enough tax money to open a new junior high school. It has been left unused since it was built two years ago.

The SEED Project
4602 Third Street
San Francisco, Calif. 94124

The South East Educational Development program was set up to attempt to bring the Hunters Point-Bayview Community and the San Francisco Unified School District closer together for cooperative, educational purposes. Para-professional and community agents attempt to achieve this purpose. The basic problem is how to involve poor parents in the planning and control of the program.

Washington, D.C.
The Anacostia Community Planning Council
2250 Railroad Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20020 202/584-2800

The Anacostia Community Planning Council was set up by the Federal government as an experimental project to attempt to find some of the answers to the educational problems in D.C. The Planning Council has 46 members and is made up of predominately Black parents, community people, teachers, and students. The parents are utilized in the school as CRAs, reading assistants. The Council and the D.C. Board of Education are trying to work out a partnership plan to control the Anacostia district's ten schools.

Pulaski County, Ark.
Parent Implemented Follow-Through Project
Rte. 2, Box 532
Little Rock, Ark.

The Follow-Through project at the College Station Elementary School started in the summer of 1968. Advised by Ken Haskins of the Morgan Community School, the group of 59 Black and one White parents hired a director, set plans and budget and hired a teacher and aides. The white County Board of Education agreed that money from Follow-Through in Washington would be controlled by the locally selected parent board. The project included only the first grade with

plans to add a grade a year. Subsequently, the parent board will extend its control each year to include a new grade. The children are served two hot meals a day, the parents can leave their children at school as early as 7:00 A.M. and pick them up at 5 P.M.

Dayton, Ohio
Model Cities Community School Council
Director: Arthur Thomas
1665 Richley Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45408 513/222-6101

The Model Cities Educational Component held community-school board elections in the west Dayton area, 98% black, this past Spring. The elections were conducted on a door-to-door basis. The community board hopes to work in a partnership arrangement with the Dayton Board of Education. The specifics of the arrangement will be established at a later date. Meanwhile the community board is developing parent constituencies which can bring pressure on the schools.

East St. Louis, Illinois
Follow-Through Project
Director: Geraldine Jenkins
902 Illinois Avenue
East St. Louis, Illinois 62201

The Follow-Through Project in East St. Louis has been in operation for one year. After a number of visits to different community schools, the parents' committee decided to use the Bereiter-Englemann approach in their program. The project plans to add a grade each year. Involving about 250 first graders in a number of schools; the first year of the program developed a good deal of interest among hopeful parents. East St. Louis is an extremely poor community with 50% black population.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
District #4 Ad Hoc Committee
32nd and Ridge Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The Philadelphia Board of Education is considering decentralization plans for that city which would delegate more power to the district offices. The District #4 Committee is attempting to organize its North Philadelphia community so that the Black community will have some influence in running that district's schools. A proposal has been written outlining the Committee's plans for involving the community in its children's education.

East Palo Alto, California
Ravenswood City School District

The Ravenswood Elementary School District serves a predominately Black area near San Francisco. The 5-man locally-elected school board includes four black members. Although as a state district the Ravenswood Board already has the control that a board like Ocean Hill would like to have, the pressing responsibility on the Ravenswood Board is to involve the community at large in the decision-making process. Title I funds have been made available for a School-Community Counselor program which was designed to bring the community and the school closer together. Several

community-based groups have arisen spontaneously in an effort to involve the community in the education of its children.

Private Schools
PUBLIC FUNDS

Roxbury Community School
1 Leyland Street
Roxbury, Mass. 617/445-5197

The Roxbury School has begun its fourth year in September, and in keeping with plans to add a grade each year, the fourth grade will begin this year. Started by a group of low income Black parents dissatisfied with Boston public schools, Roxbury School is completely controlled by an elected Board of twenty parents. Funds from Follow-Through, small foundations and individuals support this private school. Also, the school has obtained a small grant to conduct a community intern-teacher program; the community teachers will work in the classroom and towards their degree.

Chicago, Ill.
T.W.O. Experimental Schools Project
Director: Barbara Sizemore
6253 South Woodlawn
Chicago, Ill. 312/955-1840, 1880

The T.W.O. Project is three years old. It is a "partnership" in Black Southside Chicago between the community and the establishment; the 21-member Board is 1/3 Board of Education, 1/3 University of Chicago, and 1/3 community (selected by The Woodlawn Organization). Currently, the parents are being involved in drawing up plans for the Hyde Park High School which will be implemented in the 1970 budget. The parents are working along with the teachers in developing special trips, books and laboratories to enrich the student's cultural experiences during the Fall term.

New York, New York
The East Harlem Block Schools
Director: Dorothy Stoneman
94 East 111th Street
New York, N. Y. 212/SA. 2-6350

The East Harlem Block Schools, in their fourth year of operation, is adding a third grade to the elementary school. The Block Schools are privately funded and controlled by the elected board of low income Puerto Rican and Black parents. Inspired by their success in changing regulations affecting their Day Care-nursery program, the parents are attempting this year to make all of New York City Day Care subject to more parental control. The Block Schools have plans to obtain long-range funding through Urban Coalition and more permanent classroom space through an arrangement with Model Cities. The schools were the recipient of a small Follow-Through grant for the Fall.

DUAL FUNDING

Arizona
Rough Rock Demonstration Project
Dine, Inc.
Chinle, Arizona 86503 602/781-6284

The Rough Rock Demonstration School, on a Navajo reservation, began its fourth year in September. It is *totally*

controlled by an elected board of seven Navajos. All of the teacher aides are Navajo; the professional teachers, the majority of whom are white, spend a part of their times in the hogans (homes) of the students. The school teaches Navajo as the first language; a number of books, in Navajo, have been published by the school. The school receives money from Follow-Through, Headstart, foundations and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE FUNDS

The New School for Children
27 Dudley Street
Roxbury, Mass. 617/427-2445

The New School enrolls a mixture of low and middle income black and white students. It is controlled by a Board elected by the parents. The New School has recently hired a new Headmaster, Mr. Al Holland. The New School has also recently acquired a new school building of which 1/5 of the classroom space will be used for an after school community center.

Council for Community Education Development
c/o Mr. Paul Parks, Model Cities Administrator
Bartlett Building, 2401 Washington St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02119

The Council was set up by the Massachusetts state legislature to establish an experimental alternative public school system in Boston including five predominately black inner city communities. The interim CCED Board consists of civic leaders, educators, and community people. An elected Board is now being designed. The Board intends to work closely with the community in the setting up and running of these schools. A Ford Foundation grant of $15,000 has enabled the Board to do some initial planning.

San Francisco, California
Malcolm X School
Director: Melvin Stroud
540 McAllister Street
San Francisco, Calif. 415/863-2248

The Malcolm X School began its second year in September, with a larger student body than last year. The school stresses black awareness and academic skills such as reading. Last year, sixth grade students put together a reader; this year the school hopes to publish more books with the help of the students.

The Martin Luther King School
632 Oak Street
San Francisco, Calif. 415/849-1553

The Martin Luther King school began as a freedom school when a public school was boycotted in 1965, due to a conflict between the principal and a black teacher, supported by the black community. The founders of the school raised money initially by making speeches around the country. The school is operating full-time and seeking additional funds.

The Children's Community Workshop
567 Columbus Avenue
New York, N. Y. 212/877-1426

The Children's Community Workshop is a small parent-controlled school, 75 children, on Manhattan's west side. The school is run by the racially and economically mixed group of parents and teachers. There is an emphasis on the individual child in the instructional program of the school. The British Infant School method is used. The school depends on private donations and foundation grants for its financial support.

Highland Park Free School
42 Hawthorne Street
Roxbury, Mass 617/427-3400

The Highland Park School has began its second year in September. A privately funded school governed by parents of enrolled students, Highland Park is making an effort to involve more of the low income parents in school activities and control. About three-fourths of the students come from families earning less than $1,000 per family member. A unique feature in the Highland Park School is the community teacher - professional teacher relationship. The classroom teachers are community people; the licensed teachers, from outside the community, serve as technicians and are responsible to the community teacher.

Eastern High School Freedom School
Washington, D.C.

The Freedom School was started by the Modern Strivers at a 99% Black Eastern High School. The Freedom School corporation, composed of 100 students and the staff they select, has been successful in setting up courses in African culture and history which have been accepted as accredited high school courses. The inadequate public schools lack such courses. This project is one of the few community involved/controlled projects that involves a high school. It is also unique because the students have the power. Over $100,000 was raised by the students through nationwide appeals, assistance from the Washington Teachers Union, and a matching grant from National Endowment for the Humanities.

The Mantua-Powelton Mini School
3304 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The Mini school grew out of an idea of the Mantua Planning Council; it is the council's intention that the school will be the beginning of an alternative school system for the West Philadelphia area. Their plan calls for forty schools in all, in 5 groups of 8 schools each; five community boards are to run the schools. Presently, the Mini school is run by the instructors who seem most interested in providing a variety of positive educational experiences for the children. The school operated last year with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. There were 110 students.