



1993

History of the Chicago Parental School, 1902-1975

Cynthia Kay Barron
Loyola University Chicago

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



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barron, Cynthia Kay, "History of the Chicago Parental School, 1902-1975" (1993). *Dissertations*. 3264.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3264

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



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1993 Cynthia Kay Barron

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

HISTORY OF THE CHICAGO PARENTAL SCHOOL

1902-1975

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

CYNTHIA KAY BARRON

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 1993

Copyright by Cynthia Kay Barron, 1993
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. Gerald L. Gutek, Chairman of the Dissertation Committee for his continual support and timely guidance as well as to the members of her committee, Dr. Joan K. Smith and Dr. Julius Menacker.

While many individuals shared their personal histories, she is grateful to the late Mary Broomfield and Bernard Karlin for the willingness with which they shared experiences and gave of their time to assist in the development of this dissertation.

The author is particularly grateful to Janice Chmela who encouraged her work and assisted in the final editing of the manuscript, and to Dr. Mary Ann Pollett for her willingness to share her vast collection of materials.

Her sincere appreciation is extended to her husband, Leo and to her three children; Jennifer, Matthew, and Samuel, for their willingness to carry on while she completed her study and for their faith, encouragement and patience. Lastly, She would like to offer her profound gratitude to her grandmother, Mrs. William F. Maushak for her support, interest and encouragement all these years.

VITA

The author, Cynthia Kay Barron was born July 23, 1948 in Belvidere, Illinois.

Barron received the degree of Bachelor of Science from George Williams College in 1970 and the degree of Master of Science from Chicago State University in 1977. She has certificates in General Administration, Guidance and Counseling, and teaching certificates in elementary and secondary education.

The author was a recipient of an Oppenheimer Teacher Incentive and Project Choice Grant for "Dropout Prevention and Community Involvement." Since 1970, she has had experience as a teacher, coach, attendance counselor, guidance counselor, attendance improvement manager, and dropout specialist.

Cynthia is a Vice President of the International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers and she is the Cook County representative on the Board of Directors of the Illinois Association for At Risk Youth. She is currently employed as a member of the Cook County Support Service Team providing truancy and dropout prevention services to South Suburban Cook County.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii
VITA iii
LIST OF TABLES vi

Chapter

I. THE HISTORICAL ORIGIN OF THE CHICAGO PARENTAL SCHOOL 1

Introduction
First Compulsory Attendance Law
Influence of Social Reformers
Harper Commission
Passage of the Juvenile Court Act and the Parental or Truant Law

II. THE FIRST PARENTAL SCHOOL ESTABLISHED 15

Report on Parental Schools
Organization of the School
First Commitments
Special Studies
Parole and Discipline
Growth and Changes
School Routine
Branch for Girls

III. THE YEARS OF EXPANSION AND INCLUSION 46

Girl's First Committed
Maintaining the Boys
Girls and Boys in Contrast
Concerns
Girls Transferred

IV. THE YEARS OF CHANGE AND CHALLENGES 61

The Educational Work and Routine of the School
Branch for Girls Opened
Changes in Direction
First Principal Appointed
Objections to Funding the Parental School

V. THE CLOSING OF THE CHICAGO PARENTAL SCHOOLS: DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF TRUANCY IN CHICAGO 100

Relief from the Legislature
Complaints
Relationship of Special Education to the Parental School
Northeastern Illinois University

Formation of the Study Committee
Broomfield Brings Changes
Formation of the Commission on Truancy and
Alternative Education
Deinstitutionalization of Truancy

VI.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	140
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	145

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Statement of Prosecutions by the Compulsory Education Department Since 1980	11
2. Statistics Chicago Parental School 1920-1925	52
3. Parental School for Boys/Girls - Instruction	57
4. Parental School for Boys/Girls - Operation	57
5. Character Code - Parental School	66
6. Chronological Tabulation of Related Historical Data	68
7. Superintendents of Schools from 1901 to 1948	70
8. Superintendents of Chicago Parental School 1901-1948	71
9. Cottage Names, Colors, and Slogans	77
10. Active Committee Members - Study Committee of the Chicago Residential Schools	115
11. Truancy Petitions - Residential Commitments	119
12. Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education: Members	126

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL ORIGIN OF THE CHICAGO PARENTAL SCHOOL

Introduction

Social, economic, and political concerns from the 1880s into the 1990s contributed to passage and revisions of the Illinois Compulsory Attendance Laws and to the establishment, expansion, and ultimate demise of the Chicago Parental School.

The historical origin of the Chicago Parental School can be traced directly to the efforts of many social organizations and reformers who were actively involved in seeking legislation to compel children to attend school. Law enforcement concerns led to the establishment of the Chicago Parental School to provide penalties for children violating the compulsory attendance laws.

First Compulsory Attendance Law

The enactment of the first Compulsory Attendance Law of Illinois in 1883 required children ages eight to fourteen to attend school for twelve weeks each year unless excused by the board of education or the school directors "for any good cause." According to the Proceedings of the Board of Education for 1883-84, "good cause" was determined to be "if the Board or school directors excused him on the ground that he is being taught elsewhere, that the state of his health

forbids, or that there is no school within two miles."¹ The law was generally unpopular and it was not enforced. No provision was made to enforce this law beyond the statement that "any tax payer" could sue the board of education for failure to enforce it.²

Reformers, dissatisfied with enforcement of the law, led the Chicago Board of Education to appoint a committee in 1888 to study the issues raised and to make recommendations. The committee's work resulted in the establishment of a department of compulsory attendance, appointment of three special attendance agents (later called truant officers) and the enactment of a new compulsory attendance law in 1889 that lengthened compulsory attendance to sixteen weeks each year. Continuing pressure from a coalition of settlement workers, club women, and various civic and social welfare groups in 1899, also prompted passage of the Juvenile Court Act and a parental or truant school law that mandated the Chicago Board of Education to establish, maintain, and conduct one or more parental or truant schools where children violating the compulsory attendance law would be confined, disciplined, instructed, and maintained. During the 1890's, there were many social organizations and reformers who were actively involved in securing legislation for a more tightly controlled compulsory education law. With the enactment of the first compulsory education law of Illinois, in 1883, it became evident that its provisions were inadequate to enforce the

law.

In 1888, the question of the enforcement of the law of 1883 was discussed by the Chicago Board of Education. A Committee was appointed to examine its enforcement. The committee reported that "in the opinion of the committee the law of 1883 was not as 'invalid' or 'inoperative' as had been claimed."³ Attention was called to the lack of school facilities and that the law could not be enforced until there were enough schools "conveniently located to receive pupils." The committee, however, made certain recommendations "to show people that the spirit of the law was recognized by the board." Among the several recommendations, the one which most affected the founding of the Chicago Parental School was the establishment of a department of compulsory education and the appointment of three special attendance agents, later called truant officers to help enforce the Compulsory Education Act.⁴

Three bills, one relating to compulsory education, another to child labor, and a third to truant children, all of which had been adopted at a citizens' meeting and presented to the Board of Education, were later endorsed by the board and forwarded to the General Assembly at Springfield. The child labor bill and the truant bill died in committee at Springfield and a substitute compulsory education bill already pending in the legislature was accepted by the board as a substitute for its own bill. This substitute measure became a law on July 1, 1889.⁵

In the new law of 1889, the total period of compulsory attendance was increased from twelve to sixteen weeks, and attendance was required to be consecutive for eight weeks.⁶ In Chicago during the following summer of 1889 careful preparations were made in order that the new law might be enforced when the school term began. A Superintendent of Compulsory Education, A.E. Frankland, and twelve attendance agents were appointed. Frankland served until 1894, when he was succeeded by Thomas J. Bluthardt, who assumed the added duties of Sanitary Inspector.⁷

It was soon demonstrated that many of the "waifs" brought into the public schools through its agency were mentally and physically incapacitated for the work performed by the normal child. The need of a family school, with facilities for simple work as well as study, under the charge of well prepared teachers who would train boys unaccustomed to discipline of any kind in work habits, was recognized by school officials.⁸

Influence of Social Reformers

One of the first organizations which actively sought to reform the compulsory education law was the Chicago Women's Club (CWC). A little later, Jane Addams, Ellen Gates Starr and Hull-House (HH) joined this effort.⁹

The CWC was founded in 1876 by a group of women who had participated in various literary, social, and religious organizations.¹⁰ Its first president, Carolyn M. Brown had

expressed the need for an organization of women in Chicago which would "take up the live issues of this world we live in."¹¹

From its beginnings, the CWC reflected a membership base from the upper socio-economic strata in Chicago (e.g., doctors, lawyers, teachers). The club adopted as their "motto" the words of Terrence: "Humani nihil a me alienum puto." "Nothing human is alien to me."¹² The CWC brought together members of many different groups into one united body, aiming to secure the highest standard of individual culture and of service to the community. The idea of practical work for the community was fundamental in the minds of the founders.¹³

In the very beginning, the club women organized themselves into four committees (which later evolved into departments and various sub-committees) to do their work: Home, Education, Philantnropy and Reform. The thinking of the CWC was that the "timid souls who feared that women might get outside her sphere could surely not object to serving in the interests of the home. Mothers would all take a lively interest in education; all good church workers might lend a hand to philanthropy, and the unterrified would gravitate toward reform."¹⁴

As a result of the work and investigation of the education committee relative to compulsory education, a Truant Aid Committee was organized in 1889. Its name was later

changed to the School Childrens' Aid Society. (This society is still operating today.) The society provided services to children which would enable them to attend school (e.g. shoes, clothing, etc.). In 1894 the Education Department reported that the "School Childrens' Aid has outgrown its parent department." The Philanthropy Department requested that the School Childrens' Aid Society be taken as the general work of the Club and soon this society became independent of the CWC.¹⁵

In February 1892, the newly organized Jail School Committee of the Reform Committee obtained permission to establish a school in the Cook County Jail. For the first time, boys between the ages of ten and sixteen were separated from the older boys and men incarcerated at the jail. Miss Florence Haythorn became the first teacher of these boys. In the afternoon, she became a "probation officer." On the basis of the investigations and work by Miss Haythorn, in December 1892 Mrs. Perry H. Smith (the chairman of the committee) recommended to the CWC that it "establish a manual training school for delinquent and neglected boys."¹⁶

Mrs. Smith also encouraged the CWC's efforts toward establishing a "Juvenile Court." These seeds were to combine with other forces to produce the first Juvenile Court in the United States (the Cook County Juvenile Court), the Parental School (which would be operated by the Chicago Board of Education as a "custodial institution"), and the John Worthy

School (a manual-training school operated by the Board of Education on the grounds of the Bridewell House of Correction).¹⁷

In April 1898, a joint committee from the Reform and Philanthropy Departments was organized to do probation work with children incarcerated in local police stations. Julia C. Lathrop, a staunch advocate of compulsory attendance laws and a leader in promoting reform of the Juvenile Justice system, was elected the chairman of this committee.¹⁸

The Harper Commission

In January of 1898 the Board of Education for the Chicago Public Schools commissioned a study which came to be known as the Harper Commission named after the chairman of the commission, William R. Harper. Continuing and increasing business difficulties caused social and economic unrest with the usual criticism of government administration. By 1897 criticism of the School Board became so severe, a commission known as the Educational Commission, (Harper Commission), was appointed by Mayor Harrison to investigate, report and make recommendations relative to the Chicago School system. Dr. William R. Harper, President of the University of Chicago, and a member of the Board of Education, was appointed Chairman of this commission, and the School Board appropriated \$5,000 to help defray expenses of the investigation. The Commission made its report in 1898 and had bills submitted to the Legislature to make possible some of the changes

recommended.¹⁹

The report of the Educational Commission stated that the principle of compulsory school attendance was well established and many states had enacted laws requiring and enforcing it. It was also stated that the law of Illinois, approved June 11, 1897, seemed to be satisfactory, and that much better results had been accomplished for the city in compulsory attendance than was formerly possible.²⁰

The report also stated that definite action by the board of education in several matters would improve conditions. It recommended that the majority of truant officers be men, and that the work of the superintendent of the Compulsory Education department be supplemented by the appointment of one chief assistant. The Commission also recommended a more "important step in the direction of proper school attendance, that of the establishment of one or more parental schools under the direction of the board of education."²¹

Another factor involved in the support for the Parental School Law was that many children in the greatest need of schooling were expelled or suspended for bad conduct soon after they were placed in school. Before 1893 the school authorities had already called attention to the parental neglect of these children, but said they were helpless until a parental school law could take care of them.

Suspension is the extreme penalty which can be imposed upon a wilfully disobedient pupil...Many who drop out of school become a menace to good government, vagrants, lawbreakers, ultimately

criminals and inmates of the jail, Bridewell, reform school and prison...No provision is made for their restraint, until they violate some law under which they can be arrested as criminals, and then they are committed to the jail, Bridewell or prison...Other cities have also discussed the problem and the school board of Boston has secured the enactment of a law under which they are building a parental school. The time has come when Chicago must act in this matter.²²

Passage of the Juvenile Court Act and
the Parental or Truant Law

As a result of all the forces at work in 1898, a coalition of settlement workers, club women, and various other civic and social welfare groups was organized into the League of Cook County Clubs.²³ This coalition agreed to lobby for a bill which would regulate the treatment and control of dependent, neglected and delinquent children, i.e., a Juvenile Court Law; a Parental or Truant Bill; the removal of boys under sixteen from the jail school to another location on the grounds of the House of Correction (located adjacent to the County Jail); and, the use of probationary services.²⁴

A year later in April, 1899 the Juvenile Court Act was passed by the Illinois General Assembly and the Cook County Juvenile Court was established and given jurisdiction over boys and girls under the age of sixteen in the county adjudged to be dependent, neglected, or delinquent.²⁵ The court was empowered to take custody away from unfit parents and to place a child on probation in a foster home, or in an institution. The fundamental characteristic of the Juvenile Court at its establishment was its non-punitive nature, i.e. viewing a

child's maladjusted behavior as in need of "treatment," with the court acting in lieu of the parent.²⁶

In 1899, the legislature finally passed the parental or truant school law, which provided that cities having a population of 100,000 or more must establish "one or more parental schools for the purpose of affording a place of confinement, discipline, instruction, and maintenance for children of compulsory school age who may be committed thereto." In accord with the law's provisions, children who would not go to school, that is children who were truants or who went to school but while there behaved so badly as to be a nuisance and make their attendance worse than useless, could be committed either by the Circuit or County Court to the parental school for custody, discipline, and training.²⁷ It was therefore provided that truants or incorrigibles were to be committed to the newly established parental schools through the agency of the Juvenile Court.²⁸

The Parental School Law provided that any truant officer or any agent of the Board of Education or any reputable citizen of Chicago could petition the Circuit or County Court (Juvenile Branch) to inquire into the case of any child between seven and fourteen years of age who was found not to be attending school or was reported to be guilty of habitual truancy or of persistent violation of the rules of the school. The court was authorized to commit any such child to the Parental School until he or she, (the law covered both males

and females but, there were no residential provisions made for females until years later,) became fourteen years of age.

Finally in 1903 the legislature made radical changes in the Compulsory Education Law. The law of 1903 provided that all children between seven and fourteen must attend some public or private school for the entire time during which the school attended was in session, and this could not be less than 110 days of actual teaching. This law also allowed no exemption for those who were physically or mentally incapacitated. It made the appointment of truant officers mandatory, and the prosecution of indifferent parents possible.²⁹

In 1899 William Lester Bodine was appointed Superintendent of Compulsory Education.³⁰ He was to serve in this position for the next forty-four years. William Bodine's system for enforcement of the Compulsory Education Law was know as "Law Enforcement." This was a sharp contrast to the two Superintendents of Compulsory Education before him who used the system of "Moral Suasion." Table One illustrates the sharp rise in prosecutions under William Bodine.

 Table 1: Statement of Prosecutions by the Compulsory
 Education Department Since 1890.

Year	Superintendent	Prosecutions	System
1890 to 1894	Frankland	None	Moral Suasion
1894 to 1899	Bluthardt	One	Moral Suasion
1899 to 1906	Bodine	2,807	Enforced Laws

 Source: Annual Report of the Superintendent of Compulsory Education, 1906.

During the last decade of the 19th Century in Illinois, reform movement leaders who raised issues related to child welfare and education had successfully organized citizens and encouraged elected officials to take action to ensure that children in the greatest need of schooling would be educated. At the beginning of the 20th century, the Chicago Board of Education, faced with a mandate to establish a parental or truant school within two years, needed an equally organized approach to respond to the legislation.

At the turn of the century, the same reform movement leaders who had pressured for enactment of compulsory attendance laws and enforcement provisions had also organized citizens and pressured elected officials to mandate the establishment of a parental or truant school. The Chicago Board of Education, faced with the mandate to establish this school, looked to William Lester Bodine to respond to the legislation within two years. Bodine, appointed in 1899 as the Superintendent of Compulsory Education, accepted the challenge and continued in his position for the next 43 years.

CHAPTER 1 NOTES

1. Harvey B. Hurd, The Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois, 1883, (Chicago: Chicago Legal News Co., 1883) 167.
2. Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckinridge, Truancy and Non-Attendance in the Chicago Public Schools (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1917), 53.
3. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, September 1888 to August 1889 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1889), 41.
4. Ibid., 75.
5. Abbott and Breckinridge, Truancy and Non-Attendance in the Chicago Public Schools, 54.
6. Hannah B. Clark, The Public Schools of Chicago (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1897), 29.
7. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, September 1888 to August 1889, 45.
8. Henry Barrett Chamberlin, "Chamberlin Articles," Chicago Examiner (Chicago: December 1905).
9. Mark Krug, The Melting of the Ethics: Education of the Immigrants, 1880-1914 (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1976), 63-67.
10. George S. Counts, School and Society in Chicago (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1928), 207.
11. Annuals of the Chicago Woman's Club (Chicago: Chicago Woman's Club, 1916), 15-16.
12. Ibid., 16.
13. Ibid., 15.
14. Ibid., 16.
15. Ibid., 142.
16. Ibid., 160.
17. Ibid., 125.
18. Ibid., 176-177.

19. Report of the Educational Commission of the City of Chicago, by Carter Harrison, Chairman (Chicago: City of Chicago Mayor's Office, 19 January 1898), 160-161.
20. Ibid., 161.
21. Ibid., 264.
22. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, 1892-1893 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1893), 65-67.
23. Paul Gerard Anderson, "Juvenile Protective Association," Social Service Organization, ed. Peter Romanofsky, 2 Vol.: No. 2; The Greenwood Encyclopedia of American Institutions; Westport (Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press, 1978), Vol. I, 392.
24. Ibid., 393.
25. Harvey B. Hurd, The Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois 1899 (Chicago: Chicago Legal News Co., 1899), Sec. 4, 137.
26. Paul Gerard Anderson, Social Service Organization, 393.
27. Abbott and Breckenridge, Truancy and Non-Attendance in the Chicago Public Schools, 86.
28. Ibid., 86.
29. Abbott and Breckenridge, Truancy and Non-Attendance in the Chicago Public Schools, 53, 56-57.
30. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education 1899-1900 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1900) 486.

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST PARENTAL SCHOOL ESTABLISHED

Legislation mandating establishment of a parental or truant school led to the opening of the first Chicago Parental School in January 1902. While the law authorized the Board of Education to equip and maintain a parental or truant school for boys and girls of compulsory school age, from its opening until 1919, only boys were committed to the school. During these years, many studies were conducted to evaluate progress and facilitate changes that might better accomplish the objectives. When the school opened, children who persistently violated rules of the schools they were attending and those who were habitually truant, would be committed to the Chicago Parental School if the facts alleged in the court petition were found to be true.

The legislature approved on April 24, 1899, the law requiring the Board of Education of the City of Chicago to build and maintain a Parental School.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly: That in cities having a population of 100,000 inhabitants or more, there shall be established, maintained and conducted, within two years from the date of taking effect of this act, one or more parental or truant schools for the purpose of affording a place of confinement, discipline, instruction and maintenance of children of

compulsory school age who may be committed thereto in the manner hereinafter provided.¹

At last, in 1899, the Illinois General Assembly, recognizing the public demand, passed a law which enjoined Chicago to establish a Parental School within two years. This, with the Juvenile Reform Law creating a Juvenile Court and providing for a parole system, and probation officers to look after truants,² was the first effective step, and resulted after years of activity by those who looked forward to reformed conditions.

The law of 1889 made establishment of a school for habitual truants obligatory upon Chicago, and was enacted in response to vigorous agitation on the part of various organizations interested in the welfare of the City. Judge Richard S. Tuthill, whose work with juvenile delinquents had made him an authority on the subject, was one of the most active promoters of the movement, declaring that "as truancy is the first step in the wrongdoing of the majority of the youthful criminals, the parental or home school, where habitual truants may be confined and instructed, is an imperative necessity."³

Habitual truancy in a large city like Chicago has always been viewed with alarm both for the child and the society of which he is a part. Former Superintendent MacQueary stated that the "delinquent child not only misses the education which society provides in self-defense but he is gaining an education in evil. Frequenting cheap theaters, associating

with bad companions, smoking, drinking, swearing, drifting into the habits of indolence--he is on the broad highway to crime," and it is not long before the truant becomes the child criminal, is arrested and committed to a penal institution. It was to prevent this, to save him from the step which puts him on record as a law breaker, that the Parental School was made part of the public school system.⁴

Superintendent MacQueary further stated that the Parental School was in no way a penal institution. Its very name was chosen in order that a right understanding of its role as an institution undertaking the work of the parent might be given from the outset.⁵ "Parental boys are the so-called 'underheritaged'--they have not been well fed, well clothed, well bathed or well trained. They are the children of the street, and as such are a menace in their possibilities for evil."⁶

There was much hope that this Parental School would reach a certain class of truancy cases. By a system of co-operation and vigilance between the court, the Board of Education and officers, parents and pupils would soon realize that the Parental School was not a home for dependents, or a boy's paradise to encourage truancy but, on the contrary an institution where juvenile reform would be effective.⁷

Report on Parental Schools

The Board of Education responded at once to the provisions of the law requiring establishment and maintenance

of the Parental School. In January 1900, William L. Bodine distributed his report on parental schools which he had prepared after visiting schools at Boston, New York, Brooklyn and elsewhere.⁸ Bodine had been appointed Superintendent of Compulsory Education on July 13, 1899 after the death of Thomas J. Bluthardt.⁹ Bodine's report covered the constructive features of such schools. His report stated:

The aim of the instruction should be constructive, that is, it should feed, clothe, and care for the children as effectively as possible to the extent of providing medical care, opportunities for sports, and vocational education; but it should also be in some measure a penal institution in the sense that it must provide motives on the part of the child for remaining in the ordinary school.¹⁰

In response to his report, the Committee on Compulsory Education of the Board of Education recommended that the Board request the Mayor and city council of Chicago to authorize the Board of Education to issue bonds, in the sum of \$125,000, for the purpose of erecting a parental school building, in compliance with the state law.¹¹

In June 1900, the Committee on Compulsory Education recommended that Thomas H. MacQueary be elected Superintendent of the New Parental school, at a salary of \$3,000 per year. A further recommendation was that the Superintendent of the Parental School be compelled to reside at the school as soon as it was completed.¹² MacQueary was selected as superintendent after a careful examination of the relative merits of a number of available men. Following the recommendation of the Committee on Compulsory Education, he

was instructed to visit institutions similar to the proposed school and make a careful examination of the methods found successful in their experience. The Supervisor of Manual Training, Robert M. Smith, was directed to accompany MacQueary to visit other cities to study the educational principles and practices at similar institutions.¹³ Bodine suggested that these gentlemen devote their time mainly to the study of educational principles and practices involved in such institutions.

In June 1900, a report of the Committee of Compulsory Education recommended that William Lester Bodine be re-elected as Superintendent of Compulsory Education for the ensuing year.¹⁴ He would remain in this position for the next 43 years. This committee also recommended that Dr. A.N.J. Dolan be elected assistant superintendent of the Parental School, at a salary of \$2,000 per year.¹⁵

The report that MacQueary and Smith made on their visits, addressed the physical, mental, manual, moral and religious development of the students who would be committed to the Parental School. Bodine's report emphasized the "cottage plan."¹⁶ Under this plan each cottage was under the supervision of a cottage mother and father who were known as Family Instructors. The care and appearance of the cottage was in the hands of the Cottage Instructors, and in those of the children who lived in the cottage. This was considered as much a part of a boy's training as anything else during his

time in the school.

Appropriations and Planning

With the above reports in mind the city council appropriated in May 1901, \$200,000 for the construction and equipment of the Parental School. There were bids on everything and it was decided that it should accommodate a minimum of 240 pupils.¹⁷

Whereas it is inadvisable, in the opinion of the Board, to construct buildings for a lesser number of pupils than 240, since in the opinion of all experts conversant with the subject of truants said accommodations will in fact be insufficient for the needs of the city. Therefore the Board recommends an additional sum of \$100,000 for the construction.¹⁸

This brought the total sum appropriated to \$300,000.

Of the few in the United States, Chicago's school was the most generously equipped. Following the advice of its own investigators, based on the experience of men familiar with the work, the Board of Education adopted a plan which would allow residents of the Parental School to do outdoor work.

A site was selected in the northern part of Chicago. In October 1900, forty acres of an area known as Bowmanville were selected for the school.¹⁹ The area is now more familiarly known as Hollywood Park, and the site itself is now known as St. Louis Avenue. In September 1901, ten more acres were purchased.²⁰

The plan gave the boys an opportunity to do outdoor work, such as gardening and caring for cows and horses. As MacQueary stated: "It supplies the 'chores' which many a city

man, reared in the country remembers gratefully as a source of strength in giving him the work suited to his years, work often denied the city boy who stretches out idle hands to the attractive vices so prevalent in his surroundings."²¹ The expense for the school was large and attracted adverse criticism. This criticism was answered in that prevention is better than cure. It was thought by most who were in support of the Parental School to be better for the city to spend money on a school for training boys in ways leading to an honest, upright manhood, than to let them drift until they openly defy the law and authority forces society, in self-defense, to confine them in expensive penal institutions.²²

The mission of the Chicago Parental School was not the mere teaching of reading and writing. This mental training was to be accompanied by the discipline which makes for character and morality. It was stated in the report that Superintendent MacQueary and Smith made that if the mental training was not accompanied by these other factors then the student may become a danger to the community. "The humanizing influences of a good school, tending to develop these traits, are more needed by the truant, who, unconsciously is taking his first lessons in anarchy than any other type of child."²³ The basic philosophy of the Parental School was to consider its students maladjusted children who needed special study and guidance and to aid them in finding a place in society. The Parental School was to offer these untrained and undisciplined

children a supervised school, work, and play program.

The Parental School law authorized the Board of Education of Chicago to equip and maintain a school for boys and girls of compulsory school age who could not be made to attend school regularly by ordinary means or who while in school would not submit to authority. While the law authorized commitment of girls for truancy or incorrigibility, no provision was made for their care at this time. It was thought that the proportion of girls who were truant or incorrigible was very small and it would not be until much later that provisions were made for them. It was also part of the law that "no child shall be committed to such a school who has ever been convicted of any offense punishable by confinement in any penal institution."²⁴

Work on the buildings were begun immediately. The school opened its doors in January, 1902 with thirteen boys committed by the Juvenile Court. At the end of January the first cottage was completed. The main school building, which opened in July 1902, was still under construction. The Superintendent's residence was erected during the summer and fall; another double cottage or dormitory building was in the process of construction by December 1902. A small contagious disease hospital had been provided for, and several farm buildings had been begun. No walls, bars or bolts, or any other prison features, ruined the appearance of the school.²⁵

The total appropriation for buildings, in December of

1901, had been 306,700, and this with the land (valued at \$40,000) and equipment (costing \$13,000) made the property worth, at that time, at least \$360,000.²⁶

Superintendent MacQueary justly claimed that Chicago had the finest Parental School, from a material standpoint, in the world, and he hoped to make it the best educational institution of its kind in the country.²⁷ In the first few years of its existence, the Chicago Parental School became very well known as one of the most important experiments in reformatory methods.

Organization of the School

The school was organized on the "cottage plan." The essence of this system consisted in separating the boys into comparatively small groups, so that the man and woman in charge could give each child special attention and reproduce, in large measure, a real home and family life. The groups, or "families," in the school in 1902 consisted nominally of thirty boys, although in December of 1902 there were thirty-five in each family. There was one man and one woman, preferably man and wife, in charge of the boys.²⁸

Many superintendents of reform and truant schools maintained that twenty, or even fifteen would be enough boys to place in one family.²⁹ MacQueary decided to make the number thirty, on account of the cost of supervision. He also stated that this should be the "maximum" number in a family.³⁰ No one who has had experience with this class of

children would need to be told that thirty such boys or girls are as many as one man and one woman can properly take care of. As MacQueary so humorously stated, "I fancy that the best father and mother of 'the best families' would find it necessary, if they had thirty children, to employ a good many helpers to take care of them."³¹

The superiority of the "family organization" over the old "congregate system" (all students would be housed together in one space) formally in vogue in reform schools, was amply demonstrated in Chicago more than forty years before the Chicago Parental School was built. The old "Chicago Reform School," founded in 1855, was originally organized on "the congregate plan," but it burned in 1856, and when it was rebuilt a "family building" was erected, and later other such buildings were added. The superintendent and managers of that school repeatedly emphasized, in their reports, the advantages of the family organization over the congregate plan.³²

All the leading reform and parental schools in 1902 were organized on the cottage plan. The Illinois Manual Training School Farm, Glenwood, Illinois, and the State Training School for Girls, at Geneva were organized on this plan. The initial cost of reforming boys or girls under the cottage system was a little greater than under the old plan; it was cheaper in the end, since "a larger number is reformed and the work is more thorough and lasting."³³ According to Superintendent MacQueary's report in 1902:

The Chicago Parental School is not a school in the strictest sense of the word, and not a penal institution. We believe that the boys are sent here, not to be punished, but to be educated, to receive parental care, discipline and instruction, and the results to date are very satisfactory. As the home and social conditions of the boys committed to this school are not the best possible, we aim to give them a good home and proper training in manners and morals, as well as intellectual culture.³⁴

First Commitments

When the school first opened, children between the ages of seven and fourteen years, were committed to the Chicago Parental School for two causes: habitual truancy and persistent violation of the rules of the schools they were attending. A truant officer, or "any other reputable citizen" could petition the Circuit or County Court of Cook County to inquire into the case of any child of compulsory school age who was not attending school. The sheriff was then instructed to bring such child into court, and if the facts alleged in the petition were found true, the child may have been committed to the Chicago Parental School. The parents or guardians were notified of the proceedings, but their consent to commitment was not necessary.

The "modus operandi" in Chicago was as follows: The principal of the school, of which the truant was a nominal member, filed a petition with the Superintendent of Compulsory Education, stating the facts: age of child; names and residence of parents or guardians; date of last offense; number of offenses; etc. The Superintendent of Compulsory

Education, who was also a deputy sheriff, then sent one of the truant officers, who were deputy sheriffs, to bring the child into Juvenile Court. The parents, principal and other witnesses were present, and after hearing the testimony the Judge either committed the child to the school or released him on probation.³⁵

The Compulsory Education Department was praised by Superintendent MacQueary for its selection of the appropriate boys for commitment, for their assistance when a boy escaped, and for their assistance in supervising the conduct of paroled pupils, warning parents of their duty under the law and returning pupils who violated their paroles.³⁶

The school formally opened on January 31, 1902 and during the first year 191 boys were received. Seventy-seven boys were paroled and thirteen were discharged and one boy escaped. Also during this first year, six boys violated their parole and were returned to the school. The average age of the boys was eleven and the average time they were kept in the school was seven months. The total number of employees in the school for the first year was twenty-five. This included the following: one superintendent; three grade teachers; four special teachers; five family instructors or officers; two engineers; one fireman (two firemen during the winter); one cook; two assistant cooks; one janitor; two scrubwomen; one teamster and dairyman; one gardener; and one assistant gardener.³⁷

Very complete statistics were kept in all areas of the boys' physical, social, and mental development when he entered the Parental School and while he was in attendance. During the first year of operation, there were six grades in the school with the fewest number being in the sixth grade and the highest number being in the third grade. The actual breakdown is as follows for boys in school on January 1, 1903: Grade 6 had three pupils; grade 5 had thirteen pupils; grade 4 had nineteen pupils; grade 3 had thirty-six pupils; grade 2 had seventeen pupils; and grade 1 had eighteen pupils. The average age of those in first and second grade during this year was ten years.³⁸

During the first year of operation statistics like the following were reported:

As to their mental progress during their seven months' stay at the Parental School, 39 per cent showed marked improvement along all lines; 50 per cent made fair progress and 11 per cent were unsatisfactory and these showed many marked growth and motor abnormalities. The conduct of 20 per cent was satisfactory from the beginning; 75 per cent showed great improvement and 5 per cent improved very little, and these appeared to be decidedly abnormal. The average age of those who entered the third grade was eleven years and ten months.³⁹

In accordance with the "Rules of Discipline" adopted by the Board of Education, the school was divided into three divisions. When a boy entered the school he was placed in the second division, where he remained at least a month, and then he was promoted or reduced, according to his conduct and progress in his studies. If he received not more than thirty

demerit marks during the month and marked "good" in his studies, he was promoted to Division I; he had to remain in this division three months, consecutively, before he was recommended for parole. Any boy who received from 31 to 50 marks during the month, and made only "fair" in his studies, was kept or placed in Division II. If he received more than 50 marks during the month, and was "poor" in his studies, he was placed or left in Division III. An escape or attempt at escape would reduce a boy to a lower division, and if he was in the third division he would be kept at the school at least a month longer than he would have been had he not made this attempt.⁴⁰

No corporal punishment of any kind was allowed. Deprivation of privileges, assignment of "extra duty" and solitary confinement in a well-lighted and well-ventilated room for a period not exceeding twenty-four hours were the only forms of punishment reported.

Special Studies

The special studies taught in the Parental School were manual training, horticulture, gymnastics, military tactics and music. It was demonstrated beyond question that manual training was most effective to arouse the interest and stimulate the mental power of the children committed to the Parental School. It was a punishment to the boys to be kept away from the manual training class. There were six classes in manual training, and each class received one hour of

instruction every day.⁴¹

The garden work, or manual training out of doors, was equally interesting and helpful to the boys. There were thirty acres of land under cultivation, six of which were cultivated by the boys. On this plot the boys grew all sorts of vegetables. This work was supervised by the grade teacher and the horticulture teacher. Each class worked separately and at different times. There were many benefits to this outdoor manual training. A spirit of co-operation, and emulation was developed along with the material results from the products of the garden.⁴²

The physical development of the boys was of great concern. It was documented that many came to the Chicago Parental School showing that they had been underfed or not well fed. Therefore the Parental School paid special attention to the dietary needs, giving the boys plenty of wholesome food.⁴³ The military and gymnastic work was also a factor in their physical development. The school was organized into three companies ("A," "B" and "C"), that drilled from twenty to thirty minutes every day. The boys, according to all reports, seemed to enjoy the drills which were found to be an effective means of discipline. The gymnastic work consisted of calisthenics, work on the apparatus (there was equipment for the gymnasium), and recreation.⁴⁴

The result of all this manual training and physical

exercise was clearly shown in the examination of the boys by the Child Study Department of the Chicago Board of Education. It was found that they were less nervous, on the average, than children in other schools. One of the most important phases of the work of the Parental School was "Child Study." Each child, upon entrance, and upon parole or release, was subjected to a psycho-physical examination with a view to ascertaining his growth and motor abnormalities, or the lack of them. This often helped the Parental School to devise ways and means of special treatment in cases which needed it.⁴⁵ It was assumed the Parental School could not remove growth defects in the short time a child was there but could improve the child's motor ability and return him to the public school better fitted to do the required work. The Child Study Department reported that...

Judging from our observations and experience, as well as the facts collated by other similar institutions, we are satisfied that nine-tenths of the causes of truancy and crime must be sought in environment. Inherited defects are a comparatively small, though important, factor. It is doubtful whether a single boy sent to this school, if placed in a favorable environment, would go astray. Certainly a very small percentage would.⁴⁶

Poverty, lack of parental care and discipline, and inappropriate associations, were noted as the chief cause of truancy and crime. When a boy was brought to the Parental School his environment was completely changed. He received not only good intellectual training, but also enjoyed a good home and the best of moral and social training. If the boy

was left at the Parental School a reasonable length of time, he was thought to be strengthened physically, mentally and morally so that he could resist the adverse influences of an unfavorable environment.

There was also musical talent among the boys, especially the Italians and Germans, and they were given instruction in music three times a week. A drum corps was also organized and that seemed to make the military drill more interesting.⁴⁷

No teacher or officer of the school was permitted to give religious instruction but the Illinois Charitable and Relief Corps (a Roman Catholic Society) held Catholic Sunday-school every Sunday morning, the St. Andrew's Brotherhood, of the Episcopal Church, had charge of the Protestant Sunday-school, and a Jewish Rabbi instructed the Jewish boys every Saturday afternoon.⁴⁸

The Parental School provided that "no religious instruction shall be given in such school except such as is allowed by law to be given in public schools; but the Board of Education shall make regulations so that the pupils may receive training in accordance with the belief of their parents, either by allowing religious services to be held in the institution or by arranging for the attendance of public service elsewhere."⁴⁹

Parole and Discipline

The boys were released from the Parental school upon parole, on the recommendation of the Superintendent, approved by the Board of Education. The law said: "No child shall be released from the school upon parole until the Superintendent shall have become satisfied from the conduct of such child

that he or she will attend regularly the public or private school to which he or she may be sent."⁵⁰ During the first years the Parental School was operating the average term was four months. It was felt that it required several months, as a rule, to make any impression on the truants sent. The average time at parental schools in other parts of the country was much longer.

At the end of the first year of operation it was reported that it cost \$8.34 per student per week to maintain each boy in attendance. In 1903 it was \$7.35, in 1904 it was \$7.14 and by the end of 1905 it cost \$6.76 per week.⁵¹ At the end of the year of 1916 it was reported that the cost per student per week was \$5.34.⁵² The reduction in cost was, of course, due to the larger number of boys present.

By 1903 the average time in detention was eight and one-half months and the total number of boys served that year was 339.⁵³ There were also a total of twenty-three educational employees, which included the family and assistant family instructors and also a total of twenty civil service employees, ie., cooks, janitors, scrub women, etc.

At the end of the year of 1905 there were six dormitories. Four of these were built to accommodate thirty boys each and the other two accommodated twenty-five boys each, thus making the total capacity of the school 170. But the average daily membership for 1905 was 208, and during the latter half of the year there were between 220 to 230 and for

a while 238 boys in the dormitories.⁵⁴ This overcrowding was not only injurious to the health of the boys it also seriously affected the discipline. The idea of the cottage system was that the number of children should be small enough to enable a man and his wife to give special attention to the children which they needed. It seemed impossible that two adults could give the proper attention to forty or fifty such difficult children.

Growth and Changes

On September 1, 1906, Rufus McLain Hitch was assigned as Superintendent of the Parental School.⁵⁵ During his first year more land was purchased, bringing the total to seventy acres, and a farm cottage was built. An assembly hall and North and South wings were added to the main building and a laundry was added also. Also during his first year, the amount of time spent in exercises was reduced. A change was made in the Compulsory School Attendance Law in 1907. The age was raised from fourteen to sixteen but the Parental School Act was not changed until 1917.⁵⁶

On January 4, 1909 Peter A. Mortensen was elected as Superintendent of the Parental School. By this time, the school had expanded to accommodate 321 pupils and employed twenty-seven teachers. Peter Mortensen was superintendent until August of 1917. During his term, the school acquired a swimming pool, additional manual training equipment, additional playgrounds and classrooms.⁵⁷

By the end of the year 1910 there was a regular pattern at Juvenile Court. Friday-morning sessions of the Juvenile Court were set aside for Parental School's Cases. At each session, from ten to twenty-five boys were committed to the school upon evidence presented by William L. Bodine, Superintendent of Compulsory Education. The parents of the boys were given every opportunity to state their case in a very informal hearing. In some cases, boys were allowed to go home under probation to a truant officer, when such action seemed wise to the court, (and necessary because of the lack of spaces available at the Parental School.) During the year ending December 31, 1910, 483 boys were committed to the school. The commitments by years from 1902 to 1910 were as follows: 191, 209, 232, 249, 280, 333, 506, 483, a total of 2,704 boys. These figures do not include boys who were returned for violation of parole.⁵⁸

The school continued to do many studies on the boys when they entered the school and before they were paroled. The studies continued to show that parental weakness and indifference; poor physical or mental inheritance; bad environment and street influences and incompatibility of parents, and improper nourishment were often noted as contributory causes to being committed to the Parental School.⁵⁹

The school also continued to attend to every need of the students committed. There was a physician who called at the

school twice each week. It was his duty to examine all new boys, and to look after the condition of the boys. There was a matron who was in charge of the housekeeping as well as taking care of minor ailments of the boys under the direction of the physician.⁶⁰

The cottage plan was still in operation. Each cottage, or family, consisted of about forty boys, in charge of a Family Instructor and an Assistant, in each case, man and wife. These instructors were teachers, not guards or officers. Eight cottages were maintained, each equipped with a living room, a dining room and serving kitchen, a dormitory with individual beds, bathrooms and living rooms for the Instructors. A playground furnished with necessary equipment was provided for each cottage for its exclusive use. The organization of the cottage was permanent, as only a few boys were received or paroled at a time. The cottages were not graded as to ages or school grades.⁶¹

The supervision of play was considered as important as that of work or study, and every effort was made to cultivate an attitude of cheerful co-operation between the boys.⁶²

In August 1917, Fred E. Smith was made Superintendent of the Parental School. Also during this time, the Parental School law was amended, extending the age limit to 16 from 14. The following year Peter A. Mortensen was selected Superintendent of Schools.⁶³

In the annual report for his first year as Superintendent

of the Parental School, Fred Smith reported that the work of the school for the year 1917-1918 had not deviated much from the preceding years. It was also noted that the membership of the school varied little for several years because it had been filled to capacity practically all the time. The demand for accommodations for more boys was constantly increasing and Smith asked it be met or he felt that the efficiency of the school and its field of work would be seriously hampered. The need to expand was increased by the new law, making 16 years instead of 14 years the age of discharge. While the new law became effective July 1, 1917, no boys over 14 were committed to the Parental School until April, 1918 because no petitions were filed against them until that date.⁶⁴ The new law increased the membership in three ways: First, by admitting boys between 14 and 16 years of age; secondly, by returning those same boys on violation of parole; and lastly, by the retention in the Parental School of Boys who became 14 years old while there. By the end of 1917, the weekly cost per pupil was \$5.91.⁶⁵

The objective in 1918 was the same as it had been in 1902 when the Parental School first opened. The main objective of the Chicago Parental School was to reform the truant and incorrigible habits of the children it housed (only boys at that time). The school provided a "home away from home" for the boys, in which the favorable environment helped them to learn habits which would lead to normal, wholesome self-

development. This made it easier for them to return to their former school backgrounds when the time came for their release from the Parental School. Boys were sometimes paroled to other than their home schools in order that they might escape the temptations of their former days. This sometimes caused problems because some principals felt it was an imposition to give those "bad boys" from other schools a chance in their school. A counseling and guidance approach was also used to help the children adjust to the society in which they lived.⁶⁶

School Routine

When a child was sent to the Parental School from Juvenile Court, he was first registered with the Superintendent's secretary. He was then introduced to the Superintendent, who would ask questions which pertained to the pupil's interests and maturity level. Then the boy would be sent to the Receiving Cottage where he remained for approximately two days. In the Receiving Cottage, which contained books, games, and other paraphernalia, the pupil was examined by the school nurse, as well as having information about the school explained to him so that he could adjust more smoothly to his new home.

After the Receiving Cottage, the pupil was sent to the Adjustment Teacher's office to complete forms pertaining to entrance, interests and health. After testing the pupil to determine where he stood as far as school work was concerned,

he was then assigned to a classroom and from there he went to his assigned cottage.

Until approximately 1923, the system of discipline imposed on the boys was that of military nature. Drills, uniforms, strict obedience and cooperation were all part of an intense military training at the Parental School.

The system of teaching was basically the same as that of the public school system, but the Strathmore Arithmetic Plan was used to meet the different rates of learning among the pupils. The Strathmore Arithmetic Plan was an earnest attempt to adjust teaching procedures to meet the different learning abilities and rates of learning which exist among children. This plan was organized: (1) to diagnose the abilities of pupils by the use of 77 pages of inventory tests in the basic skills of arithmetic; (2) to direct remedial instruction by the purposeful accurate repetition of various learning steps using 300 practice sheets with each practice sheet being keyed to a learning step of an Inventory test that had been constructed to insure maximum repetition of the learning step; (3) to maintain skills by frequent reviews; (4) to encourage pupil self-appraisal using 73 self-tests in arithmetic which enabled the pupil to evaluate his progress; (5) to measure pupil achievement by using the final mastery tests at the end of each unit. The Strathmore Plan was thought to make the work of the teacher easier and more effective and aided pupil mastery of the fundamental skills. The plan worked as

follows: Test--Teach--Practice--Test.⁶⁷

Other activities and aspects of the school included weekly assembly programs; health services; religious education (two chaplains and Sunday School teachers); libraries; a student council; a school newspaper (The Skipper); shops dealing with carpentry, printing, electrical work, sheet metal work and shoe repairing.

As stated earlier, the cottages provided for the boys could accommodate up to thirty-five individuals including the cottage mother and father, called family instructors. The upkeep of each cottage was the responsibility of the cottage parents and the pupils who inhabited it. Each cottage had its own gameroom, study room and dining room along with its own dormitory. Meals were prepared in the central kitchen and were picked up by the boys to bring to the cottages. Each boy had a cart to pick up the food, and they used the underground tunnels which connected all of the buildings for this purpose. The network of tunnels was also used by the pupils to travel from classroom building to cottage without ever having to go outside. This was especially handy in the cold Winter months.

The children arose each morning at six, prepared for breakfast at six-thirty, and after doing the assigned work about the cottage, played until school time. All the activities of the day followed a fixed program. Their classes began at 9:00 a.m. and continued until 12:00 noon, at which time the pupils returned to their cottages for lunch. Classes

resumed at 1:30 p.m. and continued until 3:30 p.m. after which the pupils were free to engage in recreational activities. Dinner was served at 5:00 p.m., a one-hour library period was provided after dinner, a recreation period after study, then retirement at 8:00 p.m. Visiting hours for parents were every Sunday from 1:30 p.m. until 4:30 p.m.⁶⁸

Branch for Girls

Although the Chicago Parental School responded to legislative mandates that were enacted to ensure compliance with compulsory attendance laws and prevent truants from becoming involved in criminal activities, from 1902 to 1919 only boys were committed. During these early years of the Chicago Parental School with only boys admitted, many studies were conducted to determine the contributory causes to being committed and the effect of the "home away from home" in reforming the truant and incorrigible habits of the children it housed.

During these years, the need for additional accommodations was increasing. The school was filled to capacity most of the time and the Parental School law was amended extending the age limit to sixteen from fourteen years. The Superintendent of the Parental School noted the need for expansion in annual reports; and in 1919, expansion plans included the establishment of an "extension of the Chicago Parental School" at Rose Hill School. The extension was established at Rose Hill School and for the first time,

girls would be committed and housed at the new extension facility.

CHAPTER II NOTES

1. Harvey B. Hurd, The Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois, 1899, (Chicago: Chicago Legal News Co., 1899) 346.
2. Ibid., 347
3. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of Parental Schools, First Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, 31 December 1902 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1902).
4. "Chicago Public School System," Reprint of Article, The Chicago Record Herald, 14 April 1906.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, 1900-1901 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1901), 48.
8. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, 1899-1900 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1900), 255.
9. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, 1888-1889 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1889), 487.
10. Ibid., 488.
11. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, 1899-1900, 320.
12. Ibid., 487.
13. Chicago Board of Education, Proceeding of the Chicago Board of Education, 1900-1901, 17.
14. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, 1899-1900, 554.
15. Ibid.
16. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, 1900-1901, 18.
17. Ibid., 611.

18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., 555.
20. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, 1901-1902 (Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1902), 467.
21. Thomas H. MacQueary, Report on Parental Schools, September 1900 (Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1900).
22. Ibid.
23. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, 1900-1901, 19.
24. Harvey B. Hurd, The Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois, Chapter 122. Sec. 437.
25. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of the Parental School, First Annual Report of the Chicago Parental Schools, 31 December 1902, 4-5.
26. Ibid., 5.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., 6.
29. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of the Parental School, First Annual Report of the Parental School, 31 December 1902.
30. Ibid., 6.
31. Ibid.
32. Paul Gerard Anderson, "Juvenile Protective Association," Social Service Organizations, ed. Peter Romanofsky, 2 vols.: No. 2; The Greenwood Encyclopedia of America Institutions; Westport (Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press, 1978), Vol. I, 392. A mimeographed reprint distributed by the Juvenile Protective Association, 1979.
33. Ibid.
34. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of the Parental School, First Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, 31 December 1902, 7.
35. Harvey B. Hurd, The Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois, Chapter 122. Sec. 313., 6.

36. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of the Parental School, First Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, 31 December 1902, 8.
37. Ibid., 8-9.
38. Ibid., 9.
39. Ibid., 10.
40. Chicago Board of Education, Forty-Eighth Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education, Year Ending 20 June 1902 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1902), 74.
41. Ibid., 39.
42. Ibid., 76.
43. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of the Parental School, First Annual Report of the Chicago Parental Schools, 31 December 1902, 15.
44. Ibid., 41.
45. Ibid., 34.
46. Ibid., 36.
47. Chicago Board of Education, Forty-Eighth Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education, Year Ending 20 June 1902, 76.
48. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of the Parental School, First Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, 31 December 1902, 50.
49. Harvey B. Hurd, The Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois, Chapter 122, Sec. 313, 50.
50. Harvey B. Hurd, The Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois, Chapter 122. Sec. 313, 8.
51. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of the Parental School, Forth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, 31 December 1905 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1905).
52. Chicago Board of Education, Sixty-Second Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education, Year Ending June 1916 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1916).
53. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of the Parental School, Second Annual Report of the Chicago Parental Schools, 31 December 1903 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1903).

54. Thomas H. MacQueary, Superintendent of the Parental School, Forth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental Schools, 31 December 1905.
55. Chicago Board of Education, Fifty-Third Annual Report of the Chicago Public Schoc's, Year Ending 30 June 1907 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1907).
56. Superintendent of the Chicago Parental School, Sixth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, Year Ending 31 December 1907 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1907), 1.
57. Chicago Board of Education, Fifty-Fifth Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education, Year Ending June, 1909 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1909).
58. Superintendent of the Parental School, Ninth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, Year Ending December 1910 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1910), 4.
59. Ibid., 5.
60. Ibid., 3
61. Superintendent of the Parental School, Tenth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, Year Ending December 1911 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1911), 9.
62. Ibid.
63. Chicago Board of Education, Sixty-Third Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education Year Ending June 1918 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1918).
64. Chicago Board of Education, Sixty -Forth Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education, Year Ending June 1919 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1919), 163.
65. Ibid., 165.
66. Ibid., 164.
67. Scherer, Murdock, Freeman, The Strathmore Plan (Aurora, Illinois: Strathmore Co., 1940).
68. Superintendent of the Parental School, Tenth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, Year Ending December 1911, 10.

CHAPTER III

THE YEARS OF EXPANSION AND INCLUSION

In 1919, girls were admitted for the first time to the Chicago Parental School. Although the original legislation mandating the establishment of a parental or truant school for the purpose of affording a place of confinement, discipline, instruction and maintenance of children of compulsory school age included both boys and girls, only boys were committed from 1902 to 1919.

In 1919, a Parental School for girls was established at Rose Hill School, 6020 North Clark Street. The school was an extension of the Chicago Parental School, and was supervised by the superintendent of the boy's Parental School.¹

The boy's Parental School was a pioneer institution of its kind and it had attained wide prominence. The extension of the Parental School filled a long-felt need to provide a similar facility for girls. The Parental School for Girls was to be maintained as a branch of the Chicago Parental School.

Prior to the opening of the extension, all girls who were identified as truant and/or incorrigible were committed to penal institutions where they often came in contact with criminals. The girl's branch of the Parental School was "to be conducted on the basis of the same reconstructive and

humane standards" as the Parental School for Boys.²

For many years there had been a demand, more or less insistent, that accommodations be provided for girls whose school offenses justified and required their removal from their home school to a school where they could receive the training that would adjust them to a normal home and school life.³

The Rose Hill School building, located at 6020 North Clark Street, had been remodeled and equipped to offer the best advantage possible as a temporary home for this "class" of girls. It was not known, at this time, how great the need would be for this type of school. The mere existence of the Parental School for Girls was thought to lessen female truancy and that perhaps the present quarters would prove to be large enough. When the school opened there were accommodations for thirty-five girls.⁴

It was hoped that the school would be sent only truants and incorrigibles, and that no "immoral" girls would be committed.⁵ Fred E. Smith (principal and superintendent of the Boys and Girls Parental School) felt that if these guidelines were followed then the school would be of "inestimable value to the girlhood of our city."⁶ He believed that many girl's careers on the downward path could be checked at truancy.

On June 11, 1919, Peter Mortenson, the Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools, reported that: "Rose Hill Parental

School is ready to be opened and recommends that authority be granted for the opening of this school to date from June 5 for the employment of the following: two family instructors at \$65.00 per month of 4 weeks, one teacher of handwork, one cook at \$75.00 per month, and one scrub woman at \$2.00 per day."⁷

It was proposed to maintain this branch for the time being, under the supervision of the Superintendent of the Chicago Parental School "The business of the branch can be looked after through the main school."⁸

Girls First Committed

The first commitment of girls was on June 20, 1919, when thirteen girls entered the school. On June 27, five more were committed. This ended the school year leaving eighteen girls in the hands of the Parental School administration.⁹ These girls came from a variety of areas and backgrounds. They came from thirteen public and two parochial schools, three came from one school, two from another and one from each of the other thirteen schools. "Ten of the girls were born in Chicago, four in the south-colored girls; one in Italy, one in Pennsylvania; and the birthplace of two unknown."¹⁰ The conditions that the girls came from were similar to the conditions of the boys. An overview of the records of these first eighteen girls showed that in three cases both parents were dead; in seven cases there was no father; no mother in another case; parents separated in another; and both parents working in four cases. To show more clearly the home

conditions and the causes tending to make these girls wayward the following is taken from their records:

(1) Mother and father hard drinkers; mother found drunk in bed by the truant officer; girl sent out for whisky and beer girl stole \$45.00. (2) Taught to steal by an older sister who has reformed; insanity in the family. (3) Home conditions dreadfully unsanitary; mother mentally unsound; brother in Parental school. (4) Both parents work; want girl home to care for younger children. (5) Stepfather; mother works in tobacco factory; recently from the south. (6) Father in Atlanta; lives with grandmother; brother in Parental school. (7) Home conditions very bad. (8) Mother runs a saloon and boarding house; mother is often away at nights. (9) Lives with grandparents; out late nights; will not tell where. (10) Needs to be closely guarded; calls boys into her home from her window; kissed many boys in hall at school. (11) Both parents work and want girl to care for 5 smaller children. (12) Lives with grandmother, 78 years old; home conditions very poor; father contributes nothing to support. (13) Will not stay home; parents dead; brother in Parental school.¹¹

Maintaining the Boys

Fred E. Smith, who became Superintendent of the Parental School in 1917, after Peter A. Mortenson, was now in charge of both schools. In his annual report of the Chicago Parental School for the school year 1918-1919, he reports the following statistics. There were 311 boys in the school on July 1, 1918 and a total of 466 boys committed during the year with 216 boys returned for a violation of parole which gave a total of 993 boys in school for the year. There were 613 boys paroled during the year and thirty-one discharged because of age and six boys transferred to other schools. This gave a total of 650 boys leaving the school which left 343 boys in school as

of July 1, 1919.¹²

The causes of commitments for the boys were many and varied as were the girls. There were 148 boys committed for truancy only, forty-one for incorrigibility, seventy-three who were both truant and incorrigible, 161 who were delinquent and truant, sixteen boys were incorrigible and delinquent and twenty-seven were delinquent only. In eighty-five cases there was no father; in seventeen no mother; in seven no mother or father; and in nine the parents were separated. They also came from many different nationalities with forty-three that year being "Colored."¹³

The cost per pupil for maintaining the Boys Parental was \$342.39 per pupil for the year for all expenditures. In his annual report of the Parental School, Fred E. Smith reported that he felt there were two reasons for an increasing number of boys being returned to the Parental School during the year. "First, owing to very crowded conditions and the strong demand for room, the boys were often paroled in a shorter time than usual; second, the general unrest arising from the war increased juvenile delinquency. The raising of the age limit to 16 would also naturally increase the number of returns."¹⁴

It was felt that the Parental School had a broad influence upon the school system as a whole which was shown by the number of schools from which the students came. During the year 1918-1919, boys came from 167 public schools and from thirty-nine private schools. Of course, more boys came from

the schools that had "Special Rooms for Boys," as the boys in these rooms had all been truants or incorrigibles in other schools, having been sent to these rooms with the hope that it would not be found necessary to send them to Parental School, and many did well in these rooms.

These "special truant rooms" came as a result of the Compulsory Education law being amended in 1907, raising the compulsory school age to sixteen.¹⁵ When this occurred the Parental School's capacity of about 200 was reached. The Chicago Public School System was faced with the problem of what to do with the increasing number of truants and students with behavior problems. In addition, the Chicago Public Schools was receiving criticism because of its failure to provide adequate programs for pre-delinquent children before they were to be committed to the Chicago Parental School. Therefore, in 1911 the Board of Education established special classes for truants in some regular schools.¹⁶

Girls and Boys in Contrast

William Bodine's (Superintendent of Compulsory Education) report for the year ending June 30, 1919, gave 5,728 truant cases during the year, 5,308 of the cases being boys and 420 being girls.¹⁷

In 1920 it was reported that the Girl's Branch had two rooms, thirty-five pupils but only twenty-five seats, and four teachers. It also had a construction room with twenty tables and a playground. These figures remained about the same until

1923 when the number of teachers went down to two and the number of seats went up to thirty-four and the number of pupils averaged thirty-one to thirty-five. In 1923 Rufus Hitch was again placed in charge of the Parental School during the summer and on August 30, 1923 Orris John Milliken was made Superintendent of the Parental School. He was to remain Superintendent of the Parental School until he retired in July 1931.

The figures for 1920-1925 for both the Girls and Boys in the Chicago Parental School are as follows:

 Table 2: Statistics Chicago Parental School 1920-1925

	BOYS				
	1920-21	1921-22	1922-23	1923-24	1924-25
Committed	461	463	468	410	530
Returned	214	266	257	204	234
Paroled	620	610	649	655	590
Discharged	18	33	73	38	43
Transferred	3	6	7	24	25

Capacity of school 300

	GIRLS				
	1920-21	1921-22	1922-23	1923-24	1924-25
Committed	46	41	46	42	51
Returned	11	13	9	8	10
Paroled	38	48	55	31	56
Discharged	3	6	2	7	4
Transferred	1	2	.	2	4

Capacity of school 46

 Source: Annual Report Of The Superintendent of Schools. Year Ending June 30, 1925

Concerns

During these five years Superintendent Milliken had many concerns. The Health Department recommended that the boys in the cottages were reduced from forty to thirty-four. The Boy

Scout movement was introduced in 1924 with great success. The military type of discipline was changed to one of "play and interest." Until this time the military system formed the basis of discipline. Deprivations of privileges, the imposition of certain physical exercises, and solitary confinement for short periods in a well-lighted, well-ventilated and well-heated room were the penalties allowed and used. Punishments were reduced under the "play and interest plan." No boy's food was changed for disciplinary reasons, which had been the usual routine. Milliken also recommended that better facilities for play in inclement weather be obtained. He had attempted to use the assembly hall for this purpose and found it was not suitable. He also wanted two additional rooms and two men trained in social work to be assigned to him for follow-up work. The boys needed more help after leaving the Parental School especially because of the stigma attached to them by the receiving school.¹⁸

There was also concern for the girls located at the Rose Hill Branch at 6020 N. Clark Street. The building had been condemned. There was also need for social workers at the girls' school to follow-up on those discharged. At this time Milliken recommended an adequate building on the Parental School grounds, accommodating 150 girls, equipped for commercial work and home economics. Milliken very much believed that more time and more workers must be given to the truant, the incorrigible, and the undeveloped child. He

thought those who passed through the Juvenile Court should be analyzed in the greatest detail before commitment to the correctional schools, with special emphasis upon the best possible teaching methods, to remedy and correct. He really believed in prevention. He believed that the best place to do this was in the regular school, not in the correctional schools, and not in the Juvenile Court, except as a last resort. Milliken was also concerned that the capacity of the school had not increased in the last twenty years and wanted provision for at least one hundred fifty more boys.¹⁹

In the report of the Director of Special Schools, Frank Bruner, for the School Year 1922 to 1923 it was stated:

Children whose mental ages are under five years or whose I.Q. (Intelligence Quotients, i.e., mental age divided by chronological age) is under 50, are not admitted to special classes, because experience has shown they cannot be trained or educated to float in society. They cannot be made, even partially independent economically, and it has been found impossible to train them into habits of decency, self-respect and self-restraint. Children of such low mental limits require close surveillance and personal direction all of their lives and obviously unless their parents are able to provide these, they should be segregated in public institutions for the feeble-minded.²⁰

It was suggested in this report that the only solution was a twenty-four hour a day program extended over a period sufficiently long to correct and reform habits and this was possible only in some corrective institution such as the Parental School. It could not be done in the public schools and it was impossible to send them to the State Schools for the Feeble-minded. It was recommended that there should be

set aside at the Chicago Parental School, a cottage for incorrigible subnormals and a policy adopted of keeping them there not less than six months, or better, a year. This was the only mention of this recommendation in school reports. It was the beginning of recommendations for the use of the Chicago Parental School for other than truants and incorrigibles.²¹

In 1924-1925 there were many improvements: A screened vegetable house where the boys worked with farm products during inclement weather and away from the insects; The Boy Scout organization had been completed and out of two hundred thirty-four returns only two were Scouts; The upper part of the barn was being turned into a "rough-house" gymnasium; and a room for sub-normal children had been opened, also an "opportunity" room where large boys of low grade received individual instruction and advanced more rapidly than in regular grades.²²

Girls Transferred

It was recommended that steps be taken to erect a Girl's Parental School on the site of the Boy's Parental, 3600 West Foster Avenue; that it be developed on a cottage plan and that three such units be erected as soon as possible. The reasons given for this was that there would be enlarged opportunities for more home life in a situation where ten girls live in residence with a Matron, and attend school either with all the girls of the institution or with girls and boys' of the boys'

institution.²³

The new administration building and the new building for girls was completed in December 1926. Milliken thought this to be a step in the right direction. He stated in his report of 1926 that: "Girls and Boys had been educated upto the time they were brought into court, and as soon as we segregate them we introduce a new and serious problem."²⁴

In 1926 the Girls were transferred from Clark to the Chicago Parental School, in which they were provided with a cottage and various activities which pertained to their rather than the boy's interests. The girl's division included both elementary and high school departments in academic work as well as an excellent home economics training course consisting of cooking, sewing, and home planning management. Typing and business training was also offered in the girls' educational program. Their classroom had been arranged as a laboratory type of room with a variety of activities going on simultaneously. The varied interests created and carried on in the girls' division also received a pleasant reaction from visitors to the school.²⁵ For the years 1925-1926, Tables 3 and 4 describe differences in the cost of maintaining the boys compared to maintaining the girls.

From 1902 to 1919 the Chicago Parental School provided a "home away from home" for truant and/or incorrigible boys. From 1919 to 1928 the school also accommodated girls. From 1922 through 1928 the enrollment at both the boy's Parental

Table 3: Chicago Parental For Boys/Girls - Instruction

BOYS	
A.	Salaries and Wages:
	Teachers \$79,903.49
	Civil Service Employees 14,728.14
J.	Educational Supplies 38,827.93
K.	Books, Charts and Globes 357.26
O.	Educational Equipment 279.35
 <u>\$134,096.17</u>
GIRLS	
A.	Salaries and Wages:
	Teachers \$9,995.35
	Civil Service Employees 1,080.00
J.	Educational Supplies 3,748.02
O.	Educational Equipment
 <u>\$14,823.37</u>

Table 4: Parental School for Boys/Girls - Operation

BOYS	
A.	Salaries and Wages:
	Engineer-Custodian \$33,037.00
C.	Telephone 48.00
G.	Gas and Electricity 1,802.96
L.	Fuel 11,739.84
M.	School Plant Supplies 3,921.44
 <u>\$50,549.32</u>
GIRLS	
A.	Salaries and Wages:
	Engineer-Custodian \$5,884.67
G.	Gas and Electricity 638.50
F.	Fuel 2,882.30
M.	School Plant Supplies 610.37
 <u>\$10,015.84</u>

Source: Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education, Year Ending June 28, 1926.

School and the Girl's Branch of the Parental School was at an all time high. However, beginning with the 1929 to 1930

school year and the ensuing years, the Parental School enrollment declined dramatically. From 1928 through 1959 the Parental School continued to respond to social, economic, and legislative changes and challenges.

CHAPTER III NOTES

1. Chicago Board of Education, Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1920 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1920), 74.
2. Chicago Board of Education, Sixty-Forth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1919 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1919), 9.
3. Ibid., 74.
4. Ibid., 74.
5. Ibid., 74.
6. Ibid., 75
7. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1920 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1920), 1138.
8. Ibid., 1138.
9. Sixty-Fifth Annual Report of the Chicago Public Schools, 74.
10. Ibid., 75.
11. Ibid., 76.
12. Ibid., 67.
13. Ibid., 68.
14. Ibid., 72.
15. Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckinridge, Truancy and Non-Attendance in the Chicago Public Schools (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1917), 317.
16. Chicago Board of Education, Fifty-Eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1912 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1912), 128.

17. Sixty-Forth Annual Report of the Board of Education for the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1919, 79.
18. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1924 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1924) 33.
19. Ibid.
20. Chicago Board of Education, Report of the Director of Special Schools of the City of Chicago for the School Year 1922-1923 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1923), 12-13.
21. Ibid., 13.
22. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Year Ending June 1925 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1925) 134.
23. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1926 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1926), 11995.
24. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1926 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1926), 151.
25. Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

THE YEARS OF CHANGE AND CHALLENGES

The history of the Chicago Parental School reflects the development and changes in the education of truant and delinquent children in the Chicago school system. Beginning in 1902, the Parental School admitted truants and children with delinquent tendencies. It attempted to supply a favorable environment in which these children could learn habits conducive to normal, wholesome self-development. The fact that over ninety per-cent of the pupils attending this school came from broken or inadequate homes practically determined the philosophy, and consequently, the program administered. From 1928 through 1959, the Parental School continued to respond to changes and challenges.

From 1922 through 1928, the enrollment at both the Parental School for Boys and the branch for girls was at an all time high. During these years, the average enrollment for the boys ranged between 920 and 1,000 for the year. The average enrollment for the girls was about seventy-five to eight-two per year.¹ In the year beginning July 1928 to June 1929 the boys enrollment fell to 899 while the girls enrollment remained the same.²

From 1929 through 1937, there was a significant decrease

in enrollment. One reason given for the large decrease in the girls' enrollment and the overall change in enrollment was the opening of more "truant rooms" across the city. As stated earlier, these were rooms for truant and incorrigible boys and girls who would otherwise be sent to the Parental School. When special classes and special day schools failed, the child was taken into Juvenile Court and, if the Judge so ordered, was committed to the Chicago Parental School. The special schools were intermediate institutions between the regular schools on the one hand and the court and Parental School on the other.

Other factors that may have contributed to the declining enrollment may have been related to a critical report of the Parental School and other "corrective institutions" for boys and girls in the state that was issued in the fall of 1928. The "Shaw-Myers Report"³ became a focal point of controversy and discussion regarding the role of the school system in dealing with the problems of juvenile delinquency. William Bogan, Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools, appointed an Advisory Council to study the report and submit recommendations.⁴ The responsibility of the Advisory Committee on Juvenile Delinquency was to devise a school system program which would supplement and alleviate the program already in operation at the Parental School. There were many economic forces at work at this time. The "cost per capita" of maintaining a truant, incorrigible child at the

Parental School with twenty-four hour custodial care was cited at \$612.67. However, the liberal estimate" for maintaining a truant, incorrigible child at a "Truant School," i.e., a day school, was projected at under \$200.00.⁵

Shortly thereafter, on July 10, 1929, the Chicago Board of Education adopted "that a Truant School be opened in the Montefiore School Building located at 461 N. Sangamon Street (near Halsted Street and Grand Avenue) on the near Northwest side of Chicago.⁶ Thus, there were many forces developing in the area of truancy and delinquency including the development of truant rooms in several of the regular schools in the city.

In 1932 George D. Strayer, the Director of the Division of Field Studies of Columbia University, was commissioned by the Chicago Board of Education to conduct a survey of the Chicago Public School System. The Strayer Report on the Chicago Public Schools reported that the personnel work carried on in the special schools was most commendable; it commented further that its work should be recognized and put in every school. According to the report, "It is regretted most seriously that the kind of personal study and guidance accorded the boys in these special schools is not available until after they have already developed habits of truancy and delinquency which are well impossible to break."⁷

The Strayer report also pointed out that the strengths of the Parental School included an attitude of understanding, sympathy, and kindness on the part of the teachers and

supervisors. But it is also noted that except for the educational values inherent in the institution's routine itself and the recreational program of the playgrounds and cottages, "the educational program is narrow academically and likely to be ineffective from the standpoint of any genuine and permanent results."⁸ It was recommended that the Parental School try to conform less to what the regular schools were doing and serve as a model for the regular schools in developing programs for the entire school population. It was reported that the inadequacy for correcting the problem of truancy or delinquency was brought out by the fact that slightly over half of the persons received by the parental school between September 1, 1931, and January 25, 1932, were return commitments - boys and girls who had returned for the second, third, fourth, fifth, or sixth time.⁹ It was suggested that a better cure for delinquency and truancy was prevention which would best be accomplished by a "challenging environment in regular schools which are adapted to the needs, abilities, and backgrounds of such boys and girls."¹⁰

In 1936-1937 it was reported that every child in the Parental School had been committed to it by the Judge of the Juvenile Court on a petition charging truancy. Generally the children came to court from the special truant schools or from truant rooms in regular schools. Others committed were children brought into court by the police for various infractions of the law. The petitions filed in these cases

usually charged truancy, or were amended to include truancy. Thus all children, at this time, at the Parental School were sent there on a truancy petition.¹¹

In 1940, the Parental School discontinued its farm and barn cottages and became more oriented towards a pre-vocational program for the pupils. As stated previously, the school had machine shops, print shops, carpentry and wood shops, and many others, which perhaps lent credence to the concept of a pre-vocational school.

A character code was adopted for use at the Parental School. This was to focus attention upon character and citizenship training.¹² Student Council members printed and distributed a "Check Yourself List." Throughout the history of the school a similar character education approach had been in progress.¹³ The character code is described in Table 5 below.

In 1941, the Chicago Parental School celebrated its fortieth anniversary of exceptional service to the "special" children who inhabited it.¹⁴ After World War II, the Board of Education loaned twenty acres of land behind the school to the government for a veterans' housing project. The housing project consisted of Quonset huts, which housed the many soldiers returning from the war who needed living quarters for themselves and their families. The huts were not very large but they were oftentimes inhabited by more than one family.¹⁵

This property now belongs to Northeastern University and

Table 5: Character Code - Parental School

CHECK YOURSELF WITH THIS LIST

1. The Law of Self-Control
 - a. I will control my tongue.
 - b. I will control my temper.
 - c. I will control my actions.
2. The Law of Good Health
 - a. I will take such food, sleep and exercise as will keep me always in good health.
 - b. I will keep my clothes and my body clean.
 - c. I will practice cleanliness in my school.
3. The Law of Kindness
 - a. I will bear no spites or grudges.
 - b. I will be kind in all my speech.
 - c. I will not selfishly insist on having my own way.
4. The Law of Self-Reliance
 - a. I will develop independence and wisdom to think for myself, choose wisely and act for myself.
 - b. I will not be afraid of doing right when the crowd does wrong.
 - c. When in danger, trouble, or pain, I will be brave.
5. The Law of Reliability
 - a. I will not do wrong in the hope of not being found out.
 - b. I will not keep the truth from those who have a right to it.
 - c. I will do promptly what I have promised to do.
6. The Law of Teamwork
 - a. I will do my part and encourage others to do their part, promptly and quickly.
 - b. In all my work with others I will be cheerful.
 - c. I will form the habit of good work and keep alert, mistakes cause hardships and sometimes disaster.
7. The Law of Good Sportsmanship
 - a. I will play fair and do my best to win.
 - b. I will not be a sore loser.
 - c. I will not "razz" any player.
8. The Law of Respect
 - a. I will show respect for God.
 - b. I will have respect for those in authority.
 - c. I will have respect for myself.

Source: Thirty-Ninth Annual Report, Chicago Parental School.
June 30, 1941.

a faculty member who had lived in the neighborhood for thirty-

five years related that "the project brought a lot of entertainment to the residents of the neighborhood. Women ran small bordellos from time to time, and the Fire Department was always coming to extinguish fires resulting from the kerosene stoves used in the huts."¹⁶

During the 1930's and 1940's, the Parental School's program was governed by the philosophy that delinquency, truancy, incorrigibility, and other misdeeds of children were only symptomatic of underlying conditions, "the roots of which will be found in the family life of the child, his school situation, his economic and social environment; and in the psychological and psychological aspects of the personality of the child."¹⁷ Edward Stullken, who was principal of Montefiore Special School for the first thirty-one years of its existence and who had done much work in the field of juvenile delinquency "prevention" was a noted expert in truancy and delinquency prevention in the Chicago Public School system. During the 1930's and 1940's the schools were waking to their vital interest in and responsibility for the environmental factors of education. They were changing their emphasis from the thing taught to the person taught.¹⁸

In 1948 the Chicago Parental Guidance Manual provided a chronological tabulation of the historical data related to the school from 1896 to 1948, a listing of superintendents of schools from 1900 to 1948, and the superintendents of the Chicago Parental School from 1900 to 1948. That information

is provided in Tables 6, 7, and 8 below.

 Table 6: Chronological Tabulation of Related Historical Data

1896	John Worthy School organized in the Bridewell for delinquent boys, Robert M. Smith, Principal.
1899 July 1	Juvenile Court Established. Branch of Circuit Court.
1899 July 5	Richard S. Tuthill, first judge of the Juvenile Court.
1899 July 1	Parental School Law passed by the legislature. It makes the establishment of Parental School in Chicago obligatory within 2 years from July 1, 1899.
1899 July 13	William Lester Bodine, elected Superintendent of Compulsory Education.
1899 Dec. 27	Citizens petition Board of Education asking that speedy action be taken for the erection of a Parental School for children of school age (14).
1900 Jan. 10	5,000 copies of Bodine's report on Parental Schools ordered printed by the Board of Education for general distribution.
1900 Oct. 17	Forty acres of the Bowmanville plot fixed upon as site of the Chicago Parental School. Blocks 5, 12, 21, 20. N. 1/2 Sec. 11, Twp. 40, R. 13 E. 3rd P.M.
1900 July 1	Thomas H. McQueary appointed first superintendent of Parental School.
1900 Sept. 5	Thomas H. McQueary and Robert M. Smith submit report to the Board of Education on other Parental Schools.
1901 Sept. 25	Ten acres added by purchase of block 4, from Wm. A. Peterson, making site 50 acres.
1901 Nov. 13	Swimming pool, first construction completed on Parental School property.
1902 Jan. 31	Cottage No. 1 completed. (A-G)
1902 May 1	Main building opened-one floor.
1902 Nov. 12	Superintendent's home finished.
1903 Apr. 15	Ice house ready.
1903 May 15	Vegetable cellar built.
1903 Sept. 8	Cottage No. 2 occupied. (C-D-E)
1903 Nov. 27	Small hospital for isolation purposes completed. (Burns' Cottage).
1903 Dec. 7	Barn completed.
1904 July	Julian W. Mack appointed Judge of Juvenile Court.
1906 Sept. 1	Rufus McLain Hitch assigned as Superintendent

Table 6 (continued)

		of Parental School.
1907		Special Military Instructor dispensed with.
1907		Compulsory School age raised from 14 to 16 but Parental School act not changed till 1917.
		Laundry opened at the school.
1908		Farm cottage built.
1908		Merritt W. Pinckney, becomes Juvenile Court Judge and Mary Bartelme made assistant.
1909	Feb.	Assembly Hall and North and South Wings added to Main Building.
1909		Blocks 13 and 29 purchased adding 20 more acres. Total 70.
1909	Jan. 4	Peter A. Mortensen elected as Superintendent of Parental School.
1913		Greenhouse at the School provided for by action of the Board of Education.
1913		Valuation of Parental School properties estimated at \$455,293 (not including 40 acres School Fund Property).
1915	June 9	John Worthy School's name changed to Chicago and Cook County School for Boys. New location-22nd St., between Harlem and Desplaines Ave., Riverside, Illinois.
1915	Oct. 17	Orris John Milliken made Superintendent of Chicago Cook County School for Boys.
1916		Victor P. Arnold elected Judge of the Juvenile Court.
1917	Aug.	Fred E. Smith made Superintendent of the Parental School.
1917	June 20	Parental School law amended extending age to 16.
1919	June	Parental School for Girls established at Rosehill School, 6020 N. Clark Street, under supervision of Superintendent of Boys Parental School.
1921		Cottage No. 3 completed. (B-H)
1923		Mr. Hitch again placed in charge of the Parental School for the summer during investigation.
1923	Aug.30	Orris John Milliken made Superintendent of Parental School.
1923		Military training and uniforms discontinued.
1925		Girls transferred from school on Clark St., to Chicago Parental School.
1927	July 5	Mary Bartelme becomes Judge of Juvenile Court.
1927		Dr. Munson's study of 165 boys committed to the Parental School.
1929		Montefiore Special Organized.
1930		Chicago and Cook County School for Boys closed.
1930		Moseley Special School organized.
1931		Visiting teacher added to Parental School Staff

Table 6 (continued)

	but soon discontinued.
1931 July	Mr. Milliken retired and Mr. Mortensen elected again.
1933 Dec. 14	Parent-Teachers' Association organized and Charter granted.
1933	Frank H. Bicek appointed as Judge of the Juvenile Court.
1935 July 25	Dennis W. Kelley appointed Superintendent.
1937 Aug. 1	William J. Page appointed as Superintendent.
1940	Judge Bicek elected to serve another term as Juvenile Court Judge.
1941	Chicago Parental School in the 40th year of continuous service to maladjusted children.
1946	20 acres of property on North side of School loaned to the government by the Board of Education for veterans' housing project.
1946	Major Frank Beals retires as Assistant Superintendent of Special Schools.
1946	Dr. Grace Munson elected as Assistant Superintendent of Special Schools.
1947	Dr. Herald Hunt chosen General Superintendent of Chicago Public School System.
1947	Tenth Anniversary of Wm. J. Page as Superintendent of Chicago Parental School.
1948	Judge Frank H. Bicek retires as Judge of Juvenile Court.
1948	Judge Robert J. Dunne appointed Judge of Juvenile Court.

 Source: The Chicago Parental School: Guidance Manual, 1948.

Table 7: Superintendents of Schools from 1901 to 1948

1.	Edwin G. Cooley.....	1900-1909
2.	Ella Flagg Young.....	1909-1915
3.	John D. Shoop.....	1915-1918
4.	Peter A. Mortensen.....	1918-1919
5.	Charles E. Chadsey.....	1919-1920
6.	Peter A. Mortensen.....	1920-1924
7.	William McAndrew.....	1924-1928
8.	William J. Bogan.....	1928-1936
9.	William H. Johnson.....	1936-1946
10.	George Cassel, Acting Sup.....	1946-1947
11.	Herold C. Hunt.....	1947-

 Source: The Chicago Parental School: Guidance Manual, 1948.

Table 8: Superintendents of Chicago Parental School 1901-1948

1.	Thomas H. MacQueary.....	1900-1906
2.	Rufus M. Hitch.....	1906-1909
3.	Peter A. Mortensen.....	1909-1917
4.	Fred E. Smith.....	1917-1923
5.	Orris J. Milliken.....	1923-1931
6.	Peter A. Mortensen.....	1931-1935
7.	Dennis W. Kelley.....	1935-1937
8.	William J. Page.....	1937-

Source: The Chicago Parental School: Guidance Manual, 1948.

In an article written by William J. Page, Superintendent of the Chicago Parental School from 1937 to 1953 he stated:

The services of two adjustment teachers and the institution of individual instruction have contributed much to success in meeting individual needs. Formerly, the development and progress of each pupil was entrusted largely to the classroom teacher whose duty it was to teach a class of twenty-five to thirty-five maladjusted and misdirected children of varying ages and abilities. Under the adjustment program, incoming pupils are tested for grade achievements in the fundamental subjects of reading, spelling, and arithmetic before being placed. Separate units are then furnished for each child at his ability level. Each pupil receives individual instruction and can advance as rapidly as he is capable. Where it is necessary, remedial instruction is given by the adjustment teachers.¹⁹

The loan of land from the Board of Education seemed to be the beginning of the end of the Chicago Parental School for Boys and Girls. The chronological historical data listed in Table 6 ends with the appointment of Judge Robert J. Dunne to the Juvenile Court. Judge Dunne closed the girls division of the Chicago Parental School in 1948; and girls who were truant or delinquent were subsequently sent to the Geneva School for Girls.

The Educational Work and Routine of the School

In 1948 a picture of what a boy's life was like inside the Parental School could be found in the guidance manual published during the time that William Page was Superintendent of the school.

The beginning was really the Family Court room in Juvenile Court when the Judge committed the boy to the Parental School. At that time handcuffs were placed on the boy and in many cases he was dragged kicking and screaming to the Wagon that would transport him to the school.²⁰ When the boy arrived at the school he was registered by the Superintendent's secretary and this information was placed in his file. The Superintendent usually met with the young man and had a "friendly chat." It was during this chat that he asked questions concerning the pupil's particular interests. The boy was encouraged to tell the Superintendent exactly how he felt about things and what he had heard about the some of the cottages so that he could see if the boy had the correct information. During this time the Superintendent also tried to find out how mature the boy was so he could place him in a cottage with a group of boys about the same age and who had similar interests.²¹

After the interview above, the boy was sent to the receiving cottage where he remained for about two days. He did not meet other boys from the school until he left this cottage. The Receiving Cottage was equipped with games,

books, writing paper and pencils, radio and pictures of the school's activities.²²

While in this cottage, the pupil was examined by the school nurse to see if he needed any medical attention. A culture of his nose and throat was taken and sent to the Board of Health for examination. The boy took a shower and was given a change of clothing until his own clothing was cleaned and washed in the school's laundry. During the time in the Receiving cottage the boy was given an opportunity to learn some things about the school and cottages so that adjustment would be easier. He was taught things that he needed to know in order to get along well in the cottages: make his bed, serve food, wash dishes. He was instructed on taking daily showers and appearing neat and clean at all times. He was also instructed about writing his parents and mailing them a visitor's pass along with a list of required items needed during his stay.²³

From the Receiving Cottage, the boy went to the Adjustment Teachers' office. He filled out entrance, interest, and health record forms and was tested to get an approximate grade level in his school work.²⁴ A boy was never placed in a grade lower than the one in which he was at the last school he attended. Often, after testing, it was found that some boys were able to advance up to a year and a half.²⁵ After the testing, the pupils were assigned to a classroom. The major classroom subjects were reading,

spelling and arithmetic. The reading and spelling units were comparable to those of other public schools but in arithmetic the Strathmore plan was used. This plan was thought to make the work of the teacher easier and more effective and aided pupil mastery of the fundamental skills. This method worked on a plan of: Test; Teach; Practice; Test.²⁶

The boys learned about carpentry, printing, electrical work, mechanical drawing, sheet metal work, shoe repairing, sewing, cooking, greenhouse work, waiting on tables, and a variety of crafts. Each boy had a least two hours a day in shop. Half of the school day was devoted to academic work and half to vocational shops.²⁷

The entire school met in the auditorium for three half-hour periods a week for assembly programs and inspirational talks. Members of each cottage took turns in staging an original assembly program; held weekly in the evening and included appropriate holiday plays, dramatizations and musicales.²⁸ Musical organizations included the glee club, choir, drum and bugle corps and rhythm and harmonica bands. Two evenings each week during the winter months, pupils would meet in the gymnasium for educational films and scheduled volleyball or basketball matches.²⁹

Twice a year a musical dramatic performance was offered for parents, teachers, and friends of the school. These presentations (as were the girls) were under the sponsorship of the Parent-Teacher Association which used the funds for

clothing and other necessities not provided for in the school budget. The money collected also went towards gifts purchased for the children and given them at the annual Christmas and spring party.³⁰

It needs to be understood that in no case was the Parent-Teacher Association an organization of the enrolled boys or girls parents. The members of this organization were leaders in the Parent-Teacher movement from all parts of the city and were especially interested in the maladjusted child. The Association was organized in 1933 at the suggestion of Joseph C. Ross, a Judge who had long been very interested in the boys and girls of the Parental School.³¹ Among its numerous achievements were: 1) Providing a better Christmas for all the boys and girls at the school. 2) Paying for eyeglasses for all those who could not afford to pay. 3) Obtaining clothing and shoes for many of the children. 4) Sponsoring an annual Children's Parents' Day in an effort to help the children by getting better acquainted with their parents. 5) Providing awards for various sports events. 6) Buying school equipment not provided for in the school budget. 7) Carrying on an educational program throughout the city's P.T.A.'s in the interest of underprivileged children. 8) Supporting and promoting any suggestions of the Parental School Staff that would improve conditions for the boys and girls. 9) Conducted tour groups through the school to acquaint the people of the city with the educational program of the Parental School. 10)

secured outstanding speakers in the Social Welfare field for their meetings.³²

In addition the P.T.A. sponsored a flower and garden party in June and an entertainment and card party in December to raise money for their activities. In December the boys of the school were responsible for the entertainment while in June the girls had the major responsibility. Annually more than 1500 visitors attended each of these programs.³³ Mrs R.W. Lee was the organization's first president.³⁴

The routine of the children usually went like this:

The children rise each morning at 7:00 a.m., make their beds, and prepare for breakfast and school. The occupants of each cottage are responsible for cleanliness and order in their own cottage. School begins at 9:00 a.m. and continues until noon. To allow sufficient time for the children to bring the food to their cottages, have dinner, and wash the dishes, the noon hour extends from 12:00 to 1:30 p.m. When school is dismissed at 3:30 p.m. the pupils are free to engage in such activities as baseball, hiking, horseshoes, and other outdoor activities. Supper is served at 5:00 p.m., after which pupils have a one-hour library period during which they may read or write letters to their parents. A short recreation period is permitted before the 8:00 p.m. retiring hour. Visiting hours for parents are from 1:30 to 4:00 p.m. every Sunday.³⁵

All the cottages had names, colors, and slogans. There were eight cottages in the school and each cottage was under the supervision of a cottage mother and father who were known as Family Instructors. Each cottage had its own recreation, study, and dining room and a dormitory which accommodated thirty five pupils. For the cottage names, colors, and slogans, see Table 9.

Table 9: Cottage Names, Colors, and Slogans

"A"	- All Americans-----	Pink
"B"	- Busy Bees-----	Maroon
"C"	- Courageous Chaps-----	Gold
"D"	- Dependable Dees-----	Apple Green
"E"	- Energetic Eagles-----	Silver
"F"	- Friendly Fellows-----	Royal Blue
"G"	- Golden Rule Girls-----	Yellow
"H"	- Happy Helpers-----	Navy Blue

Source: The Chicago Parental School: Guidance Manual, 1948.

Meals were prepared in a central kitchen and were served family style in each cottage using an underground tunnel system so that the pupils did not have to go outside especially in the bad weather.³⁶

The health of the children committed to the Parental School was provided for in a very comprehensive plan. The school was equipped to take care of any student who did not feel well. The Board of Education assigned a physician who gave a thorough physical examination to each pupil. Family instructors were furnished with health bulletins which outlined procedures to follow in the general health program. The staff physician was on call twenty-four hours a day. Hospitalizations cases were taken care of by the Cook County Hospital. The Chicago Board of Health established a dental clinic at the school and examined every child's teeth and made any necessary repairs before the child returned home. Eyes were examined and glasses fitted through a fund established by the Parent-Teacher Association, also from the Ella Flagg Young

Fund of the Chicago Teachers' Union. The Parental School also had the services of the Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary whenever needed.³⁷

The religious education of the children committed was also provided for. The Parental school had two chaplains, a Catholic priest and a Protestant minister along with a group of Sunday school Teachers.

The Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, from the St. Patrick Girls' School were the Sunday school teachers for the Catholic boys. They volunteered their time and service every Sunday morning. The priests came from Our Lady of Mercy parish of which the Parental School Chapel was a mission. The Catholic chapel was located on the third floor of the main building. Catholic pupils were expected to go to Mass every Sunday and on Holy Days of Obligation.³⁸

The Chicago Church Federation and the Bethany Theological Seminary cooperated to see that the spiritual training and guidance of the Protestant pupils was taken care of. Young men preparing for the ministry taught religion to the Protestants. Every Sunday morning Protestant pupils attended Devotional Service and Sunday School instruction from 9:00 to 10:30 a.m. in the Protestant chapel and classrooms, located on the third floor of Cottage A. Hymns, Bible reading and an inspirational talk by the chaplain was included each Sunday. Bibles were given to the pupils that were donated by the Chicago Church Federation.³⁹

There was a school library and there were cottage libraries. The books were purchased by the Chicago Board of Education, loaned by the Chicago Public Library, and donated by the Parent-Teacher-Association and other benefactors.⁴⁰

The Chicago Parental School also had a Student Council. Two members were elected by the pupils in each cottage. The Family Instructors appointed one councilman-at-large from their respective cottages. Meetings were held once per week. The Council was mainly an advisory body working for the benefit of the school. It settled many problems in regard to sports, games and programs. It planned, set and organized the rules for the various contests and tournaments. To be eligible for council membership a pupil had to maintain a high standard in both school work and conduct.⁴¹

The school also had what was known as a weekly sheet which described the activities and important events of the staff and student body. The material was gathered by the guidance counselor who observed and supervised most extra-curricular and co-curricular activities and reported them. This weekly sheet was called The Skipper and it went to press in the Parental School print shop where the printing instructor and his class had the responsibility of setting up the print.⁴²

Sometime during 1949 a boy scout unit was organized. This unit had an agreement with all public schools and most neighborhood scout units to admit the boys who left Parental

as scout members in good standing.⁴³ The scout unit was under the direction of a scout director, a scout master, and a group of loyal men who served on the scout committee. The Protestant chaplain chaired all of the above. The members of this committee spent two or three evenings a week working with the boys on scouting.⁴⁴ There were week-end hikes and vacations in cabins. There was a women's auxiliary organization whose funds went exclusively for scout affairs who gave benefits and programs.⁴⁵

There was a merit system in effect at the Parental School. A boy committed to the Parental School for the first time was eligible for a transfer to his home school when he acquired 800 merits in his cottage and 200 merits in school. Cottage merits could not be counted as school merits, or vice versa. By making a satisfactory adjustment in Cottage, Chapel, and detail, a pupil could earn 200 merits a week toward his required 800 cottage merits. Pupils earned 50 merits a week toward 200 school merits by doing the required school work.⁴⁶ If a pupil was returned to Parental School by the principal or Court officer for a second period of training he had to earn 2400 merits in the cottage and 600 in school before he was eligible for a transfer.⁴⁷

Pupils who had to be placed in Foster Homes or other such plans by the court usually remained in the Parental School until the plan was complete. Once the child reached the age of sixteen he was usually permitted to go home unless the

court was involved.⁴⁸

If a child was incorrigible in the Parental School or if he was a bad influence on the other pupils, the Superintendent had the authority to return this pupil to the Juvenile Court for commitment to some juvenile reformatory.

The Parental School had a parole policy. After the pupil was returned to his home school, a monthly follow-up system determined his progress and conduct. If his adjustment was not satisfactory after an investigation and, if advisable, the boy was returned to the Parental School.⁴⁹

Branch for Girls Opened

On September 8, 1953 a custodial school for girls under the Board of Education auspices opened on the South Side of Chicago at 4545 Drexel boulevard. It became a girls' branch of the Chicago Parental School, 3600 Foster. It previously housed the St. George private school.⁵⁰ Provision of a Parental School for truant and dependent girls was demanded by Judge Thomas E. Kluczynski of the Family Court. Between 1948 (when the girls' cottage on the Parental school grounds (3600 Foster) was ordered closed by Judge Dunne and 1953, Judge Kluczynski had to find accommodations with private institutions for girls in the same category.⁵¹

The school was painted with fresh pastel tints and new blond furniture in its parlors and bedrooms. The building was once a mansion owned by a member of the Singer family. Marble fireplaces and heavy wooden doors remained as reminders of the

former elegance of the building. The rehabilitation was to be guided by teachers and family instructors who were to provide twenty-four hour supervision and training. The school was planned to meet individual needs and interests, with the instructional program emphasizing household arts and personal grooming. Recreation, counseling, and group living under favorable conditions was thought to go far toward putting the girls back on the road to becoming responsible citizens.⁵²

Although custodial care for girls was eventually provided at the Rosehill Branch of the Chicago Parental School, at the onset of the Parental School no provision was made for the detention of truant and incorrigible girls. By 1914 the Chicago Home for Girls had evolved, providing custodial care to dependent and/or delinquent adolescent girls. By the 1936-37 school year, the Chicago Home for Girls had a high school teacher and two elementary school teachers, assigned by the Chicago Board of Education.⁵³ Two years latter it was made a branch of the Ross School located at 6059 South Wabash Avenue.⁵⁴ In 1941 the Chicago Home for Girls, formally known as the Women's Refuge then the Refuge for Girls, became a branch of the Montefiore Special School.⁵⁵

A girls branch of the Montefiore School was established in January 1943.⁵⁶ By June 1944, the branch consisted of six divisions of 224 girls, seven teachers, a truant officer, and a health attendant.⁵⁷ So, even though the Girls Division of the Chicago Parental had closed in 1948 there were other, more

cost effective means of servicing these children.

Changes in Direction

It seemed that during this time no one was able to decide what the Parental School should be: detention home, school, residential treatment center, nonparental institution, etc. "No one really knew how effective a change agent it really is."⁵⁸ It was reported by Havighurst in his 1964 survey for the Chicago Board of Education that the reasons for the ineffectiveness of the Parental School were: The average length of stay was approximately eight weeks for initial commitments and twelve weeks for recidivous male students. The cottage or family instructor position did not attract professional personnel needed in this type of work. They worked long hours for minimal reimbursement. It was suggested by the survey that the position should be filled by a man and wife (as was done when the school first opened) one of whom should be a trained social worker or psychologist. Only women were employed at the Girl's Branch, which made it impossible for the girls to establish any healthy identification with men. There was a scarcity of treatment resources available to the Boys and Girl's school especially considering the fact that every boy or girl in the school was well on the road to delinquency.

The situation was different at the day social adjustment schools. Boys were being released from the Parental School whether or not they were determined to be ready, so as to make

room for new referrals from the court. Boys were not being released from Montefiore or Moseley (day social adjustment centers) until a team at the school determined them ready.⁵⁹

In 1951 it was reported that there were five types of Social Adjustment Schools in the Chicago Public Schools System. (1) The Montefiore and Moseley special day schools for boys, operating on a 6 1/2 hour day and a 12 month school year. (2) The Washington Branch of Montefiore and the Haven Branch of Moseley, day schools for girls, operating on a 6 1/2 hour day, 10 months a year. (3) The Chicago Home for Girls, a branch of Montefiore, a semi-private residential institution for girls who need to be removed from their own or foster homes, for whom the Board of Education provided a full time teacher for 10 months a year. (4) The Chicago Parental School, a residential school for boys, operated on the cottage plan, 13 school months a year. For boys placed here the Board of Education provided housing, food, clothing if necessary, and "cottage parents," as well as specially qualified teachers who did not reside in the institution. (5) The school within the Cook County Juvenile Detention Home, a branch of the Montefiore School, for which the Board of Education provided, for 13 months a year, specially-trained teachers and educational supplies to make it possible for boys and girls detained by the Family Court to attend school during their residence.⁶⁰

During the early 1950's objections began to surface about

maintaining the Parental School. One objection was that the location needed to be studied. In the fall of 1953 the Chicago Region of the Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers, in cooperation with the administrative staff of the Chicago Board of Education, prepared a comprehensive questionnaire with the triple objective of providing material for an overall analysis of school conditions and needs in Chicago, a study project for parent-teacher organizations, and a basis for legislation and community action programs in the interest of adequate schools for all Chicago's children.⁶¹ The questionnaire was prepared with the cooperation of Dr. Benjamin C. Willis, General Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools along with many others. By the very nature of things, it was suggested that the children would be better served if they were placed in smaller groups in schools nearer their homes where the maximum guidance and attention could be given them.⁶² It was recommended that these children needed to be served within their own environment because once they were released from the Parental School they were returned to the same environment from which they came and nothing had changed. It was also suggested that much needed to be done to educate the community to the point of view that these young children are, "more sinned against than sinning; that they have the potentialities for real contribution as well as real detriment to the community."⁶³ Another reason cited for community based education was the fact that these children had

no opportunities to associate with regular pupils as all pupils at these schools were special pupils.⁶⁴

It was reported during these years that usually a third of the children failed once they were paroled. Like the case reported in the Chicago Sun Times in 1952:

Like Joe, an 11-year-old. His mother phoned soon after he returned. He was a changed boy; everything was fine. Two months later she called to say, unhappily: "He's beginning again..." Joe went back to Parental.⁶⁵

Parental School's problem was one that all similar institutions shared - how can you make a boy/girl over in a few months, and what can be done when the environment to which he/she returns cannot be changed? Superintendent Page of the Parental School was noted for worrying over this matter.⁶⁶ It was during the 1950's and 1960's that the value of pouring money into a residential school such as the Parental School was questioned heavily. Circuit Judge Robert J. Dunne, who was in charge of Family Court for five years until his reassignment in 1952, said "The Parental School is well run and it is a good thing we have it. My principal concern is that we don't get the child early enough to correct his bad habits. Too often his behavior has become chronic and it's hard to get it out of his system."⁶⁷

Professor Robert J. Havighurst of the Committee on Human Development of the University of Chicago, stressed a similar point, not so much about the Parental School, as about all institutions which worked with delinquent children. "We do a

poor job of prevention. New ways of working with the child, his family and the community are being developed, but they are being used in only three or four places in the country."⁶⁸

At the time of this report the Chicago Parental School had an enrollment of 250 boys (during October through November, 1953) and 12 classrooms. The pupil-teacher ration was 19.⁶⁹ Because of the rapid turnover of pupils and the special problems they presented, pupils received individualized instruction. It was reported at this time that the Parental School had 13 classroom teachers, .4 psychiatrist (2 days per week), 13 family instructors who lived in cottages with the boys and a physician. The physician was needed for daily needs but also because newly arrived boys were given a physical examination and isolated for 48 hours.⁷⁰

In this same report it was noted that the school was in need of complete rehabilitation due to its age and apparent neglect. Wooden stairways and floors were reported as being a fire hazard and the toilets were not in good condition and there was a serious problem of heating and ventilating.⁷¹

First Principal Appointed

The Chicago Parental School for boys located on the northwest side of Chicago, and the branch for girls on the south side of Chicago operated throughout the calendar year. Food, housing, education, recreation, and total care were provided by a special staff. In May 1956, a new emphasis on educational achievement enhanced the role of the school in the

rehabilitation of the pupils. A principal was appointed to head the instructional program and complete psychological and educational appraisals were initiated for each student to insure appropriate educational placement and instruction. Social workers were appointed to facilitate the reintegration of the pupil into the family and into the pupil's area school after his/her release. During the period from 1954 to 1959, the Parental School plant and residential quarters were rehabilitated.⁷²

Until 1954 there was no principal at the Chicago Parental School. The Superintendent of the school was in charge of everything: residential program (cottages), instructional program (school), a clerical and business department, maintenance department. The duties involved under such a multiple responsibility made it impossible for the entire picture to be given complete and effective consideration. In 1956, Henry Tessmer was appointed the first Principal of the Boy's Parental and of the Girl's Branch. John E. Meegan was Superintendent of both the Boy's and Girls since 1953. Benjamin C. Willis had been Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools since 1953 and would remain so until 1966. Meegan would remain as Superintendent of the Parental Schools until his death on May 31, 1971, and Henry Tessmer would remain as principal of both schools until 1973.⁷³

The goal of the principal was to implement an educational program based upon sound educational, social, and personal

values. Among the many important recommendations were: a continuing of the rehabilitation, that was begun in January of 1954; a study of possible state or county reimbursement of the total maintenance cost; and goals and a program that were consistent with his knowledge of how to work with children with severe and many faceted problems.⁷⁴

In September 1956, Dr. Francis A Mullen, the Assistant Superintendent in charge of Special Education developed the following two definitions:

Defines Parental School: as a residential school receiving pre-delinquent or truant children on commitment by the Family Court. It endeavors to rehabilitate the child and return him to his family, prepared to make a normal adjustment in his school and community. It does not accept seriously delinquent children. Chicago has the only such school in Illinois.

Defines Socially Maladjusted Child: as a child with problems of personality and adjustment that appears to be caused largely by disadvantageous pressures from his environment. Symptoms may be excessive shyness, timidity, laziness, not accounted for by physical factors as well as persistent truancy or undesirable behavior in school or community.⁷⁵

Objections to Funding the Parental School

During the late 1950's there were many objections to the cost of maintaining a child at the Parental Schools. In 1955-56 the average cost of a child at the Parental School was \$1585.96, of which \$190 was paid as special aid by the State. This left \$1395.96 per pupil (about 4.4 times the average cost of an elementary pupil in the regular program) to be paid from the education fund.⁷⁶ All children were still assigned to the Parental Schools by court order. No other school district

in Illinois was expected to pay for custodial care from its education fund.⁷⁷ In 1961, it was reported that another attempt would be made to have the custodial cost of the Chicago Parental School assumed by the State. There was only one other school in the United States where round-the-clock care throughout the year was charged to the education fund of a local school district. A bill for this change was passed in 1955, 1957, and 1959, and vetoed each time by Governor Stratton.⁷⁸

In 1959 Lois Wille, a reporter for the Chicago Daily News, wrote a series of articles about the Parental School. These articles basically focused on the poor conditions of the Parental School and the fact that the case loads for all involved at the school were too heavy. In an interview with one of the cottage mothers, the mother was quoted as saying that "I don't know what to do with them. I'm at my wit's end." "One poor child has homosexual tendencies. Another has an I.Q. of 61. He can barely care for himself."⁷⁹ The others: chronic truants, purse snatchers, runaways. All shared one of the five cottages at Chicago Parental School. The mother added: "We may as well face it. We can't do anything for these kids. We're fooling ourselves if we think we're helping them."⁸⁰ Another staff member said: "We can't rehabilitate these boys. All we can do is collect information of value to schools and institutions that receive them after they leave here. We're a clearing house for the youngsters'

troubles.⁸¹

Also during the late 1950's, the educational literature reflected the idea that there appeared to be one definite symptom of delinquency that could be readily identified, that of truancy from school. The idea that truancy from school should be considered important to the school not only in terms of the school's traditional vested interest in attendance, but also as a conspicuous example of behavior that sets the pupil apart from the normal and accepted.⁸² As a signal pointing to the beginnings of open conflict with the school and home, truancy cases should cause the parent and school to search for factors that could be the cause. A study for the period 1945-1951 by Dr. Clifford Shaw, Director of Sociological Services for the Institute of Juvenile Research, documented the existence of a close relationship between male delinquency and truancy. The eight areas of Chicago's seventy-five community areas highest in male juvenile delinquency rates for the period 1945-51, also were the highest in male truancy rates. With an estimated male population aged 10-16 years of 20,680 boys (14.6 per-cent of the estimated Chicago total for this age group), these eight community areas contributed more than a third (35.2 per cent) of the city's Juvenile Court delinquency cases and more than a third (43.6 per cent) of the city's Juvenile Court truancy cases. Shaw's study concluded that every truancy case merited an examination of all the truant's relationships to the primary and secondary social

groups in which he operates.⁸³

There seemed to be frustration at the Boys Parental School. Staff members and people like the Reverend Christopher Smith, Chaplin at the Parental School, pointed to the girls' branch at 4545 South Drexel, as an example of how this kind of correctional institution should be run. The girls' branch had five staff members for thirty girls, only five or six girls to a room, and a warm, home-like atmosphere. Only seven per cent of the girls ended up in Family Court again compared to 50 per cent at the boys' branch.⁸⁴ A paper submitted to Mary Broomfield, Superintendent of the Parental School in 1973 by Aphrodite Flamboura, a former teacher of the Boys Parental School recommended that there be a Cottage Supervisor who would be educationally required to possess a Master's degree in Psychiatric Social Work. It was also recommended that the family instructors go through an orientation policy and consistently continuous follow-up.⁸⁵ It was reported in 1959 that all that was required to be a cottage parent was a high school diploma for the husband and "much common sense for both the husband and the wife."⁸⁶ Superintendent Meegan said, "We don't want any screwballs." But one cottage mother suggested another qualification: "It helps if you're big. My husband has been beat up. The two of us just can't keep that many boys in line."⁸⁷

Other problems were cited in Lois Wille's series on the Parental Schools. Many of these were the same problems that

had been surfacing the last few years: Only one psychologist and one social worker to handle 130 to 160 boys aged 8 to 15. Dr. Daniel Novak, the Parental School's only psychologist said in an interview: "In one year we had 1,400 boys pass through here. I didn't even have time to talk to them all."⁸⁸ The boys were aware of this also. It was reported that a 15 year old said "No one seems to have time to talk to me. I get the feeling we're just brushed aside."⁸⁹

All of these factors: the cost of maintaining a pupil at the Parental School; poor conditions at the Boy's Parental; the idea that a child should stay in his same environment while being treated for truancy and incorrigibility; deteriorating buildings at the Boys' Parental; seemed to set the stage for the eventual demise of the Chicago Parental School.

In 1959 Lois Wille of the Chicago Sun Times reported that the school had been criticized by staff members and child welfare groups because it provided virtually no treatment for the youngsters under its care. As one school employee explained: "A kid in trouble comes here for 12 weeks, and all we have time to do is make him go to bed early, get up early and go to class. We're fooling ourselves if we think we're helping him."⁹⁰ R. Sargent Shriver, Chicago Board of Education president, put it very clearly: "Frankly, I've been enthusiastically trying to get rid of the institution ever since I got on the board five years ago. The Board is

delighted to run the academic end of it. But, we're not trained to feed and care and do therapeutic work for emotionally disturbed children."⁹¹ Two years ago, as was stated earlier, the Illinois legislature's School Problems Committee recommended that the Board of Education be relieved of the noneducational costs of the school. The legislature agreed and passed a bill to have the state pay the \$3,000 per year it costs to shelter and feed a boy at the Parental School. But Governor Stratton vetoed it.⁹²

The next major factor that was to affect the school was the building of the north branch of the Chicago Teachers' College in 1961. This caused much consternation among the residents living within the area. The neighborhood people were very much against the building of the Teachers' College, mainly because of the parking lot and the fear of the campus being extended.⁹³ The north branch of the Teachers' College was the first step in getting rid of the Parental School said Bernard Karlin, who was Acting Superintendent of the Chicago Parental School when John Meegan died. The 1970's would see the eventual end of the school.

CHAPTER IV NOTES

1. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago for the year Ending June 1928 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1928), 1385.
2. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1930 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1930), 2121.
3. Clifford R. Shaw and Earl D. Myers, "The Juvenile Delinquent," The Illinois Crime Survey, ed. John H. Wegmore (Chicago: Blakely Printing, The Illinois Association for Criminal Justice, 1929), 645-761.
4. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education for the Year Ending July 1929 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1929), 20.
5. Ibid., 20.
6. Ibid., 20.
7. George D. Strayer, Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago, Illinois, Vol. V. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932) 80.
8. George D. Strayer, Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago, Illinois, Vol. II, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), 92.
9. Ibid., 92.
10. Ibid., 93.
11. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1937 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1937), 259-260.
12. William J. Page, Thirty-Ninth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School (Chicago: Chicago Public Schools: 1941).
13. Mary Broomfield, Associate Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools. Interview by Author, Tape recording, Chicago, IL, July 1989.

14. Mary Broomfield, Associate Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools, Personal Files.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Edward H. Stullken, "Education for Behavior Deviates," Chicago Schools Journal (Chicago: Vol. XXI No.4 Dec. 1939) 104.
18. Ibid., 107.
19. William J. Page, "The Chicago Parental School," Chicago Schools Journal (Chicago: Vol. XXX No. 2, October 1948) 61.
20. Mary Broomfield, Associate Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools. Interview by Author, Tape recording, Chicago, IL, July, 1989.
21. The Chicago Parental School: Guidance Manual, 1948 (Chicago: Washburne Trade School, 1948), 10.
22. Ibid., 11.
23. Ibid., 11.
24. Ibid., 13.
25. William Page "The Chicago Parental School," 62.
26. Scherer, Murdock, Freeman The Strathmore Plan (Aurora, IL: Strathmore Co., 1940).
27. Chicago Parental School: Guidance Manual, 16.
28. Page, "The Chicago Parental School," 62.
29. Ibid., 63.
30. The Chicago Parental School: Guidance Manual, 36.
31. Bernard Karlin, Principal, Montefiore Special School, Interview by Author, Tape Recording, Chicago, IL July 1989.
32. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1938 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1938).
33. Bernard Karlin, Principal, Montefiore Special School, Interview by Author, Tape Recording, Chicago, IL, July 1989.

34. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of the City of Chicago for the Year Ending June 1938.
35. William J. Page, "The Chicago Parental School," 63.
36. Bernard Karlin, Principal, Montefiore Special School, Interview by Author, Tape recording, Chicago, IL, July 1989.
37. The Chicago Parental School: Guidance Manual, 1948, 13.
38. Ibid., 20.
39. Ibid., 22.
Karlin, Interview.
40. Ibid., 29-30.
41. Ibid., 33.
42. Broomfield, Interview.
43. Karlin, Interview.
44. Broomfield, Interview.
45. Karlin, Interview.
46. Chicago Parental School: Guidance Manual, 35.
47. Ibid.
48. Karlin, Interview.
49. Ibid.
50. Helen Fleming, "Custodial School For Girls To Open." Chicago Daily News, August 25, 1953.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid.
53. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools For the Year Ending June 1937 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1937), 262.
54. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Year Ending June 1939 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1939), 304-305.

55. Annals of the Chicago Woman's Club (Chicago: Chicago Woman's Club, 1916), 340-341.
56. Fourteenth Annual Report of the Montefiore Special School, 1942-1943 (Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1943). 2.
57. Sixteenth Annual Report of the Montefiore Special School, 1944-1945 (Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1945), 44.
58. Robert J. Havighurst, The Public Schools of Chicago, (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1964), P. 458.
59. Ibid., 455.
60. Special Education in Chicago, 1951, (Chicago, Illinois), 81.
61. Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers, Public School Needs of Chicago's Children (Chicago, Illinois: 1954), 3.
62. Ibid., 63.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid., 68.
65. Ruth Moore, "How Chicago Parental School Aids Boys 9 to 16 Who Played Hooky," Chicago Sun Times, 24 November, 1952.
66. Ibid.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid., 64.
70. Ibid., 65.
71. Ibid.
72. Study Report No. 9, 1964 Series, Programs for Handicapped and Socially Maladjusted Children (Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1964) 81.
73. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education for the Year Ending June 1973 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1973).
74. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Year Ending June 1956 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1956), 20.

75. Chicago Public Schools, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Year ending June 1957 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education 1957), September.
76. Chicago Schools: Official Organ of the Citizens Schools Committee, Program of State Legislation for 1957 (Chicago: 1957) 1.
77. Ibid.
78. Chicago Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Year Ending June 1961 (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1961).
79. Lois Wille, "School Here Can't Cope With Cases," Chicago Daily News, 19 March 1959.
80. Ibid.
81. Ibid.
82. Donald J. Blyth, "Truancy - Prank or Problem?," Chicago Principals Club Reporter Vol. XLVII, No. 1 (Chicago: Oct.-Nov. 1957) 7.
83. Clifford Shaw, Subsequent Criminal Careers of Juvenile Delinquents (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929, 1952) 43.
84. Lois Wille, "Case Load Is Too Heavy," Chicago Daily News, 20 March 1959.
85. Mary Broomfield, Interview.
86. Lois Wile, "School Here Can't Cope With Cases."
87. Ibid.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid.
90. Lois Wille, "Just a Headache For School Board," Chicago Sun Times, 21 March 1959.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid.
93. Karlin, Interview.

CHAPTER V

THE CLOSING OF THE CHICAGO PARENTAL SCHOOLS: DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF TRUANCY IN CHICAGO

It took many years for policymakers to move away from the institutionalization and commitment of a student because of nonattendance. During 1974-75, Chicago was one of the few places in Illinois where truants were being brought to court under Truancy Petitions. The use of the courts led to further litigation to maintain due process of laws and associated costs were great. Also, the Chicago Board of Education, because of due process requirements, had to investigate and provide psychological and sociological reasons underlying school nonattendance, including family practices and parental involvement. Courts were becoming more reluctant to hear truancy cases, due process requirements were burdensome on schools, and the policy of institutionalization was unpopular as well as ineffectual in dealing with the problem of truancy. Until September 1973 the Parental School Program was operated by the Chicago Board of Education. However, since September 1973, the program had been maintained by Northeastern Illinois University and was eventually closed in early 1975.¹

The years between 1953 and 1971 were relatively stable for the Chicago Parental School in terms of administrative

staff. John E. Meegan was appointed Superintendent of the Parental Schools (both the Boys' Parental and the Girls' branch) and remained as such until his death on Labor day in 1971. Benjamin C. Willis was superintendent of schools from 1953 until his retirement in 1964 when James Redmond was appointed. Superintendent Willis accomplished much during his thirteen years, from 1953 to 1966, as head of the country's second largest public school system. He updated high school curriculum, fostered special education classes, strengthened science and mathematics course work and was the first to stand strong behind the need for a vocational educational program, and, of course his building program was by far his major contribution.²

As noted earlier, in 1956 a Principal, Henry Tessmer, was appointed for both the Boys' and Girls' Parental. He would remain Principal of the Boys' Parental until it was sold to Northeastern University in 1973. He was Principal of the Girls' branch until about 1959 or 1960 (school directories are unclear in this area) when Marie Senechal was appointed as Head Teacher of the Girls' Parental.³ In 1969 Mary Broomfield, who was Assistant Principal of the Motley Day School for Socially Maladjusted Girls became "Acting" Principal of Motley, Simpson alternative school for Pregnant Girls, Bousfield Social Adjustment school and the Girls' Parental. She remained in this position until the Parental Schools were sold to Northeastern in 1973, when she resigned

her position with the Chicago Board of Education and became a part of Northeastern University's faculty and was named Superintendent of the Parental Schools (both boys and girls).⁴

Bernard Karlin, who was appointed "Acting Part-time Assistant Superintendent of the Boys Parental on November 17, 1967 became the full-time Assistant Superintendent of the Boys Parental in January of 1968. He was then named the "Acting" Superintendent of the Boys' Parental on May 31, 1971 when John E. Meegan died suddenly. Bernard Karlin remained in this position until the Parental Schools were sold to Northeastern in 1973.⁵

When Bernard Karlin replaced Meegan as Superintendent of the Parental Schools in 1971 he was Superintendent of the Boys Parental only. At that time Mary Broomfield was both the Principal and Superintendent of the Girls Parental.

Bernard Karlin's association with the Chicago Parental School, Boys' branch goes back to 1959. He was working as a Physical Education teacher at the Drummond school at the time and he also had the social center program at Drummond. Social Center was an after school activities program instituted by the Chicago Public Schools in the late 1940's which provided a wide range of recreational activities for students at selected schools after the regular school day. As stated earlier, Lois Wille, a reporter for the Chicago Daily News had a front page story on the poor conditions at the Boys' Parental School which ran beginning March 19, 1959. In

her article she examined the poor recreation program that the boys had. She said the program was awful and all the kids did was watch television.⁶ According to Bernard Karlin:

"I was asked by the Director of social Centers to run a 'banged up program' at Parental. I was to train the family instructors, (I was supposed to be out there anywhere from four months to one year) in recreational programming. I was to set up a program for each cottage (three hours plus per cottage per week, twenty hours together)."⁷

To be able to accomplish this in terms of payroll and working hours the Parental School social center became a branch of the Drummond school social center.⁸

On November 17, 1967 Mr. Karlin was asked by Louise Daughtery, Associate Superintendent of Special Education to assume the responsibility of the "Acting Assistant Superintendent" of the boys Parental. Karlin recalls:

I also held the full-time position of Research Consultant at the Montefiore School. I did both jobs, Montefiore during the day and Parental during the afternoon and early evening until January of 1968 when I guess Louise had a good enough look at me and placed me at the Parental as Assistant Superintendent full time, so I left Montefiore.⁹

During the years Bernard Karlin was involved with the Parental School and also during the time Mary Broomfield was "Acting Principal and Superintendent of the Girls Parental there was little or no due Process for the children who were committed on truancy petitions.¹⁰ Jack St. Lawrence, a Deputy for the Board of Education, represented the Parental Schools in court. According to Mr. Karlin:

Talk about a lack of due process. In those days if the kid was released from Parental School and it

was deemed that within a one year period he was not living up to the parole situation that principal called the Bureau of Socially Maladjusted and told them that the child is not doing well. We would get a call from the Bureau telling us to 'pick the kid up.' So then the Principal would call us if this kid was acting out or truant and on the day that this kid was in school, Jack, as the Deputy authorized by the Sheriff's department, would go to the school and put the cuffs on the kid and pull him right out of school. Talk about a lack of due process. That's the way it worked.¹¹

Relief From the Legislature

In May of 1969 WBBM News Radio 78 in Chicago aired the following editorial:

Chicago's Board of Education is again asking the state legislature for relief. It needs relief from the expense of operation of the home section of the Parental School at 3600 W. Foster Avenue.

Bills have been passed in the last five sessions of the legislature to separate the educational responsibility of the Parental School from its welfare operations. In each case the Governor has vetoed the bill when it came before him.

Chicago's Board of Education must now spend well over one million dollars a year to provide food, lodging and care for the students at the Parental School. This is a time when the Chicago school system faces a major fiscal crisis.

It is a matter of common sense that the school board should provide for the education of the Parental School students. But it is equally a matter of common sense that the state welfare agency should be carrying the food, lodging, and care costs. Chicago is the only school system in the entire state which must--by--law maintain a Parental School.

In this complex society of ours, custodial care is more and more a specialty. The school board is in the education business, not in the custodial care field.

We are hopeful that the legislature will again pass a bill to bring relief to the Chicago school board. And we urge Governor Ogilvie not to veto such a bill if it does come before him.¹²

The responsibility for paying for the custodial cost for

children assigned to the Chicago Parental School was transferred from the Chicago Board of Education to the State of Illinois in 1969.

Section 34-129 of the Illinois School Code for 1969 reads as follows:

Reimbursement for custodial expenses. The State shall reimburse the board for custodial expenses incurred by it in the home section of the parental school. The board shall submit to the Superintendent of Public Instruction at the end of each school year an accurate and detailed statement of claim showing the total custodial expenses incurred in the operation of the home section of the parental school for the superintendent's verification and approval before the claim is paid. Custodial costs shall not include educational expenses but shall include and be divided into the following classifications in preparing the statement of claim: (a) salaries of necessary personnel; (b) medical services; (c) food services; (d) supplies; (e) communication and transportation costs; (f) operation of physical plant, including heat, light, water, repairs, replacements and maintenance.¹³

Complaints

A major complaint about the Parental School that was surfacing during the 1960's was the idea that there was no follow-up of the children who were committed.¹⁴ "It almost seems as though nobody wanted to find out what happened to these children after they left the special class or school. Yet, how can the program be improved or evaluated if nobody knows the results."¹⁵ Lacking such information, it would appear difficult to feed back information by which curriculum or program changes could be made. "It would seem as if no one wanted to know what happens to the children."¹⁶ Havighurst

recommended in the 1964 study that social adjustment classes and other services should be established in regular elementary schools in sufficient numbers so that the elementary school aged, emotionally and socially maladjusted children could be helped closer to home.¹⁷ Havighurst noted: "It is merely an assumption that the life style of the children can be changed or modified by a nominal stay in the residential setting."¹⁸

In 1969 the Parental Schools Act provided:

there shall be established and maintained one or more parental or truant schools for the purpose of affording a place of confinement, discipline, instruction and maintenance of children...of compulsory school age who may be committed thereto.¹⁹

The two Parental Schools in Chicago (Boy's and Girl's) were still managed by the Chicago Board of Education even though the custodial expenses were being reimbursed now by the state. A common complaint of the Law in 1969 was that there was no standard by which the courts could determine truancy in the Parental School Act. The Parental School Act described a truant as "any child of compulsory school age who is not attending school and who has been guilty of habitual truancy or persistent violation of the rules of the public school."²⁰ Armed with this vague criteria, the court attempted to determine whether or not a minor should be compulsory placed in a parental school.

The procedure used by the court in determining whether a minor was truant was informal. The court only accepted truancy petitions from the Chicago Board of Education; police

could not refer a child to court on a truancy petition. The Board's decision to file a truancy petition was based on individual school principal's reports. Usually the principal's report was accompanied by a Truant Officer's Case History Report.²¹

The Board of Education was represented by its attorney at the hearing and he presented the case against the child. Occasionally a truant officer would testify as a witness for the Board of Education, but this was relatively rare. The accused was not informed of his right to counsel and unless he specifically requested an attorney, one would not be provided for him. The judge questioned the child and his parents as to the veracity of the allegations and allowed them to speak in their own defense. After hearing the evidence, the judge made an adjudication of truancy or dismissed the case.²²

A typical proceeding could be illustrated by the following hypothetical judicial cross-examination in 1969:

Judge: "Johnny Brown, did you know you were supposed to be in school those days?"

J.B.: "Yes"

Judge: "Why Weren't you there?"

J.B.: "I didn't want to go to school."

Judge: "School was open and you did not attend, therefore, I commit you to the Chicago Parental School."²³

Though this illustration may be somewhat extreme, it typifies the perfunctory handling of most of the truancy

petitions. There was no attempt to determine if the parents should or would accept the responsibility of educating the child. The truant was thereafter committed to the Parental School for a minimum of four weeks, most truants stayed at the school for approximately three months. Procedurally, the Parental Schools Act provided little, if any, protection for the constitutional rights of the alleged truant.

It was observed that the vast amount of discretion given the school principal was an excellent example of how the constitutional privileges of the defendants could be jeopardized. The principal was allowed to instigate proceedings against any individual child who missed school "habitually". Since neither "habitual" nor truant" was defined in the Act, this discretion was broad and virtually unlimited. One can see that the application of this discretion could be used solely to eliminate trouble makers; while passive truants could be allowed virtually free rein in absenting themselves from school. Once the decision was made to file a truancy petition, a minor was almost inevitably committed to the Parental School.²⁴

Relationship of Special Education to the Parental School

During this time period special education in Chicago, Illinois and throughout the country was going through a reorganization. The legislative history of special education in Illinois can be seen as beginning with the Juvenile court Act of 1899. As stated in Chapter One this law mandated that

school-age children who were dependent, neglected, or delinquent were to be treated "special," i.e. via a judicial process different than adults. The Parental School Act gave "special education" to those who were judged truant and incorrigible by the Juvenile Court. It mandated the city of Chicago to establish and maintain a special school for such children; and, by 1902 the Chicago Parental School was in operation. In 1911 the Illinois General Assembly enacted legislation providing funding for the education of delinquent children. In 1915 legislative funding was extended to truant and incorrigible children in special classes. As a result of these two laws the Chicago Public Schools received reimbursement for their special programs one of which was at the Chicago Parental School.²⁵ Up to the time when the State took over full custodial costs of the Parental School the state paid \$190 out of \$1585.96 for the costs of maintaining a child at the Parental School. Therefore the early history of special education legislation in Illinois really began with the truant, incorrigible, and delinquent child.²⁶

In 1943 the laws previously enacted by the Illinois General Assembly, authorizing various programs and some appropriations were put together into "The Illinois School Code" and it became the legal basis for the development of special education programs in the public schools. Also, in 1943, the Department of Special Education was established in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

(OSPI).²⁷ The School Code defined various categories of "exceptional" children. Those "maladjusted" were: "children between the ages of 5 and 21 years who are truant, incorrigible, delinquent or in need of special educational facilities to prevent their becoming truant, incorrigible or delinquent."²⁸

In 1957 the Illinois General Assembly redefined the categories of exceptional children. Maladjusted children were now those who "because of social or emotional problems, are unable to make constructive use of their school experience and require the provisions of special services designed to promote their educational growth and development."²⁹ The passage of the Armstrong Act in 1963 also had an impact. The Act required OSPI to develop administrative procedures and policies "as soon as practicable" for the "prevention of segregation and the elimination of separation of children in public schools because of color, race, or nationality."³⁰ Also in 1963, under the Community Mental Health Facilities and Services Act, school districts were authorized to purchase mental health services from private agencies. In 1965, House Bill 1407 amended Article 14 of the School Code making it mandatory for school districts to provide special education programs for all handicapped children by July 1, 1969.³¹ In 1966 House Bill 1666 was enacted which provided financial assistance to school districts developing special education programs in compliance with the provisions of HB 1407. In

1972 amendments to the School Code expanded the definitions of exceptional children making the board of education financially responsible for those children who were psychiatrically diagnosed as requiring therapeutic and/or residential setting to meet their needs.³²

In 1975 Congress enacted the most comprehensive special education legislation to date: Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped children Act. PL 94-142 revised and expanded previous special education laws and mandated that a free appropriate education with related services be provided to handicapped children ages three to eighteen by September 1, 1978, and children three to twenty-one by September 1, 1980.³³

Northeastern Illinois University

Another factor which led to the closing of the Residential Schools was Northeastern's desire for the property. As was stated earlier by Bernard Karlin who was Assistant Superintendent of the Boys Parental since November of 1967 then Acting Superintendent until it was sold to Northeastern University in 1973: "The north branch of the Chicago Teachers' College (Northeastern was formally called: Chicago Teachers' College, then Illinois Teachers' College Chicago North, then Northeastern State College, then Northeastern Illinois University) was the first step in getting rid of the Parental School. A few years after the college was established, the Board of Education decided to

Avenue on the South side. Both branches were to be directed by Mary Broomfield. Ms. Broomfield had to resign her position with the Chicago Board of Education and become a part of the Northeastern Illinois University faculty as did all of the teachers who worked at either the Boys or the Girls Parental beginning in August 1973. Mary Broomfield established her headquarters at the boys' branch and commuted between the two. She also had an office on the Campus of Northeastern University. Bernard Karlin took a full time position at the Montefiore Special School.³⁸

Northeastern Illinois University was funded by the state to run the school for the first two years after it was purchased. In the same Public Act which made the appropriation there was another section which stated:

The sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is appropriated to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities for use at Northeastern Illinois University in conducting a study in cooperation with appropriate state, city and community agencies to determine the most appropriate means of operating the parental schools and the functions thereof, with the resultant recommendations to be reported to the Illinois General Assembly no later than March 15, 1974.

This Act takes effect July 1, 1973,
Passed in the General Assembly June 29, 1973.
Approved July 17, 1973.³⁹

It was during this time, when Northeastern University purchased the Schools, that the name changed from the Chicago Parental School to the Chicago Residential school for Boys and the Chicago Residential School for Girls.⁴⁰

Formation of the Study Committee

The Seventy-Eighth General Assembly, State of Illinois, Senate Bills 510-511, "to determine the most appropriate means of operating the parental schools..." resulted in the formation of The Study Committee for the Chicago Residential Schools. With direction from Illinois Governor Daniel Walker, Dr. Jerome Miller, Director of Children and Family Services, appointed Mr. Seymour J. Adler, Director of Court Services, Juvenile Court of Cook County, to chair the Study Committee.⁴¹ Dr. Miller was the former Reform Commissioner in Youth Services from Massachusetts who, in the late 1960's and early 1970's pioneered successfully the deinstitutionalization of Juveniles to community based services in that state. Governor Walker of Illinois appointed a national search committee for the Directorship of the Department of Children and Family Services in Illinois (DCFS) and hired Dr. Miller as Director in mid 1973.⁴²

Mr. Adler and Dr. Miller jointly selected thirty-one committee members, who represented a cross-section of persons from various parts of the community. Among the members were social workers, educators, correction specialists, and others including community leaders. A full list of the active committee membership is seen in Table 10:

The committee began to collect data relative to the past and present performance of the Residential Schools (Parental Schools). This was accomplished through committee and sub-

Table 10: Active Committee Members - Study Committee of the Chicago Residential Schools

Seymour J. Adler - Chairman
Director of Court Services
Juvenile Court of cook County

Robert A. Adams
Associate Executive Director
Program Operations
Council for Community Services for
Metropolitan Chicago

Ruth Adams
American Civil Liberties Union

Frances Barnes
Executive Director
Living Center for Girls
Volunteers of America

Betty Begg
Director
Division of Correctional Services

Peter Brownstone
Executive Director
Methodist Youth Services

Allen Carpenter
Criminal Justice Specialist
Illinois Law Enforcement Commission

Raymond W. Fannings
Executive Assistant
Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society

Irmgard Heyman (Ms.)
Child and Family Services

Naomi Heitt (Ms.)
Executive Director
Illinois Commission on Children

Russ Meek
Search for Truth - WVON

Table 10: (continued)

Bertram Mims
Co-ordinator
Community Development and Services
Chicago Urban League

Katharine Mortell
Senior Planning Associate
Council for Community Services for
Metropolitan Chicago

Dawn Clark Netsch (Senator)
Illinois State Senate

Alfred L. Portis
Executive Director
Christian Action Ministry

Paul Senegal
Illinois Department of Corrections

Robert Thayer, Director
Office of Affirmative Action
Illinois Department of Children and Family
Services

Bowen H. Tucker
American Civil Liberties Union

J. Robert Weber, Administrator
Juvenile Division
Illinois Department of Corrections

Charles M. Young, Supervisor
Grand Boulevard Office
Juvenile Court of Cook County

Vasco Bridges
The John Howard Association

Source: Study Committee Report on the Chicago Residential
Schools, 1974.

committee meetings with Chicago Board of Education officials
(i.e., Board Attorney Murad Agenlian, Attendance Director Jack
Oberhart, and personnel from the Bureau of Maladjusted
Children.)⁴³

The committee also held meetings at both Residential Schools,

toured the facilities, and talked at great length with the current administrators and staff. In all, the committee worked independently without staff support from Northeastern Illinois University or the Department of Children and Family Services.⁴⁴ It was later decided that public hearings would be the best forum for investigation. Public hearings were scheduled for the entire week of February 4-9, 1974, in the Senate Hearing Room, 160 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois. The committee determined that it wanted to hear testimony from the following categories of witnesses: Current and past administrators and staff of the Residential School, students, community groups, parents, persons expert in alternative schools, Chicago Board of Education officials, judges and court personnel related to truant calls.⁴⁵

According to some sources, particularly Bernard Karlin and Carol Zientek, this Study Committee merely went through the motions of ratifying an accomplished fact. Once Northeastern Illinois University purchased the land it was a "done deal."⁴⁶ Everyone knew they wanted the land to expand. They ended up building a big football complex with a track around it then got rid of the football program before they even played one game on the new facility. "It was scandalous."⁴⁷

But according to Mary Broomfield, she did not believe anything except that Northeastern wanted to continue the program. "I believed in the program. I resigned my position

with the Board because I believed in the program and I did everything in my power to make the program a viable one."⁴⁸

So during this time period, from 1973 when Northeastern officially took over the Residential Schools and 1975 when the schools officially closed their doors, there was Mary Broomfield, working very hard with her handpicked staff trying to implement the best program possible to keep the school going. There was also the study committee which had to have a report ready for the legislature by March 15, 1974, deciding the fate of the school. Then there was the general population, including truant officers, and principals who "knew" that it was only a matter of time before the schools would close their doors for good. Northeastern wanted the land and that all there was to it.⁴⁹ Through all this controversy there was one thing that everyone agreed upon. During this time, from 1973 until 1975, when Northeastern took over the operations of the Residential schools and Mary Broomfield was Superintendent of the Residential Schools, the program took on new meaning and Mary made institutionalization in the Chicago Residential Schools a humane and valuable experience.⁵⁰

Broomfield Brings Changes

Even though there was a change in ownership, Superintendents, and studies being conducted, commitments were still being made to the Residential Schools. Although, beginning with the sale to Northeastern in 1973 the number of

commitments began to decrease.

The following table shows the number of juvenile court petitions filed and the number of residential commitments in the school years immediately preceding the closing of the Chicago Parental School.

 Table 11: Truancy Petitions - Residential Commitments

YEAR	TRUANCY PETITIONS	RESIDENTIAL COMMITMENTS
1969-1970	1474	618
1970-1971	1471	587
1971-1972	1264	546
1972-1973	1216	568
1973-1974	978	349
1974-1975	1057	238
1975-1976	440	5

 Source: Statistical reports of the Bureau of School Attendance, Chicago Board of Education, 1969-70 to 1975-76.

Changes began to occur at the Residential Schools almost immediately. "This program was very special to me. "I was anxious to implement some of the programs, objectives and procedures that I had begun at the girl's school before the sale to Northeastern."⁵¹ According to Al Peterson who Mary Broomfield recruited to teach science at the Boys Residential from an elementary school and in a few months was assigned to the counseling position at the Boys Residential: "It was an exciting time, I had the freedom to do what I thought to be most appropriate in the classroom. Mary had such belief in us that it was exciting. We worked very long hours. Sometimes I would leave my house at 7:00 a.m. and not return until 8:30-9:00 p.m. But I didn't mind."⁵²

The philosophy or purpose of the Residential Schools for Girls and Boys was as follows:

The Residential Schools for Girls and Boys is a public institution whose program is designed to offer a comprehensive program of special services to girls and boys who are in trouble with themselves and society....The aim is to help each student re-direct their energies so that they may return to their own community as a contributing citizen and successfully engage in some program of continuous education, and participation in socially acceptable, responsible, and personally gratifying roles.⁵³

Generally, in the "new" program the students were categorized into three basic categories: (1) Students who were academically able to return to a regular program after an intensive program of counseling, concentrating on improvement of self-image, awareness of their responsibility to self and the ability, as well as the understanding of the need, to interrelate positively with others. (2) Students who required more supportive services than the above and who would be placed in a transitional program where they lived on campus, attended regular schools, and gradually learned to cope with the responsibilities of regular school attendance. (3) Students who could never benefit from continued attendance in a regular school program and who would be placed in pre-vocational training on campus and placed in apprenticeship positions with small cooperating businesses based upon interest and aptitude. They continued to receive the supportive services of the residential school until an evaluation of their progress revealed that they were capable

of becoming self-supporting. (4) As an on-going segment of the transitional program, some of the students, based upon recommendations of the various staff disciplines and through the staffing procedure, were permitted to reside at home and attend classes at the Residential School. Prior to this transition the parents, student, and administrative staff conferred and jointly agreed to the students entrance into this phase of the program.⁵⁴

Another procedure that was changed immediately was the intake procedure which began at Juvenile Court. Prior to Mary Broomfield becoming Superintendent of the Residential Schools the boys and girls were handcuffed immediately once the judge committed them to the Parental School and usually not allowed to say goodbye to their parents or whoever brought them to court. This procedure had been changed for the girls during the time when Mary Broomfield became the "Acting Assistant Principal,"⁵⁵ but the boys were still being handcuffed. During the first year of operation under Northeastern Al Peterson moved from the science teaching position to the counselor position at the Boys Residential.

"Every Thursday morning I would go to Juvenile court for the Truant Court call. After a few times of seeing how distraught the children and families were over having the boys handcuffed and dragged away I convinced the judge to allow me to talk with the boys and their families to explain the objectives of our program, the inherent benefits to both student and family, and our desire for the parents cooperation in helping us to achieve stated objectives through regular visiting, participation in parent workshops, and the responsibilities of the parent and child in our Behavior Modification

program."⁵⁶ (The Behavior Modification Program will be explained later.) "Eventually we purchased a station wagon at the school so I could drive them myself instead of putting them in the police wagon. I told them they could jump out now and run, but no one ever did."⁵⁷

The reforms described by Peterson were in stark contrast to what had happened in the past and it seemed to set the tone for the way the children arrived at the Residential Schools.

The main consideration in the Behavior Modification program was a shift in emphasis. "For most students the emphasis had been placed upon the negative aspects of the student behavior. He/she was often labeled truant, socially maladjusted, delinquent, and a host of other terms which implied degradation. The Behavior Modification program was designed to shift the emphasis to the positive qualities the students manifested, provided immediate and long term reinforcements."⁵⁸

Another important addition to the Residential program was the addition of a resource teacher "to bridge the gap between the Residential Schools and the community in order to maximize the child's adjustment and successful school experience upon his return to his family and community."⁵⁹ As noted earlier, this was an ongoing complaint of the Parental Schools that no one seemed to care what happened to these children after they had left. The service of the resource teacher included providing support to children and their families around social and personal problems which might have interfered with school attendance or difficulties which originated from within the

receiving school or alternative program in which the child had been placed.⁶⁰ In the follow-up process, the resource teacher provided services to all students who were released from the program. The students generally fell into three categories. The first group consisted of students who had been released from the Residential program and returned to regular public school, or those for whom a special placement had been made. Those in the second group commuted to the Residential Schools and resided at home with their families. The final group was composed of students who resided at the Residential Schools but who attended neighborhood public schools.⁶¹

Specifically, conferences were held with each child and his family prior to placement in any of the programs to prepare them for the child's new experience and to establish a cooperative working relationship with all parties involved. Subsequently, regular contact was maintained with the child and his family through home visits and telephone calls to ascertain his school and home adjustment, the family's current situation, and any problems that may have required the intervention and assistance of the Residential Schools staff. A close working relationship was maintained, by the resource teacher, with the social worker who provided evaluation of the child's family situation. With this knowledge, potential crisis situations were avoidable.⁶²

A new service provided by the Residential Schools was the

addition of the Research Component. This component was responsible for collecting and analyzing data on the entire area of truancy both within the school and on a nationwide basis. The research conducted involved information about the kind of student the school served, the relationships between truancy and other variables, the adjustment of students within the program, an assessment of various programs within the school, and an analysis of other programs which addressed themselves to truancy.⁶³

Formation of the Commission on Truancy and
Alternative Education

During the same time of innovative programming at the Residential Schools and of the Adler Commission there was yet another Commission which was appointed in August of 1974, "The Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education," upon the recommendation of Mary Broomfield, Superintendent of the Residential Schools and the President of Northeastern University, Dr. James A. Mullen. William M. O'Connell, ACSW, Chief Psychiatric Social Worker at Juvenile Court and Jerome Herron, a Community Development Specialist of the Chicago Urban League were appointed as co-chairmen. In September, 1974 seventy-five other persons were invited to become members of the Commission: thirty-three accepted, including parents, truant children, and representatives from governmental and private agencies, and from civic, educational and community organizations. At that time, Jerry Knight, President of the Council on Environmental Management and Social Justice and

Patrick Keenan, Associate Professor of Law at DePaul University College of Law were hired as Consultant and Legal Counsel.⁶⁴ Table 12 gives a list of all commission members and the area of representation.

A complaint voiced many times by those in the legal system was that the Juvenile Court Act provided that the Circuit Court of Cook County had jurisdiction over Minors Otherwise in Need of Supervision (MINS), part of the 1965 Juvenile Court Act. Included in the definition of MINS was "any minor subject to compulsory school attendance who is habitually truant from school."⁶⁵

In 1969, any adult person could direct through the States Attorney the filing of a petition in respect to a MINS child who was allegedly truant. The Act provided for a detailed summons and notice requirements as well as a thirty day period between filing of the petition and the subsequent adjudicatory hearing. Before proceeding with the hearing the court appointed a guardian ad litem for the juvenile if:

- a) no parent or guardian appears with the juvenile,
- b) the petition requests a guardian be appointed,
- c) The court finds a conflict of interest between the juvenile and his parents.⁶⁶

If a court determined that a juvenile was a truant and that it was in the best interest of the juvenile, it would declare him a ward of the court and proceed to a disposition hearing. At the disposition hearing the court was required to determine if the parents, guardian or legal custodian of a

Table 12: Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education:
Members

Robert Adams
Council for Community Service in Metropolitan
Chicago

Murad Agenlian, Esq.
Chicago Board of Education, Attorney

Major Armsted, Jr.
Chicago Board of Education

Betty Berg
Department of Human Resources, City of
Chicago

Bobby Jo Benson
Student

Mary Broomfield
Northeastern Illinois University

Dr. Gordon Brown
Illinois Office of Education

Reginald Brown
Chicago Board of Education

Dr. Ariel David
Illinois Department of Mental Health

Danny K. Davis
West Side Association for Community Action

Gilbert Derr
Chicago Board of Education

Eric Eason
Student

James Erickson
Illinois Department of Mental Health

Lawrence J. Gorski
Legislative Consultant

The Honorable Arthur Hamilton
Judge, Juvenile Court of Cook County

Table 12: (continued)

John Healy
Illinois Office of Education

Jerome Herron
The Chicago Urban League

Ernest Jenkins
YMCA Urban Progress West

Robert Larkin
Kennedy-King College

Jean Lee
Parent

Orvin Lee
Student

Dr. William H. Lienemann
Northeastern Illinois University

Robert Lucas
Kenwood-Oakland Community

Katharine Mortell
Council for Community Services in
Metropolitian Chicago

Dr. Mary Nelson
Christian Action Ministry

Ardell Nickels
Montefiore PTA

William O'Connell
Juvenile Court of Cook County

Bill Page, Assistant Superintendent
Illinois Office of Education

John Preto
Student

Patricia Preto
Parent

Hedy M. Ratner
Educational Service Region of Cook County

Table 12: (continued)

Sunni Reed
Illinois Department of Children and Family
Services

Marshall Seeder
Illinois Department of Children and Family
Services

Julie M. Smith
Illinois Department of Children and Family
Services

Jerome Stermer
Illinois Department of Children and Family
Services

Shirley Totty
United Concerned Parents

Carolyn A. Wilson
Illinois Office of Education

Carol Zientek
Juvenile Court of Cook County

Source: Report on the Commission on Truancy and Alternative
Education, June 13, 1975.

ward of the court were unfit, unable or unwilling to care for,
protect, train or discipline the minor. If it was in the best
interests of the minor the court could take him/her from
custody of his/her parents, guardian or custodian. Unless one
of these qualifications were not met, the court would place
the minor in custody of his guardian. If this was not
acceptable the court could:

- a) place the juvenile in the custody of a suitable
relative or other person;
- b) place him under the guardianship of a probation
officer;
- c) commit him in the Department of Children and
Family Services with their consent; or
- d) commit him to some licensed training school or
industrial school.⁶⁷

In summary, the Juvenile Court Act epitomized a modern, fair attempt to cope with a recurrent problem. However, because the Parental Schools Act had jurisdiction in Chicago, the majority of truants adjudicated under the MINS petitions were from the suburbs of Chicago. Those who were concerned with the juvenile's rights were anxious to see the Parental Schools Act repealed.⁶⁸ The view expressed by many at this time was that Legislation which would give equal treatment to truants in Chicago and truants in the suburbs was imperative. Further, this legislation should provide workable standards so that all truants would be treated the same; rather than depending on discretionary whims of school principals which allowed some truants to escape adjudication and others to be committed to Parental Schools. Uniform legislation, explicit, justifiable standards, and compulsory enforcement procedures were needed to improve the present system of punishing truants.⁶⁹

This prevailing attitude of giving truants due process under the Juvenile Court Act was brought on by the famous Gault decision of 1967 when it was declared that "a juvenile who is charged with being delinquent must be proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt."⁷⁰

The Adler Commission finalized its report in Spring 1974. The committee was divided as to its recommendations. All committee members felt that the current residential facilities and programs should not have been retained

unchanged. All supported a sharp reduction of the residential component and all agreed that the Foster Avenue facility should be closed. Some members favored immediate closing, and others wanted to retain the facility for up to two more years.⁷¹ But in the end the report was just that "a report."

The Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education concluded their report in July of 1975. Their report combined research, program development, and community organization in an effort to expand the already existing Chicago Residential School for Truants into a comprehensive treatment center -- residential and day programs. Truants who would also be adjudicated delinquents could be committed to the program by the Juvenile Court. (MINS petition) Other truants would be voluntary residents or day attendants through referrals by themselves, their families, or their local schools.⁷²

The report described extensive program development which consisted of a creative mix of community based alternative schools, other community based programs, and a central diagnostic and education center with live-in facilities. Most minors would live at home or in small community based group homes, or foster homes. A minor enrolled in the program could be in attendance at his local school, an alternative school, a purchased vocational training program, or the diagnostic and educational center, based upon his/her individual needs.⁷³

There were about 300 minors enrolled in the pilot program as it was evolving during the writing of this report. Goals

were set to expand the program for about 1,200 minors, with about 300 in residence at any given time and about 900 living at home but still under jurisdiction of the program.⁷⁴

While all these forces were in play with each other the final outcome was financially, and economically the Chicago Residential Schools for Boys and Girls was not to be. As stated earlier, Northeastern was funded by the state to run the schools for the first two years after it was purchased. However, in fiscal year 1976 (starting July, 1975), the state decreased Northeastern's appropriations of \$2,250,000, to \$325,000, for the maintenance of the Residential/Parental School. So, Northeastern closed the school on July 15, 1975.⁷⁵

President Mullen, of Northeastern, and William Lienemann, vice President of Administrative Affairs, were taken to court and ordered to re-open the school doors and keep them open as long as the money lasted. It was decided that the girls' branch was to be closed and the girls transferred over to the boys' branch. The school was run only during the day after that time, and on August 15, 1975, the Chicago Residential/Parental School closed its doors for good.⁷⁶

Deinstitutionalization of Truancy

Deinstitutionalization of status offenses was perhaps the most prevalent type of reform urged during the time, and afterwards, of the Residential Schools closing, that was urged in the area of juvenile justice. The idea was that status

offenders, truants included, should be kept out of secure institutions. After secure institutions were abolished, community-based facilities were to take their places.

In Chicago, truants no longer ended up in secure facilities, their parents were still prosecuted, school truant officers were active in dealing with truants. Nonetheless, there were virtually no Chicago truants going through the Juvenile Court, except those few who were referred on a MINS truancy petition from Municipal court, once the Residential Schools for Chicago truants closed in 1975.

The problem was, and is, that the second phase of deinstitutionalization never materialized. No organizations or programs arose to replace the Juvenile Court and Residential Schools. Deinstitutionalization without a substitute plan was not a desirable state of affairs. As Carol Zientek pointed out, "as long as it is recognized that truants are in need of services, deinstitutionalization without replacement services is not an answer."⁷⁷

Without a formal plan for handling truancy, many of the same criticisms and suggestions about the inability to enforce the compulsory education laws that were being voiced ninety plus years ago, prior to the establishment of the Parental/Residential Schools were being heard again. Many school officials and Juvenile Court officers felt that some sort of recourse to the court was necessary to enforce the compulsory school attendance laws.⁷⁸

Suggestions were made for a modern truancy program in Chicago prior to the closing of the Residential Schools in 1975 by the Commission of Truancy and Alternative Education but there were many reasons why alternative truancy programs did not result. Money problems, political reasons, and the fact that there were other plans for the land occupied by the schools combined with the reform sentiment to close the Residential Schools. Also there are not many advocates for truants. Parents of truants rarely push for special programs for their children. The schools were closed abruptly with nothing to fill the void.⁷⁹

Juvenile Judges have handled the Chicago truants separately since the Parental Schools Act established the Chicago Parental School for the city and also a separate system for processing the children who were truant. For seventy-three years, truant officers took Chicago youngsters who skipped school before a Juvenile Court Judge who held a special "truancy court" each week. The judge could commit a youngster to the Parental/Residential School until the child reached age sixteen. This procedure was ended with the repeal of the law by the governor when he vetoed the funding for the Residential Schools in August of 1975. The Juvenile Court closed down its truancy court, and Chicago truant officers were not taking habitual truants to court.

Funding for regional truancy programs was suggested by the Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education but was

vetoed. The veto of that bill left the city schools with enormous problems and no help.

CHAPTER V NOTES

1. Carol Zientek, Educational Advocate-Probation Officer, Cook County Juvenile Court, Interview by Author, Tape recording, Chicago, IL, 4 January 1989.
2. Cynthia A. Wnek, "Big Ben the Builder: School Construction -- 1953-66" (Ph.d. diss., Loyola University at Chicago, 1988), 248-249.
3. Directories of the Chicago Public Schools: 1953-1972 (Chicago: City of Chicago, 1953-1972).
4. Mary Broomfield, Associate Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools. Interview by Author, Tape Recording, Chicago, IL July 1989.
5. Bernard Karlin, Principal, Montefiore Special School, Interview by Author, Tape Recording, Chicago IL, July 1989.
6. Lois Wile, "School Here Can't Cope With Cases," Chicago Daily News, 19 March 1959.
Karlin, Interview.
7. Ibid.
8. Chicago Board of Education, Proceedings of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, (Chicago: City of Chicago, 11 Jan, 1969), 68666.
9. Karlin, Interview.
10. Karlin, Interview.
Broomfield, Interview.
11. Karlin, Interview.
12. Mary Broomfield, Associate Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools, Personal files.
13. The School Code of Illinois (State of Illinois: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1969) 397-398.
14. Robert J. Havighurst, The Public Schools of Chicago, (Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1964) 196.
15. Ibid.

16. Ibid., 457.
17. Ibid., 461.
18. Ibid.
19. Illinois Revised Statutes (State of Illinois: Ch. 122, Secs. 26-1 to 26-11, 1969).
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. "Greg Howard Report," Study Committee Report On The Chicago Residential Schools, by Seymour Adler, Chairman. (Chicago: 1974). 6.
23. Ibid.
24. Dr. Jack C. Oberhart, Retired Director, Bureau of School Attendance, Chicago Public Schools, Telephone Interview by Author, Chicago, IL, February 1987.
25. Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction The Illinois Plan for Special Education, (Springfield: State of Illinois, Office of Public Instruction, 1949) 9.
26. Chicago Board of Education, Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Chicago Public Schools for the Year Ending June 1930, (Chicago: City of Chicago, June 1920), 74.
27. David W. Donald "Special Education-Program Development and Education" Illinois Journal of Education 1968) 101.
28. OSPI, The Illinois Plan for Special Education 9.
29. Edward Nelson, Jr. "Legislation-A Necessary Frame of Reference for Special Education" Illinois Journal of Education (April 1968) 110-113.
30. OSPI Action Goals for the Seventies: An Agenda for Illinois Education (Springfield: May, 1972) 46,
31. OSPI, Article 14 Handicapped Children, Special Education Publication No. 265 (Springfield: 1965) 10.
32. Louise G. Daughtery, Report of Progress: Implementation of Mandatory Legislation in Special Education (HB 1407) (Chicago: Chicago Public Schools: 1969).

33. Ted L. Miller and Harvey N. Switzby, "Public Law 94-142 and the Least Restrictive Alternative," The Education Digest, Vol. XLV, No. 4 (December, 1979), 29-32.
34. Karlin, Interview.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. Laws of the State of Illinois passed by the Seventy-Eighth General Assembly (State of Illinois: PA 78-174) Approved July 17, 1973. 460.
38. Mary Broomfield, Interview.
39. Laws of the State of Illinois passed by the Seventy-Eighth General Assembly. 461.
40. Broomfield, Interview.
41. Study Committee Report On The Chicago Residential Schools, Summary, by Seymour Adler, Chairman. (Chicago: 1974) 3.
42. William O'Connell, ACSW, Chief Psychiatric Social Worker, Cook County Juvenile Court, Interview by Author, Tape Recordings, Chicago, IL January, 1989.
43. Ibid.
Jack Oberhart, Interview.
44. William O'Connell, Interview. According to Mr. O'Connell he was appointed co-chair of the Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education. This Commission came out with several recommendations for the Residential schools. He also worked very closely with Seymour Adler who was his Superior at the time.
45. The Study Committee Report on the Chicago Residential Schools, by Seymour Adler, Chairman (Chicago: 1974) 6.
William O'Connell, Interview.
46. Karlin, Interview.
47. Ibid.
48. Broomfield, Interview.
49. Oberhart, Interview.

50. Ibid.
William O'Connell, Interview.
Carol Zientek, Interview.
Bernard Karlin, Interview.
Al Peterson, Director Adopt A School Programs, Chicago Public Schools, Interview by Author, Chicago, IL 2 August 1989.
51. Mary Broomfield, Interview.
52. Al Peterson, Interview.
53. Northeastern Illinois University, Residential School for Girls and Boys: Program (Chicago: Northeastern Illinois University, 1974) 1.
54. Ibid.
Mary Broomfield, Interview.
Al Peterson, Interview.
55. Mary Broomfield, Interview.
56. Al Peterson, Interview.
57. Ibid.
58. Mary Broomfield, Interview.
59. Northeastern University Residential Schools Reports, 83.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid.
Northeastern University Study Committee Reports, 83.
62. Mary Broomfield, Interview.
Al Peterson, Interview.
Northeastern University Study Committee Reports, 85.
63. Mary Broomfield, Interview.
Report of the Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education, by William M. O'Connell, ACSW and Jerome Herron, Co-Chairmen (Chicago: Juvenile Court of Cook County, June 13, 1975) 91.
64. Ibid. 3-4.
65. Illinois Revised Statutes (State of Illinois: Chapter 37, Secs. 705-2(b)).

66. Law of the State of Illinois enacted by the Seventy-Fourth General Assembly (State of Illinois: S.B.388 Approved 5 August 1965) Article 5 Sec. 7.

67. Ibid.

68. William O'Connell, Chief Psychiatric Social Worker, Juvenile Court of Cook County, Interview by Author, Chicago, IL, 4 January 1989.

69. Seymour Adler "Greg Howard Report."

70. Re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967). 4.

71. Study Committee Report on the Chicago Residential Schools, 38.

72. Report on the Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education, Summary.

73. Ibid.
William O'Connell, Interview.

74. Ibid.
Ibid.

75. Mary Broomfield, Personal files.

76. Ibid.

77. Zientek, Interview.

78. William O'Connell, Interview

79. Ibid.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study chiefly focused on the social, political, and economic influences that led to decisions about enforcement of the Illinois Compulsory Attendance Law; and, specifically, how these influences contributed to the establishment of the Chicago Parental School in 1902, its expansion and operation, and its eventual demise in 1975.

Chapter I described the social, political, and economic pressures and events that resulted in the passage of the first Juvenile Court in the United States in 1899, the Compulsory Attendance Law in 1883, and the Parental or Truant Law in 1899. The later, required the Board of Education of the City of Chicago to build and maintain a Parental School for the purpose of confinement, discipline, instruction and maintenance of incorrigible and truant children of compulsory school age. Pressures from a coalition of settlement workers, club women, and various civic and social welfare groups seemed to be the driving forces behind these legislative initiatives.

In Chapter II, the roles of various individuals who responded to the mandate and established the first Parental School and the influences and factors affecting the organization of the school were discussed. Though the

legislation directed the establishment of a residential school for truant children of compulsory attendance age, the first Parental School opened in 1902 and only boys were committed.

In Chapter III, pressures to implement truancy prevention measures and expand the residential facility were addressed. Again, in response to the social, political, and economic conditions of the time, special classes were established for truants at the local schools as an alternative to residential placement and the expanded Parental School admitted girls in 1919.

Chapter IV detailed the many changes and challenges that occurred between 1928 and 1959. Some of the significant events included studies and reports that were critical of the Parental School (especially the number of return offenders), the establishment of the Girl's Branch of the Parental School on the South side of Chicago, the change in educational philosophy, and the appointment of the first Principal of the Parental School.

Chapter V discussed how the move toward community-based management and "deinstitutionalization" in other public institutions led to the deinstitutionalization of truancy in Illinois. This chapter also described how the establishment of study committees and hidden agendas led to the decision to close the Parental Schools (now called the Residential School for Boys and Girls) in 1975.

The history of the Chicago Parental School provides one

example of how social, political, and economic considerations contribute to passage of legislation and establishment of public institutions to address specific problems. The Chicago Parental School was established in response to legislation that mandated regular school attendance for compulsory school age children and provided penalties for violations of the Compulsory Attendance Law.

After the closing of the Chicago Parental School, the same forces that shape legislation and propose solutions to societal problems continue to have an impact on issues related to compulsory school attendance. Legislation removed truancy from the Juvenile Court's jurisdiction. The State Board of Education convened a Truancy Task Force to propose solutions, and the legislature appropriated funds for Truants' Alternative and Optional Education Programs (TAOEP) that can provide preventive, interventive, and remediative services and programs to reduce the truancy and dropout rates in Illinois.

Today, these TAOEP projects are developed by local school administrators and staff in collaboration with community agency representatives, government officials, the business community, parents, and students. Typically, a comprehensive needs assessment and a review of the research results in a proposal to implement services and programs that can address the specific problems of the "at-risk students and families" that lead to excessive school absenteeism, academic failure, and decisions to drop out of school.

Local school districts (individually or in joint-district collaborations), educational service regions, and community colleges have provided alternative programs that focus on early identification of potential truants and dropouts and provision of diagnostic, intervention, and treatment services that can keep at-risk youth in school. Some of these same agencies also provide optional education programs with self contained educational programs that can lead to a high school diploma. Some of these optional programs are housed in storefront buildings, church basements, or in schools within a school.

When one looks at the recommendations made by the Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education; to expand the services provided by the Chicago Residential School for Girls and Boys, the types of diagnostic, interventive and treatment services provided today by TAOEP legislation were already in place. The recommendation to expand the already existing Chicago Residential School into a comprehensive treatment center would have been ideal and the dream of Mary Broomfield. The changes which occurred in the Residential School for Girls and Boys when Mary Broomfield became Superintendent were model changes. It was very unfortunate that the school was shut down completely with no attempt to expand the components that were working. As seems typical in education programming, the "old" is totally out as we create "new" and "better" programs.

While this particular study of the history of the Chicago

Parental School examines the social, political, and economic forces that had an impact on its establishment, operation, and eventual demise; other scholars are encouraged to investigate more current events that seem to be influenced by the educational reform movement that encourages more school-based management, innovative and expanded educational options, and child-centered services and programs.

Follow-up studies could determine what kind of supportive services and programs or alternative schools have the greatest success in improving student attendance and academic achievement. It is precisely that type of information that may contribute to pro-active rather than re-active responses to societal problems. A desired outcome of future studies might be to move us from our present condition as "A Nation At Risk" to a commitment that encourages and empowers all children to seek and take advantage of educational programs that will allow them to become productive citizens in "a nation at work."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Abbott, Edith, and Breckinridge Sophonisba P., Truancy and Non-Attendance in the Chicago Public Schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1917.
- Addams, Jane. Twenty Years at Hull-House. 1910 revised ed.; New York: The Macmillan Co., Inc., 1945.
- Chicago Woman's Club. Annals of the Chicago Woman's Club. Compiled by Henriette Greenebaum Frank and Amalie Hofer Jerome. Chicago: Chicago Woman's Club, 1916.
- Chicago Woman's Club. 1939-1940 Yearbook. Chicago: Chicago Woman's Club, 1940.
- Counts, George S. School and Society in Chicago. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1928.
- Cutler, Irving. Chicago: Metropolis of the Mid-Continent, 2nd ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Co., The Geographic Society of Chicago, 1976.
- Cook, John Williston. Educational History of Illinois. Chicago: Henry O. Shepard Co., 1912.
- Duis, Perry. Chicago: Creating New Traditions. Chicago: Chicago Historical Society, 1976.
- Giallombardo, Rose, ed. Juvenile Delinquency: A Book of Readings. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Glabb, Charles N. and Brown Theodore A. A History of Urban America. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1967.
- Havighurst, Robert, J. The Public Schools of Chicago. Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1964.
- Herrick, Mary J. The Chicago Schools: A Social and Political History. Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage Publications, 1971.

- Howalt, John. Notes on the First one Hundred years of Chicago School History. Chicago: Washburne Trade School Press, 1940.
- Hurd, Harvey B. The Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois, 1883. Chicago: Chicago Legal News Co., 1883.
- Hurd, Harvey B. The Revised Statutes of the State of Illinois, 1899. Chicago: Chicago Legal News Co., 1899.
- Jackson, Kenneth T. and Schiltz, Stanley K., eds. Cities in American History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1972.
- Krug, Mark. The Melting of the Ethnics: Education of the Immigrants, 1880-1914. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1976.
- Laws of the State of Illinois enacted by the Seventy-Fourth General Assembly. State of Illinois: S.B. 388, 1965.
- Laws of the State of Illinois passed by the Seventy-Eighth General Assembly. State of Illinois: PA 78-174, 1973.
- McCahey, Joseph. Our Public Schools, Saving the Delinquent Boy. Chicago: Unpublished, 1937.
- Morse, William C., Cutler, Richard L., and Fink, Albert H. Public School Classes for the Emotionally Handicapped: A Research Analysis. Washington, D.C.: The Council For Exceptional Children, 1964.
- Murphy, Patrick T. Our Kindly Parent - The State: The Juvenile Justice System and How It Works. New York: The Viking Press, 1974.
- Pennoyer, John Christian. The Harper Report of 1899: Administrative Progressivism and the Chicago Public Schools. Denver: University of Denver, 1978.
- Reavis, William C., Pierce, Paul R., and Stullken, Edward H. The Elementary School: Its Organization and Administration. 1931 revised ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Scherer, Murdock, Freeman. The Strathmore Plan. Aurora, Illinois: Strathmore Co., 1940.
- Shaw, Clifford R. and McKay, Henry D. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

- Shaw, Clifford R. and Meyers, Earl D. "The Juvenile Delinquent." In The Illinois Crime Survey. Edited by John H. Wigmore. Chicago: Blakely Printing, The Illinois Association for Criminal Justice, 1929.
- Sorrentino, Anthony. Organizing Against Crime: Redeveloping the Neighborhood. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1977.
- Strayer, George. Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago Vol. II. New York: Columbia University Press., 1932.
- Strayer, George. Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago Vol. 5. New York: Columbia University Press., 1932.
- Stullken, Edward H. "Montefiore Special School for Problem Boys." In Preventing Crime: A Symposium. Edited by Sheldon Glueck and Eleanor Glueck. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1936.
- Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois. The School Code of Illinois. Illinois: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1969.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- Anderson, Paul Gerard. "Juvenile Protective Association." A Reprint from Social Service Organizations, Vol. 1. In The Greenwood Encyclopedia of American Institutions. 2 Volumes. Edited by Peter Romanofsky. Westport, Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- American Institute of Criminal Justice. "Just The Facts." Published by the American Foundation of Criminal Justice. Undated.
- Blyth, Donald, J. "Truancy - Prank or Problem?" Chicago Principals Club Reporter, Vol. XLVII, No. 1 (October-November 1957).
- Bodine, William Lester. "School Attendance." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.
- Chamberlin, Henry Barrett. "Series of 37 Articles on the Chicago Public Schools." Chicago Examiner, Beginning December 17, 1905.

Chicago Board of Education. "Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education." Chicago Schools Journal, Vol. 31, No.1-4, No. 7-9 (Dec. 1948, Jan. 1949).

Chicago Public Schools. "Boy Scouts Organize at Parental School." Educational Progress in the Chicago Public Schools, Chicago: Department of Instruction and Guidance, Vol. 1, No. 2 (October 1949). 6.

Chicago Public Schools. "Parental Photo Lab Arouses Interest." Educational Progress in the Chicago Public Schools, Chicago: Department of Instruction and Guidance, Vol. 4, No. 4 (October 1952) 8.

Chicago Public Schools. "Truant Girls Fund New Outlook in Modernized Mansion Home." Educational Progress in the Chicago Public Schools, Chicago: Department of Instruction and Guidance, Vol. 6, No. 1 (January 1954) 3.

Citizens Schools Committee. "Chicago Parental School." Chicago's Schools, Vol. XXIII, No. 1 (Sept. 1956). 4.

Citizens Schools Committee. "Chicago Parental School." Chicago's Schools, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (Dec.1956) 5.

Citizens School Committee. "Chicago Parental School." Chicago's Schools, Vol. XXIII, No. 3 (March 1957).

Citizens Schools Committee. "Chicago Parental School." Chicago's Schools, VVol. XXVII, No. 2 (Winter 1960-61) 4.

City of Chicago. "Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium." Bulletin, Vol. 3, No. 11 (November 1923).

Dewson, Mary. "Probation and Institutional Care of Girls." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.

Donald, David, W. "Special Education-Program Development and Education." Illinois Journal of Education, (1968).

Fleming, Helen. "Custodial School For Girls to Open." Chicago Daily News, August 25, 1953.

Flersheim, Elsie. "The Graduate Truant." Chicago Schools Journal, Vol. X, No. 4 (December, 1927), 133-134.

Flynn, Betty. "Truant Centers a 'Surprise'- School Principals Not Informed in Advance of Willis Proposal." Chicago Daily News, June 15, 1962, 21.

- Ford, John, Anson. "Parental School Points Out Right to Way Ward Boys." Chicago Tribune, April 29, 1914.
- Freudenheim, Mildred. "The Exceptional Child." Chicago Principals Club Reporter, Vol. XXXI, No. 2 (November, 1938).
- Graham, Ray. "The School Administrator Looks at School Social Work." A Reprint from Social Work [Journal of the National Association of Social Workers] October, 1958.
- Guenther, Lo Raine; Hagstrom, Betty; Weil, Louise. "The Development of the Public Schools of Chicago." Chicago 1941, 1941.
- MacMillan, D. P. "Why We Have Truants and Delinquents." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.
- Miller, Ted, L. and Switzby, Harvey, N. "Public Law 94-142 and the Least Restrictive Alternative." The Education Digest, Vol. XLV, No. 4 (December, 1979).
- Milliken, O.J. "The Chicago Parental School." Chicago Schools Journal, Vol. IX, No. 8 (April, 1927), 303-304.
- Milliken, O.J. "Chicago Public Schools." Chicago Schools Journal, Vol. III, No. 1 (September, 1920), 9.
- Mortenson, Peter A. "The Chicago Parental School." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.
- Moore, Ruth. "How Chicago Parental School Aids Boys 9 to 16 Who Played Hooky." Chicago Sun-Times, 24 November 1952.
- Nelson, Edward, Jr. "Legislation-A Necessary Frame of Reference for Special Education." Illinois Journal of Education, (April, 1968).
- Page, William, J. "The Chicago Parental School." Chicago Schools Journal, Vol. XXX, No. 2 (October, 1948).
- Pinckney, Merritt. "The Delinquent Girl." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.

- Pinckney, Merritt. "The Juvenile Court." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.
- Postel, Harold H. "The Special School Verses the Special Class." Journal of Exceptional Children, Vol. 4, No. 1 (October, 1937)
- Sawyers, June. "Suitcase Mary Leads a Crusade for Needy Girls." Chicago Tribune, March 12, 1989. Magazine Section, 8.
- Shoop, John D. "The Home and Truancy." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.
- Snow, Mary. "Essentials In Education." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.
- Spiegel, Modie. "School Attendance From A Business Man's Viewpoint." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.
- Stullken, Edward, H. "Education for Behavior Deviates." Chicago Schools Journal, Vol. XXI, No. 4 (Dec., 1939).
- Stullken, Edward, H. "Providing for Exceptional Children." Chicago Principals Club Reporter, Vol. 42 (May, 1954).
- Stullken, Edward, H. "Special Education for Behavior Problems." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XIV (June, 1931), 5-8.
- Stullken, Edward, H. "The Welfare of Problem Boys." Illinois Teacher, Vol. XXIII (November, 1934), 77-80, 92-93.
- Stullken, Edward, H. "Thirty Years' Work With Problem Children." Reprint from Federal Probation Quarterly (September, 1962).
- Suzzallo, Henry. "The School of Tomorrow." The Child in the City, A Series of Papers Published by the Department of Social Investigation - Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912.
- Wallin, J.E. Wallace. "The Nature and Implications of Truancy from the Standpoint of the Schools." Journal of Exceptional Children, Vol. 5, No. 1 (October, 1938).

Wille, Lois. "School Here Can't Cope With Cases." Chicago Daily News, March 19, 1959.

Wille, Lois. "Case Load Is Too Heavy." Chicago Daily News, March 20, 1959.

PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS

Adler, Seymour, Chairman. The Study Committee on the Chicago Residential Schools, Chicago: 1974.

Britton, Gertrude Howe. An Intensive Study of the Causes of Truancy in Eight Chicago Public Schools Including a Home Investigation of Eight Hundred Truant Children, Chicago: Hull House, Undated.

Chicago Board of Education. Annual Report of the Superintendent of Compulsory Education for the year Ending June 1906, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1906.

Chicago Board of Education. Annual Report of the Superintendent of Compulsory Education for the Year Ending June 1942, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1942.

Chicago Board of Education. Forty-Sixth to Sixty-Fifth, Sixty-Sixth Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education for the Years Ending 30 June 1889 through 1919 and 30 June 1922, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, passim.

Chicago Board of Education. Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Year Ending June 1923 through the Year Ending June 1975, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1923-1975 passim.

Chicago Board of Education. Report of the Director of Special Schools for the School Year 1922-1923, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1923.

Chicago Board of Education. Directory of the Chicago Public Schools, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, For the Years: 1898-1938; 1940-1941; 1942-1943; 1946-1974 passim.

Chicago Board of Education. Rules and Regulations, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1904.

Chicago Board of Education. Rules and Regulations, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1910.

- Chicago Educational Commission. Report of the Educational Commission of the City of Chicago, Chicago: The Lakeside Press, R.R. Donnelley and Sons Co., 1898.
- Chicago Public Schools. Annual Report of the Business Manager for the Year Ending December 1926, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1926.
- Chicago Public Schools. Chicago Parental Schools Guidance Manual, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1937.
- Chicago Public Schools. Fourteenth Annual Report of the Montefiore Special School 1942-1943, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1943.
- Chicago Public Schools. Sixteenth Annual Report of the Montefiore Special School 1944-1945, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1945.
- Chicago Public Schools. One Hundred Years of progress: 1845-1945, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1945.
- Chicago Public Schools. Program for Handicapped and Socially Maladjusted Children, Study Report No. 9, 1964 Series, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, August 1964.
- Chicago Public Schools. Report of the Bureau of Child Study and Physical Examination of Teachers, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1929.
- Chicago Public Schools. Report of the Department of Child Study and Pedagogic Investigation, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1900.
- Chicago Public Schools. Social Adjustment Education in the Chicago Public Schools, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1947.
- Chicago Public Schools. Special Education in the Chicago Public Schools: The Socially Maladjusted, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, October 1951.
- Chicago Public Schools, Special Education in the Chicago Public Schools: A Manual of Procedures and Policies, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, Revised, 1953.
- Chicago Public Schools. Study Report for District 1, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1964.
- Chicago Public Schools. The Parental Picture, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1937.

- Citizens Committee on the Juvenile Court. Facts About the Cook County Juvenile Court, Chicago: Citizens Committee on the Juvenile Court, April 1966.
- Citizens Committee on the Juvenile Court. The Juvenile Court: New Directions - 1967, Chicago: Citizens Committee on the Juvenile Court, March 1967.
- Cook County Juvenile Temporary Detention Center. 1978 Annual Report. Chicago: Cook County Juvenile Temporary Detention Center, 1978.
- Daughtery, Louise, G. Report of Progress: Implementation of Mandatory Legislation in Special Education (HB 1407). Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1969.
- Fries, David. "Deinstitutionalization of Truancy in Chicago: The Aftermath of the Closure of the Residential Schools." Chicago: Juvenile Justice Seminar, April 24, 1981.
- Hitch, Rufus McLain, Superintendent of Parental Schools. Sixth and Seventh Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1907 and 1908 passim.
- Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers. Public School Needs of Chicago Children, Chicago: Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers, 1954.
- Illinois State Board of Education, Compensatory Education Section, the Department of Federal and State Grants. "Policy and Program Development of the Truants Alternative program 1975-1983: An Historical Report." prepared for the Department of Federal and State Grants and the Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation, April 7, 1983.
- Juvenile Welfare Association. Information Booklet, Chicago: Juvenile Welfare Association, Undated.
- MacQueary, Thomas H. Report on Parental Schools, September 1900, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1900.
- MacQueary, Thomas H., Superintendent of Parental Schools. First through Fifth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1902 through 1906 passim.
- Mortensen, Peter A., Superintendent of Parental Schools. Eighth through Tenth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, Chicago: Chicago Board of Education, 1909 through 1911 passim.

Northeastern Illinois University. Residential School for Girls and Boys: Program, Chicago: Northeastern Illinois University, 1974.

O'Connell, William, M. and Herron, Jerome, Co-Chairman. Report of the Commission on Truancy and Alternative Education, Chicago: Juvenile Court of Cook County, 1975.

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Illinois Plan for Special Education, Springfield: State of Illinois, Office of Public Instruction, 1949.

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Action Goals for the Seventies: An Agenda for Illinois Education, Springfield: State of Illinois, Office of Public Instruction, May, 1972.

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Article 14 Handicapped Children, Special Education Publication No. 265, Springfield: State of Illinois, Office of Public Instruction, 1965.

Page, William J. Thirty-Ninth Annual Report of the Chicago Parental School, Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1941.

DISSERTATIONS

Clark, Hannah, "The Public Schools of Chicago: A Sociological Study." Ph.D. Diss., The University of Chicago, 1939.

Pollett, Mary Ann, "A Study of Social Adjustment Education in Chicago, 1929-1981." Ph.D. Diss., Loyola University at Chicago, 1982.

Wnek, Cynthia, A. "Big Ben the Builder: School Construction -- 1953-66." Ph.D. Diss., Loyola University at Chicago, 1988.

INTERVIEWS

Broomfield, Mary. Associate Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools. Interviews, July, 1989.

Chmela, Janice. Project Director, Cook County Support Service Team. Interviews, June, 1992, July 1992.

- Karlin, Bernard. Principal, Montefiore Special School.
Interviews, July 1989.
- Oberhart, Jack, C. Retired Director, Bureau of School
Attendance, Chicago Public Schools, Interview, February,
1987.
- O"Connell, William, ACSW. Chief Psychiatric Social Worker,
Cook County Juvenile Court, Interviews, January 1989.
- Peterson, Al. Director, Adopt A School Programs, Chicago
Public Schools, Interview, August 1989.
- Pollett, Mary Ann. Teacher, Montifore Special School,
Interview, July, 1989.
- Zientek, Carol. Educational Advocate-Probation Officer, Cook
County Juvenile Court. Interviews January 1989.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Cynthia Kay Barron has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Gerald L. Gutek, Director
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and
History
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Joan K. Smith
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Associate Dean, Graduate School
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Julius Menacker
Professor, Education, Department of Policy Studies
University of Illinois at Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation committee 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 Philosophy.

November 9, 1992
Date

Gerald L. Gutek
Director's Signature