



1981

An Analysis of the Administrative Tasks Defined in the Posdcorb Model and Performed in the Operationalizing of the Community Education Concept in Selected Elementary School Districts of Cook County, Illinois

Arthur Edward Jones
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jones, Arthur Edward, "An Analysis of the Administrative Tasks Defined in the Posdcorb Model and Performed in the Operationalizing of the Community Education Concept in Selected Elementary School Districts of Cook County, Illinois" (1981). *Dissertations*. 2030.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2030

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1981 Arthur Edward Jones

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS DEFINED IN
THE POSDCORB MODEL AND PERFORMED IN THE OPERATIONALIZING
OF THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION CONCEPT IN SELECTED ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

by

Arthur E. Jones

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

January

1981

Arthur E. Jones

Loyola University of Chicago

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS DEFINED IN
THE POSDCoRB MODEL AND PERFORMED IN THE OPERATIONALIZING
OF THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION CONCEPT IN SELECTED ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

The general purpose of this dissertation was to analyze the administrative processes and procedures employed in the operationalizing of community education. The POSDCoRB model was selected because it provided an appropriate framework by which the administrative process can be analyzed and assessed and because the POSDCoRB functions correspond with the essential elements of community education development and implementation.

A survey of related literature was presented to provide the practicing administrator with a source of information which could be examined in the event development and implementation of community education was being considered. The review included background information regarding the community education movement and the community education concept; information regarding administrative process as applied to community education; information regarding the application of the community education concept relative to such contemporary educational problems as declining enrollment, school closings, and school economic issues; and an examination of the POSDCoRB model of administration as it applied to this investigation.

The study was conducted in six elementary school districts in Cook County, Illinois which were identified by the Illinois Office of Education as having community education programs and which met one or more of the criteria established for inclusion in this investigation. An interview was conducted with the superintendent of schools, or the administrator responsible for community education in which the district's level of involvement in each POSDCoRB function was probed. In addition, responses regarding the application of community education by district administrators were solicited. The data collected from each district were categorized and reported in relation to each administrative function performed.

Analysis included: An examination of the factors which influenced the administrative decision to initiate the community education process; a comparative analysis of the methodology employed in operationalizing those POSDCoRB functions present in each district; identification and discussion of problems encountered in the administrative process and alternative solutions; examination of the various funding sources employed in the operation of community education; and examination of the future implications for community education as an administrative response to contemporary educational issues.

Conclusions were drawn regarding the utilization of each POSDCoRB administrative function as applied to the operationalizing of the community education concept. Among the conclusions reached were: Planning processes are more purposeful when individuals involved accept and advocate a common philosophical perspective regarding community education; Interagency participation and collaboration in planning activities facilitates the integration of community resources in problem solving and program development; Planning processes should include the identification of the existing community resources required to actualize the concept; Development of a multi-agency community education program will cause new, integrated, governance models to emerge; Cooperative funding models offer the most promise as means of securing and maintaining support for community education programs and processes; Administrators must emphasize the development of community education process if the concept is to become a catalytic force in the development of a synergized school community; Acceptance of community education as a philosophy of education requires the school to assume a proactive role in the community and to act as coordinator, facilitator or initiator for addressing unmet school and community needs. In addition, conclusions were drawn regarding community education as an administrative response to such issues as desegregation and declining enrollment. Recommendations and areas for further study were also presented.

The findings and conclusions reported in this dissertation should be beneficial in assisting school administrators to analyze the process of developing and implementing community education and to avoid the pitfalls inherent in this type of educational enterprise.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my wife, Sally, and to my children, Kathleen and Christopher. Their patience, understanding and encouragement have been invaluable to me during the completion of this dissertation, and their love and support have sustained me throughout its accomplishment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Melvin Heller, Chairman of the Dissertation Committee, for his continued patience, encouragement, and guidance throughout the process of completion of this study and throughout the years I have been in the graduate program at Loyola University.

My gratitude is also extended to Dr. Jasper Valenti and Dr. Phil Carlin for their support and assistance during the development of this study, and to my colleagues and friends who helped me to sustain my effort in this regard.

Finally, I acknowledge my appreciation for the love and support that has been provided to me by my wife, my children, and my parents in all enterprises which I have ever undertaken.

VITA

The author, Arthur Edward Jones II, is the son of Arthur Edward and Mary Elizabeth (Kelly) Jones. He was born October 1, 1942, in Wheeling, West Virginia.

His elementary education was obtained in the public schools of Wheeling, West Virginia, and secondary education at Triadelphia High School where he graduated in 1960.

In September, 1960, he entered Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia and received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1964.

He enrolled in the graduate school of West Virginia University and received the degree of Master of Arts in Guidance and Counseling in 1968.

He has been employed in the field of education since 1964. He has been a teacher at the junior high school level and guidance counselor at the elementary and secondary levels. He has served as an assistant director of guidance and as a junior high school principal. The author is currently Superintendent of Schools for Forest Park Elementary School District No. 91, Forest Park, Illinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
VITA	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES	ix
 CHAPTER	
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Purpose	4
Method and Procedure	8
Limitations and Delimitations	11
Community Education Definition	12
Summary	13
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	15
Community Education	15
Community Education Administration	23
Community Education Applied to Contemporary Educational Issues	31
An Examination of POSDCoRB Administrative Processes	41
Summary	48
III. PRESENTATION OF DATA	51
School District A	52
Background Information Regarding School District A	52
Background Information Regarding Individual Interviewed	53
Planning	53
Organizing	56
Staffing	57
Directing	60
Coordinating	60
Reporting	62
Budgeting	63
Administrative Perceptions	64

	Page
School District B	65
Background Information Regarding	
School District B	65
Background Information Regarding	
Individual Interviewed	65
Planning	66
Organizing	69
Staffing	70
Directing	71
Coordinating	72
Reporting	72
Budgeting	73
Administrative Perceptions	74
 School District C	 75
Background Information Regarding	
School District C	75
Background Information Regarding	
Individual Interviewed	75
Planning	76
Organizing	83
Staffing	85
Directing	88
Coordinating	90
Reporting	92
Budgeting	93
Administrative Perceptions	94
 School District D	 95
Background Information Regarding	
School District D	95
Background Information Regarding	
Individual Interviewed	96
Planning	96
Staffing	99
Directing	101
Coordinating	101
Reporting	103
Budgeting	104
Administrative Perceptions	105
 School District E	 106
Background Information Regarding	
School District E	106
Background Information Regarding	
Individual Interviewed	106
Planning	107

	Page
Organizing	110
Staffing	110
Directing	112
Coordinating	113
Reporting	114
Budgeting	114
Administrative Perceptions	115
School District F	116
Background Information Regarding School District F	116
Background Information Regarding Individual Interviewed	117
Planning	118
Organizing	122
Staffing	122
Directing	123
Coordinating	124
Reporting	125
Budgeting	125
Administrative Perceptions	126
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	127
Examination of Factors Influencing Decision to Implement Community Education	127
Comparative Analysis of Methodology Employed in Operationalizing POSDCoRB Functions	133
Planning	133
Organizing	139
Staffing	143
Directing	149
Coordinating	151
Reporting	154
Budgeting	156
Identification of Problems Encountered and Discussion of Alternative Solutions	160
Examination and Discussion of Community Education Funding Sources	168
Examination of Future Implications of Community Education	173
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	177
General Summary	177

	Page
Conclusions	179
Conclusions Regarding Planning of Community Education	179
Conclusions Regarding Organizing of Community Education	181
Conclusions Regarding Staffing of Community Education	182
Conclusions Regarding Directing of Community Education	184
Conclusions Regarding Coordinating of Community Education	185
Conclusions Regarding Reporting of Community Education	185
Conclusions Regarding Budgeting of Community Education	186
Conclusions Regarding Community Education Programs and Process	187
Conclusions Regarding Community Education as an Administrative Response to Contemporary Educational Issues	188
Recommendations	189
Areas for Further Study	191
Concluding Statement	193
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 194
 APPENDIX A	 198
 APPENDIX B	 206
 APPENDIX C	 217

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A Interview Guide	198
Area I Planning	199
Area II Organizing	200
Area III Staffing	201
Area IV Directing	202
Area V Coordinating	202
Area VI Reporting	203
Area VII Budgeting	204
Area VIII Other Matters for Investigation	205
APPENDIX B School District A Parent Survey	206
APPENDIX C School District B Advisory Council Needs Assessment	217

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

School districts throughout the State of Illinois and the Nation are experiencing declining enrollment, school closings, and reductions in the number of teaching personnel. Accountability has become the watchword in education and public confidence in its schools has allegedly diminished.

In addition, the taxpayer revolt of the seventies has resulted in legislative initiatives intended to limit the schools taxing authority at a time when inflation and ever-increasing demands for programs and services are creating extreme demands upon local school district budgets.

School administrators are required to contend with these competing forces and to find practical solutions to the problems they create.

A concept which promotes collaborative problem solving, increases mutual cooperation and trust, optimizes school-community relations, and mobilizes the human, fiscal, and material resources which exist within school district boundaries deserves investigation.

Proponents of community education maintain that it is such a concept, and although it has its roots in Colonial times, it is currently receiving renewed interest.

Contemporary designs for community education have developed from the efforts of Frank J. Manley and Charles Stewart Mott, founder of the Mott Foundation in Flint, Michigan. This partnership developed in 1935 as a reaction to the growing problems of juvenile delinquency and crime. In contrast to earlier efforts in development of the community education concept, Manley and Mott identified large social issues and then established processes to try to solve them.¹ The ideas nurtured in Flint have grown into a national movement.

From 1964, when there were 100 community schools in America, to 1977 the number grew to 5,885.² This growth is largely a result of the Mott Foundation's training and dissemination efforts. The Foundation has provided funds for 15 universities to develop Centers for Community Education Development, and each center has developed affiliations with other universities and state and county departments of education. Consequently, the national community education network includes 95 centers

¹Clyde M. Campbell, "Contributions of the Mott Foundation to the Community Education Movement," Phi Delta Kappan (November, 1972) p. 195.

²Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Report to the People (December, 1977) p. 8.

with the responsibility for furthering the development of the concept.³

The emphasis on problem-solving which was the major thrust of the early efforts in Flint prevails today.

The potential of community education as a viable philosophy for the educational administrator, and as a model for educational problem-solving is delineated by Minzey as follows:

Community education is not a combination of disjointed programs or an "add on" to the existing educational structure. It is an educational philosophy which has concern for all aspects of community life. It advocates greater use of all facilities in the community, especially school buildings which ordinarily lie idle so much of the time. It has concern for the traditional school program, seeking to expand all types of activities for school-age children to additional hours of the day, week, and year. It also seeks to make the educational program more relevant by bringing the community into the classroom and taking the classroom into the community. It includes equal educational opportunities for adults in all areas of education: academic, recreational, vocational, avocational, and social. It is the identification of community resources and the coordination of these resources to attack community problems. And finally, it is the organization of communities on a local level so that representative groups can establish two-way communication, work on community problems, develop community power, and work toward developing that community into the best it is capable of becoming.⁴

³Ibid.

⁴Jack Minzey, "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," Phi Delta Kappan (November, 1972) p.153.

Considerable research has been conducted relative to identification of the components of community education, the philosophy of the concept, the role of the community-school coordinator and the goals of community education programming; however, very little attention has been given to a study of the administrative processes involved in the development and implementation of the concept.

There is a need to analyze the processes employed by school administrators and to identify those procedures, strategies or methods which prove effective in operationalizing the goals of the community education concept.

There is also a need to assess the effectiveness of community education as a means of responding to the problems which face the educational administrator of the eighties.

It is hoped that the findings and conclusions of this investigation will be beneficial to the educational administrator who wishes to develop the community education concept in his school district.

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to identify elementary school districts in the suburban Chicago area which have implemented the community education concept as defined and to examine the processes and procedures employed.

Among the key descriptive words found in the litera-

ture to describe the interwoven elements of the administrative process are planning, organizing, managing, coordinating, decision-making, appraising, controlling, commanding, programming, deliberating, and evaluating.

Jensen and Clark indicate that all authorities seem to agree that there is some kind of sequential order for the elements in the process, but agreement as to what elements are to be included is much less pronounced.⁵

For the purpose of this investigation a review of various descriptions of the administrative process was completed. This review included an analysis of the work of Fayol (1916), Sears (1950), Gregg (1957), Litchfield (1956), Griffiths and Hemphill (1961), Campbell, Corbally, and Ramsey (1966) and others involved in the study of administrative process.

A model which encompasses many of the processes identified by those writers cited above and provides a description of the sequential relationship of the elements included in the administrative process is POSDCoRB. The POSDCoRB model was developed by Gulick and Urwick in response to the need for defining divisions of work in a

⁵Theodore J. Jensen and David L. Clark, Educational Administration (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964) p.52.

complex organization. At the time POSDCoRB was first described Gulick was on the President's Committee on Administrative Management. The model includes the elements of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting.⁶ Gulick describes these elements as follows:

Planning, that is working out in broad outline the things that need to be done and the methods for doing them to accomplish the purpose set for the enterprise;

Organizing, that is the establishment of the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined, and coordinated for the defined objective;

Staffing, that is the whole personnel function of bringing and training and maintaining favorable conditions of work;

Directing, that is the continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instructions and serving as the leader of the enterprise;

Coordinating, that is the all important duty of inter-relating the various parts of the work;

Reporting, that is keeping those to whom the chief executive is responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus includes keeping himself and his subordinates informed through records, research, and inspection;

Budgeting, with all that goes with budgeting in the form of fiscal planning, accounting, and control.⁷

⁶Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick, Papers on the Science of Administration (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937), p. 13.

⁷Ibid.

The POSDCoRB model is selected because it provides the framework by which the processes of community education administration can be analyzed and assessed. Gulick's model outlines the functional elements of administration. These elements correspond with essential elements of community education development and implementation. Although all elements may not be distinguishable, this investigation will include a study of the methodology employed as appropriate to administrative strategies implemented in individual school districts. The POSDCoRB model provides the means whereby the administration of community education can be systematically investigated.

This paper will involve an investigation of the methods utilized in the completion of those POSDCoRB administrative functions performed in each district included in the study. In addition, an analysis of the information and documentation received will be completed to determine those methods and/or procedures which proved most successful. A secondary goal will be to analyze the effectiveness of community education as a vehicle for resolution of contemporary problems which confront the educational administrator.

Method and Procedure

This study was intended to include selected elementary school districts in the suburban Chicago counties of Cook and DuPage which have implemented the community education concept, however, it was determined that only one elementary district in DuPage County had a program which was operative. Consequently, the emphasis of this study was shifted to elementary districts in Cook County, Illinois. Only those districts which administer an ongoing community education program that meets one or more of the following criteria will be included in the sample:

- a. The district has modified and/or extended its regular education program to meet the educational, recreational, social and cultural needs of children youth and adults residing within its legal boundaries.
- b. The district has implemented the concept of inter-agency cooperation and utilizes the community's human and fiscal resources in the development of programs and services to address community needs.
- c. The district community education program makes extensive use of school and/or other community facilities.
- d. The district has created a community education advisory council which determines program policy, coordinates cooperative programs with other community agencies, and identifies community problems and proposed solutions.

The degree to which elementary districts in Cook County met the above criteria was determined by the "Community Education Needs Assessment Survey" completed by the Program Planning and Development Section of the Illinois Office of Education in February of 1977, and updated in the Spring of 1979.

Letters and a brief questionnaire were sent to the superintendents of each district identified to determine the scope of the program, the implemental methodology, and local district definition of community education.

The superintendent, or where applicable, the administrator responsible for community education, in those districts which met the criteria established and whose programs were consistent with the definition employed in this study were asked to participate in a directed interview. The purpose was to ascertain methods, problems, and solutions in performing the tasks or functions identified in the administration of community education programs. The focus of the interview was directed toward the collection of information and documentation relative to the performance of POSDCoRB functions.

The choice of the POSDCoRB administrative model was the result of analysis of the various administrative strategies involved in the operation of an effective community education program and evaluation of various

administrative models available such as Nomothetic-Idiographic (Getzels and Guba) and Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor). This study was devoted to investigation of the form, structure, and procedure inherent in the educational administrative process. Although the POSDCoRB model was first developed in 1937 and utilized by Gulick while he was on the President's Committee on Administrative Management, its elements of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting closely correspond with functions employed in educational organizations of today. POSDCoRB provides an effective framework by which the functions of educational administration can be examined and analyzed.

The data collected from each district was categorized by its relationship to each administrative function defined by Gulick. The data is organized and presented in such a manner that analysis of each function, and its presence or absence from the continuum of administrative processes can be systematically conducted. Each component of the POSDCoRB model will be examined relative to its relationship to the process of implementing the district's community education program.

This analysis will include the following:

1. Examination of the various factors which influenced the administrative decision to develop and implement the community education process.

2. A comparative analysis of the methodology employed in operationalizing those POSDCoRB functions present in each district included in the study.
3. Identification of common problems encountered in the administrative process and discussion of alternative solutions employed.
4. Examination of the various sources of funding employed in the operation of community education in districts investigated.
5. Examination of the future implications of community education as an administrative response to declining enrollment, reductions in force, school closings, and the taxpayer revolt.

Limitations and Delimitations

The scope of this study is affected by the limitations which are inherent in the interview method of research. The use of the interview, in descriptive research, involves the collection of data through verbal interaction. "The adaptability provided by direct interaction is the source of both the main advantage and disadvantage of the interview."⁸

⁸Walter R. Borg and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1974) p. 211.

The use of open-ended questions and the ability to adjust the pace and emphasis of the interview provides the researcher with greater flexibility and with the opportunity to collect more in-depth information than in the survey method. However, the adaptability gained by the interpersonal situation can lead to subjectivity and bias.

In addition, the interview method is time consuming and therefore tends to limit the number of subjects from whom data can be obtained.

This study is delimited to elementary school districts in Cook County, Illinois and includes only those school districts which were identified by the State Board of Education as having developed community education programs or services and which meet one or more of the criteria established for inclusion in this investigation.

The data collected is limited to input provided by the district superintendent or where applicable, the administrator responsible for community education. Input relative to the methodology and procedures employed was not solicited from board members, other administrators, teachers, advisory council members or consumers.

Community Education Definition

The definition employed for the purpose of this study is the one proposed by Minzey and LeTarte. They

suggest that a proper definition of community education must include these elements: (1) traditional and nontraditional educational programs for both adults and children, (2) an emphasis on community process as well as programs and an impact on the community, (3) a recognition of the catalytic role schools can play and the contribution of other agencies and groups.

The definition they propose is:

Community education is a philosophical concept which serves the entire community by providing for all of the educational needs of all its community members. It uses the local school to serve as the catalyst for bringing community resources to bear on community problems in an effort to develop a positive sense of community, improve community living, and develop the community process toward the end of self-actualization.⁹

Summary

In scope and process community education goes far beyond the traditionally structured educational establishment for its resources. It considers every individual and every agency, organization or group as a part of the learning establishment. It encourages the development of a coordinated delivery system for providing educational, recreational,

⁹Jack D. Minzey and Clyde LeTarte, Community Education from Program to Process (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972) p. 19.

social and cultural services for all residents, and emphasizes the shared utilization of all human, physical, and financial resources of a community. This investigation is intended to identify those administrative processes which prove to be effective means of actualizing these goals.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Although the community education concept and the community school movement have received considerable attention in the research, there has not been a study of the administrative functions employed in the implementation of the concept as defined in Chapter I.

The purposes of this review are to provide background information regarding the community education movement and the community education concept; to provide specific input regarding the administrative process as applied to the operationalizing of the community education concept; to examine the application of community education as a vehicle to address contemporary educational problems of declining enrollment, school closing, and school economic issues; and to examine the POSDCoRB model of administration as it applies to this investigation.¹

Community Education

While the concept of community education has been refined and redefined in recent years, the fundamental

¹Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick, Papers on the Science of Administration (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937), p. 13.

tenets have existed for quite some time. Totten and Manley point out that the principles of community education were first considered by the Greeks and Romans as a supplement to intellectualism.

Some of the ancient philosophers viewed education as a process of building up a sense of community responsibility. They agreed that the truly educated man was one who was socially moral and determined to make his society better for having lived in it. They were aware of the potency of education as a force in shaping society and advocated an educational system that would be closely in touch with the wants and needs of society. They believed that people could be taught to rely upon their own intelligence and abilities to overcome their differences.²

Community education has been operationalized in many historical-societal contexts. Scanlon points out that this process of "cultural transformation" was evident in pre-colonial South America, the Middle Ages, and in several settings during the Industrial Revolution.³

In the United States, community education can be traced to the mid-nineteenth century. During this period of increasing complexity due to techno-social change, educators and social philosophers recognized the need for improved

²W. Fred Totten and Frank J. Manley, The Community School: Basic Concepts, Functions, and Organization (Galien, Michigan: Allied Educational Council, 1969), p. 15.

³David Scanlon, "Historical Roots for the Development of Community Education," Community Education, Principles and Practices from Worldwide Experience, 58th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, ed. by Nelson B. Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), pp. 38-65.

community living. Schools in early rural America served as meeting places and family activity centers; however, deliberate organization and development as community schools was not conceptualized.

During the period 1900-1930, the writings of men such as John Dewey and Joseph Hart contributed significantly to the development of this concept. John Dewey advanced the idea that the schools could no longer afford to operate separate from their communities. In his opinion failure to develop meaningful relationships between school and community would result in educational waste.⁴ Hart emphasized the school's responsibility for seeking assistance and cooperation from other community agencies.⁵ Both were strong advocates for the consummation of a marriage between education and the community. This underlying premise of community education remains today.

During the time of the Great Depression, schools became more actively involved in meeting needs of the people they served. Economic, social, and moral problems demanded that schools assume greater responsibility for individual and community enhancement. The involvement of the schools in

⁴ John Dewey, The School and Society (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1899), p. 89.

⁵ Joseph K. Hart, Educational Resources of Village and Rural Communities (New York: McMillan Co., 1913), p. 3.

the process of serving an expanded population and greater community responsibility resulted in the further development of the community education concept.

Samuel Everett, in The Community School, was among the first to present thorough documentation of the concept and philosophy of community education. He advanced the theory that the residents of a community should be involved in planning and development of the school as a life-centered institution.⁶

Clapp, in defining the community school as a vehicle for community development, agrees:

First of all, it meets as best it can, and with everyone's help, the urgent needs of the people, for it holds that everything that affects the welfare of the children and their families is its concern. Where does it end and life outside begin? There is no distinction between them. A community school is a used place, a place used freely and informally for all the needs of living and learning. It is, in effect, the place where learning and living converge.⁷

Significant impetus to the community education movement was provided by the personal and financial support of Charles Stewart Mott. Through the establishment of the Mott Foundation the concept of community-school interdependence was

⁶Samuel Everett, The Community School (New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1938).

⁷Elsie Clapp, Community Schools in Action (New York: The Viking Press, 1939), p. 89.

developed and implemented in Flint, Michigan. A second Michigan-based organization, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, has provided financial assistance to projects devoted to the development of community education since the mid-1940's. The support provided by the Mott and Kellogg Foundations has been instrumental in legitimizing community education as a viable force on the American Educational scene.

Current conceptualizations of community education are based on prior experience with process implementation; however, there still exists some confusion over its meaning and purpose. The term is applied to a number of separate activities yet a segmented view of programs or services often creates misunderstanding regarding the breadth and scope of the concept.

Community education can become an educational philosophy which guides and directs the emphasis of a total school system.

It enlarges and enhances the role of the public school so that it is quite different from before. The school becomes responsible for all aspects of education as it relates to its community... The school, however, does not become all things to all people. It attempts to recognize the needs of the community and to act as the coordinator, facilitator, or initiator to see that these needs are met.⁸

⁸Jack Minzey, "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," Phi Delta Kappan (November, 1972), p. 152.

The school adopts the role of catalyst and performs an organizing function. The National Community School Education Association provides a comprehensive philosophical definition of community education depicting it as,

...a dynamic approach to public education. It is a philosophy that pervades all segments of educational programming and directs the thrust of each of them toward the needs of the community. The community school serves as a catalytic agent by providing leadership to mobilize community problems. This marshalling of all forces in the community helps to bring about change as the school extends itself to all people.⁹

With the passage of the Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act of 1978, and the development of the accompanying Proposed Rules, community education was defined as:

...a program in which a public building, including but not limited to a public elementary or secondary school, or a community or junior college (or a related extension center), is used as a community center operated by a local educational agency in conjunction with other groups in the community, community organizations, and local governmental agencies, to provide educational, recreational, health care, cultural, and other related community and human services for the community that the center serves in accordance with the needs, interests, and concerns of that community.¹⁰

⁹The Community Education Bulletin, Regional Center for Community Education Development, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, II, No. 3 (January, 1971).

¹⁰Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act, Proposed Rulemaking (Federal Register, Vol. 44, No. 127, June 29, 1979), p. 38386.

The primary ingredients of the community education concept are "programs" and "process." The program component is an integral part of community education which represents the more overt activities of a school-community. Programs are generally the outgrowth of an expressed community need or desire and are designed accordingly. The initial level of entry into the process is often at the program level.

The second aspect of community education is process. Process is the heart of community education. It is a method or technique to interest and involve people within a community to identify their needs and desires and to develop ways to satisfy them. It is a way of involving people in community decisions which affect them, and of organizing and activating citizens for maximum development of individual and community potential. Process is defined by Minzey as "...the attempt to organize and activate each community so that it more nearly reaches its potential for democratic involvement and development."¹¹ The interrelationship between program and process is reciprocal in nature and important in considering modern applications of community education.

A basic foundation of the community education philosophy is the mutually dependent relationship and linkage

¹¹Minzey, op. cit., p. 152.

which exists between the home, the school, and the community in the interaction process. Community education finds its roots in the interrelated functions and processes by which people help themselves and their communities. Decker describes the philosophy as one which, "advocates processes and programs to utilize the total community environment and human resources so that the community becomes a dynamic interchange of living-learning experiences for all people."¹²

VanVoorhees equates the concept of community education with the following interrelated hypotheses:

1. Every person, regardless of age, economic status or education background has unmet needs and wants which require the help of others for solution;
2. people in every community have untapped skills, talents, and services to share with others, either individually or through existing organizations, and;
3. in all communities there are many available public facilities that go unused a large portion of the day and evening.¹³

Operationally, the community education concept is based on a series of assumptions which, if adopted by the public schools, represent significant variance from the traditional role perception. The concept is comprehensive

¹²Larry E. Decker, "Community Education: The Need for Conceptual Framework," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin (November, 1975), p. 8.

¹³Curtis VanVoorhees, "The Definition Issue," National Community School Education Association News (May, 1971), p. 8.

in scope, and the potential for actualizing school and community resources is great. Because the concept is the outgrowth of analysis and evaluation of community-school needs, community education programs, and the processes employed for implementation, vary from community to community. Although there is disagreement among "community educators" relative to ranking and components of community education, the evolutionary sequence proposed by Larry Decker offers a format which generally describes the process of concept implementation. He presents the components as follows:

1. Expanded use of school facilities;
2. Lifelong learning and enrichment programs;
3. Interagency coordination, cooperation, and collaboration;
4. Citizen involvement and participation;
5. Community development, and;
6. Integration of community education with the K-12 curriculum.¹⁴

Community education may offer the organizational model required to meet today's challenges as an educational administrator.

Community Education Administration

The administrative responsibility for implementation of the concept may reside with the superintendent of schools, an administrative assistant, building principal, or community

¹⁴Decker, op. cit., p. 10.

school director. Regardless of the job title of the individual responsible for administration, the processes employed in the administration of community education are closely controlled by the objectives and qualities which make a school district community oriented.

Haskew and Hanna have identified some of the beliefs which serve as basic tenets of the community-school administrator:

1. The community-school administrator believes that the school exists to improve the community of which it is a part. In his thinking he has gone beyond service to children...
2. This administrator believes that high priority should be given in education to the development of social competence.
3. A third belief is that participation is both a way of education and a way for education... schools learn what the people want by participating in efforts to find out what people want.
4. The community-school administrator believes that it is tremendously important to have strong, serviceable, allegiance-worthy communities, peopled by citizens who can and do make participation-democracy work.¹⁵

The success of efforts to develop the concept requires community involvement and commitment as well as the cooperation of agencies and institutions in the community. Such

¹⁵L. D. Haskew and Geneva Hanna, "The Organization and Administration of the Community School," The Community School, 52nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, ed. by Nelson B. Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp. 134-135.

broad-based involvement significantly affects the type of administrative and organizational structure employed. Melby describes the impact as follows:

Community education, now rapidly spreading, can hardly be provided by the old bureaucratic organization... It is time we began to see that it is the structure itself and the theory on which it is based that is out of gear with the educational enterprise.¹⁶

Harold Moore in his article, "Strategies for Making Community Education Work," extended this concept: "The best community school programs tend to be decentralized in their organization and administration to make community involvement and commitment effective...decentralization of school organization and administration is apparently necessary."¹⁷

It is generally agreed that community education development and implementation requires a special kind of administrator. It is necessary that he be able to manage a decentralized organization which invites and encourages input and participation from all segments of the school and community.

In the AASA booklet, New Forms for Community Education, the community education leader is described as follows:

...He needs training and experience that will develop his social awareness and sensitivity to individual and

¹⁶ AASA Commission on Community Education Facilities, New Forms for Community Education (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1974), pp. 38-39.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 39.

group needs, attitudes, and moods. He must know his community and the people in it and be able to work with business, industry, and government. In short, he must be an educational administrator, a sociologist, and a political scientist. He must be a researcher, a planner, a manager, a thinker, and, a doer. Above all, he must be a humanitarian.¹⁸

Joseph Cronin has suggested that the superintendent of schools serve as the coordinator for community education. Under his direction would be an assistant superintendent to handle a broad spectrum of activities, including health and social as well as educational and financial.¹⁹ As a leader of community education, the superintendent facilitates the interaction process for defining and assessing needs. He assists in finding the resources required to meet those needs and he helps people decide what is important to themselves and to their communities.

Kerensky suggest that there is a relationship between the concept of synergistics and the administrative behavior of the community educator. He views community education as a process "...that mobilizes all community resources in the development of human potential... he envisions new assumptions regarding governance of public education and the role

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 40.

¹⁹ Joseph Cronin, "New Government Reorganization to Provide Boost for Community Involvement in Education," Community Education Journal (March - April, 1972), p. 61.

and degree of participation of the lay public in the local decision-making process."²⁰

Synergistics is defined as, "a system in which the independent elements when interacting in a unity produce a whole that considerably more effective than the sum of the parts taken separately."²¹ Simply stated this means that the whole may be greater than the sum of its parts when applied to the area of human endeavors. In executive management in the industrial setting, synergistics is apparent in the think-tank process which is employed as a means of increasing creative productivity. In addition, higher education commonly employs a collegial approach to project development. A primary task of any administrator is that of coordinating human resources. Appropriately conceptualized and implemented, synergistics provides the basis for an effective strategy for the educational administrator.

Synergizing the community and school also involves complete utilization of the potential fiscal and material resources for the benefit of all recipients of school-community services. The process of synergistics suggests that

²⁰V. M. Kerensky, "Community Education: A New Synergism," Community Education Journal (March - April, 1974), p. 30.

²¹L. Craig Wilson, et.al., Sociology of Supervision (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969), p. 351.

when all school and community resources are combined in a purposeful manner the result will exceed the product of the same resources functioning independently.

Hawkins points out that synergizing the community means the process whereby the potential human and material energy of existing in a community is utilized for the common good. "Synergistics suggests that when all energy producing elements are combined in a meaningful manner the result produced will exceed the output of those same elements functioning independently."²² Administration of community education requires coordination, collaboration, and cooperation and involves the employment of democratic leadership. In short, community education efforts must be geared to community needs and the total available educational, social, economic, physical and political resources must be made to interact in a purposeful manner.

Basic to the development of community education is the concept of administrative leadership. Knezevich sees leadership as being concerned with human energy in organized groups.

It is a people phenomenon. It is a force that can initiate action among people, guide activities in a given direction, maintain such activities, and unify

²²Harold L. Hawkins, "Synergizing the Community," Planning and Changing (Winter, 1977), p. 219.

efforts toward common goals. Leadership is of prime importance to administrators because people are a part of all organizations.²³

Leadership embodies the concept that group progress depends upon the emergence of satisfying relations between people in order that the best ideas available are being brought out, accepted, and followed.²⁴

Haskew and Hanna discuss the administration of community education in the Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education.

Administration is the process of bringing people, ideas, and materials into such relationships that an enterprise moves efficiently toward the achievement of its objectives. Administration implies the formulating and constant review of objectives. It implies planning. It includes organizing, managing, and directing. It contemplates the control of quality and the evaluation of results. Although the enterprise being administered is the essential determinant of the character of the administrative task, administration itself is intrinsically process.²⁵

Organization and administration of community education involves processes and functions similar to those required for operationalizing any other educational effort. The processes selected are relative to the ends to be achieved.

²³Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975), p. 81.

²⁴Haskew and Hanna, op. cit., p. 143.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 133-134.

The administrative functions employed in developing the community education concept vary from school district to school district and, adoption of the concept places unusual demands upon administration. Moore offers the following assumptions concerning the characteristics and goals of an effective organization:

1. Reliance on democratically established goals, and a viable philosophy should be substituted...for the authority oriented approach.
2. The administrative staff should be an "open" one, not fearing change or challenge.
3. The administrative climate should reflect the philosophy of community education, using a problem-solving approach.
4. A flat and flexible administrative organization, in contrast to a vertical one, offers the best promise.
5. The individual school and community must be seen as an educational unit, with freedom to adapt to the needs of the local area and delegated authority commensurate with assigned responsibility.
6. Administration should recognize that not all wisdom is found in the administrative staff but is liberally possessed by laymen and the teaching staff.
7. Increasingly, decisions should be made by those possessing the competence to do so, not merely the rank or position.
8. Leadership should bring people, ideas, and resources together to produce an optimum opportunity for all learners.²⁶

²⁶Harold E. Moore, "Organizational and Administrative Problems and Practices," Phi Delta Kappan (November, 1972), p. 169.

Administration of community education does involve processes employed in general educational administration, yet the focus and emphasis on participative decision-making and organization development provide a unique challenge to one's professional management skill.

For the educational administrator community education offers a positive model for addressing current educational issues. It offers a feasible formula for maximizing educational and social services while minimizing their cost. "It thrives upon whole-scale participation of both individuals and groups and gives impetus to advanced levels of decision-making...Contained within its credo is the self-fulfilling prophecy for each individual and the very seeds of community self-actualization."²⁷

Community Education Applied to
Contemporary Educational Issues

The nature of the community largely determines what goes on in school. Therefore to attempt to divorce the school from the community is to engage in unrealistic thinking... The community and the school are inseparable.²⁸

²⁷ Phillip T. West, "The Leadership Prerogative in Community Education," Planning and Changing (Summer-Fall, 1977), p. 73.

²⁸ James B. Conant, "Community and School are Inseparable," Slums and Suburbs (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 20.

The literature cites the various opportunities community education provides for maximizing the utilization of available resources in problem-solving. Proponents point to an enlarged pool of resources available to schools which interact purposefully with their various communities to resolve community and school district problems. In order to take advantage of the existing human, material, political and financial assets, however, school administrators and boards of education will need to give up their individual power base and initiate plans and activities directed toward increased sharing of the many resources available in the education community.

Agencies, organizations, and institutions do not cooperate, coordinate, or collaborate - the people within them must. Educational administrators and other individuals in leadership positions of the community must agree to teach each other to share their knowledge and skills, to tear down their fences, and to work together toward common goals. Community education is seen as the vehicle through which this interaction can occur.

Community education is envisioned as a comprehensive and dynamic approach to individual and community improvement, based on the premise that local resources can be drawn together to assist in solving most community problems and individual needs and further that the public schools and governmental units have the capacity for far greater impact on the total community.²⁹

²⁹Marvin Maire, "Community Education: From Concept to Reality," Community Education Journal (May, 1973), p. 40.

Community education is not a panacea for coping with all of the current educational problems and challenges. Yet by developing a more integral and intimate relationship between the schools and the community, and by directly involving people of all ages in the educational system, a more positive climate for problem-solving and decision-making should exist.³⁰

Working together on problems of mutual concern in the development of the community education concept can often create a community where none previously existed. A keystone of this expanded concept of community education is the acceptance of broader responsibility by boards of education and educational administrators. They provide the expertise and leadership needed in working with all agencies, institutions, and citizens in the design and implementation of programs and delivery systems which most effectively meet the total educational needs of the community.³¹

Considerable research in community and organizational development supports the concept that a feeling of ownership affects one's commitment to decision-making and problem-

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ William J. Ellena, "Tomorrow's Schools," Administrators and Policy Makers' Views of Community Education (Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1977), p. 14.

solving. The task of the schools is to restore lay citizens ownership of the schools. Meaningful community involvement brings schools and community together to seek answers to contemporary problems and to plan for future opportunity; however, communication must be two-way.

As Ernest Melby points out, "People need to know the facts about our failures as well as our successes... We now know that our biggest failure results from our own lack of use of community resources."³² When people understand school problems they are less likely to make unreasonable demands of the schools. When citizens identify with the schools they support them.³³

Properly employed, community involvement through advisory councils, interagency steering committees, neighborhood councils, or parent-teacher organizations can be the best public relations tools available to the school administrator.

In addressing the issue of restoring community support and ownership of the schools, the Durham North Carolina County Schools have developed the following principles:

1. Before lay leaders will come forth, public school leadership must be willing to take the first step by

³²Ernest O. Melby, "Community Education Can Renew Our Faith," Community Education Journal (November, 1973), p. 11.

³³Mark W. Hurwitz, "The Public Schools - of, by, and for the People," Community Education Journal (July, 1973), p. 10.

demonstrating a willingness to cooperate with the community for greater school utilization.

2. After the initial informative stage, lay leaders must assume direction of the program so as to ensure broad community ownership.
3. A minimum amount of money is needed to employ program administrators to tie things together and to coordinate activities with the school and community leaders involved.
4. During both the initial and developmental stages, programs must reflect the broad interests of the public and those educators at the involved schools so as to ensure full participation and cooperation.
5. Appealing to the vested interests of elected officials and institutional leaders appears to be the most promising way to gain human resources and financial support. Benefits - financial, political, educational and otherwise - will far outweigh the small investment required.³⁴

Community education is not the total answer, but it does facilitate the development of improved relationships and it does provide a system for coordinating the resources available to the educational community.

The importance of developing collaborative relationships within the community is further supported by a study of inter-agency cooperation conducted by the Appalachian Adult Education Center. That study lists the following consequences of collaboration:

1. Quality of Services. The quality of services which can be offered by one institution alone is generally sufficient to meet the needs of only the most self-

³⁴J. Frank Yeager, " 'Our Schools' as Compared to 'Those Schools'," Administrators and Policy Makers' Views of Community Education (Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1977), pp. 41-42.

directed, i.e., the least needy, clients. Collaboration facilitates the sharing of professional expertise and experience, as well as the sharing of other important resources.

2. Quantity of Services. The number of people served and the number of services offered can be increased through cooperation between institutions.

3. Visibility of Services. Coordination between agencies and institutions makes each of them more visible in the community. Increased visibility, quality, and quantity of services are frequently regarded by the community - and by funding sources - as signs of successful services which should be continued. Collaboration allows for stronger data collection for accountability.

4. Costs of Services. No single institution has unlimited resources available. Collaboration allows participating agencies and institutions to support each other and to tap other sources of funds, reducing costly duplication in time and effort.³⁵

The current trend toward declining enrollment has created surplus space in many schools, and school closings are occurring throughout the State and country. School districts are exploring the concept of community education as means of turning the problems of declining enrollment and excess space into an asset for the community. The Educational Facilities Laboratory in a report entitled, Surplus School Space: Options and Opportunities, addressed this issue. This report suggests that the communities which are finding the most acceptable solutions are those which have extensive citizen

³⁵ George W. Eyster, "Interagency Collaboration...The Keystone to Community Education," Community Education Journal (September-October, 1975), p. 25.

involvement.

A variety of options exist when space becomes available in school buildings:

1. Provide an opportunity to eliminate inefficient, badly located, or otherwise undesirable school buildings.
2. Provide an opportunity to reassign programs and services previously inadequately assigned.
3. Provide for expansion of libraries, fine or practical arts program or other instructional programs.
4. Provide space for specialists who have been added to staffs.³⁶

When these options are exercised, the school and community are faced with the question of school closings. School facilities represent a major financial investment of the community. For this reason and due to the psychological impact of this action the community often looks for further alternatives. The Educational Facilities Laboratories offers these additional possibilities:

1. Inventory public and nonprofit organizations regarding their unmet needs.
2. Explore creation of a nonprofit agency to take over school buildings and manage human services centers and programs.
3. Analyze rental or lease of a wing or floor to a compatible public or nonprofit agency.
4. Consider redeployment temporarily to hedge against a day when space may again be needed for schooling.

³⁶ Educational Facilities Laboratories, Surplus School Space: Options and Opportunities (New York: [EFL, 1976]), p. 7.

5. Surplus schoolhouses, or portions of schools, make ideal bases from which to run the variety of programs that fall within the province of community education.
6. Adult and school programs in career and vocational education centers require significant per person area, a space demand which could be met by moving into vacant school buildings.
7. Comprehensive planning may reveal some ways to meet the reverse order program needs of colleges, high schools and middle schools since elementary schools are usually the first to meet the impact of enrollment decline.
8. Consider recycling abandoned schools as components of a desegregation program.³⁷

For the most part these options are more acceptable to a community than vacating or "moth-balling" their schools. Reuse of the surplus space for community services is an attractive option. Services can be delivered by a single agency or by many agencies or community groups. They might be housed jointly with a school or occupy an entire surplus school. The advantages to the educational administration and board of education are:

1. The cost of operating and maintaining the building can be covered wholly or in part by other users.
2. Conversion to community use may soften the blow of school closure to community residents.
3. If future enrollment patterns are unclear, temporary reuse can keep the building in good condition at little or no cost to the school board, and still keep the option of reopening as a school.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 8-10.

4. By supporting community activities and services, the school board may widen its base of support for traditional education responsibilities.³⁸

EFL researchers suggest that future use of surplus school space should be determined publicly and with community participation. Creative reuse of space involves cooperative problem-solving by agencies, residents and the school administration with decisions being made in the spirit of collaboration rather than in isolation.³⁹

The maximum utilization of physical resources is a basic tenet of community education. All physical resources of schools, park districts, municipal government and other taxing bodies have been developed, built and paid for by members of the community. Shared utilization is a natural response to increased requirements for community programs and services.

Community education provides a vehicle through which maximum utilization of scarce revenue can occur. It is illogical for taxing agencies, funded by the same residents, to act as if they are serving separate entities. Community education provides the means for educational oriented insti-

³⁸Educational Facilities Laboratories, Using Surplus School Space for Community School Centers (New York: [EFL, 1979]), pp. 6-7.

³⁹Ibid., p. 7.

tutions, agencies, and organizations to complement one another, cost-share at times, and integrate fiscal resources for the attainment of mutual goals.

Problems associated with movement toward greater collaboration exist, yet there are many problems confronting education which require consideration of such efforts:

1. Increased citizen concern about cost effectiveness and improved delivery of services.
2. Diminishing resources, forcing greater efficiency.
3. Legislative mandates.
4. Increased demand for services.
5. Magnitude of social problems.
6. Amount of unnecessary service duplication.⁴⁰

It would appear that the rationale for collaboration through community education is strong yet community education is not going to solve all the problems of education. It is not a panacea, "But... community education serves an important function in reminding us of the interdependence of the schools and the community. As the schools return to a concept of serving the community, public support and confidence in schools will increase."⁴¹

⁴⁰Dale L. Cook and Frank G. Cookingham, "Interagency Action: Cooperation, Coordination, Collaboration," Community Education Journal (January, 1980), p. 4.

⁴¹Thomas E. Truitt, "Education and Community," Administrators and Policy Makers Views of Community Education (Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1977), p. 47.

An Examination of POSDCoRB
Administrative Processes

The POSDCoRB model provides the framework by which the administrative processes involved in developing and implementing the community education concept can be studied. The model as defined by Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick is delineated in Chapter I.

The purposes of this review are to provide further elaboration of the seven functional elements of the model and to present a brief description of each.

1. Planning. Planning involves the administrative process of defining goals and setting objectives for the enterprise. The implication is that every institution should know where it is going and administrators should engage in planning to give direction to the activities of an institution.⁴²

Young defines planning in terms of the questions an administrator must answer to determine the most appropriate course of action. He sees planning as a continuous process of obtaining, organizing, and utilizing information systematically to make decisions about:

⁴²Knezevich, op. cit., p. 27.

1. What is the scope of the planning effort and who will be involved;
2. What outcomes are desired;
3. What resources will help the effort and what restraints will hinder the effort;
4. What specific things must be achieved to reach the goals;
5. How many methods or ways are possible to accomplish each specific thing to be done;
6. Which method or methods are best;
7. Who is going to implement the methods and when; and
8. Whether the effort was successful, and, if not, what changes need to be made.⁴³

Planning also includes the identification of resources and restraints.

Planning is future oriented and the process involves the identification and definition of emerging roles for the organization.⁴⁴ The function involves making decisions about the probable consequences of various courses of action. It is a future oriented task.

2. Organizing. It is through organizing that the tasks of an institution are subdivided and then related and arranged to create an operating unity.⁴⁵ Fayol described

⁴³Ken M. Young, The Basic Steps of Planning (Charlottesville, Virginia: Community Collaborators, 1978), p. 1.

⁴⁴Knezevich, op. cit., p. 29.

⁴⁵Knezevich, loc. cit.

organizing as determining the general structure or form with every detail in place. He and other classical, formal writers ignored human factors and informal groupings in the organization.⁴⁶

In systems theory, the organizing function involves coordination of people and resources. To organize implies the development of interconnections between subsystems and the total organizational design. Organizing involves the design of methods and determination of activities required to achieve objectives of the institution.⁴⁷

A major function of the administrator is to organize the task of the institution in such a manner that work assignments, activities, and human components are clearly defined, coordinated, and goal directed.

3. Staffing. Staffing is the administrative function of selecting, training, and placing individuals in positions within the educational system. For these decisions to be effective and appropriate, the educational administrator must have a clear understanding of the needs of the organization and the requirements of the position.

⁴⁶ Joseph L. Massie, "Management Theory," Handbook of Organizations (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965), p. 388.

⁴⁷ Knezevich, op. cit., p. 30.

It involves the process of correlating personnel and their competencies with specific roles and functions of the enterprise. Knezevich defines staffing as identifying, employing and assigning the human resources needed to pursue objectives and fulfill program demands.⁴⁸

4. Directing. Direction is often used in synonymous terms with the process of stimulating. Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer discuss levels and kinds of "stimulating."

At one level, the organization or the administrator acting for the organization can exercise considerable pressure upon an individual in that organization. Seldom, if ever, can a status leader in an organization free himself completely from exercising some such influence. At another level, however, stimulation can be much more rational. In other words, members of the organization also examine the evidence and come to recognize that certain courses of action are desirable. It is our belief that effective administrators act nearer to the rational level of stimulation than to the pressure level.⁴⁹

Other writers in the field of educational administration prefer such words as "influencing" or "leadership" to describe this function.

Planning, organizing and staffing are the initial steps in the administrative process. They establish the foundation

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 37.

⁴⁹Ronald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966), pp. 147-148.

for the activities of the organization. Directing is the next essential step in initiating the activities of the enterprise toward the designed goals. This step is concerned with the authority-issuing directives, consulting, decision-making-necessary to keep the institution going.⁵⁰

Recent descriptions of this function focus on the interpersonal elements involved in influencing the behavior of others relative to performing the tasks and responsibilities required for the successful operation of the organization.

5. Coordinating. Coordination is an essential function of the administrator of community education. He must be aware of interrelationships among and between agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals involved in the delivery of educational, recreational, social, cultural, and personal services within the community education network, and develop strategies for coordination of these efforts.

Coordination is a critical function of the administration if duplication of effort is to be avoided. Newman views coordination as, the synchronizing and unifying of actions of groups of people.⁵¹ Coordination is the means of unifying

⁵⁰Knezevich, loc. cit.

⁵¹William H. Newman, Administrative Action (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1950), Chapter 22.

individual efforts and preventing groups from working at cross purposes. It is the function of fitting various groups or operations into an integrated system of goal-directed activity. Coordinating involves bringing into appropriate relationship the people and the things necessary for the organization to achieve its purposes.⁵²

6. Reporting. Knezevich suggests that the word controlling is synonymous with the reporting function defined by Gulick and Urwick. The concept of control is inherent in the systems approach. In the systems concept, control is defined as that function of the system which provides direction and conformance to the plan of action.⁵³

Control is a way to keep the organization on its intended course. This function relates to the show of information among and between individuals or groups within the organizational hierarchy. The control function requires information on various operations thus enabling the administrator to detect deviations that could create difficulties.⁵⁴ Once detected, corrective action is required as an element of the control function.

Reporting refers to the sharing of input and feedback between participants at all levels of the organization.

⁵²Campbell, et.al., op. cit., p. 149.

⁵³Newman, op. cit., p. 72.

⁵⁴Knezevich, op. cit., p. 31.

Reporting may be a positive or negative process, yet it is an important function if the administrator is to effectively appraise the workings of the educational system and take expeditious corrective actions when required. This cycle can be described as an information - measurement - feedback - correction process.⁵⁵

This function involves evaluation of planning and organizational efforts, and supervision of people and operations within the system. It is a monitoring process.

7. Budgeting. Budgeting is the function of identifying financial resources, allocating revenues required to fulfill organization goals or program requirements. Budget priorities are determined by the outcomes of the administrative functions discussed previously. Budgeting involves the processes of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, and reporting.

The budget is the fiscal interpretation of the educational program. The three major phases of budget preparation are: determination of the educational program; determination of estimated revenue required to accomplish program goals; and, determination of estimated revenues.

Gulick and Urwick include accounting of expenditures

⁵⁵Ibid.

and monitoring of budget guidelines as a part of this total process. The budgeting function enables the administrator to actualize the goals of the organization.

Summary

The underlying principles of community education are founded in the writings of John Dewey and Joseph Hart. The concept of school-community interdependence is well established in the literature.

Emphasis is placed on the importance of the school district as a catalyst for bringing community resources together; providing leadership in development of a positive sense of community, and identifying and addressing educational, social, cultural, and recreational needs of all segments of the community.

Community education may be adopted as a philosophy of education. As a district philosophy, community education significantly affects the traditional role and job description of the educational administrator. His role is expanded from that of educational leader of a school or school district to educational-community leader. The administrative processes employed by the community education administrator are similar to those generally employed; however, the objectives of community education direct the activities of administration toward populations and entities not generally addressed.

In addition, administrative style tends to be more democratic and power or authority more decentralized.

Community education is enjoying a renaissance of interest at this time. The AASA Commission on Community Education Facilities indicate a renewed interest in community education has provided an opportunity to take a fresh look at schools and their roles in the community. Several points emerge:

1. Schools everywhere, whether in the city, suburbs, or rural areas, duplicate facilities and resources that already exist in their communities.
2. Schools contain facilities that can be shared by other agencies to meet needs in the community as a whole, and the community contains resources - people, places, and things - that can make the educational experience richer and more real.
3. As schools overcome their separatism, and education and the real world begin to mesh more relevantly for students and parents alike, much of today's dichotomy between boards of education and their constituencies begins to disappear; and real working relationships between boards and communities begin to emerge.
4. Reconceiving education on an interagency community-wide basis makes a lot of sense economically in forms of both capital and operational budgeting.⁵⁶

These points are critical to the school administrator as he addresses the current problems of declining enrollment, reductions in force, school closings, and the taxpayers' revolt.

⁵⁶AASA, op. cit., p. 81.

An analysis of the administrative processes involved in the operationalizing of the community education process will be conducted utilizing the POSDCoRB model of administration developed by Luther Gulick.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

In this Chapter the information received from those districts selected for study is presented. The data reported was secured through interviewing of individuals in each district who are responsible for the administration of community education programs and services. Each interaction focused on the districts' approach to planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting and was structured by use of an Interview Guide (Copy included as Appendix A).

It was the original intention to include elementary school districts from Cook and DuPage Counties within the scope of this study. After review of the data secured from the preliminary survey of districts who were purported to have community education programs, it was concluded that there were only a few districts in Cook County and only one in DuPage County which met the criteria for inclusion in this study. Consequently, the focus of this investigation was directed upon elementary districts in Cook County, Illinois only.

This Chapter includes data secured from six elementary school districts in Cook County, Illinois. The study is intended to probe the similarities and differences among the

districts relative to the methodology and procedures employed in operationalizing the community education concept and to examine those POSDCORB administrative functions utilized.

SCHOOL DISTRICT A

Background Information Regarding Elementary School District A

School District A is an elementary school district which is located in West Cook County, Illinois. The 1979-1980 sixth-day enrollment of District A is 2,641 students. District A operates seven kindergarten through sixth grade facilities and one junior high school. The 1978 equalized assessed valuation of the district is \$151,832,527 and the total 1978 tax rate is 2.7959 per one hundred dollars of equalized assessed valuation. District A has an Education Fund tax rate of 1.945 and the 1979-1980 operating cost per capita is approximately \$2,000.

District A has experienced racial and socio-economic change in the population served and is currently implementing a desegregation plan which involves pairing of elementary attendance areas and transportation of students to achieve racial balance.

Background Information Regarding
the Individual Interviewed in School District A

The administrator who provided the information reported herein is the Superintendent of Schools in District A. He has been involved in education as a teacher and administrator for twenty years. Superintendent A has been an administrator for ten years and holds the degree of Ph.D. in Education Administration and Supervision.

Superintendent A has been instrumental in the development of community education in the district and has served as the District A Superintendent for five years.

The data presented regarding the development and implementation of the community education concept in District A was secured during an interview conducted on April 16, 1980.

Planning

The development of the community education concept was an outgrowth of the district's effort to involve community members in discussions of district needs and educational goals. Community-wide town meetings were conducted during the 1976-1977 school year. Discussion centered upon the results of the Gallup Poll of public attitudes toward schools and the Phi Delta Kappa Goal Setting Process was utilized to secure input regarding the community's educational priorities.

Participants included parents, non-parents, grandparents, business people and staff members.

The decision to initiate a comprehensive program of securing community input was influenced by the rapidly changing racial composition of the district and by the need to develop a desegregation plan. The decision to pursue broad-based participation in these processes has influenced the district's current philosophy and practices regarding school-community interaction and citizen involvement. One result of these processes was the realization that the adults were expressing needs beyond the expected concerns related to how they could influence the quality of the educational experience and facilitate the learning process.

As a consequence, extended school P.T.A.-community committees were formed to determine the needs of their school community and to plan activities, programs and services to address the needs. The district provided school facilities, designated Tuesday evening as Community School Night, and made district personnel available to assist in the planning process.

During this time, the district conducted a study of community needs and attitudes through circulation of a questionnaire which focused upon multiple issues (Copy included as Appendix B). Those aspects of the study relevant to citizen involvement and school-community relations were utilized by

each school committee. Surveying is now an annual process employed as a means of assessing parent interests, opinions and needs. The school committees are extensively involved in decision-making and planning regarding programs, services or activities to be offered on Community School Night. Building Principals are invited to participate and welcome, but are not responsible for planning.

The concept of community education and the development of a sense of community has become an integral part of the district's desegregation program and has been written into the Title VI grant. As a consequence, the process of securing community involvement and participation has been formalized through the establishment of a district-wide Advisory Council, and the employment of a School Community Relations Director.

With the assistance of School Community Relations Aides, who are assigned to each school, the Director is now responsible for all aspects of planning School Community programs. The planning process focused on input from members of each school community and includes external agency or organization participation only when a specific need for a program, service or activity is best met by an external provider. Representatives from community agencies, organizations, or groups are not included in decision-making or planning processes.

Superintendent A reported that members of the Board of Education are supportive of efforts to open lines of interaction between school and community and of the schools' role in responding to community needs. Board of Education policy emphasizes the community's ownership of the schools and encourages the utilization of school facilities by community groups. The district has not developed a statement of philosophy regarding community education which serves as a directive for the development of goals, objectives and long-range planning strategies.

Organizing

As the concept of community education evolved and became an accepted part of the school's desegregation effort, the organizational structure became more formal and the responsibility for administration and supervision became part of the Federal Program Director's role. As a consequence, the basic organizational design is influenced by rules and regulations governing the Title VI grant.

The roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in planning, supervising and directing community school and adult programs are included as an integral part of the district organization. School Community Relations Aides report to the Principals of schools which they are assigned and are supervised by the School Community Relations Director who reports to the

Federal Programs Director. The Federal Programs Director reports to the Superintendent of Schools. These positions are important within the district's organizational chart.

The School Community Relations Director is responsible for coordinating the efforts of staff and parents and identifying resources required for successful programming. The procedural aspects and methodology employed are prescribed by the Federal grant. Community education goals and objectives regarding school community programs and building a sense of community are interrelated with the desegregation plan to the degree that differences between the programs are indistinguishable.

Staffing

In order to maintain involvement of community residents and to facilitate home-school interaction, the district employs parents from each attendance area to serve as School Community Relations Aides. These positions and the position of School Community Relations Director are non-professional positions. The people employed are trained in group problem-solving, communication skills and planning procedures. Their primary functions are to support and facilitate the individual schools community relations and to assist their citizens in planning for Community School Nights.

Instructors and supervisors of various programs are

generally members of the district professional staff; however, there has been some involvement of Mental Health and community college personnel as well as parents and other district residents when programmatic needs require utilization of external resources.

Personnel involved in community education programs are accountable for compliance with district policies and are subject to the same personnel practices as other district personnel; however, evaluation and supervisory procedures differ. Certificated and professional staff who serve as resource teachers are responsible to the Federal Programs Director who is also certificated. They are more closely supervised and more formally evaluated than are the non-professional staff. It was reported that non-certificated parents employed in the program receive less supervision and less systematic evaluations by their immediate supervisor who is also non-certificated.

Salary and benefit programs for community education program personnel are consistent with district policies. Certificated employees are compensated according to teacher or administrative salary schedules, and non-certificated employees are compensated in conformance with the secretarial salary scale.

Staff attitudes about movement towards a more open environment for home-school interaction are described as being

initially reluctant and reserved, but it was emphasized that staff is becoming quite accepting and much more positive. There are differences of background and philosophy among both administrative and teaching staff. For some, sharing school facilities and participation with community in planning and decision making are new experiences. Veteran staff members were accustomed to working under a philosophy which resulted in deliberate separation of school and community.

The role of the Principal changed when the district began implementation of the desegregation plan and opened the schools to greater adult participation and school-community interchange. Recent appointments to school principalships were selected because they embraced the concepts of community-school interdependence and citizen participation and involvement. It was reported that veteran Principals, who were accustomed to a more paternalistic system, have had to adjust to this openness into the school-house. Changes in the Principal's role perception have been encouraged through in-service education, changes in the job description, personal counseling with the superintendent and annual goal-setting activities.

Directing

Responsibility for directing community education planning development and implementation activities resides in the position of Federal Programs Director; however, school committees and School Community Relations Aides are involved in the decision-making processes.

The Board of Education is the source of policy-making authority if not the origin of policy changes. Concerns about policies and suggestions for change may come from parents, teachers, district administrators or board members. Each group is encouraged to evaluate policies and present input regarding needed change.

Coordinating

The schools perform the role of catalyst by bringing people together and providing a forum for adult needs to emerge. The schools have become an avenue for community involvement. The Board of Education assumed a leadership role and directed their attention to developing a broader sense of community. There has been a significant investment of time in the organization of programs and services intended to facilitate the development of a sense of responsibility for the future of the schools and the community.

The district invited community agency involvement when desegregation plans were being developed and public meetings were being held; however, representatives of village government, the park district and other agencies of the community are uninvolved with the present community-school and community building efforts of the district.

Coordination of plans for programs and services among or between the schools and other agencies of the district does not exist, and sharing of public facilities for youth or adult programming efforts does not occur.

The schools feel that it would be extremely difficult to coordinate community agency and organizational efforts in the district since their boundaries intersect with the political boundaries of five different communities. It is the district's position that they are doing as much as they have the time and resources to accomplish relative to helping adults meet their needs through the schools. Their primary emphasis continues to be on the family and the child's role in the family.

The Director of Federal Programs has developed a well-coordinated program of staff pre-service and in-service training in the area of human relations and has utilized the community education process as a means of building family and community with the goal of creating successfully integrated schools and communities.

Reporting

Reporting the status of the community education effort and disseminating information regarding its effectiveness is the responsibility of the Federal Programs Director and the Superintendent of Schools. Information is shared within the district through district and building level meetings, newsletters and memoranda. External publics are reached through handouts left in public places, parent newsletters, and a weekly column in the local newspaper.

These functions are supported by members of the Title VI staff and the Title VI Advisory Council. The staff and advisory council are involved in the evaluation of programs and services and the monitoring of progress in meeting Title VI goals and objectives.

A thorough report of desegregation and community education efforts is presented to the Board of Education twice a year in order that board members maintain involvement in the assessment of the district's plan and are aware of the status of implementation activities.

The channels for reporting between members of the Title VI staff and the administration are outlined in the description of the district's organizational activities.

Budgeting

The primary source of revenue for direct overt costs of the community-school effort such as staff salaries and benefits and program materials is the district's Title VI federal grant. The district contributes local revenues for less visible indirect operational costs such as utilities.

Another source of revenue is the district's Title IV C Responsibility Education Project. This grant complements the district's community education effort by focusing on goal setting and self perception experiences intended to build a sense of community among students and parents.

The Advisory Council and school committees are involved in budget development as related to decisions regarding programmatic emphasis. The budget is developed according to federal guidelines for Title VI funding and is included within the district budget. Superintendent A indicated that community school and adult education payoffs are a fortuitous result of federal involvement in desegregation.

Administrative Perceptions of Most
Effective Management Style and Future of
Community Education Concept

It was reported by Superintendent A that he preferred "the situational approach where leadership style varies with the level of maturity of those being led." There is a tendency toward administrative behavior which focuses on persuading and delegating rather than telling and selling. Superintendent A feels that the most effective role for him is that of the developer of human resources.

It was emphasized that "in operating a community education project there are a lot of details, directives, goals and resources to be sorted out and that the schools have not done well in isolation." Superintendent A believes there is "a need for more involvement of community in the investment they have in the schools, but we must involve taxpayers not only for our purposes as we see them, but for our purposes as they see them, and for their purposes as they see them."

It was felt that there is a cost benefit dilemma related to seeking out and serving segments of the adult community but that there may be a symbiotic relationship developing between schools and their communities which cannot be ignored.

SCHOOL DISTRICT B
Background Information Regarding
Elementary School District B

School District B is located in West Cook County, Illinois. The 1979-1980 sixth-day enrollment of District B is 5,244 students. District B operates: one kindergarten through fourth grade school; one kindergarten through fifth grade school; three kindergarten through sixth grade schools; and six kindergarten through eighth grade facilities. The 1978 equalized assessed valuation in the district is \$320,971,704 and the total 1978 tax rate is 2.3412 per one hundred dollars of equalized assessed valuation. District B has an Education Fund rate of 1.50 and the 1979-1980 per capita operating cost is approximately \$1,700.

District B has experienced financial difficulty in recent years and has been unsuccessful in passing rate increase referendums on three occasions in recent years. District B is currently evaluating areas in which expenditures can be reduced and is studying the feasibility of school closings.

Background Information Regarding
the Individual Interviewed in School District B

The individual responsible for coordination of the District B community education program is a building administrator. Coordinator B has been involved in education as a teacher

and administrator for thirteen years. He has been an administrator for nine of those years and holds a Masters Degree in Education Administration and Supervision.

The data presented regarding the development and implementation of the community education concept in District B was secured during an interview conducted on April 28, 1980.

Planning

The decision to establish a community education program was motivated in 1978 by the availability of financial assistance through the Educational Service Region of Cook County.

The Educational Service Region was the administrative agent of a Title IV C grant intended to facilitate the development of the community education concept in Cook County, and the district was identified as being eligible for participation in the project.

The initial step in development of the district's program was to formulate a Community Education Advisory Council. The Council was composed of representatives from the parochial schools, civic organizations, business, industry and elementary school Parent-Teacher Associations.

The Council worked with consultants from the Institute for Community Education Development, Ball State University, in the preparation of a needs assessment instrument intended to identify community academic, social, cultural and

recreational needs and desires (Copy included as Appendix C).

The survey was conducted with the assistance of each school Parent-Teacher Association and the results supported the need for community level programming. It was determined that residents were interested in neighborhood school based adult education activities and recreational activities which emphasized social interaction. The results of the survey were utilized to determine the types of programs desired and a Project Coordinator was appointed to identify community resources and plan and implement programs or services.

The project embraced the philosophy that community education is a process which makes maximum use of community involvement in identifying community needs, desires, and resources; and which is directed toward maximum utilization of community resources in meeting community needs.

It was reported that implementation of this philosophy was influenced by the fact that clearly articulated operational goals and project priorities were not developed.

The community park districts and community college were contacted to determine their interest in collaborative programming. This model was not accepted, nor were the implications for cooperation understood; however, the community college did provide technical assistance relative to program development and scheduling. It was reported that the community college was concerned about the effect providing elementary school

based extension programs would have upon main campus attendance. Other agencies which were contacted and accepted the model were the YMCA, Red Feather organizations, the Girl Scout Council and the Red Cross. Although few agencies actively participated in the project, a cooperative attitude appeared to exist and agencies were informed of the project's intent and purpose.

Although a formal system of interagency and community resource coordination does not exist, it is felt that these processes have opened the doors for cooperation. Informal lines of communication among and between the people involved with the schools project and other community agencies have been established and the district's Community Education Coordinator believes that people feel more comfortable working together as a result of the efforts made in planning and developing the community education concept.

The Board of Education supports the concept and has a policy which allows school facilities to be utilized by community groups on a fee basis. Facilities for community education sponsored programs and activities are provided on a non-fee basis; however, the Board does not provide local resources for direct costs of operating the project.

Organizing

The initial phases of organizational development were directed by the District B Assistant Superintendent, who assumed the title of Project Director. Assistant Superintendent B designated an Assistant Principal in the district as Project Coordinator. The Coordinator is responsible to the Director and the Director reports to the Superintendent of District B. The Director is responsible for supervision of the Coordinator and monitoring of project implementation efforts. Responsibility for programming, staffing, interagency and intradistrict communication was delegated to the Project Coordinator.

Program development activities were directed toward the implementation of programs or activities which were requested by community residents. Coordinator B reported that since goals and objectives were not written, his efforts were limited to meeting short-term expectations relative to program development. Coordinator B indicated that more guidance and structure and a clearer statement of priorities from the central office would have been helpful. Lines of communication were open between the Project Coordinator, the Project Director and the Superintendent of Schools, yet Coordinator B was given limited access to the Superintendent and Board of Education and minimal direction relative to project goals. Planning efforts focused on short-term outcomes and visible project products.

Staffing

Initial efforts to secure staff to teach or supervise District B community education activities were concentrated upon enlistment of District B certificated personnel. District B certificated personnel were asked to complete a "Personal Data Sheet" in which they described their employment preferences, qualifications and past experiences. The Project Coordinator reported that he was unable to secure qualified instructors from the District B staff for activities such as disco dancing, and that he had to secure instructors in most special skill classes from the private sector. Coordinator B indicated that he should have surveyed the staffs of the high school and community college which serve elementary district residents. Coordinator B stated that he believes community education program offerings would have been more extensive and that the pool of qualified instructors would have been enlarged.

Teachers or supervisors selected to participate were required to submit lesson or activity plans and to develop goals and exit level objectives. In addition, pre-test and post-test instruments were written to determine participant gains relative to course or activity goals. Coordinator B indicated that these requirements presented a problem for the non-professional employees and that he spent considerable time helping staff members prepare for their programs.

A formal system of staff evaluation is not employed and job descriptions are not written. Community education

staff evaluation is based upon informal observations of Coordinator B and participant comments.

District B personnel policies and salary and benefit programs are not applicable to personnel employed in the community education project. The hourly rates of compensation for instructing or supervising community education programs is greater than the District B rate for extra-duty assignments. In addition, Coordinator B indicated that he paid some instructors from the private sector more per hour than instructors from within the District B organization.

Directing

Coordinator B, in collaboration with Project Director B, has primary responsibility for directing community education activities and for administrative decision-making. External involvement was provided by the District Advisory Council when the project was first implemented; however, involvement of community has become minimal.

The Coordinator described his role in community education as human relations. In his opinion, if the Project Coordinator is not received by other groups, and if he does not listen to them and modify his plans to accommodate their needs, community education cannot occur. Coordinator B described his role as requiring a lot of person-to-person discussion

which he feels is essential between organizations and agencies which provide community based programs and services.

Coordinating

Community agencies are informed of activities and courses being offered by the District B community education project, yet there is very little coordination of offerings between agencies. Agencies of the community, including District B, have not altered their plans for services or programs to avoid duplication of effort. Coordinator B reported that this did not affect enrollment since the community was so large that there are many needs to serve.

Reporting

Dissemination of information regarding the progress being made in implementing the community education project was assisted by articles in the District B Newsletter, P.T.A. newsletters and the local newspaper.

Internal reporting requirements are met through monthly meetings between the Coordinator and Project Director at which time project reports, program plans, and administrative decisions are discussed and reviewed.

Budgeting

When District B participated in the Educational Service Region Title IV C project, federal revenue was the primary source of funding. Additional monies were secured through charging tuition and material fees to participants. Since federal grant revenues are no longer available, participant fees and agency facility usage fees sustain the community education budget.

The community education budget and accounting systems are separate from systems employed by the District B Board of Education. The community college serving District B assumes responsibility for the administrative costs involved in course registration and records of receipts and disbursements are kept by Coordinator B.

It was reported that District B is having financial problems and that local revenue is not available for sustaining the level of involvement in community education which occurred when external funding was available. District B, the community college and the YMCA would be interested in forming a cooperative for community education if external funding could be secured. The future of the community education effort in District B is dependent upon external funding. Coordinator B does not feel that local resources within the school district or from within other community agencies will be committed to furthering the development of the concept.

Administrative Perceptions of
Future of Community Education Concept

Coordinator B stated that the school district should be the catalyst for community education. Implementation of the concept can create a positive image for the district. Community education encourages the involvement of residents who would not take an interest in the school such as senior citizens and non-parents.

Coordinator B sees community education programming as a possible advantage of declining enrollment:

The use of excess space for such programs as "Tot Spots" assists schools and local groups. If schools were closed and operating expenses could be secured, the buildings would be ideal sites for community education centers. Finances are a critical factor however. The Community Council was a good idea. I could see so much more happening in town B or any town if groups could get together, pool their resources, and work on common interests or common problems. Most people are distant from schools. They see school open six hours per day and do not have access to the buildings at other times. That is surely a waste of space.

SCHOOL DISTRICT C

Background Information Regarding
Elementary School District C

School District C is located in West Cook County, Illinois. The 1979-1980 sixth-day enrollment in District C was 901 students. District C operates four kindergarten through sixth grade instructional programs and one junior high school. The 1978 equalized assessed valuation of the district is \$84,973,976 and the total 1978 tax rate is 2.286 per one hundred dollars of equalized assessed valuation. District C has an Education Fund tax rate of 1.785 and the 1979-1980 operating cost per capita is \$2,367.

District C is a middle class community which is beginning to experience racial and ethnic pluralism within the school population. The district is also experiencing declining enrollment and is currently evaluating alternative methods of dealing with this phenomenon.

Background Information Regarding
the Individual Interviewed in School District C

The individual who provided the information reported herein is a building principal who serves as the Community Education Coordinator. Coordinator C has twenty-two years of experience in the field of education. He has eleven years

of administrative experience, has served as Coordinator of the District C project for five years, and holds a Masters degree in education administration.

Coordinator C has been involved in the district effort since the concept was first introduced by the District C Superintendent. The data presented regarding the development and implementation of community education in District C was secured during an interview conducted on April 3, 1980.

Planning

The decision to establish a community education program in District C was preceded by investigation by the Superintendent and members of the Board of Education of the applicability of the concept in addressing district needs. In the Spring of 1975 the Superintendent became aware of a project being initiated by staff of the Educational Service Region of Cook County which was directed toward the development of a model for community education. A Request for Proposal was sent to all Cook County elementary school districts. District C submitted an application and was accepted as one of three Cook County school districts to participate in a Title IV C grant received and administered by the Educational Service Region.

The Community Education Coordinator reported that the decision to participate was greatly influenced by the fact that the community education concept included philosophical tenets which were similar to those of the Board of Education and

administration of District C. Specific examples cited were the emphasis on community involvement and participation in district decision-making processes and the concept of inter-agency collaboration.

It was not such a big adjustment for us to adopt community education philosophical positions because we already felt committed to working with people in the schools and other agencies of the community. We were encouraged to find a concept which reinforced these practices. We just did not know we were thinking like community educators.

The Superintendent and Board of Education solicited the assistance of the School Board Advisory Council and the Superintendent and building principal were designated as coordinators of the planning process. An entire school year was devoted to planning and the focus of this effort centered upon activities consistent with the District C "Community Education Statement of Purpose":

We view Community Education as a concept and an attitude which permeates and influences the lives of the total community in which we serve. The products of implementation of a Community Education model should recognize the educational, recreational, cultural, and social needs and interests of our population from pre-school age through adulthood.

In addition, it is a process that extends the role of Community Education from the traditional concept of teaching children to one of identifying the needs, problems, and wants of the community. It involves the careful development of public-oriented programs and increased utilization of public-owned facilities. The purpose of this project is to influence the lives of individual residents and to enrich the environment of the entire community.

Community Education is not a concept that can be effectively implemented, in our opinion, by a single governmental agency such as the public schools, but, to realize its full potential, it must include collaboration and cooperation among all governmental, civic, and social agencies of the community to be served.

A combined meeting of elected officials from the Board of Education, Park District and Village government was convened. The goals and objectives of the community education planning process were thoroughly explained and interagency support was secured before the planning strategies were initiated.

Members of the School Board Advisory Council were the nucleus of the planning group. These individuals are appointed by the Board of Education as a standing committee to advise and assist the Board in investigating solutions to local educational issues or problems. In addition, representatives of non-public schools, other governmental agencies, community organizations and the District C teaching staff participated in this process.

In order to develop greater understanding of the community education concept and awareness of its application in District C, consultants from the Educational Service Region of Cook County, the Illinois Office of Education and the Ball State Institute for Community Education Development worked with the planning committee and provided assistance in the planning process. In addition, Council members attended community education training sessions, and visited other communities to observe how they implemented the community education concept.

District C attempted to secure extensive community involvement and input. Two survey instruments were developed. One was directed toward securing individual resident input regarding educational, social, recreational, and cultural interests and needs. The second was directed to other community agencies, organizations, or groups to determine the programs and services which were available. A District C Program and Service Resource file was developed from the results of the Advisory Council's survey of agencies and organizations.

The results of the community needs assessment were analyzed and evaluated relative to priority needs of various age groups. The Community Education Advisory Council compared needs to available services and identified the appropriate agency or organization which possessed the resources and had the responsibility for providing desired programs or services. Long range goals were developed and a Village C Action Plan for Community Education was written and disseminated throughout the community. The Action Plan for Community Education and the community education program goals and objectives provided purpose and direction to the planning and programming efforts.

As a result of this initial effort, agencies began meeting regularly to share and collaborate in program development and planning activities. The elimination of duplication of

service was a major goal. The District C emphasis on inter-agency interdependence has persisted since the community education concept was first introduced. The process of securing agency collaboration in implementation of community education was a primary function of the Community Education Advisory Council. This effort was enhanced by the appointment of a part-time Coordinator for Community Education whose responsibilities included: identification of the appropriate human, physical or financial resources required to implement programs; coordination of agency efforts to develop programs; and the provision of assistance or consultation of the Advisory Council as well as other cooperating agencies.

Coordinator C reported that when the Action Plan was initially implemented, there was greater emphasis on developing new programs and services, yet as the Council and agency leaders became more comfortable the emphasis shifted to developing the various agencies' ability to assume responsibility for program development and to developing a sense of community and a positive attitude toward the benefits of collaboration.

The primary problem encountered was that of agency selfishness and reluctance to give up their "turfdom" authority. This problem was addressed by the Board and administrators involved in developing the community education concept in District C by their assuming a leadership role in demonstrating the value of interagency collaboration.

Coordinator C indicated that the school district was most willing to assist and support other agencies and provide both the human and physical resources of the district to other groups or agencies of the community. The district was not concerned about losing their identity and autonomy. A conscious effort was made to give credit for agency-supported programs being operated in the schools to the appropriate individuals or group. Coordinator C stated the belief that people saw this happening to such a great extent that other agencies became more willing to share their resources and make concessions to accommodate needs of others. He believes that the school district must provide leadership and serve as a catalyst for the development of a greater sense of community agency interdependence.

Coordinator C indicated that he feels one of the most important strategies employed in the planning and development of the concept was the involvement of people who would be affected by the project in the planning and decision-making processes. There was a deliberate effort made to maintain and support rather than disrupt the basic and traditional programming efforts of participating agencies and organizations. Coordinator C cited the development of the evening adult education program in cooperation with the district's community college as an example. School principals were employed to administer the local programs rather than "outsiders."

School personnel were involved in programming decisions. Teachers were employed as instructors and all school employees were permitted to take courses without charge. He indicated that a lot was done to ease concerns about evening utilization of classrooms and other school facilities. He reported that similar strategies have been employed within other agencies when new community education programs were implemented. "An important concept to be remembered is the need for agencies and organizations to retain their identities."

It was reported that the Board of Education has supported the development of community education consistently since the concept was first introduced. They have adopted policies encouraging the utilization of school facilities and emphasizing the community's ownership of district buildings and grounds. They have entered into reciprocal agreements with the Community C Park District, Recreation Board, Village governmental officials, and the Community Center. These agreements specify the resources which will be shared and exchanged between cooperating entities. In addition, they have adopted resolutions in support of the concept. The Coordinator reported that the Board of Education has accepted the concept of community education as a philosophical position which guides and directs their decisions regarding cooperative enterprises with other agencies. The Board also supports the participation and involvement of the building

principal who serves as Community Education Coordinator and the Superintendent in activities related to the development of community education in School District C.

Coordinator C reports that the process of people working together and sharing positive attitudes about their relationships has had an impact on the range of community services available to residents of Community C. However, he feels that the project has had an even greater impact on agency attitudes about similarities and differences inherent in their respective roles and responsibilities. He reported that the planning process continues to involve representation from community agencies and organizations as well as citizen input relative to effectiveness of programs and community needs.

Organizing

Community involvement in planning and emphasis upon interagency collaboration has had a definite influence on the organizational design of the District C community education project. Coordinator C reported that as the concept evolved as a working philosophy, the governance structure and operational design of the project has assumed a more integrated identity. Although the District C Board of Education and administration continue to provide leadership in ongoing developmental and implementation activities, they no longer

have singular authority as was the case when federal funds for the project were administered by the Board.

Community Education programs and services are governed by the Community Education Steering Committee which consists of the Village Clerk, Park District Director, Superintendent of Schools, Library Board representative and Community Center Director.

The Community Education Advisory Council reports to the Steering Committee and makes recommendations relative to specific programs or unmet community needs to the entity deemed to be most appropriate in terms of their role and responsibility. Members also provide advisory input to the Community Education Coordinator and assist in the development of community education program plans. In addition, they serve as the administrative agent for a Community Education Township Revenue Sharing Grant. The Advisory Council consists of representatives from agencies and organizations throughout the community as well as representatives from the non-public schools, the School Board Advisory Council and school Parent-Teacher Organizations. The Council is a not-for-profit corporation and it has its own Board of Directors and By-laws.

The Community Education Coordinator serves as the administrator of the District C community education project and works directly with the Advisory Council. He is responsible for implementing Advisory Council recommendations and assisting

in the identification and activation of available resources. Coordinator C reports directly to the Superintendent of Schools and maintains communication with the leaders of the other agencies and organizations.

An organizational chart has been developed which reflects the interrelationships of groups and individuals cited above. Coordinator C indicated that people know where they fit within the organization and who to go to if they need assistance, yet he is uncertain about whether people know how much authority they have at each level. He expressed the concern that although individual members of the Steering Committee are supportive and strongly committed to the concept, there is a need for more active involvement in shaping the future organizational structure and establishing revised community education goals for the District C project.

Staffing

The District C Community Education Coordinator is employed jointly by the Community Education Council and the District C Board of Education on a part-time basis. His primary role in District C is elementary school principal. Coordinator C receives additional compensation from the district and the Council. A job description has been established by the employing entities. Performance responsibilities are:

1. To develop and implement pre-school programs and activities for children and their parents in conjunction with the District C Community Education project.

2. To develop and implement parenting programs for school-aged children and their parents in conjunction with the District C Community Education project.
3. To develop other courses, programs, and/or activities to meet expressed needs of children and/or their parents.
4. To interview, select, and recommend employment of certificated and non-certificated personnel involved in the District C Community Education project.
5. To supervise all individuals employed to work in Community Education Council sponsored programs.
6. To direct the ongoing development of Community Education programs and services.
7. To work with Community Education Advisory Council in program development and evaluation.
8. To conduct a thorough public information program regarding programs and services.
9. To establish a working relationship with Community C agencies and organizations involved in educational and recreational program development and service delivery.
10. To assist in the development of the Project budget and to administer Community Education expenditures.
11. To requisition required supplies, equipment, and materials.
12. To assist in the establishment of the Community Education governance and organizational structure.
13. To maintain open lines of communication with all community organizations and respond to requests for information about the project, its programs, and its services.
14. To explore additional funding sources for continuation and expansion of the Community Education project.

Coordinator C indicates that there is district staff support for the community education project. He feels that teachers believe the concept belongs in the district and that community education goals are consistent with District C emphasis on parent involvement and citizen participation in decision-making.

In addition to attending local workshops, Illinois Community Education Association and National Community Education Association conventions, the Coordinator has participated in the Community Education Leadership Training Program in Flint, Michigan, sponsored by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. He indicated that in-service training was essential to him and that in-service training in the area of community education was also provided for the District C staff. He recommended; however, that more formal staff in-service should have been provided when the concept was first being introduced rather than after the project was operating.

Since the District C project is multi-agency supported and operated, instructors or supervisors for community education programs and services are employed, supervised, and evaluated by the agency responsible for implementing specific programs or services. Employment policies as well as salary and benefit programs are determined by the individual agency or organization. Individuals employed to work within community education programs operated by the Community Education Council

are subject to the same employment policies as School District C employees in comparable positions. Coordinator C indicates that the same standards expected of the personnel involved in the operation of the kindergarten through eighth grade educational program apply to community education personnel and programs. Evaluation procedures do differ from those utilized in the assessment of District C teacher performance. Evaluation is less formal. Performance is assessed by review of participant feedback and by observations made by the Community Education Coordinator.

Coordinator C indicated that the building principal's role in District C has been affected by the development of community education. He feels that the principal must view himself as a school community leader-educator. "He must be able to share the decision-making authority and involve parents and others in the operation of the school program." Coordinator C feels that some principals may require additional training if they are to be successful in fulfilling these expectations.

Directing

When District C began their community education project the school district Board of Education was the primary policy-making body. As other agencies have become more involved in the project, the base of authority has been expanded. The

policies of the agency operating specific programs are those which apply. When programs are cooperatively sponsored and operated, the Community Education Coordinator works with the Community Education Steering Committee to assure that proposed programmatic goals and procedures are consistent with policies or practices of the participating agencies.

Programs or services provided by the not-for-profit corporation of the Community Education Advisory Council and governed by the Council and policies are developed in accord with the Council's Constitution and By-laws. The Community Education Corporation is directed by its officers and decisions regarding Council programs and services are made by the membership. The Council consists of representatives from the school district, Community Center, Park District, Recreation Board, Public Library, Youth Commission, public and non-public school parent groups, the School Board Advisory Council, and citizens at large. The Council gains its authority from the participating agencies and organizations, and presents recommendations and requests for cooperation to the agency governing boards.

The Coordinator is responsible for communicating Council decisions to the various agencies involved and minutes of Council activities are disseminated to all groups participating in the community education project. In addition to serving as the District C representative to the Council, Coordinator C is responsible for assessing the appropriateness of Council

initiated activities. He must also see that attitudes toward community education among community agencies remain positive, and coordinate Council initiated programs. Coordinator C indicated that human relations activities account for 90% of his responsibility.

Coordinating

In the early years of the development of the community education concept the district performed a catalytic function as convener, facilitator and motivator. The leadership provided by District C was an instrumental factor in the acceptance of community education as a process for community synergism. At the present time; however, Coordinator C reports that the school district's function is best described as coordinator. The school district, in cooperation with the Advisory Council, continues to provide leadership among community agencies yet the extent of District C's involvement in a specific activity is now dictated by the program requirement, school district resources, and by the nature of the activity. District C assumes responsibility for programs which focus on the educational and personal-social needs of the community, and other agencies are responsible for those activities which are more closely related to their organizational purpose.

District C's Coordinator indicated that their program emphasizes interagency collaboration and integration of resources in meeting the educational, social, cultural, recreational and personal needs of community residents. He cited the following examples of agency collaboration in Community C:

1. The school district, park district and village have joined an Intergovernmental Consortium and have hired a Coordinator for securing C.E.T.A. revenue and eligible participants. Manpower, equipment and materials are shared among the three taxing bodies.
2. School District C and the Park District have jointly employed an individual as Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds.
3. School District C has an agreement with their community college related to the provision of adult and continuing education courses offered in the elementary district.
4. The Park District and School District C utilize facilities of the respective agency for recreation or education programs without charge.
5. School District C and the Park District jointly lease a community building and cooperatively sponsor an Early Childhood Education Program for three year olds of the community.
6. School District C and the Village Community Center jointly sponsor a Clubhouse Child Care program for school-aged youngsters of working parents. School district facilities and personnel are employed.
7. School District C and the Village Recreation Board sponsor summer recreation programs. School district facilities are utilized, and personnel employed and the Recreation Board funds the program.

The District C Coordinator and Superintendent monitor the effectiveness of efforts such as those cited and meet regularly with leadership from participating agencies or

organizations to assess the effectiveness of activities and jointly plan community education programs.

Coordinator C reported that the Community Education Advisory Council has prepared a slide-tape presentation of community education activities and programs and that this presentation is shown to community organizations and groups to increase community understanding and awareness, and to demonstrate the effectiveness of interagency and inter-organization collaboration.

Reporting

Interpersonal communication processes are the primary means of reporting community education plans, decisions and progress. Representatives on the Advisory Council are responsible for reporting to their agencies or organizations. Coordinator C is responsible for reporting to the Superintendent and for maintaining lines of communication with leaders from other participating agencies.

Intra-district communication regarding the District C program is handled through memoranda to the staff and faculty. Each agency has a newsletter which is employed for communication to the public and the Advisory Council prepares a monthly Community Calendar for dissemination and information purposes.

The Board of Education is apprised of community education activities by means of the Superintendent's Newsletter

and Superintendent's reports at meetings of the Board.

Budgeting

The primary source of revenue for the first three years of the District C community education project was the Educational Service Region sponsored Title IV C grant. Additional revenue was available for consultant services from a flat grant received from the Office of the State Facilitator for Community Education. This revenue was supplemented by a grant from the Illinois Dangerous Drug Commission which provided for a community-based counseling program.

Coordinator C reports that the primary sources of current funding are a Township Revenue Sharing Grant which is administered by the Community Education Advisory Council corporation, tuition received from parents of children enrolled in the Early Childhood Education Program, and other program participant fees. This revenue is supplemented by manpower and materials received through C.E.T.A. grants.

Community education programs or services which are operated by individual agencies are funded by those agencies. In addition, agencies provide released time for personnel to work with community education planning and organizational activities.

The Community Education corporation budget is separate from the budgets of participating agencies. Coordinator C

indicated that the Council determines their goals for the year and allocates their resources in relation to priority needs. He emphasized that the "ultimate goal of any community education project would be that it become self-supporting and acquire operating revenues from participating agencies." He believes that external funds should only provide supplementary revenue.

Administrative Perceptions of Most
Effective Management Style and Future of
Community Education Concept

Coordinator C reported that he feels the team management approach to administering community education programs is the most effective. He feels that one cannot assume an autocratic administrative style and be successful in securing interagency collaboration. He believes team management and participative decision-making is necessary for community ownership, involvement and support to occur.

He believes that "community education is an avenue which should be investigated by any district which is facing declining enrollment." He feels that it is a concept which can assist the administrator in meeting many needs of contemporary society, and that community education will become widely accepted in the future.

He pointed out that school closings have not had such

a negative affect on the community when schools have been used for community education or community service. He feels that recycling of existing public-owned facilities is preferable to creating new facilities for community education activities.

Coordinator C reported that community education influences the public's attitude toward its schools. He feels that as schools serve a wider age range of the community, they become more meaningful community institutions. "Schools are more responsive." When properly employed, he believes that, community involvement through advisory councils, neighborhood "councils, or P.T.A.s can be the best public relations tool available to school administrators."

SCHOOL DISTRICT D

Background Information Regarding Elementary School District D

School District D is located in West Cook County, Illinois. The 1979-1980 sixth-day enrollment in District D was 332 students. District D is a one school district serving youngsters in grades kindergarten through eight. The 1978 equalized assessed valuation of the district is \$70,926,877, and the total 1978 tax rate is 1.4131 per one hundred dollars of equalized assessed valuation. District D's Education Fund tax rate is .9848 and the 1979-1980 operating cost per capita is \$2,340.

District D is a residential community with residents of upper middle class socio-economic background. Although the district has experienced considerable decline in enrollment, school programs have not been affected. District D's finances are considered to be quite stable. State Aid accounts for only five percent of the budget. Community support for education is strong.

Background Information Regarding the Individual Interviewed in School District D

The District D superintendent was the individual who provided the information regarding community education in the district. Superintendent D has twenty-seven years of experience in the field of education and has had eighteen years of experience as a school administrator. He has been superintendent of District D for the past thirteen years and he holds a Masters degree in Education Administration.

The data presented regarding the development and implementation of community education in District D was secured during an interview which occurred April 17, 1980.

Planning

Superintendent D indicated that he believes their community education program began as a result of the Board of Education's feeling that they are responsible for education in the community and that the obligation extends beyond kinder-

garten through eighth grade. He reports that the program is the result of a sense of consciousness that theirs is a community centered school. He said that the school building represents an asset of the community and that it should be utilized as such: "Our job is not to make money, our job is to spend it wisely." Superintendent D stated that this feeling was very strong on the part of the Board when they entered the program.

In 1974 the district decided to expand community programming and offer adult education programs. At that time letters were sent out to all identifiable agencies and organizations of the community. Each was invited to send a representative to meet with the superintendent to discuss plans for establishing adult education in the elementary school building. The Board of Education appointed a representative and the faculty was encouraged to participate in the discussion. It was emphasized that the planning and development of the district community education program was facilitated by the fact that the District D community college was interested in expanding at that time and that they were looking for a center. Superintendent D stated that they were motivated by the assistance offered by the college and by their own consciousness.

Groups sent one representative to communicate for them and to serve as a liaison between the committee and their

constituencies. Superintendent D indicated that this group was still active and that they are called the Adult Education Advisory Council. The Council's primary role is to determine community interest and recommend courses or programs which should be offered. Superintendent D stated that members bring feedback from the groups they represent and report the courses their group desires. In addition to surveying their own groups, the Council has developed questionnaires which are distributed to the individuals enrolled in courses to determine other courses or programs they would support. Superintendent D reported that the committee is involved in selecting the nights as well as the courses. He stated that Tuesday and Thursday are Adult Education Nights in District D and that no other activities are planned.

The District D Council is involved in assessment of the courses offered yet they do not have long-range goals for the adult education program. Superintendent D reported, "We know where we are and where we want to go, but we do not write goals. We are all aware of our needs and we have a deep commitment for expanding the program and not diminishing it."

Superintendent D reported that the Board of Education maintains a commitment to the community concept and that they "almost uniformly ratify the Adult Education Council's recommendations." Although the district Board has not developed a written policy about adult and community education, the superintendent reported that their "Statement of Philosophy"

espouses the concept that learning is lifelong and that it should be a continuous process from birth to the grave. Planning of District D programs involves rather extensive community input and courses or programs do seem to represent the wants, needs and desires of their adult residents.

Staffing

When asked if the District has encountered problems relative to staff support of the community school concept, Superintendent D indicated that there has been a problem with some teachers feeling a sense of ownership of their classrooms. The district has conducted teacher inservice education workshops intended to foster a sense of cooperation with the community yet it was reported that the success of these efforts is questionable. Superintendent D expressed the opinion that the teachers employed in the district Night School are very supportive of the concept of community involvement and that their positive feelings have a helpful influence on those teachers who complain about the program.

The district encourages their teachers to teach in the adult education program and selects instructors from their faculty whenever possible. Superintendent D reported that many of his teachers are involved and that, as elementary teachers, they see it as a unique opportunity which enables them to work with adults and earn additional income. When unable to secure a qualified instructor for a particular course,

the community college provides their assistance. The superintendent selects and employs the individuals from his faculty who serve as Night School Coordinators, yet their salaries are reimbursed by the community college since the college is responsible for operating the District D adult education program.

The Coordinators' job description was also developed by Superintendent D and they are directly responsible to him. The Coordinators' duties include: management of the program; assuring the safety of people enrolled in the program; supervision of the program; evaluation of teachers; registration, reporting and interaction with the Adult Education Advisory Council.

Evaluation of night school teachers involves a minimum of one class visitation and one written evaluation. Superintendent D indicated that procedures for evaluation of adult education teachers are the same as those employed by the district. Although all teachers are employed by the community college, District D preserves the prerogative to retain or remove staff members. Salaries for teachers and coordinators are determined by the community college pay scale rather than District D.

It was reported that often principals have the same sense of exclusive ownership for the school which is expressed by teachers. Superintendent D stated that the principal must put ownership feelings aside if a school is to be truly

community based. He believes that the principal of a community school must be open, accessible, flexible, and willing to involve people in the decision-making process; and that an authoritarian attitude regarding school administration is in direct conflict with the theory of community involvement and participation.

Directing

Superintendent D reported that the Adult Education Advisory Council is involved in decision-making regarding course offerings and that this group reports directly to the Board of Education. He indicated that his role is to coordinate the scheduling of adult education and community recreation programs. In addition, he is responsible for supervision and evaluation of the Night School Coordinators. Superintendent D and a member of the Board of Education serve as facilitators for the Advisory Council.

Coordinating

District D works very closely with other agencies of their community. They provide the school facilities, as well as administrative and custodial personnel, and other agencies operate community education programs and services. District D adult education courses are sponsored and conducted by the community college. District D provides facilities and custodial services and the community college prepares course schedules,

hires teachers, and operates those courses requested by the district or its constituents.

The District D superintendent describes the school's role as respondent to requests for facilities from other village agencies or organizations. The district does not participate in planning of programs.

It was reported that on nights when community college courses are not offered, the recreation board utilizes school facilities without charge. Superintendent D stated that they not only provide adult recreation in evenings but also provide after school recreation programs for students. In District D, Recreation Board activities supplement rather than supplant those student activities sponsored by the school. The Recreation Board concentrates their programming efforts upon primary level aged youngsters during the school year and on programs for all age groups during the Summer. Superintendent D emphasized that the Community Recreation Director determines programs and that they are funded by the Village Board. All activities are conducted at the District D school since the Recreation Board does not have a building or grounds.

District D facilities are also used by the one parochial school of the community and various volunteer organizations such as scouts.

Superintendent D emphasized that none of the activities described generate revenue for the schools. He indicated that, "the district feels a sense of commitment as the education

center of the community and that district facilities belong to all members of the community."

The superintendent reported that program duplication is avoided by open and continuous communication among and between facility users. Plans for adult education and recreation programs are discussed prior to final schedules being developed. He indicated that "turfdom" problems have not interfered with planning and implementation of community oriented programs because people who use the school are "grateful to have a place to meet and grateful that the district permits them to use the facilities."

Reporting

Information regarding program plans is disseminated among and between individuals involved in the community education activities by various means. Representatives to the Advisory Council are responsible for serving as liaison between the Council and their groups. The Board representative is responsible for ongoing communication with members of the Board. Superintendent D is responsible for dialogue with members of the teaching staff and with officials of cooperating agencies or organizations. Night School Coordinators are responsible for reporting to the Council. Minutes of Adult Education Advisory Council meetings are printed and distributed to participants and Board members. It was reported that this is the only formal practice of the Council and that by-laws or procedural guidelines have not

been written.

The District D newsletter is employed as a means of reporting community education plans, programs, and activities to residents. It is mailed to all residents quarterly.

Budgeting

District D employs the traditional form of line-item budget. Superintendent D indicated that expenditures for community education would not be described in the budget. District D tax revenue is utilized for night custodial salaries and indirect costs such as heat and lights. The community college provides operating revenue for adult education courses and reimburses the district for salaries paid to Night School Coordinators. There are no other sources of revenue for community education activities or programs.

Administrative Perceptions of Future of Community Education Concept

When asked about the future of community based programming in District D, the superintendent pointed out that their primary goal continues to be the provision of a quality elementary education and that they cannot lose sight of that mission. He added that "we can do this during the day, but it is a shame to lock the building, turn off the lights and allow a 4.5 million dollar plant to remain idle after 5:00 p.m." He

continued, "that is not good economics even though we would save some money in doing so ... in terms of our potential worth to the community, residents would not be getting sufficient return from their investment." He emphasized that community education has not affected the quality of the regular program. He stated, " we are contributing to these programs (community education) and committing district resources but we feel this will come back to us...if we meet needs, we feel that when we have needs that the people will respond to our needs."

Superintendent D allowed that a lot depends upon the availability of financial resources and that if money gets "tight" or fuel shortages occur they may have to stop programs. However, he added there are inventive ways to finance programs which they have not "tapped." "Buildings could be diverted into some other educational use rather than closing them ... rooms that have become empty could be rented to private agencies for programs such as day care for pre-school aged youngsters."

Superintendent D indicated that community education could assist a district solve the problems which result from declining enrollment. He concluded that one advantage of a school district's adopting the community school approach is that when you have space and identified needs you can share that space on a cost-share service reciprocal basis with cooperating agencies. In this manner, he feels, the community gets a much greater benefit from their taxes.

SCHOOL DISTRICT E

Background Information Regarding
Elementary School District E

School District E is located in South suburban Cook County, Illinois. The 1979-1980 sixth-day enrollment of the district was 1,702 students. District E operates six attendance centers. There is one kindergarten through fifth grade school, one kindergarten through sixth grade center, two kindergarten through fourth grade centers, and two fifth through eighth grade programs. The Equalized Assessed Valuation of the district was \$37,951,542 in 1978 and the total district tax rate was 2.1499 per one hundred dollars of Equalized Assessed Valuation. The District E Education Fund tax rate was 1.2891 and the per capita operating cost for the 1979-1980 school year was \$2,360.

School District E serves two adjacent communities. The socio-economic level of the district is low and the number of youngsters eligible for compensatory education services is high. Consequently, the district receives a considerable amount of federal revenue to supplement local tax dollars.

Background Information Regarding
the Individual Interviewed in School District E

The individual who provided the information reported

herein is employed as a full-time consultant to District E. She serves as Community Education Coordinator and devotes approximately twenty-five percent of her time to operating the program. Coordinator E has fifteen years of experience in the field of education and has taught both at the elementary school and college level. Coordinator E has been employed as a consultant to the district for eleven years and has been involved in the development and implementation of the District E community education program from its inception. She has contributed articles to state and national community education publications and holds the degree of Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction.

The data presented was secured during an interview conducted on April 15, 1980.

Planning

Coordinator E reported that the district's involvement in community education began with an emphasis on parenting activities. She indicated that the district's motive was to work with parents of school aged children in order to increase their ability to work with their children in such academic areas as phonics, metrics and mathematics.

The responsibility for planning parenting courses was shared by the superintendent, Coordinator E and parents who were involved in the first series of courses offered. In addition, Coordinator E described the Board of Education as being very supportive of opening the schools to the adult population. She indicated that the Board gave them "carte

blanche" to do what needed to be done.

It was reported that the district was encouraged by their success with adult programming. Consequently, they applied for participation in a community education pilot project which was being funded by ESEA Title IV C and administered by the Educational Service Region of Cook County.

A Community Education Advisory Council was established in compliance with the requirements of the Title IV C grant. Coordinator E indicated that the Council was composed of residents of both communities served by the district as well as park district officials and representatives from various civic and community groups. She stated that many of the participants were parents of school-aged youngsters.

Coordinator E mentioned that there was difficulty sustaining constant membership on the Council and regular attendance at meetings. She expressed the opinion that the District obtained a great deal of input from residents through informal sources but that the model of advisory council as leader and facilitator was not effective in District E. She added that the Advisory Council did conduct a comprehensive needs assessment developed by the Ball State University Center for Community Education Development. It was her opinion that the results were of assistance to the district's grant-writing efforts, but that the survey did not yield significant data relative to program planning. Coordinator E felt that results secured from a petitioning process whereby people could request

a course or program were more relevant to their program planning efforts. It was stated that the district no longer utilizes the advisory council concept in their community education project. It was revealed that planning efforts did not include the development of long-range objectives. Coordinator E cited the district's purpose being, "to give parents and other adult participants what they want."

Planning of the District E project does involve interaction and cooperation with other agencies or organizations of the school community. It was reported that community education activities have been conducted in cooperation with the fire department, park district and C.E.T.A. office. In addition, Coordinator E plans and conducts an annual Community Education Fair which involves the participation of all local agencies.

The primary emphasis of the current District E program is presentation of adult education courses which represent an expressed need of parents and others.

Coordinator E believes that as a result of community education there is a higher level of parental participation and that parents have begun to realize their importance as members of the educational team.

Activities relative to community education program planning in District E are guided by the following Statement of Philosophy:

The District believes that the schools belong to the people, and the educational system must be responsive to the needs and interests of the community...not only the school-aged children. We feel that a District which does meet community needs and encourages widespread involvement will not only provide service to the community, but simultaneously increase

"the quality of the educational experience for its school-aged children via the additional support and interest resulting from parents and community."

Organizing

Coordinator E stated that written statements of line-staff relationships, and a formal organizational design are absent in District E. It was added; however, that the interrelationship between community education and other district programs are clearly understood. The superintendent performs a leadership role in the District E program and is involved in all major decisions. Coordinator E is directly responsible to the superintendent. Although there is no formal structure for communication between the school district and other agency leaders, Coordinator E indicated that communication is frequent and that interaction occurs when agencies are seeking assistance or support.

Staffing

Coordinator E is responsible for selection of community education course instructors. Recommendations are presented

to the superintendent for approval and Board for ratification. Many of the teachers are residents of the school community, and it was reported that the instructors' qualifications "range from non-professional to people with specialized training to certificated teachers." Coordinator E stated that it is often difficult to find instructors for unusual course offerings and that most of the teachers are uniquely qualified for a specific course rather than generally qualified to teach various subjects. Training sessions are conducted for all new staff. In addition, a "Community Education Handbook for Teachers" has been developed which describes procedures to be followed and outlines teacher responsibilities.

The Community Education Handbook includes the District E statement regarding those qualities which community educators should possess:

1. Knowledge of subject matter;
2. Versatility of teaching methods;
3. Flexibility;
4. Maturity to handle unstructured situations;
5. Good self-image;
6. Ability to channel discussions effectively;
7. Ability to communicate thoughts and ideas at many levels;
8. Ability to get along with a wide variety of people;
9. Ability to fulfill guidance and counselor role;
10. Genuine concern for students' welfare.

Teachers are required to prepare and submit copies of lesson plans and written course evaluations.

The community education salary schedule differs from salary policies of other district employees. All instructors are paid at the same rate per hour of classroom instruction.

Fringe benefits are not provided. Contractual arrangements with the teaching staff are made for the length of a particular course only.

Coordinator E indicated responsibility for evaluation of instructors. Evaluation includes visitation of classes and review of participant feedback. Written evaluations are prepared but the process is described as being "loosely structured."

It was emphasized that the level of support given by the building principal will largely determine how successful community education offerings are in a particular building. Coordinator E stated the opinion that a major prerequisite for principals is "simply a willingness to accommodate adults, to be hospitable, and to offer whatever resources are needed for support of programs." It was reported that the roles of individual employees of the district relative to community education are well known, yet job descriptions have not been developed.

Directing

Coordinator E recounted that one of the problems she perceives is that District E does not have firm written policies which guide the operation of community education programs. Operational procedures are determined, as required, by Coordinator E and the superintendent and disseminated in the

form of written memoranda. It was emphasized that procedures included in the Community Education Handbook for Teachers were the only formal directives regarding program policy.

The Coordinator's responsibilities for directing the District E community education program include scheduling, staffing, payroll, classroom monitoring, course content evaluation, interagency interaction, and public communications.

It was reported that human relations is a large part of the Coordinator's role. "A community education director or coordinator must be able to function within the community and have a style which makes you easily accessible and makes people willing to interact with you."

Coordinating

In District E the school is the agency which is primarily responsible for coordination of interagency activities. Relationships with other agencies are described as being very positive. The only problem encountered occurred early in the development of community education in District E. It was recalled that the park district had expressed concern about the school's goals and their infringement upon the park district role. Coordinator E stated that this problem was overcome by the district's openness and willingness to explain their program and by the Coordinator making a sincere effort not to duplicate programs or services.

Emphasis on coordination and avoidance of duplication continue to be important missions of the District E Coordinator. Information regarding future course offerings or plans is sent to all community agencies on a regular basis.

Reporting

Information about District E community education activities is included in the district's community newsletter, and internal communication is accomplished via the staff newsletter and by memoranda.

Coordinator E makes formal reports to the Board of Education on a bi-annual basis and through other "informal communication avenues."

Coordinator E reports directly to the superintendent, yet there is apparent uncertainty about the Coordinator's relationship within the district administration organization. It was indicated that the Coordinator is uncertain of her authority. It was stated, " I am constantly getting in trouble because of it...my role should be more clearly defined than it is."

Budgeting

When operated in cooperation with the Cook County Educational Service Region Title IV C Project, the primary source of revenue was external federal funding. In addition, District E operated local community education fundraisers.

Coordinator E emphasized that community education is now a line item in the district budget and sustained primarily by local sources (i.e., local taxes and course materials fees). Mini grants in such areas as vandalism prevention have been a secondary source. Coordinator E stated that they have not been successful in securing foundation grants and that other agencies or organizations provide fiscal support only for specific programs or activities.

All decisions regarding the community education budget are made by the superintendent and Community Education Coordinator.

Administrative Perceptions of Future of Community Education Concept

Coordinator E expressed the opinion that a community education program administrator "has to understand and know the community and have a feel for how the community operates... he must realize that community education, to be successful, may not be what you think it should be, but what the community wants and needs." In response to inquiry regarding the future of community education, Coordinator E indicated that she believes, "community education is one of the most expeditious routes to take in solving problems of declining enrollments and school closings." However, she cautioned that, "with budgetary crunches

and cuts in funding at every level of government, community education could be one of the first programs to be cut." Coordinator E sees money as a primary factor, "I do not see community education as an up and coming area in the next five years...when we look at reductions in funding levels and local school budget deficits, I don't think the future, for community education, is very bright."

SCHOOL DISTRICT F

Background Information Regarding Elementary School District F

Elementary School District F is located in South suburban Cook County, Illinois. District F's 1979-1980 enrollment on the sixth day of attendance was 1,187 students. District F operates three kindergarten through sixth grade facilities and one junior high level program. The 1978 Equalized Assessed Valuation of the district was \$94,870,699. The Educational Fund tax rate for District F is 1.280 per one hundred dollars of Equalized Assessed Valuation and the total 1978 tax rate was 2.3522.

District F provides educational services to two entire communities and a small portion of a third. The district has been operating a cross bussing desegregation program through court order since 1968. The process of desegregation created some serious problems within the community and District F

lost approximately 1,000 students to private and parochial schools at the time. Community education processes were implemented early in the seventies as a means of rebuilding community support and community involvement in the public schools.

District F has had serious financial problems as represented in the fact that voters have defeated thirteen rate increase referendums in a thirteen year period of time.

Background Information Regarding
the Individual Interviewed in School District F

The individual who provided the information reported herein is the Superintendent of Schools in District F. Superintendent F has been involved in the field of education for thirty-one years and has been superintendent of District F for twelve years. He holds the degree of Ed.D in Educational Administration and Supervision and has written several articles regarding administrative process and District F programs in state level professional publications.

Superintendent F has been deeply involved in the district's desegregation effort and has been a most outspoken advocate for school community interdependence and interagency collaboration in the solving of community problems.

The data presented was secured during an interview conducted on April 8, 1980.

Planning

Superintendent F reported that community education began with the support of the District F community college. He indicated that they have a very strong community education program and that District F and Community College F have a very close working relationship. It was emphasized that since the community college has the resources and technology to operate adult education courses in the district, the schools' role is to "cooperate not duplicate."

The District F approach to community education has been two-fold. The primary emphasis has been on solving community problems such as vandalism and delinquency. The second emphasis has been upon utilization of District F buildings and grounds for community activities or services.

Superintendent F indicated that the schools have been required to take a more active role in facilitating the development of recreational programs since the village government spends so little money for recreation and other youth related activities. The district continually works with the village to encourage officials to assume a more active role in meeting the needs of teenagers and younger children of the community. Superintendent F explained that, "the district community education program attempts to fill a vacuum which should be occupied by the civil governments of the villages."

The community education program concentrates on dealing with problems which occur in the community. The District F strategy is to involve as many agencies, organizations or groups as possible in planning and determining methods of dealing with community problems. In this activity the district is both the catalyst and the coordinator.

Superintendent F cited the Delinquency Project as an example. This effort involved the development of a community-wide advisory council composed of representatives from the village governments, park districts, police departments, private and parochial school administrators and District F administrators. The purpose was to establish a "supra system" that would "encourage the development of activities and monitor programs operated at various sites dealing with a vast array of programs for teenagers." The group met, developed program plans and prepared a grant proposal.

Superintendent F cited a reluctance on the part of people to become involved with the multi-agency council concept because of interests in retaining their own identity and autonomy. He emphasized that, "the secret is to create programs which meet the specific needs of individual participants, and at the same time meet the needs of the community." An outgrowth of this process was the development of a public-non-public school council." Board members and administrators from District F and the private or parochial schools in the

school district meet every other month to discuss common problems and explore methods of addressing common needs. Superintendent F commented that the flight to private and parochial schools at the time of court ordered desegregation created a "lot of bitterness" between public and nonpublic school officials. He emphasized that working together now has created an improved environment for problem-solving and that the private schools have begun to realize that, "their stability and future has a lot to do with the stability of the public school system."

Another example of interagency collaboration for which District F was the initiator is the "Education Round Table" which involves community college as well as public and non-public elementary and high school administrators meeting on a monthly basis to identify common areas of interest and to develop projects which facilitate sharing and integrating of resources in the solving of common problems.

District F employs various planning systems with emphasis on problem-solving and community-wide participation. Superintendent F indicates that their efforts have not been goal oriented but have been problem and people oriented. He feels that they have been more effective because they have concentrated on short range objectives and the solution of immediate problems. Superintendent F indicated that the development of the community education concept has been a key factor in their garnering of increased community support for

the schools in recent years. "By serving the community through working to solve some of its immediate problems, the school has begun to gain the respect of the community." The school district has performed a leadership role in its school community.

Early in the development of the District F community education concept, formal needs assessments were conducted in conjunction with the community college. These results helped to shape present program emphasis. In addition, Superintendent F stated that the schools employ many different citizen advisory councils as an integral part of their mode of operation.

Superintendent F indicated that the Board of Education has "traditionally been as generous as it could be about use of school facilities by the community," and that Board policy supports the concept of community ownership of the schools. The Board's role was described as being supportive of the administration's involvement in community education as long as costs could be "covered." The Board monitors the development and implementation of community education in District F and the superintendent feels they will support the concept as long as it does not negatively affect school district finances.

Organizing

Superintendent F indicated that, "there is no formal community education organizational structure...because of the district's being more problem oriented than goal oriented." Their thrust has been related to the identification of community resources and their task has been to facilitate the interaction of community agencies, organizations, or groups in order that they work together in a coordinated manner.

Staffing

It was reported that members of the District F staff have completely accepted the community education concept. Superintendent F indicated that the district's Title VII project has provided "a lot of help with community education." The Title VII Project goal of becoming more community oriented and community involved is very consistent with the concept of community education.

Community education staff members are provided through a number of external funding sources (i.e., C.E.T.A., Title IV C, and Title VII). The process of staff evaluation is determined by the particular project in which the employee is involved. Grant proposals determine the mode of program evaluation also.

Community education staff members are selected either by

the federal project director or building principal and community education staff members are subject to the same personnel policies as regular education employees.

Superintendent F said that specific job descriptions are included in the project proposal and that salaries and benefits are comparable to those of other district employees in similar positions.

Superintendent F indicated that his principals are expected to work closely with their school communities, and that they know community involvement is a high priority of the district. Each school has Home-School Coordinators to assist in this process and it is believed that principals have realized how valuable it is to work with parents.

Directing

The superintendent monitors and coordinates all activities relative to community education in District F and supervises all personnel, yet the various projects are directed by federal project directors or principals.

Superintendent F reported that community education is an underlying philosophy of the district rather than a visible program of the district. Decision-making is team oriented and regular meetings are held with project directors and principals. Superintendent F added that everything related to district and program operation is discussed in a very open

manner. Parent participation is a consistent goal and community involvement is encouraged throughout every phase of district management.

Coordinating

As mentioned previously, District F serves as catalyst for community problem-solving and coordinator of interagency cooperation efforts. Superintendent F coordinates the various planning groups involved in community education related activities and project directors or building principals coordinate efforts of various people involved in district projects.

District F works very closely with park districts within the school district boundaries in the development of recreational activities. Superintendent F stated that school property has been provided to the park district for development as parks and recreational centers. An elementary school building which was closed due to declining enrollment and district financial problems is being utilized as the District F Community Education Center. Operating expenses are covered by rental of space to a regional film library service, the area special educational cooperative, the park district and the Community Chest. The Center also houses the C.E.T.A. project coordinator, a federally funded Teacher Center and a federally funded pre-school program.

Duplication of effort among agencies is prevented by

open and continual dialogue between District F and other agencies, or organizations involved in community education related activities. In addition, the human, financial and physical resources of the community are constantly enlisted by the schools when addressing school and community problems.

Reporting

The major medium for reporting information regarding the community education concept is interpersonal communication. Project directors and principals report directly to the superintendent on a regular basis and the superintendent meets with various planning groups on a regular basis. In addition, the principals work closely with the P.T.A. Presidents Council and project directors interact with their citizen advisory councils.

Superintendent F meets with village governmental bodies and civic organizations on a regular basis, and District F has a Speakers Bureau which is responsible for public presentations regarding all school programs and services.

A telephone hotline is available for residents to secure information about District F programs and each school publishes a newsletter which always contains information related to community education in District F.

Budgeting

Superintendent F indicated that the district budget is

subject to public input throughout the process of development. He stated that every line item is discussed and that he holds approximately twenty public meetings before Board adoption. He emphasized that budget priorities are significantly influenced by citizen involvement.

It was reported that all monies devoted to the operation of community education in District F come from federal sources. The district C.E.T.A., Title VII and Title IV C projects include items related to community education personnel or services. Local revenue is not provided for direct services yet the district does support indirect costs related to facility utilization.

Administrative Perceptions of Future of Community Education Concept

Superintendent F stated the belief that, to be effective community educators, school administrators have to be "knowledgeable about the community; knowledgeable about their school system;...and know their problems, know their resources and be aware of the community's resources and its attitudes."

Superintendent F forecasts a gloomy future for community education. "As we receive less money, community education will take it on the nose...in times of economic recession we will have greater difficulty getting financial support for education, and emphasis will have to be placed on providing basic educational services to children within our schools."

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter, the information secured from interviewing of administrative leaders in selected elementary school districts of Cook County, Illinois and reported in the previous chapter, will be analyzed and reviewed. Analysis will include an examination of each component of the POSDCoRD model in regard to its relationship to the process of implementing the community education concept. This examination will address those areas of investigation cited in Chapter I.

Examination of the Factors which Influenced the Decision to Develop and Implement Community Education

Various responses were given for the districts deciding to initiate community education. There were similarities and differences discovered when each district's motivation and purpose were explored. The factors which influenced the administrative decision making process in each elementary school district studied are presented and analyzed.

District A implemented community education in conjunction with the district plan for desegregation.

Community education and the community school concept were viewed as means of: securing resident participation in the development of district reorganization plans; involving parents and other residents in school sponsored adult centered programs and activities; and developing a sense of pride for and commitment to the schools and the community.

The primary factor influencing District B's decision to initiate community education was the availability of federal funds to support the project. Community education was viewed as a means of providing programs and activities for adults in the neighborhood schools and as a means of gaining increased citizen support. It should be noted that program development and implementation efforts were sharply curtailed when federal funds for community education were terminated.

The primary factors which influenced District C's development of the community education concept were:

1. The community education concept included philosophical tenents of community education such as emphasis on community involvement and participation in decision making, and effective utilization of school and community resources, were consistent with the goals of the district Board of Education and administration. In addition, the concept of the school district being the educational leader of the community

and being responsible for the educational needs of the total community from pre-school age through adulthood was consistent with district philosophy and practice.

2. Community education was viewed as a means of addressing district facility, program, and financial needs.
3. The availability of federal funds to advance these concepts and implement a community wide planning process.

District D's decision regarding community education was influenced by the interest of the community college in establishing an adult education extension center and by the Board's commitment to providing a community centered school system. A sense of obligation for providing education beyond the traditional parameters of kindergarten through eighth grade was an important factor. Another factor was the district philosophy that the school belongs to the taxpayers and should be available for utilization by other community agencies, organizations or groups for community based programs or activities.

Success with the implementation of parenting activities which focused upon programs intended to increase the parents ability to support and assist in their child's learning experience was an important consideration in District E's

decision to expand their adult programming efforts through community education. District E's belief that schools belong to the people and that an educational system must be responsive to the needs and interests of the total community greatly influenced the development of community education and the direction it took in its communities.

District F's decision was influenced by a number of factors. Community education was developed for the following reasons:

1. The concept was viewed as a vehicle for community problem solving.
2. There was a need to restore community support and community respect for the public schools as the result of court ordered desegregation. Community education was seen as a means of accomplishing these goals.
3. Community education was viewed as a means of mobilizing and integrating community resources and facilitating interagency collaboration.
4. When enrollments declined and a school facility was no longer needed for elementary education purposes, community education provided a positive alternative to the facility being closed and its usefulness as a public facility being lost.
5. Community education emphasis on community

involvement and participation in educational planning and decision making was consistent with the philosophy of the Board and administration.

In each district studied the Board of Education and administration demonstrated support for the concept of community utilization of school facilities and several cited the belief in the principle of community ownership of public schools as a primary factor in their decision to develop community education activities. It is essential, to the successful development of the community education concept, that school districts accept this position and develop policies, practices, or procedures which demonstrate this belief and which encourage community utilization of school facilities.

Further review reveals that the following factors were present in several of the districts investigated:

1. Commitment to the concept of citizen involvement and participation in district level and building level decision making and parent involvement in the educational process.
2. Commitment to sharing of community resources and to the process of interagency collaboration.
3. Support for and acceptance of an expanded role as educational leader of the community and concern for the educational needs of all residents from pre-school age through adulthood.

4. Commitment to the community education concept as a means of developing a positive sense of community and as a means of increasing the level of community support for the mission of the schools.
5. Commitment to the role of the schools as problem solver and to community education as a means of mobilizing the energies or resources of the community to address common needs of local agencies, organizations or groups.
6. Acceptance of community education as a philosophical foundation which governs administrative behavior and Board of Education policy.

This investigation and the current literature regarding community education process would support the premise that the aforementioned factors should be considered in the event school administrators are contemplating development and implementation of community education in their districts.

A major difference in district motivation is revealed upon investigation of each district's central purpose for implementing community education and determining whether emphasis is upon the development of programs or the development of process or both. It is important that administrative decision making include determination of the goals or objectives to be achieved by implementation of community education and analysis of expected outcomes.

When emphasis is limited to program development, the full potential of community education will not be realized. Although the product may reflect current community wants, needs and desires and address immediate short term objectives, neglect of developmental activities related to the process of involving people in the decisions which affect them will restrict one's ability to solve future problems and develop long range goals related to school-community interdependence.

Comparative Analysis of the
Methodology Employed in Operationalizing
POSDCoRB Administrative Functions

This section of Chapter IV has seven components, consistent with the seven POSDCoRB administrative functions explored through interviewing of administrators of community education programs in the six elementary districts selected for investigation. A summary of the methods or procedures employed in operationalizing each function and an analysis of the various approaches employed is provided.

PLANNING

The following is a review of those planning procedures employed, by designated districts, in development of the community education concept:

1. Community wide meetings are held and citizens are involved in educational goal setting.

- Procedure employed in District A only.
2. A district-wide individual resident needs assessment is conducted. Procedure employed in Districts A, B, C, E, and F.
 3. A survey of services and programs provided by community agencies, organizations and groups is conducted. Procedure employed in District C only.
 4. Needs of community residents are assessed annually to insure program relevancy. Procedure employed in Districts A and C.
 5. A Citizens Advisory Council is involved in assessing needs, determining program emphasis and evaluating community education on a continuing basis.
Procedure employed in Districts A, C, D, and F.
 - A. The Advisory Council is composed of parents of school aged children. Procedure employed in Districts A, C, and F.
 - B. The Advisory Council is composed of parents, non-parents, non-public school representation and representatives of other community agencies, organizations and groups. Procedure employed in Districts C, D, and F.
 6. The planning process included the development of long range goals and the preparation of a community education Action Plan. Procedure employed in District C only.

7. The planning process involved the development of short range goals. Procedure employed in Districts C and F.
8. The Board of Education has adopted policies in support of community education. Practice employed in Districts A, C, D, and F.
9. Planning is guided or directed by a community education Statement of Philosophy. Procedure employed in Districts B, C, and E.
10. Members of the district Board of Education are actively involved in planning for community education. Practice employed in Districts A, C, and D.
11. Initial planning processes included the participation of other community agencies. Practice employed in Districts B, C, D, E, and F.
12. Community education planning consultants are utilized. Practice employed in Districts B, C, and E.
13. Advisory Council members are provided training in the area of community education and provided with the opportunity to visit other community education programs during the planning process. Procedure employed in District C only.
14. Interagency collaboration and cooperation in planning and decision making is a continuous process. Practice employed in Districts C, D, E, and F.

15. District teachers are involved in planning and programming decisions. Practice employed in Districts C and D.

Essential to community education planning is the development and implementation of a procedure for needs assessment. All districts employed some means of securing resident input regarding individual wants, needs, and desires. Although some methods were more formal than others, each was designed for the purpose of securing information which would be employed to determine program or service emphasis. The more effective methods identified included identification of existing community programs or services as well as assessment of individual needs. In addition, those districts who conduct annual surveys tend to have more citizen involvement and participation in their planning processes.

Another key component in the planning process is the involvement of representatives of other agencies, organizations or groups. Inclusion of other agencies in discussion of school district program goals and objectives can prevent difficulties which could arise from the agencies becoming concerned that the schools are encroaching on their programs or services. Regardless of the degree of involvement or participation secured it is important that lines of communication be open during planning processes. This

investigation would indicate that when interagency participation and collaboration in planning has become an integral part of the planning strategy the outcomes are more acceptable to all groups involved and the scope of programs or services provided are greatly increased. This is due to the fact that the human, fiscal, and physical resources of all agencies, organizations or groups can be more effectively integrated when interaction is encouraged.

The development of a community education advisory council is a common planning strategy, and decision making regarding the composition of the group is critical. In those districts where program emphasis is placed upon the school as the primary provider of services, and service to parents of school aged youngsters is the primary goal, it may be sufficient to include parents only in the planning and decision making process. If, however, the district role is catalyst for community interaction and community problem solving, it is necessary to secure and maintain representation from other agencies, organizations and groups on the community education advisory council. In addition, the experience reported by administrators in Districts C and D regarding the value of involving teachers in planning and programming decisions points out the need to involve all those individuals or groups who will be affected by the implementation of community education. The exclusion of teachers and other people affected

could create considerable resistance to the concept of community - school interaction and interdependence.

It is also important that the Board of Education be supportive of community education and actively involved in the planning. In those districts where this practice occurred, there were more formal policies developed relative to community utilization of facilities and greater direction provided to the developmental processes. Acceptance of community education as a philosophical position which guides Board of Education planning and decision making requires active participation and a clear understanding of the concept.

Emphasis upon goal setting was not a common practice of districts investigated. Most were more interested in producing a product which reflected the interests of the adult population of the district. This practice may be effective if the district's primary emphasis is placed upon programs.

In Districts C and F, where emphasis was placed on community education process as well as programs, goal setting did occur. In District F the process was concentrated upon identification of community problems and the development of methods or procedures which addressed immediate needs. Goals were short term and problem oriented. In District C the entire planning process was devoted to identification of needs, development of long range goals, and the preparation of an "Action Plan for Community Education". The current literature

and this investigation would indicate that this approach to planning is critical to the success of the community education implementation effort. Planning without well established objectives and goals for the future of the enterprise does not yield a plan. The findings of this investigation indicate that the need for attention being devoted to long range planning and goal setting is as essential to the development of the community education concept as it is to the planning of any other activity or function of the educational enterprise.

ORGANIZING

The following is a review of those procedures employed and the factors which contributed to the development of the community education organizational design in designated districts:

1. Community education goals or objectives were interrelated with the district desegregation plan. Practice evident in Districts A and F.
2. The organizing function included responsibility for programming, staffing, interagency and intradistrict communication. Practice evident in Districts B, C, E, and F.
3. The community education governance structure and operational design are influenced by interagency

- involvement in policy making, planning and problem solving. Practice evident in Districts C and F.
4. The organizing function included the identification of community resources and definition of their interrelationships. Procedure employed in Districts B, C, and F.
 5. The organizing function included the clarification of authority of all personnel involved in community education. Practice evident in Districts A and F.
 6. The organizing function involves frequent and continuing communication between the administrator responsible for community education and the leadership of community agencies, organizations and groups. Practice evident in Districts C, E, and F.
 7. A formal structure has been developed for the purpose of carrying out community education plans or objectives. Practice evident in Districts A, C, E, and F.

When planning and programming activities include interagency involvement, and responsibility for implementation of community education is shared by multiple agencies, organizations or groups, the school district must be prepared to lose its autonomy as the primary agent for community education development. The most effective models for interagency involvement identified in this study are those in

which the school district and the community service agents have been willing to share their individual authority, and integrate their resources for the development of a program or the resolution of a common problem. When this occurs a new governance structure and policy making process which allows ownership and shared responsibility by each agency or group involved will evolve. It is important that Board's of Education and school administrators anticipate the actuality of this phenomenon occurring, and that they are willing to assume a different role in the operationalizing of the community education concept. When multiagencies interact in planning and programming this study would suggest that new integrated models for community education governance will emerge.

The organizing function also involves the identification of in-district and external community resources and the coordination of these forces for a mutually beneficial purpose. In Districts C and F the ability of the schools to resolve their own problems and to influence the resolution of community problems is contingent upon their ability to bring interacting forces together for the purpose of addressing mutual needs. It is essential that this process be open and that the organizing function be completed without hidden agendas. Communication of plans and sharing of ideas relative to the goals to be obtained by collaboration among agencies or groups

occurs in an environment of trust and mutual respect. Both conditions appeared to be present in those districts which addressed the issue of agency cooperation. When collaboration among agencies was not present in districts studied, the range of services and programs provided was restricted to those which could be provided with school district resources only.

Administrators in only two of the districts studied indicated that the organizing function attended to clarification of areas of responsibility and authority of those involved in the development and implementation of the community education concept. Lack of attention to these matters created difficulty for administrators in the remaining districts. Therefore it is evident that neglect of this element of organization can restrict the ability of the administrator and his staff to affect the future of the development of community education as a philosophy for the district. It is also apparent that lack of clarity can create role confusion and conflict among individuals or groups whose support is essential to the actualization of the concept as defined, in Chapter I, by Minzey and LeTarte.

The development of an organizational structure for carrying out planning strategies and community education goals is essential. This structure should be an integral part of the total district organization and the direct product of

the organization's commitment to an expanded school district role as educational leader or community education coordinator. When community education is perceived as an independent program the resources of the school or community organization which are available and which are employed in the development of the concept are limited.

STAFFING

The following is a review of those procedures employed and those factors which contributed to the development of processes relative to community education staffing in designated districts:

1. Pre-service and in-service training of community education and other district staff conducted.
Practice evident in Districts A, C, D, and E.
2. School district teachers are employed as instructors or supervisors of community education programs.
Practice employed in all districts investigated.
3. Community residents are employed as instructors or supervisors of community education programs.
Practice employed in Districts A, B, C, E, and F.
4. Community college teachers are employed as instructors of community education programs.
Practice employed in Districts A, C, and D.
5. Individuals employed to work within the district's community education program are subject to the same

- personnel policies as all other school district employees. Procedure employed in Districts A, C, D, E, and F.
6. Procedures for evaluation of certificated personnel employed in community education programs are consistent with district practices to evaluation of teachers. Practice evident in Districts A, C, D, and F.
 7. Procedures for evaluation of non-certificated personnel employed in community education programs are consistent with those employed in the evaluation of other district employees. Practice evident in Districts A and F.
 8. Salary and benefits for certificated personnel employed in the community education program are consistent with district policies. Practice evident in Districts A, C, and F.
 9. Salary and benefits for non-certificated personnel employed in the community education program are consistent with district policies. Practice evident in Districts A and F.
 10. Implementation of the community education concept has affected the role of the school principal. Condition evident in Districts A, C, E, and F.

11. Job descriptions were prepared for:
 - A. Teachers and Instructors. Practice evident in Districts A and F.
 - B. Administrators/Coordinators. Practice evident in Districts A, C, and D.
12. An individual with responsibility for coordination of community education efforts was appointed. Practice evident in Districts B, C, and E.
13. Personnel involved in community education programs were employed by:
 - A. The School District. Method employed in Districts A, B, C, D, E, and F.
 - B. The Community College. Method employed in Districts C and D.
 - C. The Advisory Council. Method employed in District C only.
14. Community education staff were employed through federal grants secured by the school district. Method employed in Districts A, C, and F.

In those districts in which pre-service or in-service training of both community education and regular education personnel occurs there appears to be a greater understanding of the role of the school as a community based institution, and greater support by the district staff for sharing of school facilities and resources. It should be noted, however,

that pre-service or in-service education that was limited to an explanation of the concept and did not address the need of staff being involved in the process of planning and programming was reported as being only minimally successful.

When assessing the pool of available human resources to serve as instructors or supervisors the school administrator should consider members of their teaching faculty, community residents with specific skills or talents, and community college faculty members. All districts investigated involved their teachers as instructors of community education sponsored programs, yet when this group was the only sample involved it was discovered that the range of talents were limited and the types of programs offered restricted. Many of the programs, services, or activities requested by adult residents require uniquely qualified personnel rather than generalists.

There are distinct advantages to having members of the staff involved however, in that their participation generally results in a greater sense of ownership for the program and greater internal support for the concept.

It seems that there are advantages to requiring community education staff to adhere to the same personnel policies and practices as other district employees. When separate and unrelated standards for employment exist there

appears to be less integration of the concept by other employees. In addition, inconsistency in expectations among community education and other staff members can lead to resentment and a lack of cooperation between staff members.

In most of the community education programs examined, all certificated personnel were evaluated by the same procedure employed in the performance assessment of teachers in the kindergarten through eighth grade program. A significant difference exists however, in that program or course participants were encouraged to participate in the community education course evaluation process. Generally certificated personnel were subject to greater expectation from administrators or coordinators than were non-certificated employees and evaluation of non-certificated personnel was less frequent and less formal. School administrators may be required to revise the procedure employed in evaluation of community education, yet the standard of performance should be the same for all employees regardless of degree or certification status. It should be noted that program quality and employee accountability does not need to be sacrificed even though the administrator may be required to adjust his methodology to accommodate a wider range of skill and experience among employees.

Several different approaches to the salary and benefit issue were determined and found to be appropriate. In some

cases a separate rate of pay was established for instructors of adult education, and in some districts all community education employees were paid on a scale comparable to that paid for employees in similar positions in the district. It is important that a consistent standard be applied for all and that employees be paid equally for responsibilities with equal expectations. This was not the case in all districts studied and this practice is seen as being potentially very detrimental to staff morale and internal attitudes.

All respondents agreed that the traditional school role which was most affected by the development and implementation of the community education concept is that of the school principal. A more open school - community relationship and increased involvement of parents and other residents of the community are natural by-products of community education. The principal of a community school must acquire the ability to involve parents and others in a positive and productive manner. This change involves the principal becoming what one coordinator described as school community leader - educator. It is apparent from this study that the principal of a community school must be open, accessible, flexible, and willing to involve people in the decision making process. An authoritarian administrative style is in direct conflict with the theory of school - community

interdependence and citizen participation in planning, programming, and problem solving. Implementation of the community education concept may require considerable retraining of the principal who has become accustomed to a more traditional paternalistic mode of operation.

Although the preparation of job descriptions was not a very common practice within the districts studied it is a practice which facilitates the purposeful fulfillment of employee responsibility.

A position which requires very explicit definition is that of the coordinator or administrator of community education. The process of developing the role expectations of the coordinator requires that the goals and objectives of the program be prioritized and the focus of the development and implementation effort be established.

DIRECTING

The following is a review of those directing functions or methods employed in operationalizing the community education concept in designated districts:

1. Directing of community education programs and related activities is the responsibility of a Director/Coordinator with the advice and consultation of a citizens advisory council.
Method employed in Districts A, C, D, and F.

2. Directing of community education programs and related activities requires that a major emphasis be placed on positive human relations. Practice evident in all districts.
3. Effective directing of community education involves open and frequent communication with all individuals, organizations or groups involved in the operationalizing of the concept. Practice evident in Districts B, C, D, E, and F.
4. The responsibility for community education policy making and governance is incumbent upon the school district Board of Education. Practice evident in Districts A, B, D, E, and F.
5. A Community Education Steering Committee, an inter-governmental organization, is responsible for community education policy making and governance. Practice evident in District C only.
6. Community education direction activities are team oriented and community involvement centered. Practice evident in Districts A, C, D, and F.

Direction of the activities involved in the implementation of community education planning, organizing, and staffing decisions generally includes the administrator interacting with an advisory council composed of program consumers. Most districts utilized the advisory council as

a means of involving the appropriate community representatives in the monitoring of implementation efforts and in deciding future community education emphasis. These same districts were the most team management oriented and the most committed to involving those affected by their actions in planning, decision making and problem solving activities. It appears that the involvement of people in district management decisions in those districts who have a community oriented sense of responsibility is not limited to the processes involved in implementation of community education.

Attention to positive and productive human relations and to the maintenance of open lines of communication are major components of the directing function. The community education administrator must be able to relate to all types of people. He must be a group process facilitator. He must be accessible and be a good listener. He must be able to modify his plans to accommodate the various wants, needs, and desires of those with whom he interacts on a regular basis. The development of productive interpersonal relationships among and between those involved in any enterprise, is important and in the development of a working philosophy of community education this function is essential.

COORDINATING

The following is a review of those methods or procedures employed in coordinating community education activities:

1. In development of the community education concept the school district performs the role of catalyst by bringing people together to address common concerns or mutual needs. Practice evident in Districts C, D, and F.
2. In development of the community education concept the Board of Education and school district superintendent assumed the leadership role. Practice evident in all districts investigated.
3. Community education planning and programming involves the sharing of community resources:
 - A. Human resources. Practice evident in Districts C, D, E, and F.
 - B. Financial resources. Practice evident in Districts C and F.
 - C. Physical resources. Practice evident in Districts B, C, D, and F.
 - D. Political resources. Practice evident in Districts C and F.
4. The coordinating function involves the development of formal agreements among and between participating agencies, organizations or groups. Procedure employed in Districts C and F.
5. The coordinating function facilitates the avoidance of unnecessary duplication of services. Procedure

employed in Districts C, E, and F.

Coordination is an important function of the community education administrative process. Successful coordination requires one to be aware of the interrelationships among and between agencies, institutions, organizations and individuals involved in the delivery of educational, recreational, social, cultural, and personal services within the community education network. Unless schools assume a leadership role within the community, this function can be short circuited. Coordination of services and programs among agencies does not necessarily require that the agency give up its own identity completely. It does require however that the appropriate resources of cooperating entities are shared and integrated to address mutual needs. In this regard it appears that schools perform a catalytic or facilitative purpose in community education process development.

Community education coordination involves the sharing of human, financial, physical, and political resources of the community. Coordination also relates to activities intended to eliminate unnecessary duplication of community programs or services and undesirable competition between community agencies, organizations or groups.

An effective means of clarifying interagency responsibility is the development of written agreements between cooperating entities. This method was employed

extensively in District C. Adoption of a formal agreement by the governing bodies involved tends to formalize and legitimize the collaborative relationship which results.

Through coordination of effort, the schools can assume a brokerage function by which problems are related to resources, and community resources are orchestrated in response to community needs.

REPORTING

The following is a review of the reporting processes identified in those school districts designated for study:

1. The superintendent of schools is the individual to whom all coordinators or directors of community education must report. Practice evident in all districts.
2. The reporting function involves monitoring of the effectiveness of planning and organizing efforts. Procedure employed in all districts.
3. Community education administrators/coordinators are responsible for the reporting function in regard to the maintenance of involvement of advisory council members. Practice evident in Districts C, D, and F.
4. Community education advisory council members are responsible for reporting to constituents. Practice evident in Districts C and D.

5. The reporting function involves internal communication through newsletters, memoranda, and staff meetings. Procedure employed in Districts A, C, and E.
6. External reporting processes include community newsletters, newspaper articles, activity calendars, and flyers. Procedures employed in Districts A, B, C, D, and F.

The superintendent of schools is in a critical position in which to insure the maintenance of support for community education in the community. Regardless of whom has responsibility for the operation of the program, that individual or those individuals must keep the superintendent apprised of program effectiveness and of the status of goal related accomplishments. The superintendent's attitude about the value of community education has a significant effect upon the degree of support provided by the Board of Education and by leadership of other agencies, organizations or groups. The superintendent also performs an important reporting function through his interaction with the Board of Education, and by his provision of time for discussion of community education related matters during school district administrative council meetings.

The process of reporting in the operation of community education requires constant monitoring of the effectiveness of planning and organizing efforts and continual assessment

of the relevancy of activities undertaken in the development of the concept. The administrator of community education must not only be concerned about the interaction of units of activity and personnel directly involved in the program, but he must also be attentive to reporting to advisory council members and other members of the community whose advice, counsel and support are important. In order for the reporting cycle to be complete, members of the advisory council should maintain interaction with those to whom they are responsible as representatives, and secure feedback regarding the goals, objectives, plans, and programs related to community education.

The methods of internal and external reporting identified through this investigation are typical practices of public schools. There did not appear to be much inventiveness contributed to the process of reporting relative to the operationalizing of community education in the districts studied.

BUDGETING

The following is a review of the budgeting practices and procedures identified during the investigation of administrative functions employed in operationalizing community education in designated districts:

1. The community education budget is part of the district's general budget. Procedure employed

- in Districts A, D, E, and F.
2. The community education budget is a separate document and subject to developmental procedures which differ from those employed in the development of the school district budget. Procedure employed in Districts B and C.
 3. The community education administrator/coordinator is responsible for monitoring community education fiscal practices. Practice evident in Districts B, C, E, and F.
 4. Local school district revenues are committed to the indirect costs of the community education program (i.e. light, heat, and custodial/maintenance expenses). Practice evident in all districts.
 5. School districts receive external funding for community education from:
 - A. State grants. District C only
 - B. Federal grants. Districts A, B, C, E, and F.
 - C. Private Foundation grants. District C only.
 - D. Township Revenue Sharing Monies. District C only.
 - E. Tuition or fees charged to participants. Districts B, C, D, and E.
 - F. Local fund raisers. District E only.

7. The budgeting process includes participation of the following:
 - A. Community education coordinators or directors. Districts A, B, C, E, and F.
 - B. Advisory Council Members. Districts A, C, and F.
 - C. Other Citizen Groups. District F only.
 - D. Other Governmental Agencies. District C only.

Budgeting procedures differed greatly among the districts investigated. It would appear that the methodology employed is determined more by the specific sources of revenue than by a philosophical preference relative to budgeting processes. In those cases where federal revenue sources represent the major support base for community education federal regulations dictated the budgeting process and procedures. In the case where local support was the primary source of revenue, the budgeting processes for community education tended to be integrated with district practices or procedures. However, this investigation did not yield a significant finding relative to this question.

It appears that any district involved in community education must make a conscious decision to commit local revenues for the support of necessary indirect costs related to facility utilization during non-school hours, yet this investigation revealed a reluctance, on the part

of the schools to commit local revenue to direct costs of operation. Federal funding and other external revenue sources provide the primary support base for community education in most districts. This approach to funding could have a serious impact upon the future of community education as an integrated component of a school district's continuum of programs or services. The future of external funding is very uncertain and total reliance on grant revenue could result in community education being eliminated as a school district sponsored program. This investigation would imply that the emphasis of community education concept development should be placed upon securing agency and organization support and commitment for the expenditure of local revenue to sustain programmatic activities. This goal requires the school administrator responsible for community education to focus his attention upon development of the process of integrating community resources to resolve community problems in a spirit of cooperation and collaboration as well as attending to the development of community education programs.

Where interagency involvement and citizen participation have been emphasized, the budget development process is much more open. Those districts which involve citizens or representatives from community agencies in the budgeting process are those which developed participative planning, and decision making strategies in the operation of their

community education projects. The degree of external involvement in the development and implementation of community education is directly related to the amount of external participation evident in budget decisions.

Identification of Problems Encountered
in the Administrative Process and
Discussion of Alternative Solutions

In this section of Chapter IV the major problems encountered and reported by administrators interviewed are delineated, and the various solutions which might be employed are discussed.

Problem:

There is a general lack of understanding of the community education concept by other agencies, organizations or groups of the community.

Discussion:

A major problem exists relative to understanding of the concept of community education. Community education is identified so closely with adult education programming that this component is often singularly associated with any mention of the concept.

Practices which should prove effective in creating a more comprehensive view of the goal of community education include:

1. General meetings with community service oriented agencies, organizations and groups during the planning stages, for the purpose of explaining the various components of the community education concept and defining the goals or objectives to be achieved by development and implementation.
2. Inclusion of representatives of other agencies, organizations or groups in discussion of the rationale for establishing community education within a particular city, town, or village.
3. Inclusion of representatives of other agencies, organizations or groups in the planning for community education, and the development of needs assessment instruments which will identify needs to be addressed by the recreation, social, cultural and personal service providers as well as those needs to be fulfilled by the educational systems involved in a given community. This process of involving individuals or groups in the identification of needs and development of objectives facilitates understanding and ownership of the community education concept.
4. Providing for external consultants from the Mott Foundation Institute for Community Education Development to explain the concept has proven

effective in several districts investigated. In addition it is beneficial to provide the opportunity for community representatives to attend community education workshops and visit communities in which community education is operative prior to developing plans for local district programming.

Problem:

There is a reluctance on the part of community agencies, organizations, or groups to participate in planning and development of the community education concept due to concern about the school district infringing upon their perceived "territorial prerogatives", and school district encroachment upon their program and service delivery systems. In short, there is a concern, on the part of community service entities, that they will lose their identity should they become involved with community education.

Discussion:

Concern about being consumed by another agency is a real issue in many communities in which community education has been implemented. Park districts and recreation boards are concerned about their role as recreators being usurped by the schools, and village government is concerned that their role as providers of public service and defenders of the welfare of community residents will be minimized by

involvement in community education.

Practices which were found to be effective in influencing community agencies, organizations or groups to contribute to community education planning and developmental activities include:

1. The establishment of interagency cooperation and the elimination of duplication and competition among community program and service providers as major goals of the school district community education effort.
2. Emphasis upon the identification of the human, physical, and fiscal resources of each entity involved in community education related programs or services, as well as assessment of individual resident education, recreation, social, and cultural needs. It has proven effective to conduct concurrent assessment processes in order to match community needs to available resources and to determine gaps or voids in the program/service delivery system of all entities serving a specific resident population. It is essential that the process of community education concept development give recognition to the fact that many resources are already in place, and that each group has a role to perform in the process of community planning,

- development and problem solving.
3. The school district must provide leadership and commitment to maintenance of positive agency relationships by demonstrating a willingness to contribute school district resources to the solution of other agency problems. It is important that this be done without usurping the authority of cooperating districts and without assuming the identity of the service provider.
 4. The formalizing of interagency interaction by developing intergovernmental planning and review committees will provide the opportunity for all participating agencies to monitor program development activities and assess the effect of those activities relative to the impact upon their organization.
 5. The development of written interagency reciprocal agreements which define the resources to be shared, and outline the parameters under which agency interaction will occur are effective means of securing interagency collaboration in an atmosphere of mutual trust and mutual understanding. In addition, the adoption of written agreements by the governing bodies involved creates a more lasting commitment to the concept, and fosters preservation

of the identity of participating agencies, organizations, or groups.

Problem:

There is a need for clear definition of the authority, responsibility, and role of the individual charged with the task of administering the operationalizing of the community education concept.

Discussion:

Several individuals interviewed cited concern about the extent of authority and responsibility inherent in their role. Lack of clarity regarding role expectations and lack of definition regarding the parameters of one's role creates unnecessary conflict and uncertainty. One of the most effective means of addressing this issue is the development of a job description which defines the general goals to be accomplished and the specific performance responsibilities of the community education coordinator/director. In addition, it is apparent that integration of community education as an integral part of the school district organizational design facilitates understanding of the line-staff position of the community education coordinator within the total school system.

In those instances when the community education coordinator's role involves interagency planning coordination and program development, all those involved as participating

entities should be included in the development of the coordinator's role and the definition of his responsibility.

Problem:

Maintenance of membership and attendance are cited as problems encountered when working with citizens advisory councils.

Discussion:

Actualization of the concept of meaningful citizen involvement and participation in community planning, development and problem solving is facilitated by frequent, and purposeful advisory council interaction with the administrative leadership of the schools. The advisory council has been found to be an essential component for identifying community needs, and assessing community education program effectiveness.

Factors or conditions which appear to influence the operation of advisory councils include:

1. The composition of the group reflects a cross section of citizens and agency, organization, or group representation. It is important that individuals or entities which are affected by the results of advisory council interaction are included in the continuing process of need assessment, program evaluation and, when necessary, the analysis of corrective programming alternatives.

2. The role and the responsibility of advisory council members are well defined.
3. Time is devoted to developing interpersonal relationships and to learning how to operate as a group.
4. Advisory council members are provided with in-service education regarding the meaning and purpose of community education.
5. Ownership of the concept of community education is developed through involving members in the development of goals, objectives and programmatic priorities.
6. Council members are involved in the development of by-laws or procedural guidelines which give direction to their organization.
7. The advisory council is perceived as, and employed as a problem solving and decision making body. It is essential that their responsibilities are defined and recommendations considered by community education administrators and governing bodies.
8. The advisory council is perceived as an important and essential component of the community education process, and its role in this process is continual.

Examination and Discussion
of Funding Sources Employed in the
Operation of Community Education

The most common source of funding for community education, in the districts investigated, was federal revenue. The various sources of federal funding identified were Title IV C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, The Emergency School Aid Act (Title VI), and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA).

Federal funding is viewed as an excellent means of stimulating community education related activities, yet there are serious limitations imposed upon the community education development process when external federal revenues are viewed as the exclusive source of support. In those districts where the future of the community education effort is dependent upon the availability of external funding it would appear the program is destined for serious curtailment should this source disappear. Several administrators predicted that their community education programs would not survive a period of fiscal scarcity and budget cutbacks, yet in the one instance where federal assistance was used to spur the development of community process, rather than being program oriented, there was an optimistic outlook projected relative to the future of community education.

This observation would imply that although federal revenue may be required to stimulate community education and community development activity, a primary goal would be to secure more stable, long term revenue commitments.

The use of federal money intended to facilitate school district desegregation (Title VI) for developing a sense of pride in community and responsibility for community building is viewed as an effective means of bringing the resources of the community together for community-school planning and problem solving. The philosophy of school district desegregation and the concept of community education are very compatible principles. One would predict that the processes developed relative to community participation in the integration of the schools will remain, and the conditions for problem solving and sharing will exist when federal revenues are terminated.

A review of the various ways in which federal funding was employed in the districts studied would indicate that external revenues utilized to build systems for school-community process have a greater impact upon the success of community education than does the practice of committing the focus of attention upon programs as a product unto themselves.

The second most frequently employed method of financing community education was the practice of charging participant tuition or materials fees. In districts which

cooperate with their community colleges regarding the provision of adult education and continuing education courses tuition is determined by the college. In those cases where programs are developed independent of the community college, fees are established with the intention of charging participants at a rate which will generate sufficient income to the course or program self-sustaining. It is noteworthy that in all those cases where participant fees were charged this concept persisted. This practice appears to accomplish two purposes. It perpetuates the concept of quality programming at low costs and it creates a source of "hard" money for the operation of community education programs.

Although the practice was evident in only one school district investigated, the concept of developing a not-for-profit corporation and utilizing township revenue sharing monies as operating revenue is worthy of discussion. School districts are not eligible for grant assistance from revenue sharing monies yet this source of revenue is intended to address community needs or problems which are unique to the communities of a given township. Members of the District Advisory Council have become incorporated as a Community Education Corporation and officers and directors include citizens and community agency representatives. Through this procedure schools and other agencies become eligible

for funding sources not open to the school as a single governmental agency. By incorporating, a coalition of community oriented individuals, agencies, and groups also have access to private foundation funding processes.

Another benefit of this procedure is the creation of a separate entity, with an integrated community identity, which can be utilized as a means of securing "seed" money for interagency program development and which can serve coordinating and evaluating functions relative to interagency programming efforts. The emphasis of the community education corporation identified in this study is directed toward securing continuing support for successful new programs from the appropriate educational, recreation or social agency or organization in the community. In this manner local tax revenue is utilized for program support and becomes the predominant revenue source for community education.

The funding practice which offers the most promise is the cooperative funding model. In this model various agencies or organizations provide the resources they can best contribute to the operation of programs which are planned, organized, and conducted cooperatively. The contribution may be in the form of volunteers or salaried employees from a specific entity, or in the provision of facilities without charge to other agencies, or in the contribution of a pro-rated share of the revenue required

to operate a specific program. The development of reciprocal agreements among and between cooperating agencies such as those described as being operative in District C, or the model of interagency cooperation in grant writing as identified in District F are excellent examples of this concept.

It would appear that for a school district to maximize the utilization of local tax revenue provided to support its mission as well as the mission of other community tax supported agencies, it must abandon the idea of "territoriality", and enter into a symbiotic relationship with the other agencies serving its constituency. Through this process it is more likely that community residents will receive the full complement of resources and services they require and deserve, and it is more likely that interagency support for community education will occur. Many resources of other agencies are untapped by the community educator. It seems that there is a direct relationship between interagency cooperation and community resource availability. As interagency cooperation increases, resources to community education concomitantly increase.

Examination of Future Implications
of Community Education as an Administrative
Response to School District Problems

This section of chapter four deals with an analysis of the views expressed by administrators relative to the concepts applicability to the issues of declining enrollment, school closings, and public attitudes toward the schools. In addition, discussion of the effect community education program development has upon administrative behavior is presented.

In a time when school district enrollments are declining and school buildings are being closed, community education does have application. Several districts investigated indicated that surplus space, resulting from declining enrollment, has been positively and productively employed for other community program purposes. Classrooms have been used for pre-school programs and the potential exists that empty space could be leased or loaned to other community service agencies whose goals or purposes are compatible with those of the schools. Pursuance of this course of action however, requires a district to approach the issue of declining enrollment and alternative responses in a very open and thoughtful manner. Community education provides the process and the philosophical frame of reference required to accomplish this goal.

The general concensus of administrators interviewed was that public owned facilities should be made available for public oriented programs and services. Declining enrollment has provided the opportunity for several of the districts interviewed to expand their involvement in community education. The literature and observations of community dynamics relative to the effect of school closing reinforce the concept of community utilization of school facilities which are no longer required for the exclusive use of schools. In District F one of their school buildings was converted to a Community Education Center and various agencies, organizations and groups are housed within the facility on a leased space agreement. The school has remained as an active education/social center of the neighborhood and the district has gained considerably from this arrangement.

It is also apparent that, in many communities, public facilities to meet the recreational, cultural or social service needs of residents have not been developed. School district interaction with other agencies regarding sharing resources and conserving the public investment in their facilities should be initiated when declining enrollment and/or school closings are eminent. Recycling of existing facilities is preferable to creating new facilities for community education activities.

All individuals interviewed agreed that public attitudes toward the schools were positively influenced by community education. Community education's commitment to participative democracy is one reason this perception seems to exist. As people become more involved in their schools, and public input is solicited and considered when school boards and administrators are making decisions, there is generally a greater acceptance of the plan and greater community ownership of the product. In Districts A and F a primary reason for initiating community education activities was the district's need to establish a stronger relationship with their communities.

There are benefits derived from the schools opening their facilities for utilization by a wider age group of the community in addition to the school age population. Many non-parents or senior citizens view schools as being an unnecessary tax burden until they find that the schools, through community education, are reaching out to meet their educational, recreational, social or cultural needs. The concept of the need for life-long learning experiences is actualized with the development of the community education concept. In short, it appears that community education does influence public attitudes regarding the role and importance of schools in the community. As schools are more responsive

to the needs of the community they become more meaningful community institutions, and community support tends to increase.

From analysis of the input received regarding management style or administrative behavior it is apparent that the administrator involved in community education must be open, accessible, knowledgeable about the resources and the needs of both the school and the community, and skillful in group process and interpersonal communications. It appears that the administrator of a district involved in community education must also be a developer of human resources, and skillful in team management processes. It is generally agreed that a autocratic administrative style is incongruent with the philosophy of community education.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General Summary

The general purpose of this dissertation was to analyze the administrative processes and procedures employed in the operationalizing of community education. The POSDCoRB model was selected because it provided an appropriate framework by which the administrative process can be analyzed and assessed and because the POSDCoRB functions correspond with the essential elements of community education in development and implementation.

A survey of related literature was presented to provide the practicing administrator with a source of information which could be examined in the event development and implementation of community education was being considered. The review included background information regarding the community education movement and the community education concept; information regarding administrative process as applied to community education; information regarding the application of the community education concept relative to such contemporary educational problems as declining enrollment, school closings, and school economic issues; and an examination of the POSDCoRB model of administration

as it applied to this investigation.

The study was conducted in six elementary school districts in Cook County, Illinois which were identified by the Illinois Office of Education as having community education programs and which met one or more of the criteria established for inclusion in this investigation. An interview was conducted with the superintendent of schools, or the administrator responsible for community education in in which the district's level of involvement in each POSDCoRB function was probed. In addition, responses regarding the application of community education by district administrators were solicited. The data collected from each district was categorized and reported in relation to each administrative function performed.

Analysis included: an examination of the factors which influenced the administrative decision to initiate the community education process; a comparative analysis of the methodology employed in operationalizing those POSDCoRB functions present in each district; identification and discussion of problems encountered in the administrative process and alternative solutions; examination of the various funding sources employed in the operation of community education; and examination of the future implications for community education as an administrative response to contemporary educational issues.

Conclusions

The following conclusions have been drawn from an analysis of the literature, and an analysis of the information reported by administrators of community education in those districts included in this investigation.

Conclusions Regarding Planning of Community Education

1. It is essential that the Board of Education and superintendent are supportive of an expanded educational role and increased school-community interaction.
2. It is essential that the Board of Education and superintendent provide leadership in the development of a more synergized concept of community development and community problem solving.
3. The Board of Education should adopt policies which encourage the development of community education.
4. Planning processes are more purposeful and goal-directed when individuals involved accept and advocate a common philosophical perspective regarding community education.
5. Basic tenets of community education are the concepts of citizen involvement and participative democracy. Planning strategy should include the development of a community education advisory council which functions on a continuing basis, rather than ad hoc, to assist and advise in the process of obtaining, organizing, and utilizing

information regarding the needs of the population being served.

6. Planning processes should include representative input from all segments of the school and community who will be affected by the development and implementation of community education.

7. Planning strategy should include the provision of opportunity for advisory council members to learn how to function as a group, and should include the provision of training experiences relative to the development of an understanding of the community education concept prior to their being involved in goal setting or program development activities.

8. Interagency participation and collaboration in planning activities facilitates the integration of community resources in problem solving and program development.

9. Regardless of the degree of direct involvement of community agencies, organizations or groups in the planning process, it is essential that lines of communication are established between the schools and other providers of community education programs.

10. Planning processes should include the development and implementation of a need assessment instrument which will assist in the determination of the educational, recreational, social, cultural, and personal needs of all segments and all age groups of the community served.

11. Planning processes should include the identification of programs and services provided by existing agencies, organization or groups which fulfill community education or community service functions within the community or communities served by the school district.

12. Planning for community education should include utilization of need assessment results in the development of long range goals and objectives and in the preparation of an action plan for community education implementation.

13. Planning processes should include the identification of existing community human, physical, fiscal, and political resources required to actualize the community education concept.

14. Ongoing planning activities should include annual surveys of resident wants, needs, and desires, and the assessment of participant input regarding the effectiveness of community education programs, services, or activities.

Conclusions Regarding Organizing of Community Education

1. Organizing for community education involves communication among and between leaders of community agencies, organizations, and groups in an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect. Agencies, organizations, and groups do not cooperate, or collaborate, it is the people within each entity that do.

2. Organizing for community education involves the mobilization and coordination of community resources to address common needs or resolve common problems. It is the process of bringing people, ideas, and materials into a relationship which facilitates goal achievement.

3. It is essential that the organizing function involves clarification of the responsibility and authority of those involved in the development and implementation of community education.

4. The organizing function includes the process of designing those methods or procedures required to achieve community education objectives.

5. The organizational structure for carrying out community education implementation strategies should be an integral part of the total district organization.

6. When the organizing function includes interagency cooperation and collaboration, the governance structure and organizational design takes on a multi-agency identity. The school district must be prepared to give up its autonomy as the agent for community education development. When multi-agencies interact in planning and programming new, integrated, models for community education governance emerge.

Conclusions Regarding Staffing of Community Education

1. All personnel who will be affected by the development of community education should be provided with

in-service training regarding the philosophy of the concept and the expected outcomes of implementation.

2. The development of a job description for the community education coordinator/director is essential. This process should involve representation from entities participating in the activities for which the coordinator/director will be responsible.

3. The employment of school district teachers as instructors or supervisors of community education programs has a positive affect upon the acceptance of the concept.

4. The pool of available human resources to serve as instructors or supervisors includes members of the elementary and high school teaching faculties, community college faculty members, employees of other governmental agencies or organizations, and community residents with specific skills or talents

5. Individuals employed to work within a school district's community education program should be subject to the same personnel policies as other district employees.

6. School administrations should determine the standard of performance expected of all program instructors and supervisors, certificated and non-certificated, and design a fair and equitable evaluation system which will accommodate a wide range of differences in training or experience of community education employees.

7. Salaries and benefits for individuals involved in community education activities should be comparable with those of individuals in similar positions within the school district.

8. The role of the school principal is significantly influenced by the development of community education. The principal becomes a school-community leader-educator. He must become comfortable with increased school-community interaction, and proficient in participative planning and decision making processes.

Conclusions Regarding Directing of Community Education

1. Directing of community education requires that the school administrator place a major emphasis upon positive human relations.

2. Directing of community education requires the administrator to be a group process facilitator.

3. The establishment of a community education steering committee, comprised of leaders of cooperative agencies or organizations, is an effective means of directing interagency policy making and facilitating interagency collaboration.

4. School districts in which the superintendent is team management oriented and committed to participative decision making have the most active and productive relationship with their community education advisory councils.

Conclusions Regarding Coordinating of Community Education

1. In performing the community education coordinating function, the school district assumes the role as catalyst by bringing people together to address common concerns and mutual needs.

2. Coordinating of activities among and between community agencies, organizations and groups is an essential function of the community education administrator. Through this process duplication of programs and services can be avoided.

3. Community education coordination involves the sharing of human, financial, physical, and political resources of the community. Through coordination of efforts the schools perform a brokerage function.

4. It is important that the coordinating function involve the development of formal agreements among and between participating agencies, organizations or groups. This process allows agencies to preserve their identities and to clarify interacting responsibilities.

Conclusions Regarding Reporting of Community Education

1. It is essential that the superintendent of schools be involved in and informed about major decisions related to development and implementation of the community education concept. School district coordinators, or directors should report to the superintendent on a regular basis.

2. The community education reporting process involves monitoring, assessing and controlling planning organizing, staffing, directing and coordinating efforts.

3. It is important that community education coordinators or administrators work closely with citizens advisory councils to insure that they are accurately informed regarding the status of goal attainment.

4. It is important that advisory councils report to their constituency on a regular basis and perform the function of liaisons between the council and participating entities.

5. The administrator responsible for community education must prepare strategies for the maintenance of communication within the school district organization regarding program and process activities, and plan for the dissemination of information regarding community education to residents, agencies, organizations and groups of the community.

Conclusions Regarding Budgeting of Community Education

1. School districts involved in community education should anticipate the need to assume many of the indirect costs related to implementation of more flexible, community centered policies and practices.

2. School districts should not rely exclusively upon the maintenance of external funding sources for operating revenues for community education.

3. If a school system desires to implement a comprehensive system of community education activities it must anticipate the need to commit local operating revenue, and the need to secure commitments from other entities for the operation of community education programs related to their organizational purpose or mission (i.e. recreation, cultural, or social services).

4. When community education is not perceived as an integral part of the total educational system and the philosophy of community education is not developed, community education is subject to cutbacks of service or total elimination during times of fiscal scarcity.

5. The cooperative funding model is the most promising concept for securing and maintaining support for community education programs and processes.

6. The development of community education not-for-profit corporations is a promising and innovative approach to increasing the range of available funding sources.

7. Community education budget development processes should allow for input and involvement of advisory council members and all other individuals affected by fiscal allocation decisions.

Conclusions Regarding Community Education Programs and Process

1. When the development of programs is viewed as the end product of community education and little attention is

given to developing community education process, the full potential of the concept as a catalytic force in the creation of a synergized community is retarded.

2. Community education process is the means whereby people are involved in making those decisions or solving those problems which affect them. It is participative democracy on a school and community level.

3. Community education process requires the interaction and integration of community resources working in concert to address community needs.

4. The interrelationship between program and process is reciprocal and neither ingredient of the concept is complete as a single force.

5. Acceptance of community education as a philosophy of education does not require the schools to assume the impossible task of serving all the needs of all the people of the community. It does require the school district to assume a more proactive role in the community and to act as coordinator, facilitator, or initiator for addressing unmet community needs.

Conclusions Regarding Community Education as an Administrative Response to Resolution of Contemporary Educational Issues

1. Community education theory provides an appropriate vehicle for addressing school and community needs related to the process of desegregation of public schools.

2. Community education should be considered as a means of dealing with declining school enrollments, surplus space, and school closings. Utilization of available public facilities for public oriented purposes is generally preferable to leasing space or selling neighborhood schools for private or commercial purposes.

3. Community education programs and processes expand the role of the schools, make them more meaningful enterprises for a larger segment of the resident population, and have a positive affect upon the publics opinion of their schools.

4. The development of community education may result in more efficient utilization of school and community fiscal resources, but community education should not be viewed, primarily, as a means of generating additional revenue for school district budgets.

Recommendations

1. Boards of Education should establish board policy which facilitates and supports development of community education including areas such as community involvement and participation, facility sharing and leasing, sharing of equipment and materials, sharing of personnel in the process of community problem solving, interagency cooperation and collaboration, and the development of intergovernmental reciprocal agreements.

2. Administrators considering the development of community education should focus planning efforts upon interagency involvement, and upon those strategies which facilitate participation in decision making.

3. When possible, districts should secure consultants to assist in the development of advisory council members as a cohesive group and as effective problem solvers. In addition, consultants should be employed to develop integrative problem solving and decision making skills of community leaders.

4. School districts considering the development of community education should appoint an individual as coordinator or director and provide the opportunity for training such as that offered through the Mott Foundation Community Education Leadership Training Program. An alternative would be to require all candidates for the position of coordinator or director to have prior training or experience as community educators.

5. Implementation of community education processes should be considered as an administrative response to the problems of declining enrollment, diminished public confidence in the schools and school desegregation.

6. Institutions of higher education involved in the preparation of school administrators should persist in their efforts to assist aspiring administrators to be proficient

in group process and participative decision making. Consideration should also be given to offering community education as a separate course or as a part of those courses related to school-community relations and group dynamics.

7. Future legislative initiatives regarding community education funding in Illinois and other states should concentrate on the development of local agency cooperation and collaboration in providing for community needs rather than upon the provision of revenue for the financing of community education programs by individual agencies in isolation from their cohorts.

Areas for Further Study

This investigation was not developed as a study from which specific statistical inferences could be drawn. In fact, the value of this study may be its utility as a reference for school administrators considering the initiation of community education in their school districts.

The findings and conclusions reported in this dissertation should be beneficial in assisting school administrators to analyze the process of development and implementation of community education and to avoid some of the pitfalls inherent in this kind of educational enterprise. However, a number of questions have been raised and several

areas of this topic have not been thoroughly addressed. In line with this realization the following should be pursued by further research:

1. This study suggests that administrative behavior is significantly affected by adoption of community education as a philosophy of education. A study of the school administrator as educational leader of the community should be conducted.

2. This study addressed the administrative functions involved in implementing community education in elementary school districts. The same methodology could be employed in the investigation of community education administrative processes in high school or unit school districts.

3. The data collected in this study was provided by the school district superintendent or administrator responsible for community education only. This study could be replicated and data secured from others affected by, and/or involved in the implementation of community education (i.e. school board members, school principals, teachers, advisory council members, or consumers).

4. A study of the role and function of community education advisory councils and citizen participation in goal setting and programmatic decisions would complement the findings of this investigation.

5. Funding is a critical issue for the school

administrator considering community education. A study of methods and procedures employed in the development of cooperative funding models would be a significant contribution to the current literature regarding community education funding.

6. This study suggests that community education is an effective means of addressing the problems related to declining school enrollments. A study which addresses this question should be conducted.

Concluding Statement

It is hoped that this dissertation will assist school administrators in their deliberation and/or implementation of community education programs and processes. This study identified a number of methods and procedures relative to planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting of community education. It was prepared with the intention of providing a source of information which will assist the school administrator in the analysis of the application of community education in his or her school district.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Borg, Walter R., and Gall, Meredith D. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1974.
- Campbell, Ronald F., Corbally, John E. Jr., and Ramseyer, John A. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.
- Clapp, Elsie. Community Schools in Action. New York: The Viking Press, 1939.
- Conant, James B., "Community and School are Inseparable," Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
- Dewey, John. The School and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1899.
- Everett, Samuel. The Community School. New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1938.
- Gulick, Luther, et al. Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.
- Hart, Joseph K. Educational Resources of Village and Rural Communities. New York: McMillan Company, 1913.
- Haskew, L. D., and Henna, Geneva. "The Organization and Administration of the Community School," The Community School. 52nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Ed. by Nelson B. Henry Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Jensen, Theodore J., and Clark, David L. Educational Administration. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1975.
- Massie, Joseph L. "Management Theory," Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

- Minzey, Jack D., and LeTarte, Clyde. Community Education from Program to Process. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.
- Newman, William H. Administrative Action. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.
- Scanlon, David. "Historical Roots for the Development of Community Education," Community Education, Principles and Practices from Worldwide Experience. 58th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, ed. by Nelson B. Henry, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Wilson, L. Craig, et al. Sociology of Supervision. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

Periodicals

- Campbell, Clyde M. "Contributions of the Mott Foundation to the Community Education Movement." Phi Delta Kappan 54 (November 1972): 195-197.
- Cook, Dale L., and Cookingham, Frank G. "Interagency Action: Cooperation, Coordination, Collaboration." Community Education Journal 7 (January 1980): 3-5.
- Cronin, Joseph. "New Government Reorganization to Provide Boost for Community Involvement in Education." Community Education Journal 2 (March-April, 1972): 9.
- Decker, Larry E. "Community Education: The Need for Conceptual Framework." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 59 (November 1975): 5-15
- Eyster, George W. "Interagency Collaboration....The Keystone to Community Education." Community Education Journal 5 (September-October 1975): 24-26, 33.
- Hawkins, Harold L. "Synergizing the Community." Planning and Changing 8 (Winter 1977): 218-222.
- Hurwitz, Mark W. "The Public Schools--of, by, and for the People." Community Education Journal 3 (July 1973): 10-11.

- Kerensky, V. M. "Community Education: A New Synergism." Community Education Journal 4 (March-April 1974): 30, 62.
- Maire, Marvin. "Community Education: From Concept to Reality." Community Education Journal 3 (May 1973): 40-41.
- Melby, Ernest O. "Community Education Can Revue Our Faith." Community Education Journal 3 (November 1973): 8-12, 54-55.
- Minzey, Jack D. "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views." Phi Delta Kappan 54 (November 1972): 150-153.
- Moore, Harold E. "Organizational and Administrative Problems and Practices." Phi Delta Kappan 54 (November 1972): 168-170.
- West, Phillip T. "The Leadership Prerogative in Community Education." Planning and Changing 8 (Summer-Fall 1977): 67-74.

Reports

- AASA Commission on Community Education Facilities. New Forms for Community Education. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1974.
- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Report to the People. Flint, Michigan: The Mott Foundation, 1977.
- Educational Facilities Laboratories. Surplus School Space: Options and Opportunities. New York: EFL, 1976.
- Educational Facilities Laboratories. Using Surplus School Space for Community School Centers. New York: EFL, 1979.
- Ellena, William J. "Tomorrow's Schools." Administrators and Policy Makers' Views of Community Education. Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1977.
- Regional Center for Community Education Development. The Community Education Bulletin. Boca Raton, Florida: Florida Atlantic University, 1971.

- Totten, W. Fred, and Manley, Frank J. The Community School: Basic Concepts, Functions, and Organization. Galien Michigan: Allied Educational Council, 1969.
- Truitt, Thomas E. "Education and Community." Administrators and Policy Makers Views of Community Education. Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1977.
- Yeager, Frank J. "'Our Schools' as Compared to 'Those Schools'". Administrators and Policy Makers Views of Community Education. Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1977.
- Young, Ken M. The Basic Steps of Planning. Charlottesville, Virginia: Community Collaborators, 1978.

Other

- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act, Proposed Rule Making. Washington, D. C.: Federal Register, Vol. 44, No. 127, 1979.
- VanVoorhees, Curtis. "The Definition Issue." National Community School Education Association News. 1971.

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTION

Questions will be organized in such a manner that the interviewer will be able to examine those POSDCORB administrative functions utilized in operationalizing the Community Education concept.

AREA I PLANNING

1. How was the decision to establish a community education program made?
 - a. Who was involved?
(i.e., Board of Education, administrators, teachers, Union, parents Advisory Council, other agencies)
 - b. What motivated groups or individuals to be involved?
 - c. What factors influenced the decision?
 - d. What influence did the decision have on district programs, services, and community relations?
 - e. Was the decision a positive response to a problem?
 - f. Was the decision a reaction to external force?
2. What planning procedures were utilized before implementing the community education program?
 - a. Who was involved in the planning process?
(i.e., Board of Education, administrators, teachers, Union, parents, Advisory Council, other agencies)
 - b. Was the planning process formal or informal?
 - c. Is there a relationship between program design and planning strategies? Please specify.
 - d. What problems were incurred in the planning steps?
 - e. How were these problems resolved?
 - f. What planning strategies were most successful? Why?
3. Has the Board of Education adopted a "Position Statement" or policy relative to community education?

4. To what extent was the community involved in decision-making and planning?
5. As a part of initial planning, were long-range and short-range goals established?
 - a. Who was involved in development of goals?
 - b. How do goals influence the administrative process?
6. How were needs assessed?
 - a. Who was involved in assessment of needs?
 - b. Did assessment focus on needs of individuals, or needs of organizations, agencies, and groups?
 - c. How were results employed during planning phase?
7. Has the district developed a statement of philosophy regarding community education?
 - a. How was statement developed and by whom?
 - b. What relationship exists between philosophy, goals, objectives and planning strategies?

AREA II ORGANIZING

1. What mode of organizational design was employed?
 - a. Who directed the organizational development of the concept?
 - b. Was the task completed informally or formally?
 - c. Do organizational lines of authority exist? Who is involved?
 - d. What influenced the development of the organizational design?
 - e. Are implementation strategies or procedural steps prescribed?
2. How are components of the organizational design arranged, defined, and coordinated to accomplish specific goals or objectives?

3. What strategies were developed to meet goals or objectives?
Who determined organizational strategies?
4. How were resources identified?
5. Describe the line and staff responsibilities for development and implementation of community education.
 - a. Are line and staff responsibilities described in written policy?
 - b. Have organizational charts been developed?

AREA III STAFFING

1. Did the district encounter problems relative to staff support and participation?
 - a. Were there problems in securing staff?
 - b. How were problems resolved?
 - c. Were pre-service and in-service training of staff included in development and implementation of strategy?
 - d. Was evaluation and supervision of personnel conducted formally or informally?
 - e. Are personnel uniquely qualified?
2. Who was involved in selection of staff?
3. Did selection processes differ from those utilized in the employment of other staff? If so, in what way?
4. What special skills are required for:
 - a. Building Principals
 - b. Supervisors
 - c. Instructors
5. Have job descriptions for personnel involved in community education been developed? In what ways are they similar and in what ways do they differ from those of other district employees?
6. How are salary/benefit programs and personnel policies determined?

7. How do personnel policies differ from those which guide the employer-employee relationship of other employees?
8. How do salary and benefit programs differ from those of other district employees?
9. Describe evaluation procedures employed and explain whether they differ from those utilized with other district employees.

AREA IV DIRECTING

1. Describe the community education policy-making process.
 - a. Who is involved in development?
 - b. How are policies/procedures communicated?
 - c. How are policies implemented?
2. Who is involved in ongoing decision-making processes?
3. How are decisions communicated?
4. Describe the activities for which you are responsible?
5. Define the functions which fall within your responsibility?
6. Identify the personnel under your direction and their relationship in the organizational hierarchy.
7. To what extent are human relations involved in your role? Please clarify. (i.e., interpersonal relationships, group processes)

AREA V COORDINATING

1. Describe the interrelationship which exists between the schools and other agencies of the community. Does the school perform the role of catalyst or coordinator?
2. How was the concept presented to other agencies of the community?
 - a. Does ongoing operation of the program involve inter-agency support and cooperation?
 - b. How are community agencies or organizations involved?
 - c. Were problems encountered in securing support and acceptance?

- d. How were problems resolved?
 - e. What strategies for involving external agencies were most successful?
3. How are programs, activities and services of agencies of the community coordinated?
 4. How are the resources of the community utilized in the implementation of the community education concept in your district?
 - a. Human resources
 - b. Financial resources
 - c. Physical resources (i.e., facilities, equipment and materials)
 - d. Political resources
 5. How do you avoid duplication of effort?

AREA VI REPORTING

1. How is information disseminated among and between individuals or groups involved in community education?
2. What methods of reporting are employed?
 - a. How are interpersonal reporting processes accomplished?
 - b. How are intra-district reporting processes accomplished?
 - c. How does administrator report status of community education program to community? What methods?
 - d. Is reporting a high priority administrative function?
 - e. What methods of reporting have been most successful?
 - f. What pitfalls should be avoided?
3. Does the district have a community education advisory council?
 - a. How is advisory council involved in assessing and monitoring the program goals and objectives?
 - b. What is relationship between advisory council, community education administrator and Board of Education?

- c. Have by-laws or operational procedures been written?
4. Describe your monitoring process relative to information - measurement - feedback - correction activities.
 5. How are programs, services and administrative functions evaluated?
 - a. Who is involved?
 - b. How often is evaluation conducted?
 - c. How are results utilized?
 6. How is the Board of Education apprised of activities related to the operation of your community education program?

AREA VII BUDGETING :

1. Describe the community education budgeting process.
 - a. Who is responsible?
 - b. What type of budgeting system is employed?
 - c. Is the community education budget a part of district budget or separate? Explain
2. How are community education programs funded?
 - a. Who is involved in fiscal planning, allocating, accounting, and control?
 - b. Are funding sources local, state, federal, or private?
 - c. What problems are incurred in securing funding?
 - d. How were problems resolved?
 - e. What factors influenced fiscal decisions?
 - f. What are the future funding resources?
3. To what extent are the following involved in the budgeting process?
 - a. Board of Education

- b. Office and building administrators
- c. Program supervisors
- d. Program instructors
- e. Advisory Council
- f. Other governmental agencies

AREA VIII OTHER MATTERS FOR INVESTIGATION

1. In your opinion, what management theory or leadership style is most appropriate for the school administrators involved in operationalizing the community education concept?
2. How did the presence or absence of steps in the administrative process influence the implementation of community education?
3. What methodology should the administrator considering community education employ to facilitate successful implementation?
4. What are the future implications of community education as an administrative response to:
 - a. Declining enrollment
 - b. Reductions in force
 - c. School closings
 - d. Diminished public confidence
 - e. Financial problems (tax limitation, et.al.)

APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTION: Opinions and suggestions from parents are very important to the success of any school. Please respond thoughtfully by checking your answers to the following questions about District schools. Your responses will remain anonymous and will help improve programs and procedures.

Each parent is encouraged to respond on a separate questionnaire. Thank you for your help!

1. Please indicate the number of children of each sex you have at each of the District schools listed below (write "0" if none; "1" if one child, etc.)

School	Boy(s)	Girl(s)
a.	_____	_____
b.	_____	_____
c.	_____	_____
d.	_____	_____
e.	_____	_____
f.	_____	_____
g.	_____	_____
h.	_____	_____

1:10-11
 - -
 - -
 - -
 - -
 - -
 - -
 - -
 1:24-25

2. Please indicate the number of times you have spoken with the following school personnel since the beginning of the 1978-79 schoolyear (write "1" if one; "0" if none, etc.)

My child's teacher(s)	_____
School principal(s)	_____
A school board member	_____
Other school staff	_____
My child's bus driver	_____
School-Community Relations Asst. (SCRA)	_____
Secretary at child's school	_____
Custodian at child's school	_____

1:26-27
 - -
 1:30-31
 - -
 1:34-35
 - -
 - -
 1:40-41

3. Mark the appropriate evaluation of the worth to you of your contact with school personnel this schoolyear.

	Had No Contact	Very Worth-while	Worth-while	Slightly Worth-while	Not Worth-while
My child's teacher(s)	5	4	3	2	1
School Principal(s)	5	4	3	2	1
A school board member	5	4	3	2	1
Other school staff	5	4	3	2	1
My child's bus driver	5	4	3	2	1
SCRA	5	4	3	2	1
Secretary at school	5	4	3	2	1
Custodian at school	5	4	3	2	1

1:42
 -
 -
 -
 -
 -
 -
 1:49

4. Please indicate the number of parent meetings you have attended since the beginning of this schoolyear (eg. PTA, parent's work-shops, etc.) _____

1:50-51

5. Please mark the appropriate level of your awareness of the following:

	<u>Extre- mely Aware</u>	<u>Highly Aware</u>	<u>Mode- rately Aware</u>	<u>Sli- ghtly Aware</u>	<u>Un- Aware</u>	
District 88 Reading Is Fun Program (RIF)	5	4	3	2	1	1:52
District 88 Minimal Competencies Program	5	4	3	2	1	-
Title I Program: Remedial Reading	5	4	3	2	1	-
Title VII Programs:						
1. School/Community Relations Assistants	5	4	3	2	1	-
2. Curriculum Resource Teachers (CRT)	5	4	3	2	1	-
3. Community Workshops	5	4	3	2	1	-
4. T-PACS In Newspaper	5	4	3	2	1	1:58

6. Please circle your degree of satisfaction with the following items:

	<u>Very Satis- fied</u>	<u>Some- what Satis.</u>	<u>Unde- cided</u>	<u>Some- what Unsat.</u>	<u>Very Unsa- tis.</u>	<u>Does Not Apply</u>	
My child's progress in:							
Reading	5	4	3	2	1	9	1:59
Writing	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Arithmetic	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Art	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Music	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Science	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Social Studies Skills	5	4	3	2	1	9	1:65
Multi-Cultural Studies	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Relations with:							
All Other children	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Children of other races	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Physical Education	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Amount of homework assigned my child	5	4	3	2	1	9	1:70
Discipline at school	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Teacher effectiveness	5	4	3	2	1	9	1:72

(6, cont'd.)

	<u>Very Satisfied</u>	<u>Some-what Satis.</u>	<u>Unde-cided</u>	<u>Some-what Unsat.</u>	<u>Very Unsa-tis.</u>	<u>Does Not Apply</u>	
Types of courses and programs offered	5	4	3	2	1	9	2:10
Student-teacher relations	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Integration/Desegregation	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Parental interest in schools	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Money for supplies, equipment and programs	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Upkeep and cleanliness of buildings & equipment	5	4	3	2	1	9	2:15
Parent-teacher relations	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Parent involvement with school	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Student-student relations	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
School-parent communications	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
School-village relations	5	4	3	2	1	9	-
Overall education of my child	5	4	3	2	1	9	2:21

7. Circle your feelings, in general, about your child(ren)'s safety:

	<u>Very Safe</u>	<u>Safe</u>	<u>Unde-cided</u>	<u>Un-safe</u>	<u>Very Unsafe</u>	
Going <u>to</u> school	5	4	3	2	1	2:22
<u>At</u> school	5	4	3	2	1	-
Coming <u>from</u> school	5	4	3	2	1	2:24

8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	<u>Strong-ly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Un-decided</u>	<u>Dis-agree</u>	<u>Strong-ly Dis agree</u>	
I find it valuable that my child(ren) is/are going to school with students:						
from different income groups	5	4	3	2	1	2:25
from different ethnic groups	5	4	3	2	1	2:26

(8, cont'd.)

	Strong- ly Agree	Agree	Un- decided	Dis- agree	Strong- ly Dis- agree	
I find it valuable that my child(ren) is/are going to school with students:						
with different educational interests	5	4	3	2	1	2:27
from different religions	5	4	3	2	1	-
from different races	5	4	3	2	1	-
who have different ability levels	5	4	3	2	1	-
The quality of the educational program would be improved by:						
Improving the facilities and equipment	5	4	3	2	1	2:31
Improving teaching	5	4	3	2	1	-
Improving the administration	5	4	3	2	1	-
Providing special services for children who need them	5	4	3	2	1	-
Developing new schools with new educational programs	5	4	3	2	1	2:35
Stressing basic educational skills (reading, writing and arithmetic)	5	4	3	2	1	-
Providing multi-cultural programs	5	4	3	2	1	-
Developing closer ties between schools and the local community	5	4	3	2	1	-
Improving discipline	5	4	3	2	1	-
Providing after-school hours recreation	5	4	3	2	1	2:40
Providing after-school learning opportunities	5	4	3	2	1	-
Providing Saturday/ evening appointments	5	4	3	2	1	-
My child(ren) seem(s) happy at school	5	4	3	2	1	2:43

	<u>Circle</u>		
	Yes1	No2	
9. Do you receive the District Calendar?	Yes1	No2	2:44
Do you find the Calendar helpful?	Yes1	No2	-
Do you receive the District Newsletter?	Yes1	No2	-
Do you read the District Newsletter?	Yes1	No2	-
Do you receive special notices and newsletters from your child's school?	Yes1	No2	-
Have you ever attended a District Board meeting?	Yes1	No2	-
Are you interested in attending a District Board Meeting?	Yes1	No2	-
Have you participated in the Fall/Spring Parent Teachers Conference?	Yes1	No2	2:51

10. Please indicate the amount of information you receive from each of the following sources about District schools:

	<u>Very Much</u> 5	<u>Much</u> 4	<u>Some</u> 3	<u>Lit- tle</u> 2	<u>None</u> 1	
Personal contact	5	4	3	2	1	2:52
My child(ren)	5	4	3	2	1	-
Other child(ren)	5	4	3	2	1	-
Other parents	5	4	3	2	1	2:55
Teachers	5	4	3	2	1	-
Bus Drivers	5	4	3	2	1	-
School custodians	5	4	3	2	1	-
School Administrators	5	4	3	2	1	-
School Board Members	5	4	3	2	1	2:60
Title VII:						
School/Community Relations Assistants (SCRA's)	5	4	3	2	1	2:61
T-PAC's in Newspaper	5	4	3	2	1	-
Parent Workshops	5	4	3	2	1	-
Community Workshops	5	4	3	2	1	-
District Newsletter	5	4	3	2	1	2:65
Newspapers	5	4	3	2	1	-
Television shows	5	4	3	2	1	-
Non-school related adults	5	4	3	2	1	-
Fall & Spring Parent-Teacher Conferences	5	4	3	2	1	2:69

11a. Please indicate your level of awareness of the District 88 Minimal Competencies Program.

Don't know about it _____ 1
 Have heard about it _____ 2
 Have read about it _____ 3
 Talked about it with school personnel _____ 4

2:70

b. The Minimal Competencies Program has two Pupil Record Cards. Please respond for each by checking one category in each column:

2:71

	<u>Math Card</u>	<u>Language Arts Card</u>
Haven't seen	_____ 1	_____ 1
Have seen	_____ 2	_____ 2
Have in house	_____ 3	_____ 3
Review with child	_____ 4	_____ 4
Update from quarterly reports	_____ 5	_____ 5

2:72

882
2:78-80

END CARD#

c. Please indicate the degree to which you understand the following aspects of the District Minimal Competencies Program.

ID#, 3:1-9

	UNDERSTAND:		
	<u>Well</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
Diagnosis	3	2	1
Individualized Instruction	3	2	1
Multi-method Instruction	3	2	1
Evaluation of child's competence	3	2	1
Competence required for promotion to next grade	3	2	1
Summer school opportunity to catch up	3	2	1
Other remediation available	3	2	1
Student's responsibility for mastery	3	2	1
Parent's responsibility for mastery	3	2	1

3:10

-

-

-

3:14

-

-

-

-

3:18

d. Was your child:

Promoted last schoolyear _____ 1
 Promoted after summer school and/or other remediation _____ 2
 Retained in same grade this schoolyear _____ 3

3:19

e. Please indicate how helpful to your child you feel the program and retention has been.

	<u>Very Helpful</u>	<u>Moderately Helpful</u>	<u>Slightly Helpful</u>	<u>No Help At All</u>
Retention in grade	4	3	2	1
Total Minimal Competencies Program	4	3	2	1

3:20

3:21

f. Please indicate any additional comments regarding the Minimal Competencies Program: _____

12a. A new Student Progress Report form replaced the older report cards. Please indicate the level of your satisfaction with the new format.

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Not Satisfied	
The readability	4	3	2	1	3:22
Separation of achievement and effort grades	4	3	2	1	-
Additional information provided	4	3	2	1	-
Quarterly copies for parents	4	3	2	1	-
Overall, the total form	4	3	2	1	-
Continuation of Fall/Spring Parent-Teacher Conf.	4	3	2	1	3:27

b. Please indicate any additional comments regarding the New Progress Report forms and procedures.

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AND YOUR FAMILY.

13. I live in:

- 01
- 02
- 03
- 04
- 05
- 06
- 07
- 08
- 09
- 10

Other: _____
(specify)

3:28-29

3:30-31

14. I have lived in one of the villages above for _____ years.

3:32-33

My children have been attending District _____ schools for _____ years.

3:34-35

15. I expect to be living in the District _____ attendance area: (mark one)

- All this school year 1
- For two years 2
- For five years 3
- For six to ten years 4
- Not expecting to move within ten years 5

3:36

23. District schools will be open most Tuesday evenings during the 1979-80 schoolyear for Title VII activities related to family and school. Please help us plan for these evenings by marking the appropriate column next to each topic to indicate your interest in attending.

	<u>For Sure</u>	<u>Probably Would</u>	<u>Probably Wouldn't</u>
a. Careers Nights for parents and/or children	_____	_____	_____
b. Parent Conferences	_____	_____	_____
c. Ethnic fiestas	_____	_____	_____
d. Workshops for parents on specific academic areas, such as math, reading, metrics, etc.	_____	_____	_____
e. Field trips	_____	_____	_____
f. Dial - a - District Teacher (answer questions related to child's homework)	_____	_____	_____
g. Crafts	_____	_____	_____
h. Fit 'n Trim (exercising)	_____	_____	_____
i. Family Counseling	_____	_____	_____
j. Parent Effectiveness Training	_____	_____	_____
k. Workshops on Handling Stress	_____	_____	_____
l. Tutoring	_____	_____	_____
m. Lending Library (check out learning center materials for home use)	_____	_____	_____
n. Give 'n Take Discussion (a chance to exchange ideas with board members, superintendent, gov't. officials, etc.).	_____	_____	_____
o. Other (List below)	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

24a. In what areas is District currently serving your child(ren) well?

216

b. In what areas does District need to improve/change to serve your child(ren) better?

Thank you for your time in helping us meet your child(ren)'s needs more fully.

APPENDIX C

General Instructions: As the head of household, please check (X) the appropriate responses(s) and/or fill in the appropriate blanks for each question. Please note that many items may have multiple responses.

1. Which of the following educational programs do you feel are most needed in your family?

- _____ a. pre-school
- _____ b. courses for credit
- _____ c. non-credit courses
- _____ d. programs for parents
- _____ e. parents/children programs
- _____ f. vocational training
- _____ g. programs for high school dropouts
- _____ h. programs for senior citizens
- _____ i. programs for the handicapped
- _____ j. other _____
- _____ k. none

2. Which of the following types of recreational programs do you feel are most needed in your family?

- _____ a. pre-school programs
- _____ b. elementary age programs
- _____ c. junior high programs
- _____ d. high school programs
- _____ e. family programs
- _____ f. parent/child programs
- _____ g. adult programs
- _____ h. senior citizen programs
- _____ i. handicapped programs
- _____ j. other _____
- _____ k. none

3. Which of the following types of social services do you feel are most needed in your family?

- _____ a. child care (ages 0 - 2)
- _____ b. child care (ages 3 - 6)
- _____ c. child care (school age)
- _____ d. counseling for youth
- _____ e. family counseling
- _____ f. financial assistance programs
- _____ g. medical assistance programs
- _____ h. retirement counseling
- _____ i. other _____
- _____ j. none

4. In which of the following types of programs would you and your family participate?

Program Areas

List Specific Activities

- _____ a. crafts _____
- _____ b. performing arts (dance, drama, band, music lessons) _____
- _____ c. family living (parenting, home living) _____
- _____ d. personal growth _____
- _____ e. sports and athletics _____
- _____ f. academic opportunities _____
- _____ g. other _____

5. During which of the following time periods would community education programs be most appropriately offered for your family?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| _____ a. Monday through Friday | _____ c. Sunday |
| _____ morning | _____ morning |
| _____ afternoon | _____ afternoon |
| _____ evening | _____ evening |
| _____ b. Saturday | _____ d. Key Vacations |
| _____ morning | _____ Christmas |
| _____ afternoon | _____ Spring |
| _____ evening | _____ Summer |
| | _____ School Holidays |

6. How do you learn about community services and programs?

- _____ a. Life
- _____ b. Suburban Supplement of a Chicago Paper
- _____ c. Local School Newsletters
- _____ d. Friends and Neighbors
- _____ e. Senior Citizens Bulletin
- _____ f. "Y" Announcements
- _____ g. Other

7. Indicate the number of adults from your household in each age category.

- _____ a. under 20
- _____ b. 21 - 30
- _____ c. 31 - 40
- _____ d. 41 - 50
- _____ e. 51 - 60
- _____ f. over 60

8. Indicate the number of children from your household in each age category.

- _____ a. no children
- _____ b. pre-school (Ages 0 - 4)
- _____ c. elementary school (Ages 5-11)
- _____ d. Junior high school (Ages 12-14)
- _____ e. high school (Ages 14-18)

9. Are you:

- _____ a. male
- _____ b. female

10. What is your marital status?

- _____ a. single
- _____ b. married
- _____ c. divorced
- _____ d. separated
- _____ e. widow
- _____ f. widower

11. Years of residence in Cicero?

- _____ a. 0 - 5
- _____ b. 6 - 10
- _____ c. 11 - 15
- _____ d. 16 - 20
- _____ e. over 20

12. Which public school is located nearest your residence?

- _____ a.
- _____ b.
- _____ c.
- _____ d.
- _____ e.
- _____ f.
- _____ g.
- _____ h.
- _____ i.
- _____ j.
- _____ k.

13. Please indicate your preference of building location where community education programs may be offered.

14. Further comments that will be helpful to the Council may be written on the reverse side of this questionnaire.

Arthur E. Jones
School of Education
Administration and Supervision
Doctor of Education

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Arthur E. Jones has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Melvin P. Heller, Professor and Chairman
Department of Administration and Supervision,
Loyola

Dr. Jasper J. Valenti, Professor Department of
Administration and Supervision, Associate Dean,
School of Education, Loyola

Dr. Phillip M. Carlin, Professor Department of
Administration and Supervision, Loyola

The Final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and the dissertation is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

December 10, 1980
Date

M. P. Heller
Director's Signature