1985

Implementation of the Leu-Candoli Report for Educational Change in Lincoln Park and Near North, Chicago, 1968 to 1973

Ralph J. Cusick
Loyola University Chicago

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LEU-CANDOLI REPORT FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE IN LINCOLN PARK AND NEAR NORTH, CHICAGO, 1968 TO 1973

by

Ralph J. Cusick

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

May

1985

ABSTRACT

This study examines the actions and reactions of the Chicago Board of Education and of community groups in the Chicago areas of Lincoln Park and Near North as they attempted, during the social, racial and political ferment of the late 1960s and early 1970s, to achieve agreement on proposed plans for an innovative new secondary educational facility to serve the areas.

The basis for the proposed changes came from the 1968 planning document prepared for the Chicago Board of Education by Drs. Donald J. Leu and I. Carl Candoli, outside planning consultants. The plan, Design for the Future provided a direction for long range city-wide educational and facilities planning. A major goal in the plan was to provide positive direction for racial integration at all educational levels.

Under the Leu-Candoli plan, each sub-district of the Chicago Public Schools would have formal representation from the local community working directly with Board of Education and City agency personnel. As plans were developed they would be presented to parent, student, and other interested individuals and groups to provide comments and other input.

The effect of the Leu-Candoli recommendations on the schools of Chicago has been obvious and positive. Many of the concepts, attitudes,

and strategies were implemented, including a number of special theme elementary and secondary Magnet Schools.

This study provides an historical analysis of the roles played by community participants; Chicago Board of Education personnel, both staff and line [including the author]; members of the Board of Education; and representatives of other city agencies. Among the City of Chicago agencies involved were: the Public Building Commission, which was to fund the facility; the Department of Urban Renewal, parts of the area came under the Urban Renewal Plan and certain lands necessary to facility planning would be secured through Urban Renewal condemnation and clearance; the Department of Planning and Development, which had to approve the choice of site as consistent with overall city planning; and the Park District and the Chicago Public Library, which might share certain of the facilities. The need for multiple approval at various stages of the planning added another dimension of difficulty.

The research methodology involved extensive use of the author's notes and other materials gathered during the planning process discussed in this dissertation. In addition, a wide range of pertinent published material was consulted.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author's sincere thanks go to his committee: Dr. Gerald Gutek, chairman; Dr. John Wozniak, and Dr. Philip Carlin, for their wise counsel, their unfailing support, and the words needed (of all kinds) to keep the project going. I am also thankful to the memories of Dr. Arthur O'Mara, Dr. James Smith, and Mr. Douglas Van Bramer, who helped and befriended me many years ago.

Appreciation is also expressed to the faculty of the School of Education for their fine instruction and their professional companionship.

Since every idea and each word must find a way to the printed page, my deepest thanks go to Rose Weinrib who persevered through a very rough first draft. Thanks also to Joanne Jacobi who made subsequent changes, moves and additions. Not to be forgotten was the technical assistance rendered by Diane Korling and Anne Coyne. My thanks to them all.

And, finally, my ongoing thanks to my family for putting up with late hours and a sometimes grouchy mien, for answering questions and reacting to ideas, and for providing a supportive atmosphere. To my wife, Peggy, the real catalyst, I give my last and best, "Thank You."

Without all these fine people, this dissertation never would have been completed.

VITA

The author, Ralph Joseph Cusick, is the son of William and Hannah (McGarry) Cusick. He was born on March 13, 1929 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

He obtained his elementary education in the Catholic schools of Chicago. His secondary education was completed in 1947 at St. Ignatius High School, Chicago.

Mr. Cusick entered Loyola University, Chicago, in September 1947 and received his Bachelor of Science in Education degree in June 1952. He entered the army in September 1952.

In June 1954, Mr. Cusick began work on his Master of Education degree which was awarded in February 1957. During the time he was doing his graduate work, he was elected as a member of Alpha Sigma Nu and Phi Delta Kappa.

The author became an elementary teacher in the Chicago Public Schools in September 1954. He became a principal in 1964 and served in that position at Tanner Elementary School, Cooley Vocational High School, and Waller High School. He is at present Director of Washburne Trade School.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN FOR A CULTURAL-EDUCATIONAL CLUSTER ON THE NORTH SIDE OF CHICAGO

The mandate of public education in America has historically been to serve the needs of all ethnic, racial and cultural groups. A fact of urban growth has been the accompanying need to serve increasing numbers of learners. Big city school systems by the middle of the twentieth century had, for the most part, established workable, if not perfect, patterns of building, staffing, and curriculum planning that addressed these needs. Programs of new construction typically were financed by local bond issues, if voters could be persuaded to approve them.

Entering the decade of the 1960s, however, the word 'crisis' began to be used with reference to the fiscal condition of many large cities. At the same time, as suburbs grew, the neighborhood populations of older urban areas were undergoing vast racial shifts, and some dramatic changes in educational needs were asserted by newly dominant groups.

The Chicago School system of the 1960's had deep troubles that went well beyond finances and facilities. The General Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Benjamin Willis, had become the focal point for Blacks and liberals protesting Chicago's failure to move assertively towards school

desegregation. The heretofore logical and workable concept of the neighborhood school had, because of Chicago's extraordinarily segregated housing patterns, contributed to equally segregated schools.

The Chicago Board of Education had received both the Hauser Report (1964)[1] and the Havighurst Survey (1964)[2] which highlighted the race-related problems in the schools. Critics of Dr. Willis saw no response by him to the racial issues raised in the report or the survey. The outcry from Black and civil rights groups grew. Under continued pressure, Dr. Willis resigned as General Superintendent in May, 1966.

Dr. James Redmond[3] was named to replace him. Dr. Redmond immediately addressed the interrelated problems of student and faculty integration, facility adequacy, Board business management, and long range planning to allow the school system to function effectively through the balance of the 20th century. Desegregation was to be integral to the goals of a quality educational program.

In December, 1966, the Department of School Planning of the Board of Education published the revised draft of A Long Range School Facilities Program.[4] It was an extensive analysis of each of the twenty-seven districts which were part of the Chicago School system (Illinois School District 299). The program contained no recommendations, but was to serve as a source book to assist in staff and community discussions.

Board of Education Hires Consultants

In order to coalesce the necessary planning for education in Chicago, the Board proceeded, on June 16, 1967,[5] to hire as consultants Dr. Donald J. Leu[6] and Dr. I. Carl Candoli[7]. Their task was to develop

an overall strategy that the city and the Board could use in all future educational planning.

Their work led to the development in 1968 of a recommended long-range educational plan for Chicago, published by the Board in 1968 as Design for the Future.[8] Other consultants would also be utilized: architects, educators, demographers, and people capable of planning the seminars needed to arrive at a consensus on alternative solutions.

Without educational planning there was no possibility that the overall plan for the city could be worthwhile, Drs. Leu and Candoli asserted. Participating in the development of educational facilities and curriculum alternatives would be the key agencies of city government involved in the processes of urban planning and improvement, and community organizations which had ties with the Board of Education. The maintenance of these important relationships would be fundamental to the planning process.[9]

The study conducted by Drs. Leu and Candoli addressed a number of specific problems and goals of the Chicago public school system, evaluated possible approaches to these, and recommended a number of innovative concepts intended to solve for the multiple factors then demanding the attention of Board planners. These concepts were to be developed by Chicago Board of Education planning staff with the aid of specialized consultants, and would be tailored to community needs and wishes as expressed through citizen involvement programs in each of the twenty-seven districts of the Chicago public school system. Once agreed upon, district and individual school plans would be implemented by facilities construction, curriculum modification and appropriate staffing, on a

schedule consistent with Board financing arrangements.[10]

As a basis for their recommendations to the Chicago Board of Education, Drs. Leu and Candoli had considered the whole spectrum of education from early childhood through high school. Most of the research in early childhood education, such as that done by Benjamin Bloom,[11] has made the very strong point that the early years are vitally important, since major portions of a child's capacity are established by the age of nine. Abilities and intelligence can be increased later, but at much greater cost in time and money.[12] Roles for day-care centers or nursery schools were not part of the planning concepts the consultants proposed to implement, but figured importantly in the assumptions made for the K through 12 levels.

Some conceptual directions which might be taken by pre-school programs were included as introduction to the formal recommendations of the Leu-Candoli Report. Head Start centers,[13] while extremely valuable, were found to fall far short of the goals for this vital function of early childhood education in an urban setting.

Citing the U.S. Riot Commission Report of 1968,[14] Leu and Candoli pointed out that while 40 percent of eligible children in the total United States in 1968 were in some type of pre-school program, in Chicago fewer than ten percent of eligible four-year-old children were enrolled in full-year pre-school programs. Because of financial problems in the Chicago system,[15] the capacity to accommodate even that enrollment was in fact being eroded.

Concepts of the Leu-Candoli Plan

In examining the problem, Leu and Candoli considered geographic, safety and budget factors along with the social and educational. They recommended that small schools, which they called schomes (school + home), be established in inner-city neighborhoods easily accessible to the homes of the children and to existing local elementary schools.

The schome concept had been developed by the planners of Head Start in the early sixties. In order to make early childhood education a part of life for both the child and the family, it was felt that the program should run fifty-two weeks a year. Time would be made available to have both parents and other siblings come to the school for exposure to parenting training. Hopefully, this would prepare the young child and his family for a successful and on-going education when the child entered kindergarten.

Leu and Candoli perceived the schomes as satellites to existing elementary schools with staffing, janitorial services, and administrative services provided by that school. They recommended leasing space, remodeling present vacant commercial property or, if possible, building new facilities, with the aim being that all involved would be within a few blocks of the schome. The schomes, which would serve children ages three to six, should have an optimum capacity of 150.[16]

Other early childhood problems were also addressed. The consultants noted that the child who has a malnutrition condition, a language handicap, poor housing and/or is in a broken family, often faces nearly insurmountable educational problems. Appropriate governmental agencies, they suggested,[17] could help provide for some of the children: a

coordinated program would have to have the necessary health and food services. They also pointed out that the success of any pre-school program is very much dependent upon true parental acceptance, understanding and involvement: school programs had to be continued in the home if they were to be successful.[18]

Having started with early childhood education, Leu and Candoli then considered some of the problems of older inner-city children. Since many current educational problems in Chicago schools are due to the fact that a number of children have real learning deficits, they noted particularly that deficiencies in the language arts often impeded academic progress.[19]

They placed heavy emphasis on the Chicago School Board's policy of continuous progress-mastery learning.[20] This was a relatively new concept which called for an un-graded, zero-reject, self-paced educational plan for elementary school students. They felt that this type of administrative organization, strengthened by new developments in materials and curriculum, could have an appreciable effect on inner-city education.[21] They also recommended that this individual approach be applied city-wide for all children with learning difficulties. They recommended packages of diagnostic materials and other aids which could be utilized by teachers in defining and working to address whatever deficiency the child exhibited.

Leu and Candoli found unacceptable the Chicago Board of Education's 1968 policy of leaving to local principals and teachers the rejection or adoption of continuous development. They made the strong point that it must be made standard school policy.[22]

Early intervention was emphasized: the entire inner-city education program must begin for these children no later than age three. There should be no artificial divisions throughout the years of three to fourteen, or whatever age the child entered high school. They felt that the child's progress should be "continuously and chronologically monitored through the first eight grades."[23] Education at the elementary level would then become a continuous and articulated program of instruction continuing through the early adolescent years.[24]

In pointing out the fact that there were not large numbers of certified professional teachers available in early childhood education, the consultants recommended that alternatives be explored to discover new ways to provide for instructional needs of individual pupils.

They urged the Board of Education to adopt experimental programs, pointing out that these were far more necessary in the inner-city than elsewhere. Techniques such as clusters, television instruction, programmed instruction and computer-assisted instruction should be applied much more effectively than was (in 1968) the case.[25]

They also urged that more para-professional teacher aides be teamed with certified assigned teachers, teaching interns and advanced students to form effective, flexible, instructional teams. By doing this they hoped that a small pool of subject matter specialists could be re-deployed more effectively.[26]

They pointed out that cooperative agreements could be made with local industries and with universities to provide necessary personnel and locations for in-service.[27] They also hoped that the use of well

trained interns could help facilitate recruitment of new staff, improve teacher-pupil ratio, and they further hoped that these teams would aid in changing teacher outlook to be more accepting of innovation.

Very evident in the Leu-Candoli approach was their conviction that the community and its human resources should be tapped as vital forces in any educational program. They proposed that the programs be examined very carefully so that lay people could participate in those aspects where their contributions could be meaningful. They proposed, however, that

> The Continuous Development program be left to the professionals who have the knowledge of learning dynamics necessary to build such a program. We further propose that a system of community electives be instigated whereby special aspects of the curriculum could be provided by the request of the community. The result would be an intelligent balance between the responsibility of the educational system and the community at large and the unique demands of a segment of that community.[28]

Some communities needed training in English as a second language. Some needed vocational re-training to prepare for local industrial changes. Some wanted leisure time or arts and crafts education. By satisfying the stated needs of each community, Leu and Candoli felt, the schools could help these groups become a real factor in education.

The middle school was, they observed, commonly defined as an organization of middle grades, usually 6 through 8. They preferred to consider the middle school not a grouping of grades but a grouping of ages, normally eleven through fourteen. Leu and Candoli argued that the upper-grade centers in Chicago did not provide enough time to develop programs and relationships that were needed by this age group.

They deplored the use of rigid grade levels as a basis of promo-

tion or retention, citing research showing that retention does not improve learning but may in fact obstruct it. They observed that retention for the educationally disadvantaged had an even more debilitating effect on motivation: lack of success led not only to rejection of the educational institution but possibly to outright hostility and alienation. They stated that "every student can learn and will learn if we can find ways and means of motivating and inspiring them. Schools must become a success continuum for all students."[29]

Establishment of Magnet Schools Urged

Chicago could benefit greatly, they proposed, and could increase racial integration, by pursuing the concept of Magnet Schools. These would be open to students beyond geographically defined attendance areas, and would serve both public and non-public schools. Magnet schools would also develop and evaluate innovative curricula, potentially adaptable by other schools in their own planning. Leu and Candoli made a strong plea for Magnet Schools designed to meet the unique characteristics of the pre-adolescent student.

These magnet units were unique in the following characteristics:

1. They would provide for controlled heterogeneity.
2. They would provide for adult activities and participation.
3. They would develop experimental programs.
4. They would include pre-primary, primary, and middle school students.
5. They would be staffed by teacher-paraprofessional teams composed of: a team leader (master teacher), 3 regular teachers, 1 beginning teacher, 2 student teachers, and 3 para-professionals (aides) - each team serving 150 students.

6. They would work with local universities in the development of programs (experimental and for laboratory schools).

7. They would act as dissemination centers to the satellite schools in their service area.

The size suggested for a Magnet School was approximately 2,400 to 3,000 students, of which approximately 1200 to 1500 would be pre-school or primary aged pupils and 1200 would be middle school age.[30]

The Chicago Board of Education had at that time undertaken to create the first of such magnet schools, to be located adjacent to Lake Shore Drive on a North Marine Drive site formerly occupied by a military hospital. The educational planning firm of Engelhart, Engelhart and Leggett was directing the planning of this school in 1967. Dr. Stanton Leggett[31] laid out the goals and purposes of the first magnet school.

This first Chicago magnet school would, it was hoped, provide an example of willing integration. Not only people of different races but also of different national, religious and economic backgrounds would be included. This would be accomplished by extending an invitation to many communities and then drawing students from volunteers. Once students were enrolled they would be able to remain in the school regardless of where they lived.

While the school would be a large organization, approximately 1500 children from the ages of three to ten and 1500 from the ages of eleven to fourteen, the planners provided for organization into housing units of 100 to 150 students.

Hopefully the curriculum and the program growing out of that concept would avoid limitations in time. The school would try to focus on problem-solving and the inquiry method. The school would be the

perfect center for the exchange of ideas which would be used in very close evaluation of the teaching and learning process.

The magnet school would also attract and hire teachers and those people involved in the production of instructional media. The magnet school would be a demonstration center; it would be a place where materials could be tested; it would be an observation center for both a primary and a middle-school concept based on continuous development.

One of the needed features would be development of the center for the arts of communication. The center not only would serve children in the school but would be a resource model for other schools in the area.

The planning process for the educational program would be continuous, extending into the operation of the school both in time and effect. A major effort of the process would be the development of pilot projects. A vital part of this planning would be the cooperation of the School of Education of a local area university. Northwestern University had had a long history of cooperation with the Chicago Public Schools. Northwestern staff members would work with public school officials in the planning process, in developing new programs, in attracting and evaluating prospective teachers for the school and would cooperate in programs for the professional growth of those teachers once they were involved in the school. The university would also aid in parental involvement plans.

Leu and Candoli recommended that the Board of Education start planning two additional magnet schools. One should be an inner-city school; the other should focus on secondary education in a new high

school that would be the center for curriculum and staff development in much the same way as the Marine Drive campus would be. Obviously, planning and in-service training monies would be needed. The consultants pointed out that because of previous planning Chicago had more supplementary educational resources than most large cities. The museums and parks, the whole industrial and business complex, could be involved. They stated that cooperative educational supplementary centers should be developed wherever possible. The centers would include classrooms, television studios, in-service seminar spaces, places to develop curricular material, and the like.[32]

To bring children and teachers to the centers they recommended the use of "talking buses"[33] so that time spent in travel would not be wasted. They also pointed out that various study units could be prepackaged and made available. In this way an expensive but complete package on, for instance, "Space Exploration," could be rotated through a number of schools. It might also be used in the cluster TV groups.[34]

In addressing the needs of secondary level education, Leu and Candoli pointed out the expectation that schools provide all graduates either with occupational competency or the proper background to obtain such competency through further instruction. If Chicago were to upgrade this occupational education to meet public expectations, certain revisions would have to be worked out.

A primary change would be required in the public's view of vocational education. In 1968 every high school student was seemingly aspiring to attend college, even those who might not have the ability or any real basic desire to succeed in college. Since many could not

accept this fact but were equally unable to accept vocational education, significant numbers of students became alienated and dropped out of school.

One of the needs was to get the public to accept the real and continuing responsibility of secondary education: to prepare students with basic skills and to develop in them attitudes that upon graduation they could take either to an employer or to an institution of higher education.

A second need was to try to develop those skills in students which would produce high transfer-of-training potential. Research indicates that very few people remain in the occupation for which they were first trained. Electricians become machine operators of various kinds; individuals prepared for the fine arts may move to tool and die making because their fundamental skill is in reading prints and interpreting those prints in three dimensions. Occupational education should, therefore, prepare students not only for immediate jobs but also for more advanced employment, while assuring that even students who drop out are given sufficient basic skills to make them employable and trainable.[35]

The third need was for the programs to be relevant to the needs and processes of the modern industrial world. Students see that there is little reason to study, for example, print shop techniques when these techniques no longer exist in industry. An example of this is training on a linotype machine. As linotype machines wear out they are being scrapped. Education must try to anticipate future employment needs and thus be able to train students in the most modern processes available.

This could be accomplished if schools would work more closely with the larger community which includes business and industry. The leadership that these could provide, the technical personnel they could team with teachers in the schools, could result in a large measure of success in these areas very quickly.

It was seen as imperative that boards of education learn to work closely with industry so that these goals in vocational education might be realized. Long range planning would be necessary but Leu and Candoli recommended that the commitment be made immediately so that students could make choices and be aware of the possibilities for their own future. If they were to make wise career choices it would be imperative that they have some kind of flexible model.

Leu and Candoli proposed a program they called a "Vertically Integrated Occupational Curriculum."[36] Such a curriculum would 1) begin at the elementary school level, 2) develop positive work attitudes, 3) develop positive work habits, 4) create awareness of occupational opportunities, 5) provide knowledge about families of occupations, 6) provide skills sufficient to meet the demands of a constantly changing world of work, 7) provide entry level saleable skills from which the worker could build, 8) provide the necessary occupational and academic skills enabling the student to enter technical knowledge training, and 9) reinforce the concept of education as a continuing process.

If Chicago were to follow this type of plan, Leu and Candoli saw certain modifications in the secondary schools as necessary. These involved open enrollment policies so that students and parents could increase their options. It also included greater participation and

greater commitment by both government and industry in education. It required that new high school units be rapidly developed, and that obsolete and overcrowded schools be eliminated.[37]

There was also a great need for experimentation and evaluation in new magnet schools at the secondary level. The consultants pointed out that many public agencies were attempting to improve the quality of life. The Comprehensive Plan of Chicago was quoted:

> Today the challenge to the people of Chicago is to move toward a vision of what the future city can be - the metropolis that serves people; strengthens family life; offers full individual opportunity; is free from blight, ugliness and poverty; and leads in new ideas, social progress, industrial production, and artistic achievement. To improve the quality of life -- by enlarging human opportunities, improving the environment and strengthening and diversifying the economy -- is the fundamental goal of the citizens of Chicago."[38]

If this goal were to be attained, any planning by any agency in isolation from others would represent a disfunctional waste of time and money. Leu and Candoli, therefore, recommended that the Board of Education employ a full-time planner to coordinate school planning and to represent the schools in things such as the planning of land use, coordination of school and parks, utilization of plant facilities, boundary changes, and the like.

Cultural-Educational Cluster Explained

Out of the potential for involvement with existing city resources grew a major proposal that Leu and Candoli would advance for implementation by the Chicago Board of Education, the "Cultural-Educational Cluster"[39] (later "Cultural-Educational Center"[40]).

The Cultural-Educational Park idea had not originated with Drs. Leu and Candoli, but reflected some of the most creative social thinking of the 1960's on the part of educators in all parts of the country. A working definition of such a park included the following:

> A clustering on one site of large groups of students of wide age differences and varying socio-economic-ethnic and religious backgrounds. Student groups are decentralised, within the total site, with shared use of specialized staffs, programs, support services, and facilities. The Cultural-Educational Park provides educational, cultural, recreational, and social services to public, private and parochial students, and coordinates these programs with other public service institutions (parks, libraries, museums, housing, higher education, social services, health, highways, etc.)[41]

Based on this definition, Drs. Leu and Candoli wrote of a handful of successful educational parks throughout the country. Most were in suburban or rural areas, with none operating in the inner parts of large urban settings. However, plans for educational parks were then being made in cities including Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York City and Syracuse, New York, East Orange, New Jersey, and Grand Rapids, Michigan. Most of these projects would encompass a large land area with many thousands of students in attendance from the kindergarten level through secondary schools.

Advantages and disadvantages of cultural-educational parks were discussed at length.[42] The expense of this approach to education was also stressed.[43] Evaluation criteria were presented which attempted to consider the total value system of a community, in terms of educational, social, ethnic, economic and religious aspects.[44] Three criteria were seen as vitally important: the reduction or elimination of segregation, the provision of quality education for all students, and the acceptance

by the community of any plan developed to serve it.

The critical problems of site selection were acknowledged. Among key considerations were listed the following:

1. The convenient location of the sites to the corridors of transit accessibility as developed in The Comprehensive Plan for Chicago.

2. Sufficient acreage to enable the construction of the large number of physical facilities needed.

3. Attractive locations, convenient to other cultural, educational, medical, and social complexes.

4. Locations readily convenient to suburban areas as well as adjacent to commercial and industrial interests.

5. "Neutral" locations attractive to various economic, racial and ethnic groups.[45]

A summary of three overall planning possibilities was presented to the Board. Plan A simply called for the same type of development and expansion as had been followed in the past. Plan B called for reorganization into a system of traditional "educational parks." Plan C demanded the development of a new solution, found to be feasible, based on the Cultural-Educational Park.

After a lengthy discussion of the three alternatives, the consultants rejected Plan A because, they stated, the role of the school in society had evolved to the point where it must serve from the cradle to the grave, and bear the prime responsibility for solving social issues. Since the system utilized by the Chicago Board of Education in the past was not meeting the needs of the present-day city, a massive change was indicated.

In looking at the city and its overall needs, the consultants pointed out that one of the primary problems facing the city was the

flight from the city of the white population to the suburbs due to the perceived threat of the expanding Black population. Any plans for the revitalization of the city had to deal with this. Prime to any solution was the situation of the schools: if the schools were good, people would stay. Noting the importance of the educational system in overall city planning, the consultants praised the attempts of the Chicago Board of Education to decentralize the system. But greater change was needed.

Plan B was considered very attractive, but it was felt that it did not go far enough. While it would solve the problem for one community, it did not contribute much to the planning changes necessary at the scale of the whole city. Plan B was the focal point for initial planning, and would ultimately fit into the city-wide plan.

Plan C was seen as the best possible means of providing a cohesive whole to the educational plan for the city, and it was this alternative which was proposed by the consultants in their draft report. Observing the then existing educational parks in the nation, the consultants arrived at a number of crucial cautions:

1. To pile up or compress thousands of small children with more thousands of young adults into one large factory-like building located on a small inadequate site - is not recommended.

2. To ignore the existing critical needs (fiscal, personnel, programs, facilities) of the total educational system while building a few "show room" parks - is not recommended.

3. To invest millions of dollars in any park without attempting to utilize this investment to make a major thrust at the redevelopment of the total city - is not recommended.

4. To build each park the same as other parks - is not recommended.

5. To ignore existing and planned transit systems, cultural resources, recreational facilities, non-public schools, urban redevelopment plans, and other community resources - is not recommended.

6. To attempt the park alone, while ignoring area higher education institutions, suburban school districts, state and federal fiscal resources - is not recommended.

7. To copy the park plan of another city - is not recommended.

Chicago must invent a new educational park concept. A concept which capitalizes on the unique features and needs of Chicago. The Chicago Cultural-Educational Construct should multiply educational investments into "triggering" devices for recycling, rebuilding and improving the total city.[46]

A new definition of the construct was offered for Chicago:

The cultural-educational construct clusters large groups of students of wide age differences and varying socio-economic-ethnic and religious backgrounds on one or more interrelated sites. It is an "amoeba-like" concept reaching towards all of the cultural-educational-recreational-social-economic resources of an area. The construct focuses on innovation, experimentation, and evaluation of educational change, and diffuses tested educational improvements to the total system. The construct is designed as a "sub-system" of the total city and school system.[47]

In offering models of how these new constructs would be set up, the consultants offered a number of different models based on what different sub-areas of the city had to offer in the way of unique resources.

In one model, a university or junior college campus would serve as the center of the cluster. This would assume a definite commitment from the university in terms of research, in-service training, evaluation and many human resources such as economists, sociologists, psychologists and political scientists. In this model, several magnet primary and middle schools[48] would be set up with the composition of the student body being controlled along racial lines. The students would be drawn from an area larger than the normal school district. Secondary schools' curriculum would be built on the strengths of the adjacent university, or on

resources found in the community. This would allow local specializations not offered elsewhere. A planning center based on evaluation and diagnosis would deploy resources, and would also act as the center for the collaboration of industry and the dissemination of new ideas and information.

A second model offered for consideration would use a secondary school complex as the center, with strong support from business or industrial concerns. Use would also be made of any other institutions in a given area, such as junior colleges, museums or art centers.

This type of model projected a large centralized site that would adequately serve 10,000 students with all the needed support services. The difficulty of obtaining even one such site in a built-up central city area posed great obstacles to establishing such a complex. All types of potentially available land were looked to, including open lands long held within the various parks of the Chicago Park District.[49] Creating a park as part of school planning might be looked on by some as a bonus, but diminishing scarce Park District acreage by covering it with school facilities was viewed very negatively by many in Chicago.

Drs. Leu and Candoli proposed, as part of their plan, the idea of using air rights over major streets or expressways to accommodate such educational complexes as these. This novel approach to siting would minimize the need for condemnation of private property and would avoid infringement on park land.

By keeping the conceptual plans flexible, the consultants hoped that appropriate plans could be developed for individual community areas

to accommodate four basic purposes: educational, cultural, economic and social/psychological.

To facilitate coordinated planning the consultants proposed centralized education planning centers, to be located in each of the cultural-educational clusters. The centers' responsibility would be for diagnostic and educational planning for students within the articulated area. Each center would serve from ten to twenty-five thousand patrons. Each Cultural-Educational Center would have connected with it a number of articulated schools and would serve students from pre-school through secondary ages, along with parents and adult education enrollees.

Functional responsibilities to be housed in the planning center of each CEC would include[50] the following: curriculum planning, coordination evaluation, development and support, instruction media center, diagnostic and remediation services, in-service training and development, computer assistance including data processing, and general administration. The planning center in each CEC would also provide community support services, serving both as the community planning center and the linking center between cooperating higher education institutions, parochial and private schools, business, labor and industry.

The consultants were very much concerned that a quality educational plan to be viable must be designed to increase options for the students, the parents and the Chicago Board of Education. This basic concept they built into the recommended long-range education plan. An example of this would be that middle schools could be included or adapted to upper grade centers or junior high schools. While they recommended the middle school, they realize that there would be times when

possibly other grades might be included. Another possibility could be that secondary schools continue the present organization if needed, but that they also have an option to move toward the larger internally decentralized type of school. Leu and Candoli themselves recommended building the first CECs as conventional high schools but with the buildings planned so that future changes could be incorporated at minimum additional construction cost.

Another recommendation which served the concept of broadening open enrollment policies would be the location of schools on major transit lines in order that the students could come long distances in a short time and still get to the school of their choice. Their plan also called for continuing review and audit of the total educational plan for a community or for the city as a whole.[51]

In order that such wide purposes succeed, it was deemed necessary to carefully plan programs that would assure cradle-to-grave education. The major stress would be on early education, particularly for any child who might be considered disadvantaged. The magnet schools would have a distinct advantage since early diagnostic and remediation would be possible. The center would act as a diagnostic tutorial headquarters. Here special programs could be designed for each child.

Since the Chicago Board of Education had officially adopted the philosophy of non-graded or Continuous Program,[52], this individualization was both feasible and possible.

The size of each conclave would vary, depending upon local needs, density of population and ease of transportation. In general, 7,500 to

10,000 students would be the norm, although as many as 25,000 community members in all might be served by the total range of services. A typical Cultural-Educational Center might be organized in this fashion:

7,000 primary and pre-school students in six locations

5,000 middle school students in four locations

6,000 secondary school students in two locations, with some satellite locations if needed.[53]

The mixing of eighteen-year-olds with four and five-year-olds was deliberate. The consultants felt that all ages would be better off for this contact.

The plan also called for the establishment of schomes, with heavy family involvement, the use of shared time facilities, wide community use of the Cultural-Educational Center after school hours, and heavy adult involvement in providing leadership and support service.

The secondary school component would be crucial to the viability of the concept in terms of program and scope. It would be charged with the normal academic preparation for college, plus needed vocational and technical plans for everyone. One goal would be to carefully avoid "pushing out" anyone. Along with the needed academic courses there would be many cross-cultural and cross-racial contacts.

Short-Range Plans for Prototype CECs

The question of the numbers and locations of CEC's throughout the city was also addressed. The recommendation was made that since a total changeover would cost at least two billion dollars, each conclave be integrated into existing usable buildings. Site utilization plans should anticipate obsolescence and be aimed at reducing overcrowding.

It was pointed out that by 1975 there would be a significant shortage of school space, with existing capacity including a number of very old facilities.[54] Six high school buildings and 97 elementary school buildings dated at least in part from before 1897. Sixteen high school buildings and 115 elementary school buildings were construced prior to 1916. These would be phased out before 1988.

Even short-range planning thus indicated that new construction, aimed at accommodating large numbers of students, should begin as soon as possible. It was decided that three prototype CECs should be built, to serve approximately 18,000 students each. Construction costs for each CEC were estimated as shown in Table 1.

Four possible locations were identified for the construction of these prototype CECs, all of them involving utilization of air rights over expressways. One was at approximately 75th Street and the Dan Ryan Expressway (Interstate Route 94), the second at South Damen Avenue and the Eisenhower Expressway (Interstate Route 290), and the third and fourth over the Kennedy Expressway (Interstate Routes 90 and 94) at locations on North California Avenue and near North Cicero Avenue. It was also recommended that utilization of land reclaimed at the Lake Michigan shoreline should be investigated.

In concluding their preliminary report on the feasibility of the Cultural Educational Park concept for Chicago, Drs. Leu and Candoli pointed out that to operate, much less build, such facilities, would require massive amounts of money.

TABLE 1

COST ESTIMATE FOR CULTURAL-EDUCATIONAL CENTER

Student Category	Square Feet per Student	Projected Enrollment	Total Square Footage
Pre-school and primary	70	7,000	490,000
Middle School	100	5,000	500,000
High School	130	6,000	780,000
Additional for special education	10	18,000	180,000
Gross square feet total			1,950,000
Construction cost per square foot			$ 22
Total estimated construction cost			42,900,000
Contingencies - 5 %			2,145,000
Furnishings - 10 %			4,290,000
Equipment - 15%			6,435,000
			$ 55,770,000
Estimated land cost			7,500,000
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST			$ 63,270,000
COST PER STUDENT			3,515

SOURCE: see Note 55.

The short-range plan to develop three CECs would involve a total of approximately $190,000,000. To complete the six such complexes envisioned by the plan[56] would total approximately $380,000,000. To complete all thirty-three recommended facilities would carry costs in excess of two billion dollars.

Equal opportunity for children in the central city could not be provided using then existing funding sources and formulas. The consultants anticipated massive amounts of money from both Federal and State sources to allow implementation of the Chicago plan.

With this vision in mind, the planning with the communities was to begin. District Seven was a logical place to start because it contained all the elements the consultants had mentioned as being describers of the city itself. At this time the Board of Education gave the District Superintendents the added responsibility of making the District Councils a significant part of the planning process. Before discussing the process in motion, the District Seven "community" will be explained both historically and as it was when the planning process began.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF CHICAGO SCHOOL DISTRICT SEVEN

PEOPLE AND SCHOOLS

Chicago School District Seven, known historically as the North Division of the city of Chicago, has been a microcosm of almost every aspect of 19th and 20th Century urbanization. The principal aim of this chapter is to study this area from the earliest times to the present in an attempt to 1) provide perspective on the community planning of the 1960's and 1970's; and 2) study the community, both historically and as related to this dissertation.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first deals with the period 1779 to 1871; the second covers the period 1871 to 1940; and the third, the period 1940 to 1970. Each dividing date is a watershed in Chicago's development. In 1779 the first settler, the Black-Haitian Jean Baptiste Pont DuSable,[1] built on the site of what is now the modern Equitable Building; 1871 was the year of the Great Chicago Fire, which greatly affected the North Division community, as it did the city as a whole; 1940 began the last decade through which the North Division was an area of first settlement for European immigrants, much as it had been since 1779.

Early Years - 1779 to 1871

The Chicago River network, the very rationale for the development of a city, divides Chicago into three natural districts. Each of these districts from the earliest settlement to the present has developed its own personality and patterns of growth.

The South Division of the city stretches south from the Chicago River and east of its South Branch. Here in 1804, the federal government built Fort Dearborn, across the river from the DuSable (then Kinzie) home, to protect the few settlers and secure free movement across the Chicago portage, the vital link between the Great Lakes and the Illinois/Mississippi water system. After the 1812 Fort Dearborn Massacre and the destruction of the Fort, the second Fort Dearborn was built on the same site in 1816.

Due to the commerce generated by the military establishment, the business and financial character of the South Division was established early. This commercial pattern has continued so that today the first elementary school south of the river, the Haines School at 247 West 23rd Street, is encountered at a distance of three and a half miles south of the river. On the north side, the Ogden School is only three/fourths of a mile north of the river.

The West Division began west of the north and south branches of the river and quickly sprawled over the prairie with industry, railroad tracks, working-class housing, and a few pockets of gentry interspersed. It is no wonder that the Great Chicago Fire of 1871 began in the wooden shanty area of DeKoven and Jefferson Streets. After 1900, the near west side was almost totally slums, warehousing, light and medium industry,

and the better residential areas gave way to the encroachment.

The area of interest to this dissertation, the North Division, has historically constituted a distinct educational district. At the time of the community planning which is the subject of this study, the basic geographic division was designated as Chicago Board of Education District Seven. While it technically extends to Roosevelt Road (1200 south), there is no sizable school population until one crosses the river to the north. The District is then confined between Lake Michigan on the east, the river on the south, the north branch on the west, and runs to 3000 North.

The population of Chicago grew from 360 in 1833 to 4,470 in 1840; 112,172 in 1860; and 298,977 in 1870.[2] Two main groups fired the dynamics of Chicago's spectacular growth; both were significant in the development of the North Division. The first, the white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, the WASPs, came from someplace "Back East." They had a command of capital, the business acumen bred through generations of self-sufficient free-holders and colonial merchants, along with the education and social acceptability that enabled them to exploit the ballooning economic opportunities of the prairie. Foreign-born immigrants constituted the second group. The geometrically increasing industrial growth rate created a bottomless need for unskilled labor as the city grew after 1840. Later, American Blacks in vast numbers would follow the European immigrants in answer to this need. The development of relations, or lack of relations, between the WASPs, the various immigrant groups and, ultimately, the American Blacks, is the

real story of the District Seven community.

The separation by the Chicago River of the North Division from the growing commercial section on the south bank made it an attractive, semi-rural residential area in the pre-fire period. The most prominent merchants, professionals and resident speculators lived on the north side streets such as Rush, Pine, Illinois and Cass. In the relatively classless society of early Chicago, John Wentworth could nevertheless refer to "the fashionable people of the North Side."[3] The homes in this area tended to be large, comfortable frame structures set on half-block plots with a cow or two at grass to provide fresh milk for the family children. One of the institutions to set this affluent group apart was the city's first brick church, St. James Episcopal on Kinzie Street, which opened its doors for worship on Easter Sunday, 1837. It would be 1845 before the immigrant-supported Roman Catholic Church of St. Mary's would be able to replace its small frame chapel with a brick structure.[4]

The main immigrant groups that settled the North Division were the Germans, Irish, Swedes, and Italians, in that order. In the original 1837 division of Chicago wards, the fifth ward was the "river ward" running west of Clark to the North Branch and north to the city limits. In 1843, with the ward still sparsely populated and the greatest influx of Irish still seven years away, the population was 30 percent Irish; 15 percent German and 39 percent American born.[5] Most of the Irish had been enticed into the area to work as laborers digging the Illinois-Michigan Canal. When the work on the canal was suspended during the Depression of 1837, they moved into Chicago for work and formed the

city's first major unskilled proletarian labor pool. They settled near factories and mills that had quickly lined the banks of the North Branch following the establishment of Archibald Clybourn's meat packing plant there in 1829. Near it in 1833, Chicago's first lumber mill went into operation.[6]

The Irish patch, called Kilgubbin, (which would continue to be an area of first settlement for successive groups for another twelve decades) extended from Wells to the North Branch fanning out north and south from Chicago Avenue.[7] Contemporary descriptions pictured hastily built wooden shanties, crowded inside and out, set in mud and filth.

The primary institution for the Irish was the Church of the Holy Name at State and Superior, which had been established in 1846 as the chapel of the College of St. Mary of the Lake.[8] It was built to serve the needs of the growing Irish population in the area. In 1870 there were about 700 children in the parochial schools of Holy Name. In the same period, Sunday Schools were held at key locations in the parish for at least 400 children, who would have attended the public schools or have left school early for work.[9]

Fergus's Directory of Chicago noted a "Dutch Settlement, (Common Ninetenth Century generic term for German, Dutch and Belgium) north of Chicago Avenue and east of Clark Street."[10] The fifth ward, which ran east of Clark Street had in its population in 1843, 61 percent native born Americans, 20 percent German and 8 percent Irish.[11] The year 1846 saw the establishment of both St. Paul's German Evangelical Lutheran Church at Ohio and LaSalle Streets, and St. Joseph's German language

Roman Catholic church at Chicago and Wabash Avenues.[12] The Germans were on their way to being the largest immigrant group in Chicago. Compared to their Irish neighbors, the German population had a greater number of skilled craftsmen, large representation of Protestants, a high literacy rate, and orderly domestic virtues. They were well accepted as neighbors by the WASPs.

Another group that was present in the pre-fire period, but hardly accounted for, were the Blacks. There had been a small Black population on the near North Side since the city was incorporated. In 1837 there were twenty Blacks in the sixth ward out of seventy seven in the city; in 1840, eight Blacks out of fifty three in the city; and in 1850, there were 17 Blacks in the North Division with 323 in Chicago.[13] These figures are reflected in the School Census of 1863. The Kinzie listed 1273 pupils and "no colored" (colloquial reference for Blacks); the Franklin, 1011 pupils and "no colored"; the Newberry, 929 and "no colored"; and the Ogden, directly East of the historic Black enclave, 1413 pupils "and 4 colored." It is interesting that the largest Black school group was in the Jones, at Wabash Avenue and Twelfth Street, with 126 "colored" out of 1643 pupils.[14]

Public education had really begun in the North Division with the establishment of a school room at Cass (Wabash) and Kinzie Streets in 1840, in a building not owned by the school district.

> The Trustees of District No. 4 have secured a room at $6 per month, for six months or more and have submitted estimates for furnishing with seats, stoves, necessary utensils, and fuel, amounting to $132. The Inspectors approve of all but $50 for benches, apparatus, etc., believing that in the present condition of the school fund, no appartatus such as is indispensable should be purchased. The Inspectors recommend however, that the School Agent be instructed to pay upon

> the order of the Trustees of the district such amount as they may need, not to exceed $132. The Trustees have selected Mr. Dunbar as a teacher at $400 per annum.[15]

In September of 1835, the town of Chicago had been organized into school districts and the North Side designated as District One. With the city charter of 1837, there was a redistricting and the North Division became Districts Six and Seven. The attendance in District Seven as of November 1, 1837 was 84 pupils. In October, 1840 there was another reorganization and the Fifth and Sixth Wards on the North Side became School District number Four, a designation it would retain for many years.[16]

On March 10, 1842, the Inspectors voted that a school be established in the "Dutch Settlement," provided a house be furnished by the inhabitants. This was modified, however, and the general funds provided $211.02 for materials, the people of the district provided the labor, and they constructed their own school building located on the Green Bay Road (Clark Street) between Chicago and North Avenues, it was called School Number Three, Fourth District, and was continued until the erection of a permanent building in 1846 on the corner of Ohio and LaSalle Streets.[17]

Many early Chicago business leaders showed a significant interest in education. Chicago's representatives to the State Education Convention in Peoria in 1844 constituted a "Who's Who in Business." There is an interesting reference to John S. Wright, founder of The Prairie Farmer, writing a common-school law that was enacted by the Legislature "at the time when the center and south of the state were adverse to such a thing."[18]

In 1845 the City Council declared that school rooms in District Four were wholly inadequate and unfit for the uses to which they were put, with the exception of the "Dutch Settlement." In the School Inspector's report of December 31, 1843, apparently there were three schools in District Four: The Kinzie Street, the Dutch Settlement, and of the other, there is no record. The total number of "scholars" was given as 257. None of these facilities were owned by the city.[19]

The school problem was solved temporarily by accepting William B. Ogden's offer to sell Lots 1, 2, and 3, in Block 20 of Wolcott's Addition to the city, at $950. A school building, forty-five feet by seventy feet and two stories high, was forthwith built on the site at LaSalle and Ohio at a cost of $4,000. It was given the name Kinzie School, or School No. 14. On June 23, 1848, the City Council authorized the purchase from Walter L. Newberry of eight-five feet adjacent to the school lot since the original lot gave only 111 feet of frontage on LaSalle Street.[20]

After the completion of the Kinzie School, the school at "New Buffalo" or the "Dutch Settlement" was discontinued. In January, 1846, a petition signed by residents of that area was submitted to the Council asking for the privilege of opening a German school in the old building to be kept at their expense. They offered to purchase the existing building, but reminded the Council that at the time of its erection the city had supplied the materials but the community had provided the labor. On January 30, 1846 the Council ordered that the school building be deeded to Michael Diversey and Peter Gabel in exchange for $110.00,

payable in twelve months.[21] In July, 1851 approval was given to construct a school at the corner of Division and Sedgwick Streets at a cost not to exceed $4,000. In January, 1852 the school opened as the Franklin School, No. 5. In 1857 it had a principal and five lady assistants, with a branch on Larrabee Street.[22] The site at Division and Sedgwick would have the longest continual use for school purposes of any site in Chicago - 1852-1981.

In February, 1856, purchase was authorized for the site at Elm and Wolcott (State) Streets, at a price not to exceed $9,000; here the Sheldon School would be built. Later that year the site at Chestnut and State Streets was purchased for $11,790.79; the Ogden School was constructed here, opening in 1857 as School No. 10.[23]

The Newberry School building was erected in 1858 at the corner of Orchard and Willow Streets on ground purchased from Walter L. Newberry; its predecessor had been known as a "Branch of Franklin." Newberry contained twenty-three rooms, including an assembly hall, and had seating for 1,440 pupils. This was followed by the construction of the Pearson Street Primary at Pearson and Market (Orleans) Streets; the Elm Street Primary in 1868 at Rush and Elm Streets at a cost of $20,000; the LaSalle Street Primary at Clark Street and North Avenue; and the Lincoln School in 1870 at Kemper and Larrabee Streets.[24]

The German population was most insistent that their children have access to their cultural heritage by being able to read and write German and speak it properly. In response to community demands, German as a subject or as the language of instruction was introduced into Franklin and Newberry Schools in 1866; Kinzie in 1868; LaSalle Street Primary in

1870; Lincoln in January, 1871; and Ogden in September, 1871.[25] In 1870 eight German teachers were instructing 2,597 pupils.[26]

The use of German as the language of instuction reflects the thorough German ethnicity of much of the area, the type of pressures brought by the German community to maintain its social and cultural exclusiveness, and the attempt by the schools to meet the needs of this vocal segment of the population.

The tremendous efforts, financial and political, that had gone into the expansion of the school system were virtually wiped out in the Great Fire of October 8, 9, and 10, 1871. In the North Division, only the Newberry and the Lincoln schools survived. Immediately after the Fire, they were used to shelter hundreds of displaced and homeless fire victims. Classes were not resumed until November 13, 1871.[27]

During this formative period, Central High School, Chicago's first high school, had been founded in 1856 and located at Madison and Halsted Streets.[28] It serviced the entire city. With the continual expansion of population, it became severely overcrowed in the 1860's. An experiment bred more by necessity than direction was launched. In 1869, four high school branches were established. Students could complete the ninth grade in their own section of the city, and if they wished to continue their education, could then transfer to Central for the three remaining years. It might be noted that in 1870, while 9 percent of the total city population was enrolled in the elementary schools, only 0.002 percent were in the high schools.[29]

The North Side high school classes were held in a room at the

Franklin School. The first class consisted of thirty-nine students who studied under Miss Corrie A. DeClerq. Miss Sophia Cornient taught German on a part-time basis. She taught at all four branches.[30]

While the Board of Education report of 1870 mentions the experiment as being "successfully tried," further expansion of the program had to wait until 1874 since the Franklin School was one of those destroyed in the Fire.[31]

To summarize the formation period, it contains the embryonic beginning of all the factors that will affect the schools in District Seven: the beginnings of distinct social and economic classes; constant pressure for better schools and more facilities in the right places, with never enough money in the School Board funds to satisfy all the needs; and some obvious pressures reflecting special interests.

Fire of 1871 to World War II

The trauma and destruction of the Fire, with its enormous capital loss and human tragedy, would have profound effects on the future development of the city. Rather than dampen the "I will" (City Motto) spirit, the adversities served to charge it. The factors of geographic site were so dominant that even its condition as a temporary wasteland could not obliterate Chicago's role of the prime axis of middle America. All classes acted either consciously or instinctively on the premise that the city could go no place but up, both literally and figuratively.

The Fire had burnt out much of the city's frontier character. Gone were most of the quick-built balloon frame structures; they would be replaced by brick "fire-proof" buildings. Also gone was the slurred

division and relatively easy-going relationship between the "haves" and the "have nots", another characteristic of frontier society. The well-to-do had been insured: they rebuilt their businessess and were ready to take advantage of the economic expansion. The working classes were wiped out. They had to try to rebuild in the face of a national depression. The frontier dreams of everyone having a chance to "make it big" faded, as most fell into the permanent role of wage earners rather than capitalists. The modern urban Chicago was born.

The Board of Education faced substantial problems in the post-Fire period. Taxes and rents on school land were uncollectable or discounted. Chicago's population in 1870 had been 298,977, of which 38,939 were in the public schools; by 1880, the population was 503,185 with 59,562 in the schools.[32] This rapid rise in the population coupled with the loss of one-third of the school buildings in the fire posed an almost unsurmountable challenge. It would be almost 90 years before the Board's building program could begin to catch up with need.

In the North Division, the following schools were rebuilt between 1872 and 1874: Kinzie, Franklin, Ogden and Pearson Street Primary schools; Sheldon (the former Elm Street Primary) and Vedder Street (later the Manierre). The new and replaced schools built by the mid-1880s were LaSalle, 1880; Jenner, 1880; North Division High School, 1883; Ogden, 1884; Franklin, 1884; and the Thomas Hoyne, 1885 at the corner of Wabash and Illinois Streets.[33] It was almost three years after the Fire before the high schools were reopened.

In 1874, the branch high schools were officially designated as high schools, and all high schools, including Central, began to offer

two-year terminal programs. Central offered two additional years for all students who wished to complete a four-year course of study.[34]

In 1875, the North Division High School moved to Sheldon School at the corner of State and Elm Streets with a staff of two full time teachers and a principal.[35] During the first year as a separate high school, North Division admitted 130 students. Of these, fifty two left during the year. The first graduating class in June, 1876, was comprised of twenty-one students.[36]

The first principal was Francis Hanford. His tenure was brief. He was murdered on August 7, 1876, by Alexander Sullivan, Secretary of the Board of Public Works, over a dispute growing out of a stormy school board election.[37] Henry H. Belfield was appointed the second principal, and by 1877-78, the faculty had increased to six, the number admitted to 260, and the number of graduates from the two-year program to sixty-five.[38]

In 1880-81, Central High School was discontinued and the division high schools, including North Division, were all made four -year schools.[39] However, into the third decade of the twentieth century, the two-year terminal programs still attracted large percentages of the students. In 1892-93 Board Proceedings lists the North Division High School graduates as sixteen for the Classic Course, all male; and seventy from the General two year course, all female.[40]

In 1886, North Division High School was the first in the city to introduce a course in Manual Training and Woodworking. Initially a one-year program, it was extended in 1887 to two years. The principal, Mr.

Belfield, was hired away from the school system the following year to head the new Chicago Manual Training School funded by Marshall Field, Richard Crane, and other business leaders.[41]

In 1881, the site on the northeast corner of Wendell and Wells Streets was purchased for $23,760 to erect a high school building.[42] This building was completed and occupied in September, 1883. In that year, the site would have been relatively convenient to the German Community. However, a note on school planning and the German movement north and northwest is found in the superintendent's recommendations on facilities in 1893.

> For several years the Franklin School has been overcrowded, six divisions being placed in the basements, which are poorly ventilated and undesirable as school rooms. There are eight divisions of pupils who can attend school only half day. The Oak Street School is overcrowded, having double divisions. The North Division High School building is suitably located to relieve the Franklin and Oak Street schools. The building is not well adapted to high school purposes and a large majority of the students come from points further north. I therefore recommend that a suitable site be obtained in the vicinity of Lincoln Park and a building be erected for the North Division High School, and that the present building, corner Wells and Wendell Streets, be made a primary school.[43]

In 1895 the Board received the report of the purchase for $50,000 of a lot 297.5 feet by 125 feet on the northeast corner of Orchard Street and Center (Armitage) Avenue for $50,000.[44] Although each subsequent Board Report pointed up the great need for a new high school, the Board did not advertise for building bids until May 4, 1898.[45]

The contract was awarded on May 17, 1899 for a twenty room school at the estimated cost of $150,000.[46] At the Board meeting the following month, the name was officially changed from North Division High School to Robert A. Waller High School to honor the recently deceased

civic leader, realtor, city clerk and member of the Lincoln Park Board of Commission, whose family developed Alta Vista Terrace.

On May 13, 1901, the Waller school at Orchard and Armitage was opened, although it was not completed for several more years. Increased enrollment in the 1930s led to an addition at the north end, the "new building," which was opened in 1938. This had the effect of relocating the main entrance and the administrative offices. In 1960 a second addition, which extended the school north to Dickens Street, provided a new auditorium, lunchroom, and music rooms. Some general rehabilitation was also done in the 1960s.

Many factors, beyond the simple fact of who lived in the particular area, governed which children actually attended the public schools. The area east of Wells and north to Lincoln Park continued to be largely the province of the "upper class" establishment. The descriptive label "Gold Coast" has been apt for over one hundred years.[47] In 1893, 72 percent of the voters in this area were native born Americans, compared to 34 percent west of Wells Street[48] The earliest registers of this area provided the most listings of the socially acceptable in the city.

All evidence shows that there has never been any meaningful relationship between the east and west sections of the Near North Side. The establishment has always had its own character, churches, customs, and institutions. In the time period between the Fire and World War II, these institutions had come to include a number of private schools, both primary and secondary. The truly affluent have not been part of the public high school using community; the McCormick and Farwell children in 1890 would not have gone to North Division High School any more than

would the children of Adlai Stevenson III or Marshall Field V have attended the Waller High School of the 1960s.

The real school using population, particularly at the high school level, continued to be the ethnic middle and working classes, in that order. The German population clearly constituted the dominant group in the area. In the five wards represented, 27 percent of the registered voters were German-born (representing 52 percent of all foreign-born voters) while 48 percent were American-born, but heavily first-generation German-Americans.[49] The German community was the largest single group actively concerned with public school issues. Group pressure had been used from the late 1860's onward to perpetuate German as the language of instruction in some schools and as a foreign language option in others. There were near riots in 1887 when an attempt was made to pass a State Law prohibiting the teaching of any foreign language.[50] In 1892 and '93, the public schools had 242 German language teachers with 35,547 students studying the language, representing 27 percent of all students enrolled.[51] While the German community self-consciously maintained group identity, it was diverse economically. The group placed a high value on education, and a significant percentage of the middle class who could afford to leave their children in school came from the German community. Hence the majority of high school students in the District came from this group.

In 1907-08, according to the ethnic survey in the Board Proceedings, North Division High School had a membership of 565[52] compared to 568 in 1896-97.[53] Of these 58 percent were listed as German (of the Germans: 15 percent were German-born; 37 percent were first generation;

and 50 percent had American-born parents). The next largest group was listed as American with ninety-one or 16 percent of the total; then sixty-four Swedish or 11 percent; the Irish had sixteen students with 2.8 percent of the total; and Italian, eight students representing 1.4 percent of school membership. Analysis of school records from 1913-18 shows much the same breakdown.

In 1893, the Irish, with only 3 percent of the registered voters in the area, were the second largest national group. A distinctly Irish area on the lower north side remained until just after the First World War. The dispersal resulted from pressures from other groups, particularly the Italians. The Irish, as old settlers, could afford to move into newer areas further north and northwest. The change was not foreseen and in 1904, St. Dominic's parish was established at Locust and Orleans to take the pressure off Holy Name. It was to service the Irish, who made up the bulk of the English language Catholics in the area from Division to Erie and Franklin west to the River; in 1904 the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (BVM) nuns had 978 children enrolled in their parish school. The following quotation is an interesting comment on neighborhood change, the departure of the Irish, and the long term group separatism in the area.

> During its short existence of scarcely sixteen years, St. Dominic's Parish has undergone a radical transformation. This locality has been invaded by factories and by an Italian population, thus causing the original members of the parish to seek places of residence in parishes further north. Thus, while in the beginning this parish could count nearly one thousand families as members, today the number of families has dwindled down to less than two hundred and fifty. However, there are at present 560 children enrolled in school, but many of these are of Italian parentage, and not a few also, of parents of other nationalities.[54]

As mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation, the Irish figure very insignificantly in the public school statistics because the vast majority attended parochial elementary schools, the parents being directed to use the church-connected schools or risk committing grave sin. While the numbers who continued into high school were probably proportionate to the public schools, they would have attended St. Ignatius, St. Vincent's Academy, St. Mary's for Girls, St. Michael's, Holy Name or one of the many parish high schools, such as St. Alphonsus. Irish educational separatism was very thoroughgoing.

The third major group in terms of chronological order of settlement were the Swedish. By 1893, parts of Irish Kilgubbin had become Swedetown with 32 percent of the registered voters in the 23rd ward (the original 5th) being Swedish born.[55] The Swedes had arrived in significant numbers from the mid-1860's on, but had essentially left the lower north side by about 1910 for areas further north and northwest.

The Italians were the last significant European group to settle in the area. In the early 1880's they were slowly establishing a foothold on the south end of the 23rd ward (west of LaSalle Street). By the 1910's they had essentially displaced the Irish and the Swedes and the colloquial name for the area changed from Kilgubbin and Swedetown to Little Sicily.

The first Italian-language parish was organized in 1881 and the Church of the Assumption at Orleans and Illinois, the mother church of northside Italians, was dedicated in 1886. Because of the great growth of the Italian population, St. Philip Benizi, Italian language

parish, was founded in 1904 at Oak and Cambridge.[56]

The Italians, not having a tradition of parochial education, made much greater use of the public schools than the Irish. St. Philip Benizi's parochial school had only 200 students in 1919, but there were 1,000 children in the Sunday school.[57] The Jenner School, for example, was almost 100 percent Italian. The University of Chicago sociologist Harvey Zorbaugh comments in The Gold Coast and the Slums that "By an almost imperceptible pressure the Italians are forcing the Negro children out of the Jenner School."[58] It is interesting to note that due to the movement of the Black population, the Jenner School was 100 percent Black by the 1960s.

The Italian Community on the North Side lasted through World War II. However, post-war urban changes essentially swept it away leaving only a few scattered pockets in the area.

There had always been a Black population on the North side centering in the area of Chicago Avenue and Wells. In 1910 the Black population of Chicago was 44,103, with 744 in the North Division.[59] Between 1914 and 1918, the combination of Jim Crow in the south and war jobs with high wages in the north produced a migration of Blacks from the south that brought the Chicago Black population to 109,594 in 1920, an increase of 148.5 percent.[60] In 1920 the Black population on the Near North side was 1,050.[61] A contemporary description provides perspective on the Black neighborhood of that period:

> On the North side, negroes live among foreign whites and near a residence area of wealthy Chicagoans. Their first appearance occasioned little notice or objection, since they were generally house

> and cross streets connecting them... The present neighbors of Negroes are Italians as indicated by the population changes, the neighborhood is old and run down and the reasons given by Negroes for living there are low rents and proximity to the manufacturing plants where they work. . . . In this neighborhood friendly relations exist between the Sicilians, who predominate, and their Negro neighbors.[62]

By 1925, the situation was changing. The Blacks, population of several thousand, were beginning to push Little Sicily further North. Eighty-nine percent of the Black population were American migrants from the rural South who were duplicating the historical pattern of using the always poverty-ridden, but increasingly more worn-out neighborhood as an area of first settlement. Until World War II, however, the population figures remained relatively stable.

This dissertation does not want to suggest that the North Division was solely a mixture of Irish, Germans, Swedes, Italians, Blacks and wealthy WASPs. It was and still is a melting-pot of races and peoples: orientals of all nationalities, Hungarians, Mexicans, Poles, American transients, Greeks, Russians and Russian Jews, and even a Persian colony around Erie and Clark. However, as late as 1940, the greatest number of foreign-born residents were from Germany, Italy, and Ireland.[63] With some natural shifting and pressure responses, the neighborhood remained an area of first settlement into the early 1950's.

Important to this study is the need to know which children attended the public schools in the area. It has been stated that school attendance was determined by 1) economics - private schools for the Gold Coast; early school-leaving ages for the children of working class immigrants; high school, and sometimes beyond, for the more established middle class groups, such as the Germans; 2) tradition - Roman Catho-

lics, particularly Irish tended to use Catholic parish elementary schools, and Catholic high schools if available and economically feasible; and 3) the School Attendance and Child Labor Laws.

Through the turn of the century, the majority of students left school before age fourteen to learn a trade or simply to go to work. The Newberry School, for example, reports membership at the close of September, 1871, as 971 pupils; December, 1871 as 1066; October, 1872, 1522; and December, 1875 (by which time the schools destroyed by the fire had been replaced) as the least of the period, 1115. Yet for the twenty-one years from 1858 through 1879, a total of just two hundred and twenty-eight pupils were admitted from its highest grade to the high school.[64]

It was only in 1883 that the State of Illinois passed a compulsory school attendance law making twelve weeks of school a year mandatory for those between eight and fourteen years old. In 1889, the Legislature passed a new compulsory school law which changed the lower age to seven and stipulated that eight weeks of the required sixteen weeks had to be consecutive. In 1891, Illinois passed the first child labor law, partly designed to keep younger children out of the labor market and in school.[65]

Even the Illinois School Code of 1893, whick made school attendance compulsory between the ages of seven and sixteen with 180 consecutive days of attendance, could not change the economic practice of having children become wage earners as early as possible. Effective enforcement of the school attendance and extension of the child labor laws did not come until well into the twentieth century. In 1894 there

were 731 students in the first year of high school out of a total school system enrollment of 180,000, or 0.004 percent.[66]

As the city-wide high school enrollment figures demonstrate, the economics of the Depression of 1929 made schooling beyond elementary level attractive to the working and/or immigrant classes. When the reservoir of unskilled jobs for young workers virtually dried up, the short term advantages of early school leaving disappeared and the long term hope of better jobs with more education became more attractive.

The old North Division, on the eve of World War II, had two high schools, Waller (the old North Division), and a vocational high school component of Washburne Trade School at Sedgewick and Division Streets. The elementary schools had decreased since the 1890s reflecting major population movement. Gone were the Hoyne at Wabash Avenue and Illinois Street; the Kinzie at LaSalle and Ohio Streets; the Huron Street Primary on Franklin Street; the Pearson Street School; and the Sheldon School at State and Elm Streets. By the mid-nineteen-twenties, the almost total change to commercial use of the area south of Chicago Avenue was reflected in this disappearance of neighborhood schools.

The District Seven area housing was best described as old, tired, and over-used, with much of it sub-standard. The only new residential construction had been the 1920 luxury high-rises on Lake Shore Drive. The school buildings were mainly forty to seventy years old. The Depression and the resultant school financial problems slowed school building replacement. The Board of Education's building funds had never adequately kept up with the school facility demands that resulted from the

housing construction boom that had been gobbling up the prairies on the city's outskirts; funds for replacement of existing older buildings were non-existent.

The Board's response to the needs of the lower North Side and the nature of that community's input and involvement through the first four decades of the century are well illustrated by Zorbaugh in the following, regarding Board attempts to establish community centers in the schools just after World War I:

> Little needs to be said of the relationship of the school to the local life of the North Side; there is none. The schools, centrally directed and standardized, are interested in turning out "Americans" at so many per year[,] not making adaptations to the problems and needs of a Little Sicily, a gang world, or a life in furnished rooms.
>
> The attitude of the Board of Education practically killed the school community center movement! As we have seen in the case of Little Sicily, the schools rather created local problems than adjusted or controlled them. Outside of the Gold Coast, with its private schools, there is not a parent-teachers association within the entire Near North Side. The school in this area is no longer a community institution.[67]

Zorbaugh's own footnote to this statement was:

> The attitude of the Board of Education to the problem of the local community is illustrated by the reply of an Assistant Superintendant of Schools to a north side social worker who asked for his help in studying a disorganizing gang situation: 'My dear woman, why worry about such things? You have more important things to do in giving baskets and helping the poor.'[68]

Another comment on lack of community cohesiveness as seen in the 1920's is as follows:

> The only issues that brought out numbers for community meetings were those affecting property values...and then only people from the Gold Coast. . . . It is impossible either to discover or create local issues that will bring out a response from the so-called "community" as a whole.[69]

These may be seen now as foreshadowings of greater problems to

come in school-community relations. Evidence has been given to support the statement that the school system was not community responsive, and that, concurrently, the District Seven "community" was, by 1940, made up of mutually exclusive populations, having opposing interests. It will also be shown that property values and related issues will be strong motivations for some of the community action that constitutes the subject of this dissertation.

Over the seventy-year period discussed, the school's role in society had become more complex, and increasingly more confused. In 1871, society's expectations of the school had been simple. The school was to teach -- successfully -- reading, writing, and arithmetic, plus history and geography, the subjects of social value. The school was to develop and reinforce the civic and work virtues. That, essentially, was that.

Then gradually, one after another, programs and facilities had been added to meet the expanding demands society made of the school: manual training; evening school; truant officers enforcing compulsory attendance; school libraries; school lunches; "social adjustment" rooms; physical education; baths in schools; laboratory science; military training; involvement in student welfare and community affairs; education of the physically and developmentally handicapped; entire social adjustment schools. These were only some of the specific charges to which the schools had responded by World War II.

School facility planning, wed to the "neighborhood school" concept, continued as a function carried out exclusively by Board staff. There is no evidence of significant community participation in the North

Division after the time of the "Dutch Settlement," when householders had acted directly to influence local education by obtaining from the Board the materials with which they constructed their own school.

North Division - 1940 to 1975

The preceding sections of this chapter have provided the history of population patterns and trends in Chicago's North Division over a hundred-year period, paralleled by Board of Education efforts to provide educational facilities for the area.

The purpose of this concluding section on the area's history is to provide a clear description of the "community" as it entered the time period which is the focus of this study, the "community" which beginning in 1968 was to be a participant in the Board's planning for school facilities. No discussion of community involvement can be meaningful without an understanding of the radical population shifts which occurred in the area between 1940 and 1970. The results of these shifts would add new dimensions to the problems of school facility planning.

To maintain consistency with reference to the Board jurisdictional area which is the focus of subseqent chapters, the "North Division" is hereafter referred to as "District Seven." In reference to Waller High School, distinction is made between the "school using" population and the population in the balance of District Seven.

The statistical analysis of community is based on two sources: the Census Tract tables for 1940, 1950, 1960, and 1970,[70] published by the Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce; and the Waller High School Demographic-Racial Maps prepared for 1970 and 1974 by

the individual school for the Chicago Board of Education, Department of Facilities Planning.

To determine the appropriate tracts, the Waller High School attendance area, which was essentially the same as the District Seven boundaries of 1970, was compared to the census tract mapping for the same area. Thirty census tracts and parts of nine other census tracts were found to be entirely contained within the area of the school district. For all cumulative totals, one-half of the particular figure was taken for the tracts partially included. All thirty-nine tracts were included in the district figures.

Enrollment figures for Waller students in the various census tract areas were taken from the Demographic Racial Maps for Waller High School. By overlaying the Waller enrollment on the thirty-nine census tracts, it was found that approximately 85 percent of that enrollment came from only thirteen of the thirty-nine census tracts.

For purposes of statistical analysis, these thirteen tracts have been made a sub-group, the "School Using" area. A statistical comparison was made of these thirteen tracts with the overall district and with the city as a whole, to provide a well-rounded factual picture of the community and students actually served by Waller High School in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

A comparison of District and School Using populations adds dimension to understanding of changes in the Waller High School community. Total District population may be seen to have declined by 23 percent in the thirty year period, and that of the School Using Area by 20 percent.

However, within that period the White population of the District declined by 40 percent, that of the School Using area by 59 percent.

The substantial increase in the Black population which occurred between 1940 and 1970 is dramatically illustrated in Table 2, following.

TABLE 2

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL USER AREA

POPULATION AND RACE, 1940 TO 1970

	1940	1950	1960	1970	% Change 1940 -70
			District Seven		
Totals	166,214	175,828	155,618	130,172	-23
White	161,787	158,417	131,786	97,289	-40
Black	3,883	13,982	19,501	27,247	+702
Spanish Lang.	[not given]			[12,461]	
Puerto Rican	[not given]		[3,911]	[6,585]	
Other	544	3,429	4,331	5,636	+1,036
			School-User Areas		
Totals	66,070	73,156	66,017	53,242	-20
White	62,181	58,448	45,456	25,768	-58
Black	3,630	13,250	18,608	25,507	+703
Puerto Rican			[2,471]	[4,086]	
Other	259	1,458	1,953	1,967	+759

[Bracketed figures included in White count.]

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Population Census Tracts Chicago SMSA, Sixteenth Census, 1940; Seventeenth Census, 1950; Eighteenth Census, 1960; and Nineteenth Census, 1970.

The Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) played a role in providing area public housing which, as a reflection of economic criteria, would come to be occupied by Blacks.[71] The CHA Cabrini Townhouses with 581

units were completed in 1943 in the area of the historic North Side Black community on West Chicago Avenue, and apparently filled the needs of area residents.

The 360 percent increase in the Black population between 1940 and 1950 had much the same cause as the 1910-20 increase. The attraction of war work in the North coupled with poor social and economic conditions in the South produced a true migration of southern Blacks. Chicago, at the end of the Illinois Central Railroad, had plentiful jobs, a diverse economy that needed unskilled labor, and a substantial Black population to provide community. It was one of the main destinations for the migration. The impact of the gross numbers of new arrivals was felt in the lower North Side as in all other Chicago Black communities.

The Cabrini Extension, completed in 1958, provided an additional 1,896 public housing units, and the Green Homes, completed in 1962, added 1,092 more. As Black families moved into these units, school statistics came to reflect both the direct effect of their numbers and the indirect effect of a White exodus from the area. Partly due to ingrained racial and ethnic prejudice, and partly to the natural and economically feasible desire for better and newer housing, the more mobile white working class families were abandoning the District for more removed areas of the city and the suburbs.

A further assault on the racial/ethnic/economic balance of the area population was the type of housing being constructed on land cleared after 1960 by the Chicago Department of Urban Renewal in the eastern part of the District. Many small townhouse developments were

fitted onto small sites north of North Avenue. Extending between LaSalle Street and Clark Street directly south of North Avenue, a mixed residential development, Sandburg Village, provided block after block of new apartments and townhouses. The majority of these new units were unsuited to families with school-age children. They attracted working adults, unmarried individuals, childless couples of all ages, or those whose space demands did not yet include room for growing children. The trend in occupancy of the new units was toward those who could afford the expensive square footage prices for rental or purchase.

With the increase of the Black population, the social character of the area was greatly altered by the loss of the white ethnic population. This group, including the Germans, Italians, Irish and others, continued through the early 1950s to provide a stable, heterogeneous, family-oriented tone to the neighborhoods. In 1940, twenty-four percent of the total population of District Seven was foreign-born compared to six percent in the city as a whole. There had been a sixty-eight percent decline in the number of foreign-born residents by 1970; they represented seven percent of the area's total population, although the percentage in the city as a whole had only declined one percent in thirty years.

In 1950 the School Using area was heavily white working class. The contrast between median family income in this area and that for the balance of District Seven was slight: 87 percent compared to 90 percent. By 1970, the District exclusive of the School User area showed 128 percent of the Chicago median family income; the School Using areas ninety percent; and the Black and Spanish-speaking populations of the

area seventy-six percent. One begins to see more clearly that in matters of economic and property interest, the non-school-using area, that is, Old Town, the Gold Coast, and Lincoln Park, will have a very different agenda for school planning than the Black and Hispanic School User population. In 1963, Waller High School was 66 per cent white, 28 percent Black and 6.4 percent other; in 1972, 12 percent white, 66 percent Black and 21 percent Hispanic.[72]

An analysis of the full range of census tables for 1970 provided clearly differentiated profiles resulting in the identification of two main groups.

The adult resident of the School Using area was most likely Black or Hispanic, had limited schooling, was economically disadvantaged, lived in a family with a high proportion of children to adults, was likely to be unemployed and/or a single head of household, and lived in either sub-standard older housing or a CHA unit.

The adult resident of the non-School-Using area, the balance of the District, was most likely white, had had at least the median years of education for the city, was employed (80 percent of the total population of the non-School-User area was employed), had no or few children in the household, lived in housing costing well above the city median, and had an income also well above the city median.

When representatives from these two groups came together in August, 1968, to join in planning school facilities and curriculum for secondary education in Chicago District Seven, this dissertation was provided with its essential content.

CHAPTER III

COMMUNITY ACTION

The preceding chapter has provided historical perspective on the multi-decade changes in the community areas that constitute District Seven, Chicago Public Schools. The delineation of population changes leading to the community profile of 1970 provides a meaningful background for the community actions which are the focus of this chapter.

Past Attempts at Improvement

We have seen that the greatest thrusts of school planning involved 100 years of "catch up" in an effort to provide sufficient capacity for ever-expanding land development and ever-increasing numbers of students. Traditionally, community or public involvement had taken the form of special interest petitioning. These petitions related to area demands for more school facilities and also specific improvements in existing facilities. Lighting, sanitation, and ventilation had been major areas of parent concern. Community groups had, over many years, also directly influenced curriculum. For decades, the German community successfully pressured the Board to expand instruction in the German language. Business leaders, notably Richard Crane and Marshall Field, had also

influenced the Board first to establish and then to expand manual training programs, as discussed in Chapter 2.

However, there is no evidence that area community groups were formally involved in pre-planning for facility development. The experiment in direct community involvement in planning which is the subject of this dissertation reflects the more complicated demands upon urban educational systems that developed in the racial, social and educational maelstrom of the 1960's.

Financial decisions related to local school facilities were made at Board staff level with concurrence from the Board, which in turn often received political pressure, particularly in reference to site choices.

An example of the local school being removed from any actual control of planning and implementation can be seen in the minutes for the Waller PTA for May 18, 1954.[1] The principal of the school, Miss Nellie Quinn, had received and reported on correspondence with a local editor, Mr. Siegel of the Northtown Economist. Mr. Siegel had written that he had received assurances from State Senator Edward Saltiel that an auditorium could be built for $200,000. General Superintendent of Schools Benjamin Willis had stated that if money could be saved on other construction, the addition might be started in October, 1954. The addition housing an auditorium was eventually completed in September, 1961, at a total cost of $1,200,000.

Another example suggests that clear criteria were lacking for determination of facilities' needs and locations. Plans for purchasing

buildings west of Waller High School were discussed in the PTA meeting of September 20, 1955. This was confirmed during the October 18 meeting of the Waller PTA by Dr. Thaddeus Lubera.[2] He projected that Waller's student population would double by 1961, thus a new building should be constructed west of the existing building on Orchard Street. A new building was constructed at 2021 Burling Street, opening in 1962, but it was designated as an upper grade center.[3]

In 1957 the Chicago Zoning Ordinances were amended.[4] These changes allowed many older neighborhoods to be surveyed for possible renovation and rehabilitation. Since there was Federal money available for urban renewal, many older communities took a careful look at their situation. Cleared land could mean new buildings and a change in the number of children for the schools. Eventually the Department of Development and Planning was able to complete the "Comprehensive Plan of Chicago."[5] This freed up land upon which new schools and other city facilities could be built.

A major change seen in the city since 1964 was in the attempt of city government to involve local citizens in the planning for their own communities in both school and non-school matters. This was done for a number of reasons, some political, some practical and some required by the Federal Government. The last was most important for the older neighborhoods, since without local planning, no money would be forthcoming either to the city or directly to local residents for rehabilitation of individual properties from Federal funds. Local banks also became involved.

Organized city planning with community involvement allowed the Chicago Board of Education to do some meaningful planning of its own. Dr. Donald J. Leu and Dr. I. Carl Candoli were retained on a contract beginning in June, 1967 to assess the properties, facilities, and financial capacity of the Chicago Board of Education along with the academic and vocational curricula from kindergarten through high school, in terms of the needs of the total community and the Federal requirements for racial integration of students and faculties.[6]

What facilities, located where, offering what programs, to what array of learners enrolled on what basis, would meet the changed and changing needs of Chicago into the 1970's and beyond? Community groups as well as education professionals would be involved in developing answers to those questions. For the first time in the history of the Chicago public school system, a process was outlined which would formally include users of the system in planning for the system. Public participation was to be part of that process both at the level of needs assessment and later in the selection among options proposed for meeting the community-defined needs.

The first report of Drs. Leu and Candoli, published and circulated in February, 1968, aimed to provide direction for future Board planning and implementation. Anticipating a pattern which could be applied system-wide, it was titled "A Feasibility Study of the 'Cultural-Educational Park' for Chicago." The concept of such a park was advanced by Drs. Leu and Candoli as a valuable tool in reversing the segregation of metropolitan school systems, and in promoting quality education for all

participants. Subsequent volumes would not, the consultants emphasized, propose definitive answers but would form the basis for continuous planning, with built-in criteria for revising, up-dating and making major revisions if necessary.[7]

In the introduction to this initial report, Drs. Leu and Candoli thanked the many people they had consulted when making their preliminary review of educational needs. Those named included eighteen members of the Chicago Board of Education staff, ten persons identified as Chicago area consultants and fourteen other consultants from out of the state. Nowhere was mention made of field administrators, teachers, parents, students or home community people who may have been part of the input.

Leu-Candoli Plan is Introduced

The Leu-Candoli Planning study had been presented to the Chicago Board of Education in early 1968, at a time when the system was under severe stress and criticism. A public presentation of the consultants' proposals as they might be implemented in District Seven was scheduled for an open meeting later that summer.

The Board of Education asked the local organizations in the communities of Near North and Lincoln Park to work with them. District Seven was comprised of the richest and poorest sections of the city with a large run down section that was being cleared to make room for new housing. Thus before the Board of Education triggered District-wide community planning with the Leu-Candoli Report, the battle lines had been drawn. Massive urban renewal had been initiated in the late nineteen-fifties with the building of nearly three thousand units in the

Cabrini-Green public housing project. When originally planned it was to have been a model of integrated housing. It opened on that basis but soon became all Black and Hispanic, and then all Black. The area east of there, from Clark Street to LaSalle Street and from Division Street to North Avenue, was virtually cleared of existing buildings and Sandburg Village was created. This private project became predominantly white. Rents were relatively expensive.

When urban renewal began in the area north of North Avenue, the Lincoln Park Conservation Association (LPCA) was very concerned that the mistakes they saw being made in neighborhoods throughout the city not be repeated. Their concerns were many and valid. They wanted to preserve the best of the housing stock and improve that as much as possible. They were very concerned about density of population. They carefully watched the issuance of permits, both on renovation and on new buildings. As an association, they became the unofficial guardian of urban open space.

A few buildings in the Lincoln Park area predated the Chicago fire. Some had been poorly built immediately after the fire as replacement for those lost. The bulk of the housing was erected between 1885 and 1905. Most of these were of brick construction and, if they had been decently maintained, were in fairly good shape in the late nineteen-sixties.

The problem of high rise buildings was a major one. North Clark Street, Lincoln Park West, and Lake Shore Drive were solid with high rise construction. As developers were able to obtain older houses and

three-story apartment buildings, they razed them and built tall buildings. Since transportation to the Loop was excellent and since the park and beaches were available, apartments were filled as soon as they opened; many were occupied floor by floor as they were finished. As the developers bought properties west of these streets, the LPCA watched each permit so they could block any new large multi-occupant building.

This was a very serious problem. In the early nineteen-fifties a brick three-flat building could often be bought for taxes or at a low price. Many went for $4,000 to $5,000. Some people managed to buy two or three in a row. The LPCA reasoned that if these combined lots were allowed to go to development above three floors, the density would be increased to an undesirable number and the quality of the new buildings would not match that of the older structures. Over the years, the association did very well in keeping out high rises.

They were defeated by zoning ordinances, however, in the construction of some buildings that came to be known as four-plus-ones. Most communities were zoned to keep out any building higher than three stories. In addition, such ordinances required that there be a certain amount of space between the lot line (usually the back of the sidewalk) and the walls of the buildings. Some developers got around this by building a parking area about four feet below grade and then building four stories which met the maximum height requirement. They used another loophole to build from lot line to lot line. These buildings usually consisted of one and two-bedroom apartments. Thus both the density and the transient nature of occupancy were increased.

The LPCA also took a hard look at the institutions within its boundaries. There were many hospitals, one university and one seminary, three high schools and numerous elementary schools. The association also watched the business community very closely for zoning violations.

In these dealings with the real estate developers, the association tried to apply existing laws as a first line of defense against what they perceived as violations of their goal of creating a stable community. Zoning ordinances, school boundaries, licensing laws, parking regulations and even mortgage regulations were used to try to keep the neighborhood intact.

When the LPCA saw things happening that did not fit into the overall plan they brought pressure both at the community level and at the level of City. Since seven neighborhood associations were affiliated with LPCA, they were very efficient in making their views known. More important was the fact that they were usually successful in the neighborhood, the news media and on the political scene.

The LPCA did represent most of the people in Lincoln Park but they were not without some organized opposition. This usually took the form of a special interest group which would have a fairly simple objection, usually one with which the LPCA could deal.

A concern which became most sensitive in the late nineteen-sixties was the effect of urban renewal on the area, and how it affected the poor. Those affected were mostly Hispanics and Blacks with low incomes who rented sub-standard housing in the area. Under urban renewal they would be displaced as the housing was either rehabilitated or razed. A

number of church groups became involved when their members or the people who lived in their neighborhoods were affected. The LPCA was perceived by the opposition as getting rid of the poor, because of racial prejudice, in order that high-priced housing could be built.

When the Leu-Candoli report was introduced, these two opposing sides came to the forefront, since schooling was so important to the viability of a neighborhood. As the District Seven planning group was formed, one organization, the North Side Cooperative Ministry (NSCM), an organization opposed to the LPCA, tried to take the leadership.

The NSCM consisted of a group of twenty-six churches in the Lincoln Park and Lake View areas who joined together to act as a coalition in opposition to many concepts viewed as conservative. A majority of the members lived in Lincoln Park; some were also members of the LPCA.

The first public meeting convened to discuss education planning in District Seven was held in the auditorium of Waller High School on August 8, 1968. Dr. Donald Leu and Dr. Bessie Lawrence, Superintendent of District 7, jointly presented an overview of the feasibility study and the Board planning process, to include continuing public input. In attendance were interested individuals from the area served by District Seven, and approximately 125 representatives of various community groups, the NSCM and the LPCA. Dr. Leu closed his formal presentation with the statement that the plan was suggested as a basic starting point for community input. He expressed the hope that an advisory committee could be started soon so the planning process could begin.[8]

Before Dr. Lawrence could open the meeting to questions, there

were several rude and obscene remarks from one man who stated that the group had done this before, to no avail. It took some time to bring the meeting back to order. It appeared that strong adversary positions had been drawn by members of the NSCM against any school planning in which the LPCA might also be involved.

The work of the meeting, however, concluded with establishment of a planning group temporarily identified as Education Data Unit C-7. The group had also agreed to work on long-range planning, which would have to be city-wide. They further agreed that their short-range planning would concentrate on Waller High School, which served as the general high school in District Seven.

Waller High School was at that time under severe criticism by the community, dating back several years. In the middle 1960's a Waller student had shot two students and a teacher during a study hall in the auditorium. Then Waller, along with Cooley Vocational High School, had felt the effects of riots following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in the spring of 1967. Security in all Chicago high schools would remain touchy throughout the late 1960's; at Waller, the situation was exacerbated by the massive rebuilding and redevelopment of area neighborhoods. West of LaSalle Street block after block of three-story and four-story walk-up flats were now replaced by high-rise public housing with a school-age population triple that of the highest experienced during the European immigrant period. East of LaSalle Street, three-story flats and townhouses were beginning to be replaced by high-rise mid-to-upper-income apartments with few or no children.

People in the neighborhood feared a drop in the academic quality of the schools. Many of the able students were transferred out of area public schools by parents who had that option. The proportion of white students at Waller High School had dropped from 50 percent in 1965 to less than 25 percent in 1968. Thus the stage was set for a community-based power struggle over how secondary schooling would be developed for the future.

At the next meeting held on September 22, 1968, the official planning committee renamed itself the Schools Planning Committee and elected the Rev. Mr. James A. Shiflett as its chairman. In a letter dated November 5, 1968 to Dr. James Redmond, he wrote the following:

"Dear Dr. Redmond:

"In response to the needs of the community and in accordance wih the request for citizen participation by Educational Facilities Planning Study, this committee representing a large number of community organizations and individuals urges immediate favorable action on the following proposal.

"As part of Phase I of the Public Building Commission Program, the Board of Education should include a Magnet Secondary School located near the present site of Waller High School.

"In addition to a broad general curriculum, the school should be designed to provide facilities and programs to attract and serve students interested in specialized education in communicative, language and the performing arts. It should serve as the secondary school facility of District #7 (thereby discontinuing Cooley Vocational High School, absorbing the vocational students into other vocational schools, sending the general education students to Waller and utilizing the present Cooley facility as a temporary Upper Grade Center). Also it should serve as the secondary school facility to supplement and expand the programs of the elementary Magnet School now being established on the old Marine Hospital Site.

"We ask that the Board construct the necessary physical plant to provide for a minimum of 5,000 students at or near the present site of Waller High School.

"There are a number of advantages, both to the community and to the city at large, in the immediate implementation of this program:

"1. Part of the existing physical plant can be retained, either as part of the high school or as an extension to the upper grade center.

"2. Extensive urban renewal cleared land currently exists in the immediate vicinity. Fifteen acres of cleared land lies adjacent to Waller High School.

"3. Transportation from all parts of the city is excellent.

"4. The Lincoln Park Community contains a great concentration of talented people in the arts willing to work with the schools. Such an innovative program as the Artists-in-Residence has already been established.

"5. Educational and cultural institutions in the area are active in the growth of the community. For example, DePaul University, only a few blocks from Waller, has committed itself to a long-range program of expansion; Francis Parker School is interested in continued and expanded programs in conjunction with Waller High School.

"6. The initial programs of Project Wingspread included Waller High School in an exchange with Highland Park-Deerfield HIgh Schools. This exchange can be enhanced and enlarged through the establishment of a Magnet Secondary School.

"A Magnet School of adequate capacity at the present Waller High School site will be a major force in continuing the unique make-up of this community. The Lincoln Park-Near North Side area has a cross section of economic, racial and ethnic groups unmatched by any other area in the city.

"Yours very truly, James A. Shiflett, Chairman[10]"

The letter raised a number of issues which later brought different groups into the planning sessions. Often the central idea of providing good educational facilities and programs was neglected as other issues were raised.

One major issue was school size. The Schools Planning Committee had demanded a physical plant that would handle 5,000 students. Their

argument was based on the assumption that many people (mostly white) would transfer their children from private and parochial high schools if a new facility were provided that was sufficiently large, well equipped and safe. Lane Technical High School with a population of 5,200 was cited as a model.

Another major issue that caused controversy was the strong suggestion by the NSCM that vacant land (fifteen acres) near Waller High School be used for the new buildings. The clearance of the land had been obtained with the express purpose of creating a public park.[11] Planning any type of non-recreational facilities on park land, indeed any structure, had always been anathema to many people in Chicago.

The issue of sending the 800 vocational students to other schools outside the area was seen by some as an attempt to put Blacks out of District Seven.

On November 12, 1968, a meeting of the Schools Planning Committee was held at Cooley Vocational High School. At this meeting the author, as principal of Cooley, pointed out that the Board of Education was ready to vote on whether to include the District Seven Magnet School in the Leu-Candoli report. Since the Board's plan called for considerable community participation and since curriculum planning would be a vital part of the overall plan, it was necessary to develop some concrete ideas about curriculum and programs for the schools as soon as possible.

At this point in the meeting, a shouting match started concerning the presence at the meeting of the principal and Sgt. Charles Glas, who headed the Youth Detail for the Chicago Police Department. Objections

were raised by a group of young black adults who called themselves BAD, an acronym for Black-Active-Determined. (Some of the Black students from Cooley and Waller called them Black-Angry-Dumb, which did not help maintain a peaceful meeting.) Memories of the riots that had erupted the previous spring at both Cooley and Waller, and the boycotts at Waller in September and October, contributed to the tension.

A few teachers from the Waller faculty, along with the BAD group, advocated three separate schools: one Black, one white, and one Puerto Rican. This had practically no support, especially among the students, but the ill-feeling the idea raised remained a dividing point for subsequent meetings.

One resident of Lincoln Park mentioned, during a discussion of community control, that the people who would pay for the schools were being left out of the discussion. This raised the issue of white students leaving Waller because of the unrest.

The meeting finally closed with agreement among all parties that the group should be planning for a magnet school, that it should work with all groups in the community and that it should be a platform for a positive solution to local problems.

Board of Education Approves Waller-Cooley Project

The next day, November 13, the Board of Education passed Board Report 68-881 approving Building Project Number 13.[12] This report included plans to improve Waller High School by remodeling, adding a new section, razing an old section, and revamping an upper grade center to make it suitable for high school use. It proposed to get permission to

annex five to ten acres of the would-be-park land just north of Waller. This area would provide recreational space and room to build any needed additions.

The report recommended that Cooley Vocational High School be closed and the facility be converted into a middle school. There was no mention of moving the Cooley students out of the district: instead the report stated the Board's intention that the rehabilitated facilities "provide for all interests and aspirations."

The writers of the report estimated that the project would cost approximately 9.3 million dollars. The project would be financed and built by the Public Building Commission. While the report asked that a CEC complex be planned, it did not specifically designate Building Project Number 13 as a CEC per se. This became a problem for the community as did the firm statement that 3,500 students were to be served. This drop of 1,500 from the Schools Planning Committee request meant a net loss of four million dollars to be spent on the project.

In early December, the Lincoln Park Conservation Association received in completed form a report they had privately commissioned, on the status of Waller High School.[13] The study and evaluations had been done by John Kahlert, then Executive Secretary of the state-funded Council on the Diagnosis and Evaluation of Criminal Defendents. While copies of the report were quietly circulated, and came to the attention of the author as a District Seven principal, the LPCA delayed publication of the document lest it label them "pro-establishment" and cause even more disruption at a time school planning needed to continue.

The report clearly pointed out the problems existing at Waller at that time. Basically these were tied to the flight of white students whenever any kind of disturbance occurred, the pressure brought upon the school by outsiders (BAD was an example) who refused to plan and cooperate with school leaders, a student body that wanted good schooling but could not handle the turmoil, and unreasonable demands that could not possibly be met.

The Schools Planning Committee met at Cooley on December 4, 1968,[14] and immediately split into three caucuses: Black, white and mixed. The various groups concentrated on different areas such as more involvement and input, curriculum offerings, facilities planning based on a time schedule, and how to make teachers more sensitive.

On December 13, 1968,[15] at Waller High School, Dr. Bessie Lawrence, along with some staff members from the Board of Education Central office, held a briefing meeting for involved principals, teachers, and other staff members of District Seven schools. Managing architect Jacques Brownson of the Public Building Commission was introduced, along with Dr. Stanton Leggett of the firm of Engelhardt, Engelhardt and Leggett, Inc., the Board's educational consultant for Building Project Number 13.

The message from Dr. Leggett was very clear: he was there as a well qualified expert to put the project together so as to reflect all aspects involved. As areas of concern, he mentioned nearly all the points that had been brought up at previous neighborhood meetings. Mr. Brownson gave what he felt should be a reasonable time table in

order to complete the building by summer of 1971. He also gave a list of sites that might be visited that had features which he might consider for incorporating in the District Seven offices.

Francis McKeag, Assistant Superintendent of Facilities Planning made a most important point, "that the planning process should examine all sides of the process and that the project would not move ahead until there was general community approval."

Dr. Lawrence closed the meeting by setting December 17 as the time for similar presentations to be made as part of a larger open meeting to keep the planning process moving.

The Schools Planning Committee had previously set December 18 as a meeting for caucus presentations. They changed their meeting date to the 17th to coincide with Dr. Lawrence's meeting.

At the December 17 meeting,[16] Dr. Lawrence followed much the same format as at the meeting with Board personnel on December 13. Dr. Leggett explained the planning process that was to be followed. He pointed out that the process had worked very well at the Walt Disney Magnet School and that there were many ways of getting the job done.

Mr. McKeag gave specifics on the time line. He felt that if occupancy by September 1971 was to be met the following completion dates should be considered for critical activities:

Agreement on preliminary plans by March 30, 1969
Final specifications by June, 1969
Preliminary drawings by September, 1969
Final drawings by December, 1969
Construction contract let by February, 1970
Occupancy by September, 1971
Start rehabilitation of old section in September, 1971

Mr. Brownson of the Public Building Commission pointed out that meeting the design, construction and occupancy schedule would really be controlled by the decisions made by the community. These decisions had to be made before specifications and plans could be done.

He also pointed out that the Department of Development and Planning would research alternate sites and submit them to the community. The approved site would then need a Board of Education resolution to send it to the City Council for final approval.

The presentation took about twenty minutes. The group then split into six caucuses which were to formulate questions or statements to be presented. Their concerns and recommendations were as follows:

The student caucus wanted upgrading in various departments with some new classes added, such as drafting. They also wanted pass-fail marks, the right to choose their own courses, and time for driver education at Waller.

The teachers' caucus wanted to make sure there was one comprehensive high school under one administrator, adult education at night, the use of modern technology, built in flexibility in building use, and an expansion of foreign language offerings and fine arts.

The black caucus was concerned with numbers of students since so much housing demolition was occurring in the area; what the feeder schools would do to prepare the parents and students for the new programs and how the Board could assure them that their input would be honored.

The white caucus was very much concerned with definitions used by

Dr. Leggett, Mr. McKeag and Mrs. Evelyn Carlson, Associate Superintendent, Education Program Planning. They also asked how integration could be increased if Cooley was closed, and why the north boundary of the attendance area could not be moved to include more whites.

The Latin caucus expressed basic concern that their particular and unique needs would be met, such as bi-lingual teachers and counselors, English classes for adults, and an expanded Spanish section in the library. Mrs. Carlson replied that if an individual or a group felt a certain need, it should be defined so that it could be planned for.

The mixed caucus (identifying themselves as those who refused to be labeled by color) asked what could be done to assure integration, what information the Board would give to help in planning, and what plans would be made to make Waller attractive to new students in the interim, as the rehabilitation and construction were taking place.[17]

The Rev. Mr. Shiflett called a meeting of the Schools Planning Committee to be held at Cooley Vocational High School on January 7, 1969. The agenda[18] stated the following points to be considered:

- whether the group would agree to the time schedule proposed by Mr. Mc Keag.
- consideration of the relationship the Committee would have with Dr. Leggett, the Board's Educational consultant.
- map out the strategies to expand community participation by using the caucus system.

The January 7, 1969[19] SPC meeting was long, heated and full of controversy. The only central issue resolved was the structure of the Steering Committee. From the six caucus groups of the previous meeting,

four continuing caucuses were formed. The Black caucus was allocated nine representatives, while the Latin, mixed and white caucuses had three each. The Steering Committee would meet weekly and report their progress at monthly meetings which would be public. Observers would be allowed at the weekly meetings.

Nothing was decided as to the time schedule needed by the Board of Education to formally start the planning. The relationship of the Committee with Dr. Leggett was not even discussed. The mixed caucus objected strenuously to this lack of action but to no avail.

On January 22,[20] the SPC met again. The Rev. Mr. Charles Marks of the Black Caucus was elected Chairman. "Cha Cha" Jimenez was elected vice-chairman. The Rev. Mr. Shiflett accepted his election to the position of treasurer. Linda Stevenson and Juanita White were elected as recording and corresponding secretaries. Mr. Jimenez was the leader of the Young Lords, a local Latin gang. Many of the people with more traditional values were very upset.

Dr. Leggett and staff members were present at the meeting but their presentations were not very well received since some of the people in the audience felt the "Board" was trying to push ahead too swiftly.

Community is Torn by Social Issues

A few days after the meeting "Cha Cha" Jimenez was arrested on outstanding warrants. On February 13, a large group of Young Lords and other radical groups disrupted a Police Department community relations workshop at the 18th District Police Station. Their complaints centered on alleged harassment of the Young Lords and on the fact that

police had been attending school meetings at Cooley and Waller.[21]

The police commander answered that all warrants would be followed up and that police would continue to attend public meetings if they were requested. Years later the author discovered that Dr. Wesley Amar (principal of Waller until 1969), Dr. Bessie Lawrence and he himself had been given police protection every minute they were in School District Seven. Without their knowledge, this surveillance was provided due to a number of threats against them.

At subsequent meetings of the Schools Planning Committee large numbers of gang members in gang hats and sweaters were in attendance. Their menacing antics, obscene language and threats drove many well-meaning community people out of the meetings. Attendance dropped radically and only the very interested continued coming. Some said they would return when the Steering Commmittee "grew up" and stopped playing the gang's games.

On February 23, 1969, the Rev. Mr. Marks of the Schools Planning Committee and Steve Shamberg of the LPCA attended a Mid-North Association meeting to explain just where the planning was going.[22] The Rev. Mr. Marks pointed out that the expansion of Waller could not be dealt with unless other pressing social issues were also addressed. Some of these included the quality of education in the feeder schools, police harassment of youth groups, parental involvement in planning and the power of the SPC to make decisions.

Mr. Shamberg expressed his desire for a truly integrated school. He also said that while the caucus plan was not perfect, the SPC was the

only group which was meeting, and it was at least trying to get the job done. He said they were dealing with the "now phase," which he described as dealing with students' needs; the "feeder phase" which would determine the needs of schools sending students to the high schools; and the "magnet phase" which was organized to gauge meaningful community needs. Mr. Shamberg was referring to a plan set up by the SPC to identify the work of various groups.

The Rev. Mr. Marks also criticized the work of the Board consultant, in that Dr. Leggett had not dealt decisively with the group on an on-going basis. Their view was contradicted by some people at the meeting who pointed out that Dr. Leggett was in the process of fact-gathering and preparing position papers.

The criticism was unjustified, since on February 18, 1969,[23] Dr. Leggett had produced and distributed a very comprehensive seventeen-page memorandum on school size and planning alternatives for all interested parties. In subsequent weeks a needs questionnaire and many germane journal articles were also produced.

The Schools Planning Committee and its steering group continued to meet through the spring of 1969. Dr. Leggett joined with students and teachers in discussing the problems at both Waller and Cooley. While progress was made with these groups, the consultant was less successful with the other adult groups. The local PTAs were receptive and helpful, but the Schools Planning Committee did not reach agreement on any major issues which would let the planning proceed.

Many of the groups involved in the four caucuses neglected the

school planning activity when, later in the spring of 1969, they formed the "Poor People's Coalition." The leadership was provided by "Cha Cha" Jimenez. The group's main function seemed to be to attract attention to their demands. Taking over public or church property was one means of focusing such attention.

On May 6, 1969, the Poor People's Coalition presented a list of ten demands to the McCormick Theological Seminary, an institution adjacent to DePaul University in the northwest part of District Seven. While the trustees of the Seminary expressed their sympathy for the problems expressed by the Coalition, they felt they could not fully answer their demands without more information. They refused to accede to the demands. Mr. Obed Lopes, a Coalition spokesman, expressed his dissatisfaction and said the Coalition would undertake certain educational activities which be hoped the Seminary would understand as an "act of love."

On May 14, the newly dedicated Stone Administration building of McCormick Theological Seminary at Fullerton and Halsted was occupied by the group. Included were Young Lords, the Young Patriots, the Latin American Defense Organization, the Welfare Mothers of Wicker Park, and the Concerned Citizens Survival Front. In the days following they were joined by members of the Cobra Stones (a Black gang), the Black Panthers, Black-Active-Determined, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Mau Mau and others. The sit-in began just before midnight on May 14 and lasted until May 18. Hundreds of men, women and children occupied the new building in shifts.

During the four days much discussion took place. Finally, McCormick Seminary President Arthur McKay gave the Coalition an ultimatum to leave or be moved. Four hours later the group left.

The next day, Dr. McKay went over the demands with the press. These included $601,000 for low cost housing, $350,000 of which had already been pledged for that purpose. The Coalition also wanted the use of the building for child care and cultural purposes, plus $75,000 for the Young Lords to use to train leaders, create a strong organization and to start a legal bureau. The Seminary refused all the above but pledged to continue to assist in helping the poor. It was seen as very ironic that the Coalition chose this institution as its target, since of all religious groups in the Lincoln Park area the people at McCormick had been among the most sympathetic to the needs of those in the Coalition.[24]

On May 16, 1969,[25] Mr. Lewis Hill , City of Chicago Commissioner of Development and Planning, and member of the PBC, told the annual meeting of the LPCA that both agencies were working with the Board of Education on plans for the CEC and Elementary Schools. He said,

> Whatever eventual form these plans take, I want to emphasise that the people of Lincoln Park, acting through their community organizations, will have full involvement in the educational plans that emerge in the area.

The LPCA members were glad to hear this, since they had complained that the various city agencies had not been cooperating. They also seemed to agree with the criteria he laid out. Some members were elated that Mr. Hill had come to them and not to the SPC.

Many other situations during the spring and early summer of 1969 provided opportunities for community groups to emphasize their separateness. There were more incidents at Waller which caused at least three walkouts of the students (often led by teachers). The gangs were very busy trying to recruit at both Cooley and Waller. The total atmosphere was not conducive to rational schooling, much less planning. Since Cooley was fairly quiet the brunt of local criticism was laid on the administration at Waller.

On June 8, 1969,[26] Dr. Leggett met the members of the LPCA in an open meeting and presented a preliminary draft of the specifications for the proposed Waller-Cooley complex. A number of questions and objections were raised by the largely white audience. The basic problem was how to insure the safety of the students.

They pointed out that Cooley had no white students and that Waller had dropped from 22.6% white in September 1968 to an estimated 17% white by June 1, 1969. Many objected to including Cooley since it was a vocational school and would thus not fit in with a college preparatory curriculum. One member pointed out that there was much more violence in the larger schools, that Waller was still torn apart while Cooley had none of these problems.

The final objection was the quality of education in feeder schools. Dr. Leggett was reminded that while some of the elementary schools did a fine job and many an average job, the number of below average students made the entering freshmen level very low. When asked, most of the group said they would not send their children to Waller.

Dr. Leggett pointed out that with good planning, the vocational aspects could be done in nearby industrial areas or at sites in the Loop area. He pointed out that a large school can be organized to include schools within a school. When pushed he stated that quality integrated schools were the stated objective of the Board of Education, but that accomplishing this depended on community support.

Steven Shamberg closed the meeting by pointing out that no Black school had been integrated with whites without very positive community action. He further noted that the LPCA had a group working on the problem and he hoped they could work closely with the Schools Planning Committee.

At the end of the 1968-69 school year, the principal of Waller, Dr. Wesley Amar, resigned his post with the Chicago Public Schools and accepted the position of Professor in the Education Department of Northern Illinois University. During his tenure, this most erudite and personable professional handled a very difficult assignment with skill. His leaving was felt to be a real loss to his colleagues and the community people who had worked with him.

In July, Dr. Leggett produced the final draft of the "Educational Specifications for the Waller-Cooley CEC #4."[27] It was an attempt to draw together the many ideas expressed by the students, professional staff, and community into a package which could be discussed, modified and accepted pending Board of Education approval.

On July 29, the Mid-North Association attempted to have a meeting concerning four separate issues on land use, not school-connected. One

point was the community discussion of a parcel of land at Armitage Avenue and Halsted Street which was being considered for development as a privately owned and operated tennis club. Under the proposed plan, community people and students would be able to use the facility at a very reasonable or free rate.[28]

Upon opening the meeting, Chairman Lyle Mayer was attacked and thrown to the floor. Militants took over the stage and microphone and then packed the stage with mothers and babies in an obviously planned maneuver. A TV cameraman was expelled and a court reporter's transcribing machine was confiscated. Many members of the Community Conservation Council were threatened by gang members.

Mr. Mayer and other leaders did not call the police in to clear the stage because they were afraid the babies and others might be hurt. Instead they left the auditorium of Waller to the militants, who stayed for a short time.

In reviewing the matter in a letter to the membership, Peter Bauer,[29] a member of the Mid-North Association and CCC, pointed out that since January, five separate community meeings had been stopped in the same way. In addition, the McCormick Seminary had been taken over and, at the moment, the Armitage Avenue Methodist Church was occupied by the Young Lords. (In late August, the "tennis club" site would become squatters land and re-named the "Peoples Park.") Following is the last page of his letter of August 4, 1969I:

> "In addition, citizens with whom the militants disagree have received threatening phone calls, have been threatened with arson, or have had their names, home addresses, and phone listed under 'Community Enemies' in a local revolutionary newspaper. Carolyn Barrett's name

(is) included in that listing. The paper suggests, 'The decision of how the people are to deal with the enemies is up to the people themselves.'

"What can you, as a responsible citizen do? Here are some important ways you can help:

"1. Contact Ass't. State's Attorney James Schreier, 542-2933 and make arrangements to give him any evidence you may have regarding any aspect of the July 29 violence, such as photos, eyewitness reports, specific incidents you observed. Be willing to sign complaints and testify. Many have already expressed their readiness to do so.

"2. Attend future CCC and Mid-North meetings.

"3. Alert your elected representatives at all levels to the problem.

"4. Be willing to speak out against <u>any</u> violence as a means of dissent.

"5. Express this view to those of your friends, religious and civic leaders who condone or justify terrorist tactics by reason of the existence of grave urban ills and legitimate grievances.

"Most of us recognize the desperate problems facing our citizens, our cities and our nation. But these problems cannot be solved -- they will only be exploded -- by the tactics of terrorism. It is time to stop a tiny minority of SDS-inspired militants, abetted by 'movement' sympathizers, from intimidating the 70,000 residents of Lincoln Park by violence, assaults, and threats of arson.

"Sincerely, Peter A. Bauer"

Dr. Bessie Lawrence, the superintendent of District Seven, had planned a meeting at Waller for July 31, 1969, to discuss the expansion plans worked out by Dr. Leggett with the community. In addition to all the people ordinarily involved in this type of meeting, Dr. Lawrence had also invited Board of Education members, some department heads, central office staff members and any principals who were in the city. Since Dr. Amar had resigned, she gave the task of arrangements and security to the author, who was principal of Cooley and had been deeply involved with

these meetings over the past year. Since the July 29 meeting of the Mid-North Association had been violently disrupted, plans were made for tight security to be available. Arrangements were made to seat guests near an inside door if a quick exit was needed. When it was learned that both the Young Lords and the Cobra Stones were coming in large numbers, a Chicago Police Tactical Squad was placed on alert. As the meeting started the author was informed by the police that the Tactical Squad had been pulled out to cover a homicide in the Cabrini-Green project of the Chicago Housing Authority, some two miles distant. Dr. Lawrence was informed that the police had only four men available, that there were many gang members present and since many were on some kind of a "high," the police advised leaving if the meeting became heated.[30]

Shortly after Dr. Leggett began his presentation, the Rev. Mr. Marks was recognized to read a resolution asking the Board of Education to build a planning center for District Seven. When he came to the podium he was accompanied by a group of gang members waving flags. More militants moved to the front and there was much shouting of slogans and obscenities.

At this point, Dr. Lawrence adjourned the meeting and the guests were escorted to safety in the school.

The meeting continued in a very raucous fashion. The Reverend Mr. Marks was quoted in the August 31 Booster as saying,

> When a school is in a community because the community wants it, we are batting .500. But when the school is viewed with distrust and suspicion, windows will be broken, teachers can't speak out, there is an atmosphere of tension, students are hurt and no one will want the school.

> The school must be created with the idea of acceptance and this acceptance must be felt both within and without. Otherwise the school is a colony and only "tolerated" by the community. You never know how long that tolerance will last.

The issue of a planning center had always been accepted as a part of the CEC by all involved. What was happening in District Seven was simply that one side saw the center as their personal office, paid for by the Board, in which and through which to do anything they wanted. When any limits were mentioned in discussions about the functions of the center, threats began. Eventually the point was reached when most of the professionals felt it impossible even to discuss the planning center.

This type of disagreement also brought into focus the question of who did constitute "the community." Most of the parents, interested community people and professionals anticipated and continued to expect that those providing input to District Seven planning would be neighbors or users of the District Seven schools. The leadership of the SPC, however, indicated in both actions and words that everyone, from anywhere, should be accepted. At one poorly attended meeting that summer, a young stranger wearing a Blackstone Ranger beret was asked his name, "for the record." He replied, "I don't have no record and you won't keep one." With that, he walked out.

Meantime, the Board found claims for community autonomy extending from facilities planning to include personnel. Beginning in District Seven and spreading to the city at large was the assertion of a public right to select principals to be appointed into vacant schools.

Selection of principals was (and remains in 1985) the duty of the General Superintendent[31]. The Superintendent recommends to the Board of

Education the name of a qualified principal to fill a vacancy. It was common practice for the District Superintendent to submit one name to the General Superintendant for consideration. Some community groups were demanding that they be the ones to advertise, interview, and select the principal.

On August 18, 1969, the Reverend Mr. Marks wrote Dr. Lawrence that the SPC would "seek this fall to participate in the selection of a new principal for Waller High School." She replied that his letter would be forwarded to the Department of Personnel, and that she would keep all lines of communication open.[32]

In early fall, the position of Waller High School principal was advertised. Many people approached the author asking that he apply, including a group from the SPC who were most insistent. Aside from LPCA people, it included members of the NSCM group.

In the meantime a community meeting concerning the problems of Waller was convened by the SPC and participants from the community including local school parents. They met in a day-long session on Saturday, October 4, 1969, at St. Paul's Church on Fullerton Parkway. Among those invited were Dr. Lawrence, two members of the Board, and the author. The main themes of the meeting were safety of students, improvement of the curriculum and the recruitment of more white students. The meeting was considered fruitful by Board personnel, since it provided opportunity to hear these concerns and to emphasize that the administration could not address them without community cooperation. The community people also gained some insight into the Board personnel viewpoint

on problems a high school community faces.[33]

During September and October there were many meetings and acrimonious feelings were displayed because Dr. Lawrence had not set up a selection committee. She replied that no selection committee was provided for by Board of Education procedures, but that community needs and concerns would be among the criteria in the General Superintendent's selection of the candidate to be recommended to the Board for approval.[34]

At the October meeting of the Chicago Board of Education, the author of this study, was appointed principal of Waller High School, to be effective on October 28, 1969.[35]

When he arrived at work at 7:00 a.m. he was greeted by eight people carrying signs expressing their displeasure at his appointment, since they had not selected him. Six of the eight were among those who had asked him to apply for the position.

They were invited into his office as his first guests, and the matter was discussed. They admitted they had no problem with the person, but that the process was wrong. They were told they had every right to express their opinion but that their actions just kept the school in ferment. They were also informed that while their cooperation was needed, any attempt to cause a boycott or a walk-out would mean legal actions. After some discussion they agreed to leave and said they would take their grievances to the Central Office.

The hostility displayed in this instance was directed, not to the individual, but to the Board of Education system which was then in place. When a vacancy occurred at any school, it was advertised in a

weekly Personnel Bulletin with a stated deadline. A letter and application had to be sent to Personnel stating one's qualifications and the reasons for wanting the job. After the deadline, all the letters were sent to the District Superintendent who usually interviewed as many candidates as was reasonable. The final choices were discussed with the District Superintendent, and the Assistant Superintendent of Personnel. Usually the final three or four applicants were jointly interviewed by both Superintendents. In practice the District Superintendent made the final selection. The name of the selected candidate was submitted to the General Superintendent, who usually approved it and then presented it to the full Board for approval.

Each District Superintendent, then and now, had his own style of choosing. Some, probably most, discussed the desired qualifications with the local PTA or other interested groups. Some conferred with the senior principals in the district. Many Superintendents invited possible candidates to apply. Naturally many of the candidates were from the district and were chosen because their abilities were well known.

The Schools Planning Committee of District Seven made this a major issue in all of its literature after the committee was denied the final choice at a local school in the summer of 1969. The continuing debate took time from the planning process. The Board of Education was quite willing, as were most District Superintendents, to include a formally recognized community body to share in the nomination process, but they wanted the process to be formalized, with proper written guidelines and limitations. While this eventually came about, it caused bad feelings

among the various organizations in District Seven for several years, since the more stable and established groups resented the action of the SPC in declaring itself the only body to make the selection.

The principals throughout the city felt that, as professionals, they should be treated like professionals. They resented the idea of being subjected to a "community beauty contest" and feared that the selection process would become too politicized. Since the Board had put into place a nomination (not selection) process, many principals would not apply for transfer to another school because they disliked and distrusted the process.

After the appointment of the author to the Waller principalship in October, 1969, the usual advertisement of a principal vacancy at Cooley Vocational High School was not made. The District Superintendent, Central Office Staff, and community groups all believed that Cooley and Waller would soon be joined, so another principal was unnecessary. The author was then informally given responsibility for both schools and tried to divide his time between them, especially at games, dances and other highly visible events. Monthly meetings of the SPC continued to be held, alternately, at each school.

During these monthly meetings, the various groups continued to work on the concept of a CEC. The professional staff exchanged ideas on magnet qualities, on needed curriculum changes, on building use, adult education ideas and land usage.

The November 1968 Board report approving Building Project Number 13 had stated that Orchard Street would be closed between Armitage Avenue

and Dickens Street, and that five to ten additional acres would be sought north of the school.

The closing and use of Orchard Street became the focus of very positive planning. All finally agreed to a mall concept which would contain walks, good landscaping, outside study and class areas and even a small sunken theater-type circle. The idea of a bridge linking Arnold and Waller was approved.

The acquisition of the five to ten acres however, was another matter. The Lincoln Park community had been promised that the fifteen acres directly north of Waller, bounded by Dickens, Larrabee, Webster and Halsted would be made into a public park. When the Board recommended that the area contiguous to Waller along Dickens Street be allotted to the school, the community had another battle going and more fuel was added to the fires of dissent. It created more ill will toward the District Seven administration, toward Waller itself and toward the SPC. The SPC was accused of being hypocritical in supporting the Board's position of reclaiming land while also supporting the take-over of the peoples park by radical community groups.

During the early spring of 1970 the Young Lords, under the leadership of "Cha Cha" Jimenez, tried to become more involved in the detailed planning going on, such as the work needed on the mall, the bridging of the two schools, and the cost of the proposed addition. The demands for students' rights, beleaguered teachers, and other issues faded away. Soon they were sitting in on committees dealing with space, decorating, demolition, land use, and cost over-runs.

Finally a young Latino student, a junior at Waller, came to the author with a request to help him get out of the Young Lords. This was accomplished by having him transfer to Senn High School. After he had settled in at the new school, he explained to the author that the change in direction of the Young Lords was based on the fact that the group expected that the nine million dollars would be administered from the school office. They had developed a plan to make themselves responsible for large blocked-out sums of money to be used for planning, security, demolition and labor when the work started. They would then allocate jobs on a type of patronage system.

After this was confirmed by various means, the author and some of the District staff began the long process of familiarizing Mr. Jimenez with governmental operations. After months of work, he realized how public finances are handled and his involvement with the SPC decreased. This educational process was paralleled by a strong initiative, city-wide, to decrease the power of the gangs. Many arrests were made, recruiting was hampered, parents were talked to, students were encouraged not to join, and the media was convinced to stop glamorizing the gangs. By the spring of 1971, they were no longer a force in the school planning process.

At the same time a concerted effort was made by various groups to stop Federal funds going indirectly to the gangs. Most of these funds were funneled through church groups. In the Waller area representatives of the LPCA[36] testified at a Senate Sub-committee on Internal Affairs that the North Side Co-operative Ministry was just such an organization.

This type of publicity weakened the role of the churches in the area and diminished their attempts at social change. It also partially lead to their slowly withdrawing from the SPC.

District Seven Council Becomes Involved

The Schools Planning Committee also lost credibility and support because the Board of Education was moving to establish formal school councils. For many years the local PTA's had acted, in most districts, as the unofficial advisory council for the local principal. As a nationwide organization, the PTA was very structured and rather formal. Each state had its organization divided into regions. The various levels all had paid staff so funding was important and this became a sticking point in many schools. During this time the number of schools with chartered PTAs was sharply reduced. This was particularly true in low income areas where fund raising, even one dollar a year per family, was a problem. In addition to the financial side, many of these communities were not used to the rigid formality of the organization nor did they want to hold pre-set meetings following the normal PTA agenda. Yet the principals needed input, parental involvement and support.

During the late 1960s many districts organized District Advisory Councils, based on the suggestion of the Board of Education. In turn the schools in those districts often did the same. In some cases the PTA and the Council were the same body. As the practice grew, the Board of Education discussed and finally adopted formal guidelines on January 26, 1966.[37]

In District Seven, the group was called the District Seven Education Council. Each school sent two elected representatives and the professional staff was represented by teachers and principals. This council took over the official function of the School Planning Committee.

With all the disruption in the neighborhood, very little action on the CEC occurred during 1970. Discussion continued with Dr. Leggett who was involved in planning for magnet components. This was also being done on a city wide basis with other communities. Until the beginning of 1971 there was no formal community approval of CEC Number 4 from either the old SPC or the District Seven Education Council. Most of the opposition centered on use of park land and school size. Size had become a major factor since the original request was for a 5,000 student body while the original board report had been for 3,500 with expansion possibilities.

Finally in March of 1971, the impasse was broken when the LPCA presented its own plan to the Board of Education.[38] Patrick Feeley, then LPCA executive director, rightfully pointed out that Cooley parents were tired of waiting. They had their school which was small but very much together. They were happy with their new principal, Edward Bennett, but their facility was in bad shape. They also felt that they had waited long enough for integration.

The LPCA planned for a new Cooley close to North Avenue but still south of it. It would serve 1000 students while Waller could handle 2000. They envisioned some school services and a modified magnet concept where the school could serve its own district first and attract

others from outside District Seven if there was room.

The plan also included a third high school which would probably not be needed for three or four years. This idea was based on the view that there would be a population explosion when building in the Lincoln Park area was complete and when the area between Division and North, east of Halsted, was ultimately developed by DUR action.

Feeley claimed that the combined enrollment of the two schools in February of 1971 was 2160 so that there would be sufficient space to attract students back to the new schools. The plan also pointed out that by putting the vocational component near North Avenue, away from the projects, more whites and Hispanics would feel safe in coming.

The submittal of this report to the Board of Education circumvented the District Seven Education Council and this caused quite a furor. The ideas it contained were no surprise, since the LPCA had been arguing these points for a year. But the fact that the plan had not been submitted to the Council was a shock. The LPCA representative replied that since the Council and its predecessors had never formally agreed to the original plan, they felt it was time something was done to get the project started. They also felt the Cooley parents had been ignored.

In early April, 1971, Mr. Francis McKeag informed the press that Board staff members were discussing alternate plans with Mr. Lew Hill, head of the Department of Planning and Development. Mr. McKeag indicated that the LPCA proposal was being given strong consideration.[39]

The District Seven Education Council now belatedly got behind the

LPCA proposal. On April 14, 1971, by a vote of thirteen yes, two no, one abstention, the Council formally requested that the Board of Education undertake steps to consider one new community high school (CEC Number 4) and the Department of Urban Renewal and the Department of Planning and Development take the necessary steps to provide the Board of Education with land and money to build the school.[40]

On May 12, Mr. Lewis Hill along with Mr. Robert Christiansen, Executive Director of the Public Building Commission brought to the District Seven Council meeting at Cooley an entirely new approach. They offered one school under one administration but it would be built on three separate sites. Each school would house 1000 students and they could move freely from one site to another.

One school would be at Waller, one at North and Larabee, and one at Ogden and Clybourn. A big advantage would lie in the fact that a small school is more secure. In addition the two new sites were already clear and could be developed quickly. This would also solve the problem of one school being black and the other white. This would make night programs more accessible to the community.

An additional element was added when Hill offered to replace three very old elementary schools, Mulligan, Headley and Thomas with three new ones. Cooley would be re-worked as a middle school. The package cost would be about $27 million dollars or about double the originally planned $9 million in 1968 dollars.

The reaction of the Council was to vote it down, eighteen to two. The people who spoke against it were furious. They called it betrayal,

an attempt to split the group, and pointed out that he was ignoring the plans and hopes of the two communities. A representative of the Cooley staff reminded the group that integration means coming south of North Avenue for the whites, not just moving Blacks north. Lyle Mayer of the LPCA said people did not want a school of 3500, that they had already moved away from Waller when it was 2500.[41]

Board Approves New Plan but Loses the Money

On May 17, 1971, after the rejection of the three-school plan the District Seven Education Council met with the Board of Education Area C Committee. The Board members were Mrs. Louise Malis, Chairwoman, Alvin Boutte, and Warren Bacon. The District Seven group were told they would have to submit a written study of consensus within thirty days. The full Board would meet on June 9. The Area C Committee pledged to back the one-site concept if it was the will of the community.

The Council then sent a survey to all its members that asked whether the group represented wanted the Board of Education plan for one school or Mr. Hill's plan for three. The written reply was to be mailed in by June 4.[42]

Dr. Joseph Hannon[43] had become Assistant Superintendent for Facilities Planning in August 1970. He immediately become involved with the Waller-Cooley concept. He spent many days and nights reviewing the situation with both Board staff, local staff and community groups. Over the months many refinements were made based on the needs stated by the community and confirmed by staff.

The new plan which emerged included the creation of various Acade-

mics and Institutes centered on a single theme. Students would be able to pick from the Academy of General Studies, a Learning Resource Center and a Reading Institute which would be located on the Waller site. An Academy for Vocational Skills and Technology, an Academy of Arts and an Academy of Design would be located at other sites. In addition an elaborate plan for improvement of the elementary schools was designed. The CEC would be placed in the Arnold Building.

The overall concept was accepted by the various groups because most of the controversial issues were resolved. For example, the problem of taking park land was settled by asking the cooperation of the Park District in jointly using the park facilities for physical education and recreational purposes. The large school/small school battle was assuaged by the idea of developing the two larger sites with the possibility of having small institutes located around the community.[44]

Another major problem was the location of the Academy for Vocational Skills and the Academy for Design. The cleared land was too close to the projects while the land along the industrial Clybourn Avenue was not really available.

Final agreement was obtained to submit the report to the Board of Education as soon as possible in order to get the money encumbered before the PBC funds were gone. It was estimated the cost would be about 20 million dollars. All agreed to continue working together on the various details.[45]

At the March 22, 1972 meeting the Board of Education was given the new report which rescinded Board Report 68-881 which had been approved

on November 13, 1968. The report had been the first authorization to improve Waller. Approval was deferred and the Board sent it to the School Building Needs Committee and the Committee on Area C. This was pro-forma since these two groups had to make their own recommendations.

On April 19, 1972, the District Seven Education Council held a meeting at Cooley at which they were expected to again formally approve the concept of the Board report. There were still stated reservations about the details.

At the meeting, however, the District Seven Educational Council rejected the proposal.[46]

Many of the participants who had agreed to the original plan reversed themselves. Some of the Black parents and Cooley teachers wanted it built on Larrabee or as close to North Avenue as possible. This was approved by some whites but rejected by many others.

The Council had a counter-proposal for the Board of Education. They suggested that the off-site academies be started in the fall of 1972 in rented sites. Each would have 100 students. They further recommended that the CEC not open in the fall unless the community had selected and approved a year-round plan to suit its needs.

At the Board meeting, of April 26, 1972, Board member Louise Malis presented an amendment that the Vocational Academy be placed on the Waller Campus. Gerald Sbarbaro asked for deferment because he had received a lot of mail with different points of view.[47] This deferral meant automatic consideration, according to the rules, at the Board meeting of May 10. The Board approved the change at the May 10 meeting.

Dr. Redmond cautioned the District Seven Council that all the changes made in the CEC plan might delay implementation.[48]

The Council met the next day, May 11, at Waller and agreed to ask Mr. Hill to begin implementation of the CEC proposal in the fall. They set no date or deadline but they agreed to spend two weeks to settle details. The Chairwoman, Miss Ruth McCreath, said there were many things to be done.[49]

The Chicago Tribune on August 4, 1972,[50] reported that the Public Building Commission had decided not to finance several building projects which were part of a building plan started in 1968. Included were an addition to Crane High School, two social adjustment schools, and the Waller-Cooley project.

Dr. Joseph Hannon, in charge of Facility Planning, stated that he hoped the money could be provided for somehow.

During the month of August, 1972, the District Seven Education Council met only once and informally decided to work with Dr. Hannon on seeking additional funds. It soon became apparent that no new construction money would be available. By the end of the year the Council was concentrating on how to obtain and use funds for rehabilitation work at Waller, Cooley and the Arnold building.

CHAPTER IV

BOARD OF EDUCATION PLANNING

As the Chicago Board of Education in late 1968 began the process of implementing the recommendations of Design for the Future, they were aware of the increasing social role intended for school facilities in the city's overall plans. Drs. Leu and Candoli had emphasized the broader picture in outlining strategic goals for schools on the basis of the community area to be served. They differentiated four types of area for which they proposed general goals; the Loop was considered as a special case. The goals were as follows:[1]

Commercial Loop Area - the concept of developing metropolitanism should be the key. Students from all over the city should be trained in ventures jointly planned by business, higher education and the School Board.

Inner City Areas - a long term goal was to change slum areas into racially integrated communities with good city and community services, adequate schools and housing. An immediate task was providing education that would assist inner city youth to compete financially.

Integrated Areas - these areas needed full support to remain integrated. Stabilization called for community-defined schools and

housing quotas.

Transitional Areas - while there was little that could be done to reverse the migration of higher income people, busing was recommended to buy time for local programs to be tried.

Perimeter areas - the major goal here was residential stability. Therefore, curriculum changes were needed to allay the fears of the residents. Successful integrating experiences were also necessary if the white population was to be held.

As the main focus of the educational element in these city-wide strategies, Drs. Leu and Candoli recommended the building of fifteen Cultural-Educational Centers throughout the city over a ten to twenty year period. While the cost would be in excess of two billion dollars, the consultants felt that it was not only feasible but, given the spirit of Chicago, a very realistic possibility.

In 1968 the Board had twenty school construction projects for which they were seeking approval. Included were three middle schools, two social adjustment schools, seven elementary schools, and eight high schools. Six of the high schools were to be part of CEC projects.

On February 14, 1968, Dr. James Redmond, General Superintendent, reviewed for the Chicago Board of Education the consultant services that had been completed by Drs. Leu and Candoli, and asked the Board to expand the contract for services.[2] They had accomplished the original tasks of analyzing educational plans, reviewing facility plans, and establishing planning guidelines. These ideas were summed up in their first draft of the feasibility study on the cultural-educational park. In addition, they had reviewed the 1967 and 1968 capital outlay budgets,

conducted two long planning seminars, and had established a working relationship with the Department of Development and Planning and other agencies. All projects were progressing in a timely fashion.

Under the new consulting contract, Drs. Leu and Candoli would be assigned by Dr. Redmond to undertake cooperative and continuous planning projects on the high school, middle school, adult, and special education levels, as well as CEC and supplementary centers. He also hoped they would draft a model area study, provide in-service informational and training sessions for Board of Education staff, and establish liaison with other agencies for assistance on plans for Magnet Schools and CEC sites.[3]

Implementation of the Leu-Candoli Plan Begins

Once the Board had approved this approach, Leu and Candoli began working with Board staff and District Superintendents. Possible sites were identified throughout the city and preliminary plans were made for acceptance. Much work was done on capital outlay budgets. Funding sources were checked. Plans were made for in-service sessions to inform the local staff of some of the new concepts.

The Board of Education had given high priority to District Seven in beginning the planning process outlined by the consultants, and early attention was given by Board administration to the coordination of school and community input to that process. Once the Leu-Candoli report had been accepted by the Board, Dr. Bessie Lawrence, District Superintendent, had called the public meeting of August 8, 1968 to formally present the concept to District Seven school personnel and

community organizations. Principals and teachers from the two high schools, Cooley and Waller, had been included. Dr. Lawrence asked that the two high schools' principals, teachers from both schools, and members of her staff be included in all planning sessions of the community group which was being formed.

The next official meeting in the District was held September 22, 1968. It became obvious that meetings had been held that the professional staff had not been aware of, since a pro tem chairman had been chosen and strategies such as caucusing were in place. The chairman, Rev. Mr. James Shiflett, was questioned about this and he assured the author, attending as Principal of Cooley, that it would not happen again. The community group at that time adopted the name Schools Planning Committee. Dr. Lawrence found it necessary at a subsequent meeting of the Schools Planning Committee to again raise the matter of open meetings, and an agreement was reached that all meetings would be open to observers.

The fall term of the 1968-69 school year was by now underway. The principals and teachers were given the task of researching community needs, developing curriculum changes, and keeping up with demographic changes. Before each community meeting there was usually an informal gathering of Board and District school personnel to prepare facts, figures and documents that might be needed. After each community meeting, Dr. Lawrence would conduct a review with all the principals of the district and with her staff, to develop the summary of community requests which would be returned to planners at the Board offices.

The two high school principals, on the basis of their experience with existing facilities and programs at Cooley and at Waller, were also given the assignment of providing input, as requested, directly to the Board of Education Department of Facilities Planning.

By November 13, 1968, that department had completed and presented to the Board a comprehensive facilities proposal for secondary education in District Seven, comprising Building Project #13.[4] It addressed all of the major needs which had been aired in the community meetings, and incorporated as well the Board's demographic and fiscal concerns.

Building Project #13 called for the closing of Cooley Vocational High School and consolidation of its programs and students with those of Waller, at the Waller site. The Cooley Upper Grade Center would be converted to a middle school operation.

The Waller facilities would be expanded by adding the Arnold Upper Grade Center building on Orchard Street directly west of Waller, and closing Orchard Street to consolidate the land parcels. The oldest section of Waller, dating from 1901, would be razed, and a new addition built to provide space for 1670 students, bringing total capacity to 3500. Since enrollment at Cooley and at Waller then totalled approximately 2600, an additional 900 students would be recruited from outside the district.

The program of the revitalized school would include a range of vocational and academic opportunities, would specialize in communication and the performing arts, have an adult education program, and provide for a total CEC complex.

The cost was estimated to be $9,348,000, including the acquisition

of five to ten acres of park land. Funding would be sought from the Public Building Commission.

The adoption of this plan by the Board caused a furor among some members of the Schools Planning Committee. The District Superintendent and her staff and the local principals were immediately put on the defensive. Two major issues were raised by the community: the use of park land and the figure of 3500 for the student body.

The SPC had recommended 5,000, but the demographers at the Board felt that 3,500 was more than adequate. Not only had the birth rate levelled off but people were still leaving the district. The professional staff pointed out that the buildings that had been demolished in the area contained large apartments while the new construction was mainly of the one- and two- bedroom variety. Even the town houses were small and seemed inadequate for a family with teen-agers. This argument persisted for years as the high school population continued to decline.

The use of park land was treated as a given by city planners, yet it was a headache for the local school personnel because it created so much ill feeling. Community people opposed to the idea blamed the principal and District Superintendent; people who wanted to see the land used for schools also blamed them, for not quickly acquiring the land.

Public Building Commission Becomes Involved

The Board of Education staff was working on a long list of projects to be financed by the Public Building Commission. This was done in conjunction with the Department of Urban Renewal (DUR) and the City of Chicago Department of Planning and Development. In addition to these

agencies, the Board had to deal with the City Council and sometimes with the Chicago Park District and the Chicago Public Library.

Approval of some or all of these agencies could be required for a project to be approved. The site and function had to fit the goal of the Chicago Plan Commission. The Public Building Commission had to agree to pay for it. If the site belonged to the City, the Park District, or the Department of Urban Renewal, their approval was needed. The Chicago Park District and Public Library were often involved because the Board of Education, to share expenses, in some cases asked them to build the recreational or physical education plant or library, which could then be used by others in the community during non-school hours.

The Board of Education would not approve any project being sent on to another agency for action unless "community" approval had been obtained. Although issues differed from one area to another in the city, "community" was never easy to define, and each District Superintendent had to face this procedural problem along with all the substantive ones.

In November 1969, twenty school projects being handled by the Public Building Commission were awaiting approval at various stages: seven and a half at the City Council; three and a half at the Chicago Plan Commission; three at the Planning stage; two at the Department of Planning and Development; one at the Department of Urban Renewal; two at the Board of Education; and one at the local community.[5] The project still held at the community level was the District Seven CEC/secondary-school facility.

On November 19, 1969, in the first of many status reports of the Public Building Commission,[6] it was noted that while educational specifications for Building Project Number 13, Waller-Cooley High School, had been completed in August, the Department of Development and Planning had requested re-evaluation of the site location and the scope of the project. Land cleared by the Department of Urban Renewal was available, but no architectural planning was possible until the site was agreed on.

When the author questioned the re-evaluation, he was told there had been community pressure applied to DUR opposing the use of park lands. It was generally felt by educational planners that schools and parks were a natural combination, but the feeling of the city planners at that time was that putting a school in a large park was easier than than using a smaller parcel. The cleared land adjacent to Waller was not a large parcel.

In order to keep the project moving, Dr. Lawrence, her staff, and the high school personnel worked very closely with the still controversial matters of the school site and school size. The site problem had developed into a two-way disagreement with the Board proposal. In addition to those who opposed the use of park lands for school siting, there was a large group of people who had come to believe that the school should provide facilities on more than one site. They pointed out that Leu and Candoli had even proposed this in their planning.

The issue of school size also found two groups opposing the Board recommendation. The original planning group (SPC) had asked for a school of 5,000 students and were dissatisfed with the Board's approval of facilities for only 3,500. For the people living near the school, a

student body of 3,500 was far too large. Students coming and going over the years had caused considerable property damage, and a plan to nearly double existing enrollment did not please Waller's neighbors.

This stated resistance to a large student body on one site soon became a racial issue. The Waller site was surrounded on three sides by residential neighborhoods of mostly white occupancy. Cooley was bounded by elevated train tracks, a factory, a parking lot, and a commercial thoroughfare. There were neither black nor white families living adjacent to Cooley, as there were simply no houses, so there were no similar neighborhood complaints. But since there were not many blacks living adjacent to Waller, the Cooley parents felt that objection to a "large" student population was in fact an objection to black students.

The high school staffs worked very hard to change this attitude. The students at Waller understood the problem. Those who attended community meetings expressed their sympathy. The school authorities worked on plans to keep the neighborhood quiet and did a lot of patrolling to improve control of students. It helped, but it did not completely allay the neighborhood fears.

On March 25, 1970, Francis McKeag, the Assistant Superintendent, Facilities Planning, was appointed to a new position as Assistant Superintendent, Office of the General Superintendent. His new responsibilities would be to coordinate and act as liaison with the PBC. This new position freed him to work directly with all the approving agencies.[7]

To take McKeag's place, the Board hired Joseph Hannon. He was given the immediate responsibility to evaluate and recommend to the

General Superintendent long range plans to implement the educational programs of the Chicago Public School System. He was also to evaluate and recommend sites for schools based on long range facility planning.

The Board Report noted that Mr. Hannon had had extensive experience in similar positions at Stanford University and with a major consulting firm.[8] He was to begin working one week each month until August 24, 1970, providing a smooth transition with Mr. McKeag.

The new Assistant Superintendent immediately became involved with the planning in District Seven. Even though his responsibilities were city-wide, Hannon took up residence in District Seven and was thus personally involved. He spent many hours with the professionals in the District learning what had taken place and what the present status was.

Strengthening of District Education Councils

To provide for continuing community input to school administrators, the Board of Education had in 1966 adopted a policy of recommending the formation of District Educational Councils.[9] The policy was now reconfirmed, on September 10, 1969:

> The mechanism for determining within the framework of city wide policy and city wide needs and aspirations of the people of a local community and for reaching agreements and for resolving conflicts which may occur, should be the District Superintendent's Education Council.[10]

The guidelines stated that there should be regular meetings, that the councils should be advisors to the District Superintendents, that there should be between twenty and forty members with one-third appointed by the District Superintendent and the balance elected by the members. One-fourth of the Council should represent business, one-fourth

parents, one-fourth principals and teachers, and one-fourth people from youth-serving, cultural, civic or professional groups. Minutes of the meetings would be submitted to the General Superintendent.[11]

At the time of the policy re-statement, six of the twenty-seven districts had no council. The others had them but they were not organized in a uniform way. The re-issuing of this policy gave the local District Superintendents the chance to strengthen these organizations. In District Seven this was vital since so many groups heralded themselves as the voice of Lincoln Park.

In the fall of 1969, Dr. Lawrence acted quickly to conform to the new rules. The Council had been operative but not extremely active in the Waller project because so many of the members were part of the Schools Planning Committee and/or the Lincoln Park Conservation Association (founded in 1954). During the 1969-70 school year the Council took on many more planning activities and its opinions were then brought to the School Planning Committee. As an accomplished fact by the Spring of 1971, the District Seven Council was the official body, acting under a Board mandate and using a consistent format for action.

During the early months of 1971, the Waller School Education Council was also formalized, following the general rules set up for District Education Councils, and the PTA had become the PTSA, or Parents, Teachers, Students Association. Most of the PTSA officers were also on the Waller Council, along with students from each of the four levels, parents, teachers, District office personnel, and representatives from the youth serving organizations. The meetings were held

monthly and were instrumental in giving input to the School-Planning Committee and later to the District Seven Education Council.

Among the many things the PTSA helped with that were quite successful was the organization of a football team which played its first game in September, 1971. This was done with the full support of various Board departments. Board people assisted in giving planning help, in raising money, in helping set a schedule (even though deadlines had been passed), and aided in getting coaches transferred to Waller. While most of the money had to be raised locally for uniforms and equipment, the PTSA assisted by steering the administration to the most sympathetic supporters. The return of football to Waller High School, after a thirty year hiatus, was a great boon to student morale.

As football practice started in the spring of 1971, a major problem came to a head. During the late 1960's, there had been a city-wide drive to keep the young off the streets. One of the ways of doing this was to pressure the juvenile and criminal court judges to give suspended sentences or supervision to those youths who, after being found guilty of minor offenses, would agree to return to school.

The high schools were poorly prepared to accept them back since most were over-age, uninterested and too old for the group they would be assigned to, based on credits earned. It was difficult for the school, the class and the student to place a street-wise eighteen-year-old in freshman classes. The Central office provided assistance in the form of extra teaching positions and added security. They also assisted in seeking grants specialists for each district to further meet the needs of these special student groups, and they assigned human relations

personnel to each district.

In January of 1970, the author discovered that there were on the Waller rolls close to 400 over-age youth, mostly male, with fewer than eight of the eighteen credits needed for graduation. Many had been expelled from other schools, most had poor attendance records since returning and as a group they were responsible for a large percentage of the problems in the school and surrounding neighborhood. An extensive counseling program was begun to attempt to return these students to classes. Social workers and human relations people held meetings with them. Local community business people offered to give them part-time jobs. At the same time the school expanded its job training classes.

In September 1970, Waller started a satellite school for young men willing to be trained for specific jobs. It was a joint effort between Waller and the Rev. Mr. Leon Sullivan of Philadelphia who started a foundation to help find employment for this type of person. Some of the overage youth were directed into this facility. Later, the satellite was formalized by the Board and three teachers were assigned to work with drop-outs and potential drop-outs on the premises of the Urban Progress Center, 800 North Clark Street.

One of the main complaints of the white parents of District Seven was that Waller was not safe for their children. The white population had declined from close to 66 percent in 1963 to less than 20 percent in September, 1970. The Black and Latino parents also had concerns because their children were intimidated into joining the gangs or were victimized by them on a much larger scale.

At the end of the school year in June, 1970, approximately 240 students were dropped from Waller, after many warnings and innumerable sessions with administrators and parents. Those who were overage (seventeen) and had few credits and poor attendance were counselled into General Education Development (GED) and evening school programs. This made things much more peaceful in September. Another check was made in November, 1970, and in January, 1971. Again, the GED and adult education alternatives were offered to the dropped students, and they were given access to the newly established Satellite.

While most students, parents and community people were pleased with the program, one element was unhappy. This group was led by a Waller biology teacher named John Boelter, who was a member of the Young Socialist Workers. He used his position as a teacher to recruit students to the YSW, and tried very hard to focus attention on issues. He expressed particular unhappiness with what he referred to as the "house cleaning" of overage youth, and used it to plan a boycott, with the dropping of a seventeen-year-old freshman as the basis. On April 7, 1971, Mr. Boelter was arrested and charged with mob action, resisting arrest, and two counts of aggravated battery and assault. The school was closed for the afternoon so the principal, the District Superintendent, and the Area C Associate Superintendent could talk to teachers and students.

Mr. Boelter was finally tried by the Board for conduct unbecoming a teacher. He was found guilty and dismissed from the service on February 9, 1972.[12] He was also found guilty in a city criminal court and was given a two year suspended sentence.

While his final actions were disruptive - his arrest and suspension were not well received by a few - the incident did result in some good. Many of the more troublesome students and gang members realized that they did not control anything but their own lives. The few teachers and community people who had supported him changed their course of action and became more cooperative. Peace, though not always quiet, returned to Waller.

It was during this period that two relatively minor actions by the Board of Education demonstrated the good faith in which they were continuing to address the needs of the District Seven schools. The Waller High School auditorium and lunchroom in 1969 and 1970 were in poor physical condition. While both were of fairly recent construction, 1961, they had been very poorly maintained: furniture and fittings were broken, the electrical system had deteriorated, roofs leaked, paint and plaster were falling off the walls. One of the first projects Dr. Hannon had undertaken was to allocate funds to quickly rehabilitate and attractively decorate both areas. The work began in November of 1970 with roof repairs as a first step. This quick response to an old problem gave credibility to the effort the Board was making at Waller. It helped improve morale at the school and, when finally completed, provided two good areas for student and community use. The proof that such improvements could be accomplished would be important later when the PBC money disappeared. The community then had reason to believe that at least a good rehabilitation of the facilities would be forthcoming.

Board Report 72-246, of February 23, 1972, included the following summary of overall progress attained in implementing city-wide recommendations of the Leu-Candoli report during the period of facilities construction by the Public Building Commission:

> The past three years have seen the development of numerous guidelines, educational specification, site studies and selection; architectural designs and mass purchase of building components and furniture and equipment. The foregoing has represented countless hours of staff and community time in moving projects through the planning, design and construction stages. Each project should reflect the specific needs of the students to be served as interpreted by the pupils, their parents and community and staff representatives. The individual projects have had community approval at each stage of their development, prior to seeking Board of Education approval.
>
> The cooperative endeavor with the Public Building Commission is now in full swing. The total program represents new capacity for approximately 35,000 students and covers all age and grade levels from pre-school (ages 3 and 4) through high school. The total building program involves more than 4 million square feet of area which is considered to be one of the largest, if not the largest, building program ever attempted by a large city. The educational program involves many new educational concepts, namely:
>
> The schome (pre-school) which is located in an area of economic deprivation, enrolls children as well as their parents;
>
> The magnet concept which can be applied equally well at the elementary or the high school level. It provides an innovative program with more personalized instruction attracting pupils and their parents from a broad range of backgrounds thus enabling a maximum integrative effort based on race, ability and socioeconomic levels;
>
> The middle school provides a new "house" concept and a program covering the adolescent years in grades 6 - 8;
>
> The performing arts center will provide further enrichment for children throughout the city, where classes opt to spend from a day to a week or more at the center with pupils from other schools (public, private and parochial) while working with the resident artist in fulfilling a project.
>
> A cultural-educational cluster links large numbers of students of wide age differences and diverse socio - economic - ethnic - racial backgrounds from throughout the city while focusing on innovation, experimentation and evaluation of educational change to bring about tested education improvements for the whole system.

Cooley-Waller High School,
Armitage Avenue and Orchard Street:

The community and staff have been meeting regularly to develop a plan which will provide for the needs of the area. A plan involving dispersion of facilities which will permit a closer coordination between program and community resources is under consideration. The project has been extended to include additional facilities at the elementary school level to phase out obsolete structures and improve existing facilities. Hopefully, the entire concept of the plan may be approved by the community and presented to the Board of Education in the very near future.[13]

The District Seven Education Council was now working very closely with Dr. Leggett and Dr. Hannon. Even though agreement had not been reached as to the site, plans were going ahead to develop the CEC. Many curriculum changes were discussed and needs assessments carried out. It was a difficult task because all the problems of the city were reflected in District Seven. The new school had to provide the proper education for the college bound, the vocationally directed, the non-English speaking, special education students, the over-aged and non-readers.

New Concept for the Waller-Cooley Project

What emerged from this period of highly-motivated collaboration were revisions to the original concept (Building Project Number 13, of November, 1968) extensive enough to require new authorization by the Board. The new concept was presented in Board Report 72-344-1, dated March 22, 1972.[14] It proposed that the Board of Education rescind the plans set forth in the 1968 Report and adopt a new approach, which addressed the major concerns that had been expressed in the long series of meetings within District Seven. Solutions were offered which incorporated this input from the community.

The issue of using park land would be resolved by a Board request that the Park District develop the land in such a way as to permit use for school physical education classes and for team practice. The City would be asked to close Orchard Street and to permit the construction of a bridge linking the Arnold School to the Waller buildings. The vocational facility replacing Cooley would be located south of North Avenue. The whole operation and the CEC would be a year-round venture.

The plan also acknowledged demographic realities by providing for approximately 3000 students. Two thousand would be on the Waller site in the proposed Academy of General Studies and the Academy of International Studies, eight hundred in the Academy of Vocational and Technical Skills to be located near industry on Clybourn Avenue. A building to include an Academy of Design and an Academy of Arts would be located on a separate site elsewhere in District Seven. The report also asked the Board to seek from the Park District a building which could house art and music facilities for the school and the community.

The estimated cost was $20,000,000, which was felt to be in line with PBC ideas.[15]

The original plan had been in place since 1968 but lack of agreement at the community level had stalled all progress. The new plan reflected intensive input from Board and District staff and seeming consensus from the community members of the District Seven Council, and focused on getting the process off dead center and moving ahead. The new plan addressed each of the major issues raised by the community and provided responsive solutions, workable solutions, clearly spelled out for implementation.

The Report presenting the new plan was automatically deferred to the Board Committee on School Building Needs and to the Committee on Area C. Dr. Hannon and Dr. Lawrence worked with them in the ensuing weeks. The author continued to meet with teachers and parents on the planning of details.

The April 19, 1972 meeting of the District Seven Council was expected by staff members to be concerned with formally approving the Board Report implementing the new concept. The only agenda item anticipated to require additional discussion was the actual site of the vocational school. Dr. Hannon, Dr. Lawrence and the author had a list of possible sites and were ready to work for consensus on two of them.

District Council Reverses Its Position

The District Seven Council, however, completely reversed the accomplishments of previous meetings by voting down the approval of the Board Report. The opposition was led by Alderman William Singer of the 43rd Ward. He had been the leading proponent of the Clybourn corridor idea for the vocational facility, but at the meeting he expressed support for the one-site concept, and rejected any Clybourn location. In additional discussion the Council went on to argue against opening the CEC in the fall unless they had all the plans set. The staff people at the meeting pointed out that time was running out. Dr. Hannon noted that of the twenty PBC projects, three were completed and occupied, eleven were under construction, and five were at the stage of construction drawings. Three of the projects had not been approved by the City Council and these funds were then used for other schools. Only the

Crane addition and Waller-Cooley had gone nowhere.

The meeting ended with the Council's rejection of the Board plan as its only product.

Upon receiving this decision from the District Seven Council, the Board's Committee on Area C and the School Building Needs Committee took steps to modify the proposal yet again, to respond to the expressed wishes of the community and to keep the project moving. At the next Board meeting, April 26, 1972, Mrs. Louise Malis, as Chairman of both Committees, introduced the following:

> The School Building Needs Committee and Committee on Area C met with staff and community representatives on Monday, April 24, 1972, 7:00 p.m. at the Board of Education Offices, 228 North La Salle Street, Board Members' Conference Room 201 to review Board Report 72-344-1, "Adopt New Concept for Public Building Commission of Chicago Public Schools BE-13 (Waller-Cooley C E C) -- Rescind Board Report 68-881," which had been referred to these Committees at the regular meeting of the Board on March 22, 1972.
>
> Based on this meeting, the Committees recommended to adoption, as amended below, of the aforementioned Board Report, copy of which is on file in the Office of the Secretary.
>
> Amendment (underscored) - Item #4 on page 2
>
> Establish an Academy of Vocational Skills and Technology on the campus; provide a superior vocational program, technology with appropriate facilities to house 800 students; provide for the physical resources, Learning Resource Center, Reading Center and science laboratories in the Academy of General Studies; move toward a year-round calendar compatible with the schedule of the academies on the main campus.
>
> Respectfully submitted,
>
> Building Needs Committee
>
> Louise Malis, Chairman
> Alvin Boutte, Member
> Carey B. Preston, Member
>
> Committee on Area C
>
> Louise Malis, Chairman
> Warren H. Bacon, Member
> Maria B. Cerda, Member[16]

Board Member Gerald Sbarbaro acknowledged that a number of calls and letters had been received on the matter, and requested a deferment to permit review of the community's views. The amendment was deferred to the meeting of May 10, when it was passed by the Board. The District Seven Council was informed by Dr. Redmond that implementation might be delayed due to all the changes.

In July 1972, the Board realigned the projects that were under the Public Building Commission. They removed the Crane High School addition and assumed the double responsibility of acquiring land and then finishing the addition to that west side high school.

> In regard to the Waller [Cultural-Educational Complex], the Board of Education's Educational and Facilities Planning Department will engage in discussion with the Federal and State governments to ascertain the availability of funds to cover all or part of [it]. The staff will re-open discussions with the community as to the parameters of the project and the schedule for implementation by the Board of Education. . . . Costs and appropriations will be projected at a later date.[17]

The original plan for the twenty PBC projects[18] had included two Social Adjustment Schools, three Middle Schools, seven Elementary Schools and eight High Schools, with six of the latter being designated CECs. Over the years the idea of two Social Adjustment schools was dropped for lack of local support and approval by the City Council. A needs survey had showed that two of the elementary schools were not needed, and those projects became the Taft addition and the Wells site improvement.

In the first week of August, 1972, the Public Building Commission announced that since it had spent 140 million dollars more than planned on the school building projects, and since only two schools were not

started, it would cut off all funds immediately. Taxes for the Board of Education's own building fund had by this time been encumbered, so Board resources should be looked to for all projects in the future.[19]

This eventuality could have been predicted: in fact, Dr. Hannon had been anticipating it. A school facilities rehabilitation plan had been instituted in October of 1971.[20] The program was based on a study completed for the Board in March of 1970 by the architectural and engineering firm of A. Epstein and Sons, Inc. The Board adopted the rehabilitation plan and then hired the Epstein firm to monitor it. It was their job to set priorities; to develop standards, plans and schedules; to oversee work and cash flow; and to review the progress of contractors.

Under the plan, 389 buildings would be rehabilitated. The number might be changed if it was determined, after initial investigations, that replacement would be more cost-effective than rehabilitation. No building constructed after 1951 would be considered. The original cost estimate for the rehabilitation program was 283 million dollars; the Board decided to sell bonds in the amount of 250 million dollars.

Originally it had been assumed that the Board of Education architects would undertake the building condition investigations, set the specifications and prepare working drawings for the proposed work. Given the time schedule for such an extensive program, the Board architects realized that their staff was too small. During April of 1972, when the District Seven Council had been focusing on their criteria for new construction under the PBC program, the Board had been soliciting statements of interest and qualifications from Chicago's major school

architectural and engineering firms to carry out the rehabilitation program.[21] Eighty-nine firms responded, and sixty-two were tentatively assigned blocks of schools within districts. Three construction management firms were also hired, one for each Board administrative area, to provide overall supervision and to facilitate the administration and financial aspects.

Rehabilitation Replaces PBC Funding

If District Seven were to lose its opportunity for new schools, those existing would surely require rehabilitation. Since 1969 when the Waller-Cooley project had started, very little maintenance work had been done on either building. The auditorium and cafeteria work done at Waller had been accomplished as exceptions to a reasonable plan of avoiding expense on buildings that were slated to be replaced. No rehabilitation was planned: the Board had hoped to save money by not having to do anything twice. Both schools were by now in terrible shape cosmetically and there were many heating, plumbing and electrical problems. Both of the school Councils were upset about this so Dr. Lawrence enlisted the assistance of Dr. Hannon to try to address these very real and immediate needs. After a number of meetings to examine the various possibilities, Dr.Hannon and Dr Lawrence determined that both the Waller and Cooley schools should be included in this rehabilitation program.

The program, now entitled "Deferred Maintenance and Rehabilitation, was approved by the Board on June 14, 1972,[22] with authorization for the sale of 25 million dollars in bonds; the vote was 9 to 0 to adopt. A total of 250 million dollars would eventually be spent.

The rehabilitation program itself was not without implications for programs of other agencies and vested interests of special groups. As part of the program city-wide, it had also been agreed that specifications would be included for roofing, electrical, surveillance systems, painting, decorating, window and door replacements, improvements to incinerators and the conversion of heating plant boilers as needed.[23]

Part way through the program, the City of Chicago would insist that incinerators be improved to meet new pollution standards. Some projects had been started; these were finished. The rest were put on hold in order that incinerator provisions might be revised to meet the pollution standards.[24] This represented the first serious attempt on the part of the Board of Education to cooperate with the environmental control programs of the City.

The final board report adopting the program had also given approval to convert all old boilers to new lower pressure systems and to make all new installations low pressure gas or oil systems.[24] While this made sense from the economic and pollution control standpoint, it caused complaints to Board members from the coal industry and from the Operating Engineers Union, Local 143. Converting from high pressure to low pressure meant that certified engineer-custodians might no longer be needed. It also meant that Illinois coal would no longer be used and a depressed industry would become even more depressed.

From the perspective of the community involvement program, it is of interest to note that neither of these complications was allowed to stand in the way of progress on the needed school rehabilitation:

apparently, Board decision-makers retained a sense of purpose and found it possible to accommodate these concerns about physical plant items.

While the District Seven community continued in the spring of 1972 to argue over the issues of school size and site, Dr. Hannon had quietly included Waller and Cooley on the list of schools to be rehabilitated. By the end of June, 1972, the engineering firm of Y. C. Wong Associates[25] had been engaged to do the building rehabilitation survey for the Waller-Cooley project, and the firm of Cone and Dornbusch were hired as the supervising architects.[26]

Thus on September 8, 1972, little more than a month after termination of the PBC construction funding, the Board of Education appropriated[27] the first monies for rehabilitation of the secondary schools in District Seven. Cooley was to receive $1,073,790, and Waller $964,890.

As planning started in the fall of 1972 on the major rehabilitation, the District Council continued working with Dr. Hannon and Dr. Lawrence to find money to build the CEC. The Cooley parents, however, were losing patience with this approach and fought to get something better for Cooley High School. They felt a rehabilitation of the 1904 building would be a waste of money since the layout of the school was impossibly out-dated. Efforts were then directed by the Board staff to find new funds for Cooley.

State money under the Illinois Capital Development Board eventually was authorized,[28] and planning was approved for a new vocational school to be built at Larrabee and Blackhawk.

Interest in the CEC for Waller faded since there was nothing being

done city-wide. Even though the other high schools originally designated CECs were being built, the centers would never be activated.

The status report of the Public Building Commission projects as of December 27,1972[29] showed seventeen projects finished or under construction, with two still in the final planning stage. All three middle schools were occupied: Dyett, Austin and Hope. Four of the five elementary schools were occupied: Truth, Disney, White and Morgan; the 103rd Street and Cottage Grove School was 20 percent complete. Among the high schools, Carver, Clemente, Orr, Curie and Farragut were 50 percent or more complete; Young, Taft, Julien and Carver were started but less than 12 percent complete, while Wells and Farragut were still in the planning stage. The Crane addition finally had been started with Board funds. Waller and Cooley thus remained the only schools that never proceeded beyond the talking stage: the massive planning and community involvement effort had continued until the curtain fell.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

The perspective of more than a decade's distance in time permits some critical evaluation of the effectiveness of the various players in the planning process for secondary education in Chicago Public School District Seven as it took place between August 1968 and August 1972. This chapter attempts such an evaluation by a process of review and analysis as follows:

Facilities and programs: What has been the outcome of the educational and facilities recommendations which were the focus of the Leu-Candoli plan and the Public Building Commission construction program?

Participation in the planning process: What methods may be seen to have characterized the participation of the various groups, agencies, administrators and other individuals involved in the process?

Community and Board of Education goals: Were community goals realized? If so, by what means? If not, why not? Were Board goals achieved? The District Seven experience will be compared with that of a similar community under the different administrative style of an earlier General Superintendent, and with that of other communities seeking to

implement the Leu-Candoli recommendations under the same General Superintendent and the same PBC construction program.

Facilities for District Seven Secondary Schools

A new vocational secondary school was built on a site easily accessible to all the students in Lincoln Park, Near North and the balance of the north and northwest sides. Named the Near North Career Magnet High School, it was constructed south of North Avenue but east of Clybourn, at 1450 North Larrabee Street, on land cleared under Urban Renewal. Clearance of the site had destroyed an old and favorite Chicago institution, Sieben's Brewery. Sieben's indoor bier stube and outdoor garden had been among the last remnants of the old German neighborhood.

The buildings at Sedgwick and Division that had housed successively Lane Technical High School, Washburne Trade School, and finally Cooley Vocational High School were completely razed in 1981. The location, which had been a school site since the 1840s, is now a Little League baseball park, named after Fred Carson, a Cabrini-Green community leader who was shot in the early 1970s.

The Waller High School building was extensively rehabilitated through the 1970s and early 1980s. In 1979-80 "Waller High School" was laid to rest and the institution was resurrected as "Lincoln Park High School." The intent to make a fresh start with a new image was reinforced by the simultaneous creation of elitist separate programs within the school: a Science and Mathematics Academy, a Foreign Language Academy, and an International Baccalaureate program, as examples.

While it is true that a new facility was not built on the Waller site, it has turned out that one was not needed. The Waller structure has been well rehabilitated and thus an eighty-four-year-old building has been preserved in a community which respects tradition and is very rehabilitation oriented.

The mall that the author and his staff planned has been created and is considered a neighborhood asset. Orchard Street from Armitage to Dickens was vacated and in 1981 the mall was created with landscaping that merged into the four-block-square OZ Park, successfully saved from school construction by the insistence of the community. Lincoln Park High School uses the park informally as an extended campus and formally for sports, particularly football and baseball practice.

The Arnold School building was never incorporated as a high school facility. The gymnasium in the Arnold building was set aside for high school use, and the balance of the building converted as the District Seven office and the North Side Diagnostic Center, along with some rooms for special education. The second floor of the building eventually housed the Department of Testing and Evaluation.

Each of the District Seven secondary schools has a viable range of programs which attract an integrated student body. The enrollment projections and racial assumptions of those involved in the controversial planning process may be compared with enrollment statistics for the resulting schools a little over a decade later, remembering that many had wanted a school capable of handling 5,000 students.

TABLE 3

COMPARATIVE ENROLLMENT STATISTICS

1972		1984	
TOTAL ENROLLMENT[1]		TOTAL ENROLLMENT[2]	
Waller	1,668	Lincoln Park	1,504
White -	201 (12.1%)	White -	545 (36.2%)
Black -	1,098 (65.8%)	Black -	698 (46.5%)
Asian -	20 (1.2%)	Asian -	80 (5.3%)
Hispanic -	349 (20.9%)	Hispanic -	181 (12.0%)
Cooley	585	Near North Career Magnet	1,073
White -	0	White -	78 (7.3%)
Black -	584 (99.9%)	Black -	899 (83.8%)
Amer. Ind.-	0	Amer. Ind.-	3 (.2%)
Asian -	0	Asian -	28 (2.6%)
Hispanic -	1 (.1%)	Hispanic -	65 (6.1%)
Combined Schools	2,253	Combined Schools	2,577
White -	201 (8.9%)	White -	623 (24.2%)
Black -	1,682 (74.7%)	Black -	1,579 (62.0%)
Amer. Ind.-	0	Amer. Ind.-	3 (.1%)
Asian -	20 (15.5%)	Asian -	108 (4.2%)
Hispanic -	350 (.9%)	Hispanic -	246 (9.5%)

In 1972, Waller's enrollment had been limited to the geographic attendance area which was essentially that of District Seven; for all practical purposes, the same was true of Cooley.

In 1984, Lincoln Park High School and Near North Career Magnet High School draw students from the entire city. A 1982 study of Lincoln Park's membership showed students from almost every Chicago community area, plus some non-resident (suburban) students.

Programs Created by the Leu-Candoli Plan

Considered on a city-wide basis the Leu-Candoli "experiment" was and is successful. On a physical level, ninety-four percent of the projects planned were completed. Some projects were rejected, such as the social adjustment schools and unnecessary elementary schools, but the planning was flexible enough that funding could be and was diverted to other projects. The planning was successful in that nothing was "rubber stamped." True community planning was involved in all the varied areas.

Most important for the city is the fact that the really important concepts of the Leu-Candoli plan are in place in the schools of Chicago today. Schomes, middle schools, magnet schools, the academy concept, and improved desegregation are very much part of the educational system in the 1980s. The only major component not realized is the Cultural-Educational Center. The CEC probably failed because of the fiscal commitment involved, along with some disillusionment on the part of key Board staff members as to the efficiency and effectiveness of the community planning that would have been a continuing part of each CEC.

In the Lincoln Park-Near North community, it is the author's opinion that the Leu-Candoli Plan had a positive effect. Many of the educational innovations that the Waller and Cooley staffs worked on in the early seventies are in place.

Community Goals

Was the planning process undertaken by the Chicago Board of Education successful in incorporating community goals into the planning

process for secondary schools in District Seven? The question may also be asked from the community's standpoint: were the various interests successful in seeing their goals attained?

A problem basic to the planning process is perhaps more clear in retrospect than it was at the time: the Board of Education had never defined community in a statement of policy. The Board members seemed to assume that each local school had its own group, usually consisting of parents, who would let the local principal or District Superintendent know its needs and concerns. As conflict grew in the mid-nineteen-sixties, the Board had suggested and then mandated District Education Councils. Dr. Lawrence eventually was able to strengthen the role of the District Seven Education Council as the forum for school planning discussions between the two major factions in Lincoln Park, but these groups may be seen to have spent most of the three-year planning period avoiding consensus.

In District Seven, consensus probably was not reached because the basic concept of community planning became intertwined with the extreme social issues of the late 1960'S. The Leu-Candoli plan was introduced on August 8, 1968. From August 25 to August 28, the Democratic National Convention demonstrators were encamped in Lincoln Park, parading in front of the Conrad Hilton Hotel, and in what would later be called police riots, serving to polarize feelings. Some of the member churches of the North Side Cooperative Ministry housed the demonstrators during the "days of rage," which more conservative members of the Lincoln Park Conservation Association found appalling. The two factions simply had differing agendas, which "community" meetings would serve to emphasize.

Some insight into what afflicted the people of Lincoln Park in those years is afforded by another observer, a sociologist writing on aspects of urban ritual,[3] who saw in the situation evidence of anomie, "a state of society in which the normative standards of conduct and belief are weak or lacking"[4] :

> The situation in Lincoln Park in the late 1960s was potentially anomic. . . . One source of anomie was the civil rights movement. The militant demonstrations of the mid-sixties challenged the legitimacy of customary American ways of organizing relationships between blacks and whites. As laws began to change and behavior proved to be more difficult to change, the location of the problem in the cultural phenomenon of custom became clearer. . . .
>
> For many in the area, [the] situation was not anomic; it was just dangerous. The principle of conduct was clear: keep them out. The problem was merely technical: how to keep them out. For the few persons labeled radicals, the situation was also not anomic. For them, too, the principle was clear: let them in. For them, too, the problem of civil rights was a technical one: how to keep the poor and minority ethnic groups in the area.[5]

Indeed, the North Side Cooperative Ministry had accused the Lincoln Park Conservation Association of driving the poor out of the area to increase their profits in real estate, and of practicing gross institutional racism. When members of the LPCA went to Washington to try to cut the funding of the neighborhood churches, the chasm between the two ideologies became even wider.

Political power was also an issue, since the LPCA was viewed by these opponents as being the champion of business and the larger institutions in the neighborhood. Issues such as subsidized housing for the poor, free medical care, and even the right to vote became grist for the mill of disagreement.

Thus when consensus in educational planning was requested of the

community, all the disagreements were transferred to the school situation. When the Board central staff and local professionals refused to take sides, they were labelled "conservative" by one side and "traitors" by the other.

Even with these overwhelming differences of orientation, the original plan for an innovative school of reasonable size on the proper site might have succeeded if the Chicago Board of Education had clearly defined the role of community participation and had given the District Superintendent the authority to enforce guidelines. Since this was not done, the two factions held out, each assuming they would eventually win, thus a classic twentieth-century confrontation. Board of Education personnel at every level thus spent three years seeking some forward movement, either by moving beyond that community stalemate or by somehow incorporating it into rational planning.

Board Participation in the Planning Process

As District Superintendent, Dr. Bessie Lawrence charged the principals of the district, plus her own staff members, with the task of involving equitably all community groups. As professionals they were expected not to take sides, to be receptive to all points of view, to be understanding of all aspects of community problems, and to be able to communicate to the Board of Education Central Office the needs of the neighborhoods -- without losing sight of the problems and policies of the Board. They were, of course, expected to administer and supervise their schools and perform their duties as prescribed by the Board of Education. In addition, they were to involve the teachers, parents and

and students in the planning process.

To make the task easier, the professionals of District Seven were sent to city-wide seminars on human relations, were involved in numerous in-service sessions and served as resources for all sorts of community groups. The schools were open to planning sessions and public meetings.

The principal of each high school took the lead in persuading a representative group of teachers and parents to attend the district-wide community meetings. The elementary principals in the district were kept informed of the planning progress, or lack of it, and they were encouraged to speak out. Since the focal point in District Seven was the secondary school situation, the high schools professionals and parents were involved to the greatest extent.

The high school teachers were instrumental in keeping open good communications with the students and parents. They kept the students informed of what was being discussed on a regular basis and they also served to convey to the planning group such ideas as students had expressed regarding their own needs and desires. While not all teachers and few students were interested enough to come to all the many evening meetings, both groups were kept informed of meetings by written communications, bulletin board notices and letters of invitation to parents.

The Central Office personnel served a much different role. Since their function was city-wide planning, one of their concerns was that each community was given equal service, time, resources and financial support. Since they were small in number this was not easy. It was

difficult for them to come, in force, to community meetings. There were usually one or two staff people at each meeting. When important discussions had to be made a team would be there. They were very skilled at giving public presentations.

For the most part they were of most benefit serving as a resource for the local staff. A good example of this was seen when the original plans for Waller-Cooley were being drawn up and the community wanted to plan for 5,000 students. The demographics staff worked for hours trying to develop future population and attendance projections that might substantiate the community's projections, but could only see a top of 3500 students for the new facility, and that based on the establishment of a highly successful magnet school.

Another area in which Central office staff were most helpful was financial planning. They did an excellent job monitoring new sources of funding. While obtaining funding was a staff function, they often called on the local staff to help organize lobbying efforts at the State level.

They were also quite adept at showing how money could best be spent. This was important because all projects had budget limitations, and alternate ways of spending could be presented for community response.

A most important function of Central Office staff was to keep open the communication with the various city agencies. The most important of these was the Public Building Commission, which funded the construction of the school facilities. The PBC was instrumental in the

decision that the new buildings be designed with attention to security and ease of maintenance.

Central Office staff also worked closely with staff people from the Department of Urban Renewal, the Chicago Park District and the Chicago Public Library. All were important in developing new sites, either in providing land or in sharing space. These negotiations were often very delicate.

The District Seven administrators and staff continued throughout to remain as professional as possible. Their roles remained constant as conduits to the Central Office for the concerns of the community. The positions of both factions were clearly and accurately portrayed to Central Office administrators and to other agencies. This was instrumental in finally providing what the community seemed to want.

Might a different administrative approach have achieved the same results with less delay and frustration? Certainly there is no question of the Board's good faith in monitoring the District Seven planning process and responding to any sign of consensus. Board facilities planning was well organized, and District Seven obtained a fair share of planning attention and budget.

Throughout the process, the Schools Planning Committee continued to meet monthly, and to receive the various plans developed by the Board in response to expressed needs. After discussions by the SPC, Board staff would again adjust plans to fit the ideas of the community. The staff work was directed by Dr. Leggett, who completed the educational specifications in August of 1970. But at no time had a special subcommittee of the SPC been set up to work with him, or to review the

final product and make recommendation as to its adoption.

The Board of Education could go no further than these specifications because no firm decisions had been reached regarding the site. One factor causing the delay was the controversial use of a large portion of the small adjacent park. Another factor was school size: those insisting on a large enrollment to assure racial balance and the viability of curriculum options were opposed by neighbors of the Waller site who feared the impact on the area of a large student body.

When it became evident that there was no decision coming out of the District Seven Council, the LPCA took its own plan to the Board. It was then given to the Public Building Commission. This initiative by the LPCA caused the District Seven Council to finally take a stand, and on April 14, 1971, the Council formally asked the Board to build one school for the community.

In response, the PBC offered to build one school but to put it on three sites. The District Seven Council rejected this. The Board of Education Area C Committee, still seeking a consensus that could be acted upon, in effect asked the Council to put that in writing, by conducting a formal survey of the community. The survey verified community support for a school on one site in preference to three.

The inability of the community groups to resolve issues among themselves had effectively returned planning decisions to the Board. Now it was a question of what the Board would do with that authority. It is of interest to consider how an earlier Board administration, that of General Superintendent Benjamin Willis, had implemented plans for a

similar community, Hyde Park.

Through the early 1960s, the Chicago South Side community of Hyde Park had been in ferment over the overcrowded high school situation there. Elementary students were leaving the public schools as they approached high school age. Public hearings were held. On October 27, 1965, after two days of testimony, Dr. Willis made a lengthy statement[6] concerning the expansion of Hyde Park High School at 62nd Street and Stony Island Avenue. It had been requested that Hyde Park be modernized and enlarged to provide for as many as 6000 students. This had become a major community issue with much controversy over site, size and racial composition. He observed that the situation was analogous to that then prevailing at Tilden and Waller High Schools.

Dr. Willis pointed out the distinct advantages of having more than one school in the area. These were mainly based on ease of access to the school, problems of student density, and concerns of neighbors and local business people. He strongly advised that the Kenwood elementary site at 5015 South Blackstone Avenue, then an upper grade center serving 543 students, be considered as one site for a new high school.

Using existing and projected enrollment figures, he suggested not one but three schools. He pointed out that a school for approximately 2000 students made the best use of space, permitted a full range of subjects with good grouping for diverse groups, allowed the students and teachers to know each other, and provided the right size for a good extra-curricular program.

He proposed[7] that Kenwood be built first, followed by modernization of Hyde Park; a third school would be built when dictated by future

needs. The projections for 1970 indicated a student population of 1820 in Kenwood, 2180 in Hyde Park, and 2070 in a new school south of the area. The last would be built when population trends stabilized south and west of the area. By building a new school Dr. Willis and his staff hoped to keep and attract more white students so at least one school could be mixed racially.

The Board Report making these recommendations was deferred[8] by the Board at the request of the President, Mr. Frank Whiston. By deferring adoption, the Board was supporting Dr. Willis, in effect saying that they would take a good look at the Kenwood idea.

The strong stand taken by Dr. Willis and his staff convinced the Board and approval was subsequently given to start work on Kenwood by the end of 1965. Some of the community were very unhappy with this approach but the Board persevered. Kenwood Academy was built at 5015 South Blackstone Avenue.

By the early 1980s, Kenwood Academy, as a magnet school, was one of the best academically in the city. In 1984, Kenwood's enrollment[9] was 2084, with 79 percent non-white; Hyde Park Career Academy had 2780 students, with 98.8 percent non-white. The third high school has not been built.

The strong stand taken by the Board of Education in 1965 was lacking in 1969. The neighborhoods were very similar geographically, racially and politically. Hyde Park was more stable, probably due to the presence and influence of the University of Chicago. By 1967, the city had undergone racial riots, some high schools were nearly out of

control and there was a new General Superintendent. Responsibility had been shifted in part to the local Districts and their superintendents. However, the authority still remained with the Board. The manner of exercising that authority would prove to be crucial for District Seven.

What happened in Lincoln Park-Near North may also be compared with the results in other areas of the city where the Leu-Candoli plan was being implemented in the same turbulent time period, under the same Board of Education and General Superintendent. Six high schools with designated CECs were to be built under the Public Building Commission construction program. Five of them were completed: Carver, Clemente, Corliss, Curie and Julian.

The communities of each of these five had been involved in planning at a District level in the same manner as was undertaken in District Seven. None of those five community groups achieved complete agreement on all aspects, yet all of them did reach consensus sufficient to obtain Board approval and PBC funding. All five schools were built.

On the far South Side, Carver, Collins,and Julian did not settle disagreements over their attendance boundaries until the schools were nearly ready to open, and until 1983, a lottery was held for students who were "out of District." But the dispute had not been allowed to stand in the way of school construction.

Since the Waller project was the only one not completed by the Board of Education, one must make the conjecture as to why. While the stated reason that the PBC had run out of money was true, it is also true that District Seven had been the first community to be presented with a proposed plan. The Schools Planning Committee received a very

reasonable timetable from the Board's Department of Facilities Planning and they chose to ignore it. Not meeting deadlines became a way of life. Community consensus was not obtained until the District Education Council took over the planning, and then only when the LPCA forced that approval by going directly to the Board -- a process to which community pressure groups had commonly resorted through the whole history of the Chicago school system. By the time consensus was extracted from the community, it was too late to get the school site, size and specifications in one package that could be dealt with by the approving agencies. The PBC funding opportunity was missed.

Another reason the project failed was because the public meetings were often a disgrace to anyone sensitive to normal, decent behavior. In the first two years the author's prime concern when calling a meeting was whether there would be enough police protection. It is interesting that it was often those meetings with guests from outside the district that were the ones that got out of hand. Such official gatherings provided occasion for the display of intractable social anger on the part of some groups seeking redress through the schools. Meetings were not treated as discussions toward achieving an end, but as opportunities to forego rational deliberation as a show of strength. While the important personages may have understood the essentially disruptive action of gang members and of the radical ministry, it was hard for them to accept the fact that seemingly normal adults went along with it.

Again, the sociologist's interpretation of the anomic behavior in the Lincoln Park of the 1960s may provide illumination to school admin-

istrators working to implement the wishes of society:

> Thus government and the powerful institutions of the community did not provide any moral authority to help resolve the demands of substantive justice. This in turn meant that the policies and pronouncements of government could not be seen as a source of valid meaning of the events in the community.[10]

The ostensible reason the project was not completed was that the Board of Education would not approve without community consensus. Behind that reason are a number of explanations.

Participation and input to a governing body such as a large city board of education requires that the body has received information on which to act. This the Chicago Board of Education did not do in a timely fashion. When the stalemate was obvious, the Board should have set a deadline. Without this action, the generous PBC funding was lost.

The Board's failure to exercise its authority in 1970 was tied to its desire to strengthen the involvement of the District Councils. Since the people who served on the District Seven Council had very close ties to the media and since they were a very vocal group, the Board refused to override them.

Another reason for not acting faster was the fact that this Board consisted of many of the same members who had only recently allowed Dr. Willis virtually free rein in the controversial matters which had led to his resignation. The Board members were not likely to do that again.

The final result was that the two District Seven communities maintained their separate stances and received essentially what they wanted. By 1973, of course, the leadership of the two factions had changed and their differences had been softened. The Near North community wanted a decent facility for their children, and they got the new

school, Near North Career Magnet High School. The Lincoln Park community wanted a school that could offer a good college preparatory program, and they got that in the programs that evolved at Lincoln Park High School. However, if the Board had acted in time to use PBC money, facility improvements could have been started in 1970 and done much more extensively. If that funding had been tapped for the new vocational building, more than seven years would have been saved.

NOTES - CHAPTER I

[1]Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools, Report to the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, March 31, 1964 (usually called The Hauser Report).

[2]Robert J. Havighurst, The Public Schools of Chicago: A Survey for the Board of Education, (Chicago Board of Education, 1964).

[3]James F. Redmond was General Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools from 1966 until 1975.

[4]A Long Range School Facilities Program (Chicago Board of Education, 1966).

[5]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1966-67, Board Report 67-449-2, p. 3114.

[6]Donald J. Leu was professor of Educational Planning, Michigan State University; in May, 1967 he was named Project Director of The Long-Range Educational Plan for Chicago.

[7]I. Carl Candoli was professor of Educational Planning, Ohio State University; in May, 1967, he was named Associate Director of The Long-Range Educational Plan for Chicago project.

[8]Donald J. Leu and I. Carl Candoli, Design For The Future, vol. 1: A Recommended Long Range Educational Plan For Chicago; vol. 2: Educational Facilities Data, 2 vols. (Chicago Board of Education, 1968).

[9]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1966-7, Board Report 67-449-2, 16 June 1967, p. 3114.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Donald J. Leu and I. Carl Candoli, Planning for the Future: A Recommended Long-Range Educational and Facilities Plan for Chicago (Chicago: Board of Education of the City of Chicago, 1971), p. 36.

[12]Leu and Candoli, Planning for the Future, p. 36.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Leu and Candoli, Design for the Future, 1:D-2.

[15]Leu and Candoli, Planning for the Future, p. 36.

[16]Ibid., p. 37.

[17]Leu and Candoli, Design for the Future, 1:D-3.

[18]Ibid., 1:D-4.

[19]Ibid., 1:D-6.

[20]Leu and Candoli, Planning for the Future, p. 37.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Leu and Candoli, Design for the Future, 1: D-7.

[23]Ibid., 1:D-13.

[24]Ibid., 1:D-14.

[25]Ibid., 1:D-16.

[26]Ibid., 1:D-9.

[27]Leu and Candoli, Planning for The Future, p. 27.

[28]Leu and Candoli, Design for the Future, 1:D-10-11.

[29]Ibid., 1:D-13.

[30]Ibid., 1:D-16.

[31]Stanton Leggett was a partner of Englehart, Englehart and Leggett, educational consulting firm hired by the Board in 1968 to direct facilities planning.

[32]Leu and Candoli, Design for the Future, 1: D-23.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid., 1:D-24.

[35]Leu and Candoli, Planning for the Future, p. 26..

[36]Ibid., p. 31.

[37]Ibid., p. 39.

[38]Leu and Candoli, Design For The Future, 1:B-1.

[39]Donald J. Leu and I.Carl Candoli, A Feasibility Study of "The Cultural-Educational Park" For Chicago (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1968), p. A-1.

[40]'Cluster' was changed to 'Center' in common community usage.

[41]Leu and Candoli, A Feasibility Study..., p. A-1.

[42]Ibid., pp. B-2 to 7.

[43]Ibid., B-5.

[44]Ibid., B-8 to 10.

[45]Ibid., B-11.

[46]Ibid., D-2.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Ibid., D-29.

[50]Ibid., D-31.

[51]Ibid., C-13.

[52]Leu and Candoli, Planning for the Future, p. 29.

[53]Leu and Candoli, A Feasibility Study..., p. D-21.

[54]Ibid., p. D-25.

[55]Ibid., p. D-30.

[56]Ibid., p. D-31.

NOTES - CHAPTER II

[1]Bessie Louise Pierce, History of Chicago, 3 vols. (New York: Knopf, 1937-1957), 1:12.

[2]Mary Herrick, The Chicago Schools: A Social and Political History, (Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, 1971), p. 403.

[3]Harvey W. Zorbaugh, The Gold Coast and The Slums, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929), p. 13.

[4]Pierce, History of Chicago, 1:238.

[5]Ibid., 1:415.

[6]Ibid., 1:316.

[7]Zorbaugh, Gold Coast and The Slums, p. 22.

[8]Pierce, History of Chicago, 1:240.

[9]Jubilee History of the Archdiocese of Chicago [Roman Catholic], (Des Plaines, Il.: St. Mary's Training School, 1920), p. 209.

[10]Fergus, Robert, comp., Directory of the City of Chicago: 1839 (Chicago: Fergus Publishing Co., 1876), p. 26.

[11]Pierce, History of Chicago, 1:413.

[12]Ibid., 1:230.

[13]Ibid., 1:413-18.

[14]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1862-63, p. 70.

[15]A. T. Andreas, History of Chicago, 3 vols. (Chicago: A. T. Andreas, 1884), p. 211.

[16]Ibid., 1:208-10.

[17]Ibid., 1:211.

[18]Ibid., 1:212.

[19]Ibid., 1:211-12.

[20]Ibid., 1:212-13.

[21]Ibid., 1:212.

[22]Ibid., 1:214-16.

[23]Ibid., 1:216.

[24]Ibid., 2:111-12.

[25]Ibid., 2:113.

[26]Herrick, The Chicago Schools, p. 61.

[27]Andreas, History of Chicago, 2:111.

[28]Ibid., 1:215.

[29]Herrick, The Chicago Schools, p. 403.

[30]Andreas, History of Chicago, 2:113.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Herrick, The Chicago Schools, p. 403.

[33]Various school facilities surveys, particularly School Report,1913-4, p. 87; and Andreas, History of Chicago, 3:143.

[34]Andreas, History of Chicago, 3:143.

[35]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1875-76, p. 47.

[36]Chicago Board of Education, Department of Administrative Research, Annual Statistics Book, 1877-78. Original.

[37]Chicago Tribune, 8 August 1876.

[38]Chicago Board of Education, Department of Administrative Research, Annual Statistics Book, 1877-78. Original.

[39]Pierce, History of Chicago, 3:383.

[40]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1892-93, p. 255.

[41]Herrick, History of Chicago Schools, p. 59.

[42]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1880-81, p. 79.

[43]Ibid., 1892-3, p. 37.

[44]Ibid., 1894-5, p. 222.

[45]Ibid., 1897-8, p. 178.

[46]Ibid., 1898-9, p. 210.

[47]Edith Abbott, The Tenements of Chicago: 1908-35, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 23.

[48]Pierce, History of Chicago, 3:382.

[49]Ibid., 3:521.

[50]Ibid., 3:385.

[51]Herrick, History of Chicago Schools, p. 61.

[52]Chicago Board of Educations, Proceedings of 1907-8, p. 120.

[53]Ibid., 1896-7, p. 85.

[54]Jubilee History of the Archdiocese of Chicago, pp. 620-1.

[55]Pierce, 3:441.

[56]Jubilee History of the Archdiocese of Chicago, pp. 408 and 607.

[57]Ibid., p. 608.

[58]Zorbaugh, The Gold Coast and The Slums, p. 164.

[59]The Chicago Commission on Race Relations, The Negro in Chicago, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922), p. 106.

[60]Ibid.

[61]Allan H. Spear, Black Chicago: The Making of a Negro Ghetto - 1890-1920, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 20.

[62]The Chicago Commission on Race Relations, The Negro in Chicago, p. 112.

[63]U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940; Population and Housing Census Tracts, Chicago SMSA, Census.

[64]A.T. Andreas, 3:111.

[65]Herrick, History of Chicago Schools, pp. 63-5.

[66]Ibid., p. 87.

[67]Zorbaugh, The Gold Coast and The Slums, p. 188.

[68]Ibid.

[69]Ibid., p. 216.

[70]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Sixteenth Census: 1940; Seventeenth Census: 1950; Eighteenth Census: 1960; and Nineteenth Census: 1970.

[71]Chicago, Il.: Chicago Housing Authority, Annual Report for 1975.

[72]Chicago Board of Education, Department of Administrative Research, School Membership Records, 1963 and 1972. Original.

NOTES - CHAPTER III

[1] "Records of The Waller High School PTA Meetings, 1954-57." Entry of the meeting of 18 May 1954.

[2]Ibid., 20 September 1955.

[3]"Author's Notes," District Seven meeting, 8 August 1968.

[4]Chicago, Il.: Municipal Code of Chicago, Chapter 194A, Zoning Ordinance, 29 May 1957.

[5]Chicago, Il.: Department of Development and Planning, The Comprehensive Plan for Chicago, (1967).

[6]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1966-67, Board Report 67-449-2, 16 June 1967, p. 3114.

[7]Donald J. Leu and I. Carl Candoli, A Feasibility Study of the 'Cultural-Educational Park' For Chicago (Chicago Board of Education, 1968).

[8]"Author's Notes," District Seven Meeting, 8 August 1968.

[9]"Author's Notes," District Seven Meeting, 22 September 1968.

[10]Rev. Mr. James A. Shiflett, Chairman, District 7 Schools Planning Committee, to Dr. James Redmond, General Superintendent of Schools, 5 November 1968.

[11]"Author's Notes," School Planning Committee, 12 November 1968.

[12]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1968-69, Board Report 68-881, 13 November 1968, pp. 810-11.

[13]John Kahlert, Report on School Planning for Waller High School, submitted to the Lincoln Park Conservation Association, December 1968.

[14]"Author's Notes," School Planning Committee, 4 December 1968.

[15]"Author's Notes," District Seven Staff Meeting, 13 December 1968.

[16]"Citizens Will Help Plan Magnet High," Chicago Tribune, 22 December 1968, Sec. 2, p. 2.

[17]"Author's Notes," District Seven Meeting 17 December 1968.

[18]"Agenda for meeting 7 January 1969," Schools Planning Committee of District Seven.

[19]"Author's Notes," Schools Planning Committee meeting, 7 January 1969.

[20]"Author's Notes," Schools Planning Committee meeting, 22 January 1969.

[21]"Young Lords and Friends Shout, Disrupt Police Council Meeting," Near North News, Chicago, 15 February 1969, p. 1.

[22]"Express Concern For Negroes Property in Waller Magnet Area," Chicago Tribune, 24 February 1969, Sec. 2, p. 3.

[23]Stanton Leggett, mimeographed 'hand-outs'.

[24]"Confrontation-New Style," [Press Release] McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, 27 May 1969.

[25]"New Waller Plan Calls For Area Help," Lerner Booster Newspapers, 18 May 1969, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[26]"LPCA Grills Leggett On His Plans For Waller," Lerner Booster Newspapers, 11 June 1969, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[27]Stanley Leggett, Community School in the City: Educational Specifications for the Waller-Cooley CEC #4 (Chicago: Stanton Leggett and Associates, 1969).

[28]"Author's Notes, Mid-North Association Meeting, 29 July 1969.

[29]Peter H. Bauer to Members of Mid-North Association, Chicago, 4 August 1969.

[30]"A Bizarre Night at Waller," Lerner Booster Newspapers, 31 August 1969, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[31]Chicago Board of Education, Rules of the Board of Education Sec. 4-22., p. 18.

[32]Dr. Bessie Lawrence to Charles Marks, Chicago, 20 August 1969.

[33]"Author's Notes," Community Meeting at St. Paul's, 4 October 1969.

[34]"Author's Notes."

[35]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1969-70, Board Report 69-813-2, 8 October 1969, p. 781.

[36]"Church Influence on New Left Told," Chicago Tribune, 30 December 1969, Sec. 1, p. 6.

[37]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1965-66, Board Report 73740, 26 January 1966, p. 2669.

[38]"LPCA Departs From H.S. Plan -- Asks New Cooley On Present Site," Lerner Booster Newspapers, Chicago , 31 March 1971, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[39]"Decision Seen Soon on Fate of High Schools," Lerner Booster Newspapers, Chicago, 14 April 1971, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[40]"Resolution," District Seven Educational Council, Chicago, 14 April 1971.

[41]"Neighbors Nix New Waller High Plan," Near North News, Chicago, 15 May 1971, p. 1.

[42]District Seven Education Council, Letter, Chicago, 25 May 1971.

[43]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1969-70, Board Report 70-262-5, 25 March 1970, p. 3190.

[44]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1971-72, Board Report 72-344-1, 22 March 1972, p. 3256.

[45]"Author's Notes," District Seven Council Meeting, 18 March 1972.

[46]"Education Complex Concept Goes Before District 7 Council Tonight," Lerner Booster Newspapers, Chicago, 19 April 1972, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[47]"CEC Proposal Deferred," Lerner Booster Newspapers, Chicago, 29 April 1972, Sec., 1, p. 1.

[48]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1971-72, Board Report 72-475, 10 May 1972, p. 3521.

[49]"District 7 Council to Ask DUR to Start Waller-Cooley Plan," Lerner Booster Newspapers, Chicago, 13 May 1972, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[50]"Building Fund of City School System Is $25 Million Short," Chicago Tribune, 4 August 1972, Sec. 2, p. 1.

NOTES - CHAPTER IV

[1]Donald J. Leu and I. Carl Candoli, Design for the Future, vol. 1: A Recommended Long Range Educational Plan for Chicago; vol. 2: Educational Facilities Data, 2 vols.(Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1968), 1:B-12 to 14.

[2]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1967-68, Board Report 68-132-2, 14 February 1968, p. 1454.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid., 1968-69, Board Report 68-881, 13 November 1968, p. 810.

[5]Ibid., 1969-70, Board Report 69-923-1, 19 November 1969, p. 1010.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., 1969-70, Board Report 70-202-4, 25 March 1970, p. 3190.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid., 1965-66, Board Report 73740, 26 January 1966, p. 2669.

[10]Ibid.,1969-70, Board Report 69-758, 10 September 1969, p.362.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Ibid., 1971-72, Board Report 72-208, 9 February 1972, p. 2936.

[13]Ibid., 1971-72, Board Report 72-246, 23 February 1972, p. 3041.

[14]Ibid., 1971-72, Board Report 72-344-1, 22 March 1972, p. 3256.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Ibid., 1971-72, Board Report 72-475, 26 April 1972, p. 3511.

[17]Ibid., 1972-73, Board Report 72-906, 27 July 1972, p. 181.

[18]Ibid., 1968-69, Board Report 69-361, 14 May 1969,p. 2941.

[19]"Building Fund of City School System is $25 Million Short," Chicago Tribune, 4 August 1972, Sec. 2, p. 3.

[20]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1971-72, Board Report 71-988, 13 October 1971, pp. 792-3.

[21]Ibid., 1971-72, Board Report 72-401, 12 April 1972, pp.3345-7.

[22]Ibid., 1971-72, Board Report 22-646, 14 June 1972, p. 3812.

[23]Ibid., 1971-72, Board Report 72-401, 12 April 1972, p. 3346.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Ibid., p. 3352.

[26]Ibid., 1971-72, Board Report 72-648, 14 June 1972, p. 3817.

[27]Ibid.,1972-73, Board Report 72-956, 8September 1972, p. 403.

[28]"City Given O.K. For 3 Schools," Chicago Tribune, 17 November 1974, Sec. 2, p. 4.

[29]Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 1972-73, Board Report 72-1471, 27 December 1972, p. 1541.

NOTES - CHAPTER V

[1]Chicago Board of Education, Student Racial and Ethnic Survey (1972), p. 11.

2Chicago Board of Education, Student Racial and Ethnic Survey (1984), p. 15.

3Michael H. Ducey, Sunday Morning: Aspects of Urban Ritual (New York: The Free Press, 1977), p. 183.

4Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Ma.: G & C. Merriam, 1971), p. 37.

5Michael H. Ducey, Sunday Morning, pp. 184-5.

6Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of 196566, 27 October 1965, pp. 823-34.

7Ibid., pp. 834-7.

8Ibid.

9Chicago Board of Education, Student Racial/Ethnic Survey (1984), p. 26.

10Michael H. Ducey, Sunday Morning, p. 185.

REFERENCES

Books

Abbott, Edith. The Tenements of Chicago: 1908-1935. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Andreas, A.T. History of Chicago. 3 vols. Chicago: A.T. Andreas, 1884-86.

Campbell, Roald; Cunningham, Luvern L.; McPhee, Roderick; and Systrand, R. O. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Oh.: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970.

The Chicago Commission on Race Relations. The Negro In Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.

Ducey, Michael H. Sunday Morning: Aspects of Urban Ritual. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Fantini, Mario; Gittell, Marilyn; and Magat, Richard. Community Control and The Urban School. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Fergus, Robert, ed. Directory of The City of Chicago: 1839. Chicago: Fergus Publishing Co., 1876.

Graham, Grace. The Public Schools in the New Society. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969.

Herrick, Mary J. The Chicago Schools: A Social and Political History. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, 1971.

Jubilee History of the Archdiocese of Chicago. [Roman Catholic] Des Plaines, Il.: St. Mary's Training School, 1920.

Levin, H. M., ed. Community Control of Schools; Brookings Conference on the Community School. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1969.

Philpott, Thomas Lee. The Slums and The Ghetto: Neighborhood Deterioration and Middle Class Reform. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Pierce, Bessie Louise. A History of Chicago. 3 vols. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1937-1957.

Spear, Allan H. Black Chicago: The Making of a Negro Ghetto: 1890-1920. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Sumption, Merle R. and Engston, Yvonne. School Community Relations: A New Approach. New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.

Totten, W. Fred. The Power of Community Education. Midland, Mi.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1970.

Zorbaugh, Harvey W. The Gold Coast and The Slums. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Chicago Board of Education Materials

Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools. Report to The Board of Education of the City of Chicago. [The Hauser Report]. Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1964.

Chicago Board of Education. Department of Administrative Research. Annual Statistics Books, 1875-78. Original manuscript.

_____.Department of Administrative Research. Student Racial and Ethnic Survey. 1972 and 1984.

_____.Department of School Planning. A Long Range School Facilities Program. 1966.

_____.Department of School Planning. A Status Report: Educational Objectives, Organization and Physical Development, and Projections of Needed Financing Resources For Programs and Facilities. 1971.

_____.Proceedings of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago. 1863 through 1973.

--------- Rules of the Chicago Board of Education. 1984.

Havighurst, Robert J. The Public Schools of Chicago: A Survey For the Board of Education. Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1964.

Leggett, Stanton. Commmunity School in the City: Educational Specifica-

tions For The Waller-Cooley CEC #4. Chicago: Stanton Leggett and Associates, 1969.

_____. The Walls and The City: Satellites for Cultural and Educational Centre 4, Including Waller and Cooley High Schools. Chicago: Stanton Leggett and Associates, 1971.

Leu, Donald J. and Candoli, I. Carl. Design for the Future, vol. 1: Recommended Long Range Educational Plan for Chicago; vol.2: Educational Facilities Data. Chicago: Board of Education, 1968.

_____. A Feasibility Study of the "Cultural-Educational Park" for Chicago. Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1968.

_____. Planning for the Future: Recommended Long Range Educational and Facilities Plan for Chicago. Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1971.

Other Government Materials

U. S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940: Population and Housing Census Tracts Chicago SMSA

_____. Seventeenth Census of the United States, 1950: Population and Housing Census Tracts Chicago SMSA.

_____. Eighteenth Census of the United States, 1960: Population and Housing Census Tracts Chicago SMSA.

_____. Nineteenth Census of the United States, 1970: Population and Housing Census Tracts Chicago SMSA.

Chicago, Il.: Chicago Housing Authority Annual Report for 1975.

_____. Chicago Zoning Ordinance. Municipal Code of Chicago. (1957).

_____. Department of Development and Planning. A Comprehensive Plan of Chicago (1967).

_____. Department of Development and Planning. Proposed School Construction Program in District 7. (1971)

_____. Department of Development and Planning. Sixty Years of the Chicago Plan Commission: 1909-1969 (1969).

_____. Department of Urban Renewal. Lincoln Park Project No. 1

(1965).

_____. Chicago Plan Commission. Land Use In Chicago (1943).

Periodicals, Newspapers, Etc.

Kerensky, V. M., "Correcting Some Misconceptions about Community Education," Phi Delta Kappan (November 1972): 158-160.

Marzand, Jr., S. P., "The Education Park Concept in Pittsburgh," Phi Delta Kappan (March 1967): 328-332.

Pendell, Richard C., "A Personal Interview with the founder of Community Education - Mr. C. S. Mott," Community Education Journal (February 1972): 38-42.

Shaw, Frederick, "The Educational Park in New York: Archetype of the School of the Future?" Phi Delta Kappan (February 1969): 329-331.

Weaver, Donald C., "A Case of Theory Development in Community Education," Phi Delta Kappan (November 1972): 154-157.

Chicago Tribune, 8 August 1876; 22 December 1968; 23 February, 30 December 1969; 4 August 1972; 17 November 1974.

Lerner Booster Newsapers (Chicago), 18 May, 11 June, 31 August 1969; 31 March, 14 April 1971; 19, 29 April, 13 May 1972.

Near North News (Chicago), 15 February 1969; 15 May 1971.

Waller High School (Chicago), "Records of PTA meetings, 1954-1957" School archives.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Ralph Joseph Cusick has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Gerald L. Gutek, Chairman
Dean, School of Education

Dr. Philip M. Carlin, Department Chairman
Associate Professor, Department of Administration and Supervision

Dr. John Wozniak
Professor, Department of Foundations

The final copies have been examined by the chairman of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that 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.

May 2, 1985
Date

Gerald L. Gutek
Dr. Gerald L. Gutek
Chairman