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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

As America entered the twentieth century, John Dewey championed the nation's need to establish a public education system. He and others in the progressive education movement envisioned public education as the means to stabilizing and securing the nation's future (Cremin, 1961; Dewey, 1899). As the century begins to turn again, this vision has been reiterated in the following 1992 Illinois State Board of Education vision statement excerpt:

As we approach the 21st century, there is broad-based agreement that the education we provide for our children will determine America's future role in the community of nations, the character of our society, and the quality of our individual lives. Thus, education has become the most important responsibility of our nation and our state, with an imperative for bold new directions and renewed commitments (Illinois State Board of Education, 1992).

Achieving this vision has become increasingly more difficult in the latter part of this century due to the escalating number of at-risk children and youth.

The Concept of At-Risk

In 1983, at-risk was used to describe the declining economic and educational state of America in the now famous report, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The term was first applied to children and youth in
the 1985 report, *Barriers to Excellence: Our Children at Risk* (Liontis, 1992; National Coalition of Advocates for Children, 1985). At-risk has come to symbolize the nation's failures and the condition of a large segment of its population. The term has served as a catalyst for action to secure the nation's future through improving opportunities for all of its children and youth (Frymier & Gandsneder, 1989; Wollons, 1993).

**The Demographics of At-Risk Status**

In 1988, demographers estimates that 25 million at risk children lived in America. A 33 percent increase in this population has been forecast by the year 2020 (Natriello et al., 1990; Pallas et al., 1989). This alarming growth projection is related to changing family, social, economic and demographic conditions. The nation's economic and military superiority have been challenged on the global front, residents are culturally and linguistically more diverse, family structures are varied and communities are plagued by poverty, crime and violence (Illinois State Board of Education, 1993; Kirst, 1990; O'Neil, 1991).

No community is immune from at-risk children and youth. They reside in urban, rural and suburban communities across the nation (Dunkle & Usdan, 1993; Helge, 1988; 1990). Their numbers and the complexity and multiplicity of problems confronting them have escalated to threaten our nation's social, economic and educational well being (Council of...

At-Risk Factors

Race/ethnicity, poverty, family structure, language and mother's education have been the five factors used by demographers to identify at-risk children and youth (Natriello et al., 1990; Pallas et al., 1989). The interrelationship of these factors constitute a myriad of social problems that impede optimal life success for children and youth. These problems are heralded in the media, researched in academia, debated in the legislatures and struggled with daily in school and communities across the country. The list of societal problems associated with at risk factors include the following:

- early parenting
- single parenting
- divorce
- abuse and neglect
- prenatal exposure to alcohol, drugs and HIV
- lead poisoning
- nutritional deficits
- poor school readiness
- school failure
- school drop-out
- substandard housing
. homelessness


**At-Risk Implications**

Living as an at-risk child or youth frequently means living with the burden of all five at risk factors and multiple societal problems. The implications of this compounded high risk status makes their existence even more precarious.

In 1990, 40 percent of the nation's poor were children. One out of every five children lived in poverty, with the rate being twice as high for African Americans and Hispanics. The nation's high divorce rates translate into nearly 50 percent of all children and youth being raised before age 18 in a single parent home. Minority families are most likely to be single, female headed households. Seventy-five percent of poor African American families in 1990 were headed by single females (Children's Defense Fund, 1991; United States Bureau of the Census, 1991). The economic absence of the minority male is rooted in a history of racism and discrimination. Gender combined with race has induced the African American males' at-risk status such that he is considered an endangered specie. Young males begin to
experience failure earlier and at rates much higher than their counterparts. The African American male is particularly at-risk for school failure, school drop-out, underemployment, unemployment, violence and incarceration. Homicide is the leading cause of death for 15 to 24 year olds. Due to these and other factors, family formation and stabilization continues to be a serious problem among African Americans (Greathouse & Sparling, 1993; Kunjufu, 1986; Lerman, 1993; Orleans Parish School Board, 1988; Wilson, 1987; Wright, 1991). Of all ethnic groups, the Hispanic population is the fastest growing. Yet, low educational achievement continues to be the primary barrier to their advancement (Gandara, 1993; Nicolau & Ramos, 1990).

Numerous other problems compound the at-risk status of our children and youth. It has been estimated that two million are latch key, returning to homes each day without adult supervision. Annually, one million adolescents become pregnant and more than one-half give birth. These young "parents too soon" are faced with the likelihood of repeat pregnancies, school drop-out, life-long single parenting and welfare dependency. They are high risk for pre-natal complications, premature deliveries and low birth weight babies. These negative health indicators increase the offspring's risk of mortality, morbidity, poor school readiness and intergenerational poverty. Yearly, an estimated 350,000 children are born to cocaine addicted mothers. These "crack

Schools and the At-Risk

Throughout American history, schools have been asked to Americanize immigrants, become custodians of children, help desegregate society and solve a variety of other social problems without adequate resources (Maltavo, 1984). Schools are often the first public agency to feel the effects of changing family, social, economic and demographic conditions. The nation's student population is forecasted to become increasingly urban, minority, impoverished and limited in English proficiency. The future looks bleak, with one-third of America's children and youth at-risk (Benjamin, 1989; Hodgkinson, 1985; 1988; 1989; 1991). In spite of fiscal cutbacks, schools are being pressured to do even more to meet the burgeoning needs of at-risk children and youth. The vast resources expended to address these needs has created an educational and human services dilemma (Bracey, 1992; English et al., 1992; Guthrie & Guthrie, 1991; Robinson & Mastny, 1989). Children who lack food,
shelter, health care, safety, good parenting and basic incomes are set up for educational and life failure (Dunkle & Usdan, 1993). Without continued and innovative interventions, these at-risk children and youth are in grave danger of becoming drop-outs, adolescent parents, juvenile and adult offenders, welfare recipients, substance abusers, homeless and victims or perpetrators of crime and violence (Fine, 1993; Payzant, 1992; Winfield, 1991). The growing public awareness of the devastating problems and fateful future faced by at-risk children and youth strongly suggests that no single entity can solve all the issues involved. Schools can no longer afford to function in isolation from the communities they serve. Partnerships between schools, parents, community members and organizations, social services and health care providers, churches, higher education institutions, industry, business and government agencies are vital to creating and sustaining the comprehensive front needed to address both the non-educational and educational needs of at-risk children and youth (Blank & Lombardi, 1991; Bruner et al., 1991; Hodgkinson, 1991; 1993; Kretzmann, 1992; Liontis, 1992; Melaville & Blank, 1991; Nettles, 1991; Office of Education Research and Improvement, 1991; Palanki et al., 1992).

**The Concept of School Partnerships**

School partnerships have been identified extensively in educational literature as a promising school reform and

America’s tradition of self help and volunteerism frames the idea of school partnerships (de Tocqueville, 1876). This concept is grounded in the sociological perspective of functionalism. The school of functionalism can be traced to Comte, the founder of modern sociology, who was concerned with the structure of society. He applied biological principles to sociology and proposed the structure of society as an integration of parts into wholes, with the
various parts being interdependent (Vine, 1959). Traditional functionalists, Parsons and Merton, were concerned with two goals; to relate the parts of society to the whole and to relate one part to another (Merton, 1949; Parsons, 1960; Vernon, 1965). Partnerships have an ascriptive nature because they are comprised of distinct entities with separate functions joined together to become a structured unit addressing specific needs (Colony, 1990).

The interrelationship and interdependency of individuals and institutions are embodied in contemporary sociological theories and concepts. Wellman’s community liberated idea conceptualizes community in terms of networks of individuals (Wellman, 1979). Warner’s concept of horizontal integration is a means of measuring the degree of bonding between individuals and institutions in a given community (Warner, 1981). Litwack’s theory of shared functions deals with the need for extended relationships due to societal changes that have affected the traditional primary groups (Litwack & Meyer, 1974). These extended relationships have been termed secondary relationships by Wireman. They provide a sense of belonging, minimal socialization and limited involvement of the individual to address specific public matters in public meeting places (Wireman, 1975; 1984).

Malinowski, the first anthropologist to declare himself a functionalist, viewed functional sociology as a multidimensional and interdisciplinary school of thought. In order
to understand a society it was necessary to analyze all influential factors side by side. These included biological, psychological, environmental, economic, political and cultural aspects of individual and societal life (Malinowski, 1939). This paradigm is closely aligned with Bronfenbrenner's whole child concept. This educational perspective emphasizes the overlapping connections between the environment and its influences on the development of children and youth (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). John Dewey felt that the school's role was to balance and integrate all of the influences to which children and youth are subjected. His vision for the school was one of collaborative partnerships. He described the school's function as a coordinating agent between the family, community, workplace and religious associations (Dewey, 1916).

School Partnerships and the At-Risk

All students stand to benefit when key individuals in their community accept and share responsibility for their contiguous academic and social development (Bruner et al., 1992; Davis et al., 1992; Palanki et al., 1992). Community, business and political leaders, along with parents, educators, community members and students all have ownership and a stake in our schools (Bucy, 1990; Murphy, 1993; New York State Department of Education, 1988). Healthy communities support and produce educational excellence and productive citizens. This generation's concern for the next generation
is centered around our schools. Schools serve the total community through their important role in preparing the next generation. This role was exemplified by Durkheim, another functionalist, whose thesis was that the child was a product of society and the purpose of education was the socialization of the younger generation (Barnes, 1940).

Schools must work in partnerships to develop and improve its most important products; America's children and youth (Children's Defense Fund, 1991). The broadening scope of schools to focus on the complex and multiple needs of at-risk children and youth is a critical educational policy issue (Children's Defense Fund, 1991; Murphy, 1993; Wollons, 1993). A long standing debate over whose responsibility it is to meet these needs, has shifted to now center on how far and in what ways the nation can best address these needs (Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990; Pollard, 1990). Already there is speculation that the six national educational goals of the American 2,000 initiative will not be realized, due to our failure to meet all the needs of at-risk youth and children (Alexander, 1991; Children's Defense Fund, 1991; Hodgkinson, 1991). The Illinois State Board of Education has acknowledged its system's failure to meet these needs and has identified eight basic goals toward their achievement. These goals are reflective of societal changes and their impact on educational restructuring for the twenty-first century. There is recognition and declaration by the
state's educational leaders that the eight goals cannot be achieved without the commitment and support of parents, community members, health and social service providers, business, higher education, government and industry. Goal numbers six and eight specifically relate to the establishment of partnerships. These goals, described below, highlight the collaborative leadership role that schools must undertake to improve children and family access to support services. The provision of comprehensive services are viewed as prerequisites for school success.

#6. All Illinois public school students will attend schools which actively develop the support, involvement and commitment of their community by the establishment of partnerships and/or linkages to ensure the success of all children.

#8. Each child in Illinois will receive the support services necessary to enter the public school system ready to learn and progress successfully through school. The public school system will serve as a leader in collaborative efforts among private and public agencies so that comprehensive and coordinated health, human and social services reach children and their families (Illinois State Board of Education, 1993).

The establishment and maintenance of school partnerships pose yet another challenge to local school administrators. They currently balance numerous internal day-to-day school operations. In this new role as community catalyst, they would benefit greatly from information on school partnership models. Research on the development, structure and functions of these models is critical to improving leadership skills and service delivery to at-risk children.

Study Overview

This study explores and describes school-community networks; a unique Chicago school partnership model that addresses the two Illinois State Board of Education partnership goals. Networks have been described as varied individuals, groups and institutions coming together under a common cause to improve their effectiveness by sharing information and resources. Networks operate from an holistic stance and view the problems of children, youth, families, schools and communities as interrelated. Activities and programs are delivered in a comprehensive and coordinated manner (Robinson, 1985). School-community networks were operative in Chicago prior to implementation of the Chicago School Reform Act in 1989. They are comprised of elementary and secondary schools, community agencies and organizations, businesses, government agencies, churches, volunteers, higher education institutions, parents and community members. Members of school-community networks collaborate to solve problems, provide resources and improve success opportunities for at-risk children and youth. They share ideas, skills, resources and techniques to address critical issues facing the entire school-community.
Nettles reviewed school-community projects that focused on at-risk youth and formulated a typology of community involvement with schools. This typology posits that four change processes characterize community involvement efforts to promote student development. These change processes are conversion, allocation, mobilization and instruction. In this study, School-Community Networks: Three Partnership Case Studies, case study methodology and Nettle's typology are utilized to explore and describe three school-community networks in Chicago (Nettles, 1991).

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain more insight into the ways in which schools and community entities enter into and engage in collaborative partnerships. This study explores and describes a unique Chicago school partnership effort; school-community networks. The history, purpose and student development activities of three Chicago school-community networks are investigated. Data regarding the networks' development, structure and functions are revealed through indepth interviews and documentary research.

The three networks selected have been in existence for over four years and have been involved in numerous school-community activities. All three networks serve Chicago's west side communities. The networks' membership is comprised of multiple stakeholders; parents, community members, service agencies and organizations, government agencies,
educational institutions and businesses.

Network O is centered around a neighborhood high school, its feeder elementary schools, a major corporation and community service providers. The school community served is both African-American and Hispanic.

Network R revolves around a housing development, its elementary school, community members and service providers, volunteers and government agencies. The school-community served is African-American.

Network W originated within the boundaries of a designated Chicago Community Area and its three public housing developments. Feeder elementary, secondary and higher education institutions, community members and service providers, government agencies and volunteers were propelled together around the community's health crisis. The school-community served is African-American.

Importance

This study is significant due to America's educational crisis, economy and demographic trends. There is a need to identify and replicate strategies that effectively address the nation's escalating at-risk youth population and dwindling educational and economic resources. Partnerships have been viewed as an educational reform strategy that addresses all the needs of children, not just the three R's. The needs of today's students have become so overwhelming that they are outstripping the service delivery capabilities of
the agencies and schools that were created to serve them. Collaborative partnerships are needed to identify and solve problems, access and coordinate resources and provide more chances for student success. In Illinois, the need for active and effective partnerships constitutes two of the eight Illinois State Board of Education goals. An increased understanding of school-community networks provides insight into how schools, parents, community members, service providers, volunteers, government agencies and businesses proceed to develop, structure and facilitate collaborative partnerships. Their experiences, opinions and anecdotes contribute to the dearth of literature on school-community partnerships.

**Key Concepts**

**Community** - Community refers both to locales, such as neighborhoods, and to social interactions (e.g., relations among a network of social service providers), that can occur within or transcend local boundaries (Nettles, 1991).

**School Reform/Restructuring** - Substantial system-wide change in the way schools are run and children are taught (McCormick, 1989).

**At-Risk** - At-risk students come from poverty-stricken economic backgrounds. They are more prone to social and familial stress, characterized by a lack of control over their lives, by a dim perspective in terms of their future hopes, and by a limited view of their own personal worth and
self-esteem. Frequently, these youngsters are members of a minority group. They are racially, linguistically, or socially partitioned from the members of the mainstream or majority culture (Presseisen, 1988).

**Collaboration** - Two or more independent organizations who agree to pool their authority, resources and energies in order to achieve a goal or goals they desire (Intriligator, 1983).

**Network** - A system of cooperation through which diverse groups and individuals are flexibly linked together by a shared focus to exchange information and resources in order to expand their effectiveness (Robinson, 1985).

**School-Community Networks** - School-Community Networks are community entities comprised of varied individuals working as partners to improve schools and communities. Network members include school, agency, organization, institution, business, government and community service personnel; along with community members, parents and volunteers.

**Community Involvement** - Community involvement consists of the actions that organizations and individuals (e.g., parents, businesses, universities, social service agencies, and the media) take to promote student development (Nettles, 1991).

**Conversion** - Conversion refers to the process of bringing the student from one belief, or behavioral stance, to another (Nettles, 1989).
Mobilization - Mobilization includes actions to increase citizen and organizational participation in the educational process (Nettles, 1989).

Allocation - Allocation refers to activities wherein community entities provide resources (such as social support and services) to children and youth (Nettles, 1989).

Instruction - Instruction embraces actions designed to assist students in their intellectual development or in learning the rules and values that govern social relationships in the community (Nettles, 1989).

Case Study Protocol

Overview of the Case Study

Methodology Overview. This qualitative multiple case study explored and described the history, purpose, structure and activities of three Chicago public school-community networks. Each of the three networks, Network O, Network R and Network W, constituted a case. A case study protocol served as a common structural outline. The general research strategies utilized were an historical overview of the 1980’s school reform partnership movement as a conceptual framework, indepth personal interviews, questionnaires, and the collection of documentary and archival evidence. Data collection focused on obtaining multiple, indepth, contextually grounded accounts and modes of evidence on the nature of school partnerships with multiple stakeholders and their student development activities. Descriptive, explanatory,
and content data analysis measures were used to yield network case narratives.

**Case Study Framework.** This case study protocol served as a general outline for framing, selecting, collecting, analyzing and presenting data from the three networks.

This study is grounded in an historical overview of the 1983-1993 public school reform partnership movement. The overview has identified four major public school partnership models. These are as follows:

1) school-business  
2) school-university  
3) school-interagency  
4) school-multiple stakeholders (school-community networks)

Saundra Nettles' social change typology (1991) was employed in this study as a theoretical framework for describing and classifying network student development activities. Her typology identifies the following four social change processes that characterize school-community involvement:

. conversion  
. mobilization  
. allocation  
. instruction

The objective of this study was to present a descriptive overview of each network and their student development
activities. Questionnaire items which included the following five key study areas were used to organize, code and analyze data:

1) history
2) purpose
3) structure
4) activities
5) Nettles’ four social change processes

Case Study Participant Selection. The following five criteria served as a basis for the selection of the three school-community networks:

1) The organization represented a collaborative effort between public schools and multiple stakeholders.

2) The organization engaged in school-community activities.

3) Public schools located on Chicago’s west side were members.

4) The collaboration was not mandated.

5) The organization was founded before the implementation of the Chicago School Reform Act (October, 1989).

Field Study Procedures

Step One: Research Question Development. Questionnaires were developed as probe instruments to collect explanations, remarks, anecdotes and insights into each network’s history, purpose and activities. Two separate questionnaires were used to distinguish between founding and current
members. Founding members were viewed as key informants. The questionnaire items were derived from an historical overview of the 1983-1993 school reform partnership movement and Nettles' social change typology. To enhance reliability and validity, the questionnaires were field tested during the summer of 1993. A sample of founding and current members involved in a similar west side Chicago school-community network were interviewed using the questionnaire. The pilot interviews revealed a need for more clarity regarding Nettles' four social change processes. The identified ambiguity was addressed by the development and utilization of a stimulus document that provided detailed definitions and examples of the four processes. This document became part of a brief study overview designed to enhance respondents' understanding of the study and the application of Nettles' typology (See Appendix A). The questionnaire items probed for information on the networks' history, purpose, structure, and activities. Additional questions inquired about related documents, archival records, resources, future plans, and messages to others contemplating or initiating school-community networks (See Appendices B and C).

Step Two: Interviews. The following nine steps were adhered to in scheduling, conducting and coding student interviews:

1. Contact the current leadership of each of the three networks. Present an overview of the study, request support
and permission to present study at a network meeting.

2. Present at network meeting, distribute overview of study, request support and founding and current membership rosters.

3. Contact founding and current members to provide study overview and request interview permission. (Letters with follow-up phone calls.)

4. Schedule interviews.

5. Complete Network Interviewee Face Sheets (See Appendix D).

6. Review overview of study and request permission to tape interviews.

7. Conduct interviews using founding or current member questionnaires.

8. Tape and/or take interview field notes.

9. Transcribe and code tapes and/or field notes data in accordance with questionnaire items.

Step Three: Document/Archival Record Collection. Network documents and archival records were collected, reviewed, analyzed, and logged in accordance with the next four steps:

1. Describe and request the following documents and archival records during network leadership contacts, network meetings, and individual network member interviews.
School-Community Networks

- membership rosters
- bylaws
- meeting agendas and minutes
- annual plans
- reports
- proposals/grants
- publications
  - flyers/calendars/bulletins/brochures/newsletters/media materials

School

- report cards
- profiles
- needs assessments
- school improvement plans
- board reports
- linkage agreements
- publications
  - flyers/calendars/bulletins/brochures/newsletters/media materials

Community

- demographic data
- publications
  - news materials/directories/reports/pamphlets
Business/Public Agency/Community Organization/Church/Higher Education

board member rosters
by laws
board meeting agendas and minutes
statutes/policies
procedural manuals
annual plans
reports
proposals/grants
linkage agreements
publications

flyers/calendars/bulletins/brochures/newsletters/media materials

2. During interviews probe for other documents and archival records.

3. Collect and content analyze documents and archival records in accordance with questionnaire items. Categorize and file under the five key study categories:

1) history
2) purpose
3) structure
4) activities
5) Nettles; four social change processes

Analysis Plan and Case Study Reports Overview

Individual Network Case Studies. The ensuing three steps were implemented to compose the three Network case studies:

1. Utilize founding and current member questionnaires and document/archival records log sheets as guides.
2. Answer each question with descriptive and explanatory information.
3. Analyze by means of narratives in accordance with the following five key study categories:
   1) history
   2) purpose
   3) structure
   4) activities
   5) Nettles' four social change processes
4. Write each case study report.

Cross Analysis of Three Network Case Studies. The following steps were created for developing cross analysis reports of the three school-community case studies:

1) Content review each case study for key network areas.
2) Compare and contrast identified key network areas with this study's five key research areas.
3) Create a combined key case study network/research study area list.
4) Identify related components of key case study net-
work/research study areas.

5. Utilize this list with related components to analyze the three case study reports for evidence of similarities, differences, and emerging trends. Identify relevant literature comparisons, future implications and recommendations.

6. Write the cross case comparison narrative report.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE SCHOOL REFORM PARTNERSHIP MOVEMENT OF THE NINETEEN EIGHTIES

School Reform and the Reagan Administration

Two key factors shaped the decade of the nineteen eighties as a momentous period of educational reform. They were the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan as President of the United States of America and the 1983 release of the report, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (Bacharach, 1990; Bell, 1988, 1986, 1993; Chubb, 1988; Clark & Amiot, 1983; Clark & Astuto, 1986, 1987; Clark, Astuto, & Rooney, 1983; Firestone et al., 1991; Firestone, Fuhrman & Kirst, 1990; Goldberg, 1984; Murphy, 1990, 1991; Ogan & Lafky, 1982; Presseisen, 1985; Ravitch, 1985; Shannon, 1982; Shyles, 1983). Ronald Reagan campaigned on a conservative moral platform, with a promise to, "get the government off the people's back." This platform advocated limited governmental involvement in the lives of citizens. The elimination of the Department of Education was also another campaign promise. His election ushered in an educational policy approach that was distinctly different from those of preceding administrations. Reagan's federal education policy was concerned with dismantling the United States
Department of Education, deregulating federal education, decentralizing authority to state and local school districts and decreasing the federal government's role and fiscal contributions to public education (Bacharach, 1990; Bell, 1986, 1988, 1993; Benderson, 1984; Clark & Amito, 1983; Clark & Astuto, 1986, 1987; Clark, Astuto, & Rooney, 1983; Farrar, 1990; Finn, 1983; Jacobson & Conway, 1990; Kirst, 1984, 1987, 1988; Miller, 1981; Perkinson, 1991; Shannon, 1982; Sherman, Kutner, & Small, 1982; Shyles, 1983; Smart, 1985; Timar & Kirp, 1988; Zykowski & Mitchell, 1990). The nation's economic state was a high priority issue during the 1980 presidential campaign (Shyles, 1983). Upon his 1981 inauguration, President Reagan was confronted with the predicament of America's declining global competitive edge. America was losing its preeminent international status. The "Toyota problem" vexed the new administration. America had become a debtor nation, while Japan and Germany were creditor nations. The United States of America was in the throes of its worse economic recession since the nineteen-thirties. The new president told Congress on his first day in office, "We've got to get control of the federal budget. It's out of control." (Bacharach, 1990; Chicago Tribune, 1993; Chubb, 1988; Martin, 1991; Perrone, 1985; Tyack & Hansot, 1984; Whitfield, 1991).

President Reagan turned to education as the panacea and salvation of America's political, economic and social prob-
lems. Throughout history, education has played a critical role in the development of societies. Under previous federal administrations, public schools assumed challenging responsibilities. Education was embraced as a cultural transmitter, socializer, desegregator, liberator, and instrument of survival. Reagan's administration seized the opportunity to promote educational change as the perfect solution to the country's economic crisis (Bell, 1986, 1988, 1993; Boyd, 1990; Church & Sedlack, 1976; Clark & Amito, 1983; Clark, Astuto, & Rooney, 1983; Dewey, 1916; Graham, 1993; Gutek, 1988; Kaplan, 1984; Long, 1991; Parker, 1987; Perkinson, 1991; Timar & Kirp, 1989; Tyack, 1990; Tyack & Hansot, 1984).

School Reform and the National Reform Reports

In 1981, Terrell Bell, Reagan's Secretary of Education, created the National Commission on Excellence in Education. President Reagan assigned the examination of American public education as the commission's first task. The commission's report premiered eighteen months later, indelibly welding America's survival as a nation to the quality of its public school systems. Thirty-six pages of lay, terse and inflammatory language struck fear in the hearts of readers and galvanized a national call for public education reform. The lines reiterated and sensationalized most by the media were, "a rising tide of mediocrity was threatening our very future as a nation and as a people" (Bacharach, 1990; Collins,
1985; Long, 1991; Murphy, 1990; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The report quickly became a hot news item. An estimated one million people read the newspaper reprinted document. Over three million copies were sold in the book format. The release of this precedent setting report and the floodgate of over thirty others that followed thrust public education into the national limelight and seared it into the conscious of mainstream America. The public was riveted on the global stakes. The nation’s fate dangled on a badly frayed educational string. There was strong belief throughout the country that our public schools were in crisis and our nation was indeed at-risk (Bensen, 1984; Burgess, 1984; Chafel, 1984; Chimien & Boutin, 1991; Collins, 1985; Firestone et al., 1991; Firestone, Fuhrman, & Kirst, 1990; Henson, 1986; Holly, 1983; Jacobson & Conway, 1990; Lugar, 1983; Murphy, 1990, 1991; Surwill, 1984).

The dramatic language of the reports reeked with a tone of hysteria that permeated a national climate of fear and anxiety. This climate was reminiscent of the period following the Soviet Union’s launching of Sputnik in 1957. Twenty-six years later, America’s ability to compete on the international front was threatened and our public school system was the culprit. Something urgent had to be done and that something was a national school reform movement (Ascher, 1984; Bacharach, 1990; Broudy, 1985; Graham, 1984;

The Reagan administration successfully used the reports and its new federalism to raise education to a high national agenda and to provide the crisis oriented impetus for localized school reform. His "trickle down" policy approach resulted in over one thousand state school reform initiatives being generated between 1983 and 1990 (Adelman, 1985; Bacharach, 1990; Boyd, 1990; Clark & Amito, 1983; Clark, Astuto, & Rooney, 1983; Coble, 1986; Firestone et al., 1991; Firestone, Fuhrman, & Kirst, 1990; Jung & Kirst, 1986; Kirst, 1984; McDaniel, 1989; Mitchell, 1989; Ornstein, 1991; Parker, 1983; Passow, 1984, 1989, 1990; United States Department of Education, 1984; Wimpelberg & Ginsberg, 1987, 1987). President Reagan and his two Department of Education Secretaries, Terrell Bell and subsequently William Bennett, were highly visible and vocal doomsayers. They, in concert with the media and the authors of the reports, legitimized and validated the crisis in public education. The reports were authored by blue ribbon commissions, committees and task forces composed of government, business, industry and primarily higher education leaders. Their lofty positions and prestigious titles and credentials served to strongly influence public perception. There was a common belief that these reports were credible documents, penned by experts
School Reform and the Media

Fueling these dramatic educational reports and pronouncements was a relentless media blitz of propaganda that was highly critical of public education. The media was a key actor in orchestrating the mass production of a national rhetoric of crisis. Inflammatory language and a sense of urgency shaped the context of the messages that bombarded the public. Repeated dismal statements regarding declining test scores, low academic performance, high dropout rates, school violence, vandalism, drugs and the growing at-risk population echoed across America. From April through December of 1983, the commission reports spurred magazines and newspapers across the country to write articles, stories, editorials and cartoons, accentuating the crisis in America and in public education. On Tuesday, September 4, 1984, an entire evening of prime time television was devoted to examining America's public school system. More than nineteen million people watched the American Broadcasting Company's special entitled, ABC News Closeup: To Save Our Schools, To Save Our Children (American Broadcasting Company, 1984; Bacharach, 1990; Brown, 1983; Cadoree, 1990; Chicago United, 1985; Chubbs, 1988; Collins, 1985; Deal,
This steady diet of alarming data nourished the idea that our nation was on a course to self destruction, due to our ineffective public schools. Everyone had to jump on board, take the wheel and steer it towards a reform course.

School Reform, National Reports and the Public’s Response

The nation’s economic and educational plights were now firmly entwined in the minds of American citizens. The public’s keen awareness and frustration with the nation’s economic and educational conditions, combined with the interest and influence of prestigious leaders and Reagan’s education deregulation plan, set the stage for state and local school reform debates and coalitions. The year 1983 was coined the year of the Great Debate. All over America, citizens from all walks of life responded to the perceived national crisis caused by our poor public schools. They engaged in discourse about the conditions, powers, purpose and future of public education. An unprecedented mix of education constituents were propelled together around the common goal of fixing our schools to save our nation. This spirit of collaboration and shared responsibility between various stakeholders was a persistent strand throughout the decade and into the early nineteen nineties. President

School Reform Waves of the Nineteen Eighties

During the early, middle and late nineteen-eighties, the nation took three different approaches toward improving its public school systems. These distinct efforts have been described as waves (Murphy, 1990). Wave One hit between

Wave One and School Reform (1982-1985)

Wave One was a direct response to the "nation at risk" type reports. Education and the economy remained entangled. Our schools were eroding and America was losing its economic, technological and military footing. The top soil needed was excellence to replace mediocrity (Bacharach, 1990; Brandt, 1989; Doyle & Levine, 1985; Farrar, 1990; Jacobson & Conway, 1990; Parker, 1986, 1987; Passow, 1984, 1989, 1990; Ravitch, 1985; Urban Superintendent’s Network, 1985; Yin, et al., 1984). This search for excellence was to be achieved by a movement that intensified the educational processes within schools through legislative mandates. Schools were mandated to increase course loads, time spent on instruction, graduation prerequisites, standardized test outcomes and teacher certification requirements. A top down, get tough approach was used to get the job done (Bacharach,
School Reform and School Business/Industry Partnerships

Who best to help schools get the job done than the business/industry community. Their leaders had served as experts on the prestigious assemblies that authored the national reports. Business and industry could show public schools how to meet the nation's economic and technological challenges. Their involvement in school reform stemmed from their economic needs and goals. Improved school performance and accountability would reduce illiteracy and ensure long term economic growth. Educated youth would have the necessary skills to become productive workers. Businesses could realize more profits if they didn’t have to reteach basic skills to new workers. Through school business/industry partnerships, business and industry leaders could meet their future workforce needs and continue to direct the course of public school reform (Ascher, 1983; Bell, 1984; Bernard, 1983; Campbell, 1983; Chicago United, 1985; Doyle & Hartle, 1985; Levine, 1985; Timpane, 1984).

Prior to this period, business had primarily worked with schools around vocational education. During the first wave, their direct involvement escalated from career and work experience programs to collaborating with state and
local governments and serving on educational boards to increase teacher certification requirements and school standards, manage school districts and lobby as advocates for public education (American Vocational Association, 1983; Bucy, 1990; Harvard University, 1984; Kirst, 1987; Levine, 1986; Levine & Trachtman, 1988; Lewis, 1988; Mann, 1984, 1987a, 1987b; Phi Delta Kappan, 1986; Shakeshaft & Trachtman, 1986; Thompson, 1991; Turnbaugh, 1987).

School-business/industry partnerships existed throughout all three waves. Business and industry leaders were actively involved in four collaborative levels with public schools. They adopted schools and provided student services, monetary, equipment and supply donations. Some were engaged in multi-year projects aimed at improving the basic work skills and job access opportunities for at-risk youth. Others served on local and national boards and committees to set and direct national educational reform policy (Barton, 1983; Bell, 1984; Blank, 1988; Goldberg, 1989; Lewis, 1988; McCormick, 1984; Moorefield, 1988; Segel et al., 1992; Woodside, 1984).

During the first wave the primary school partnership approach advocated in educational reports was school business/industry. The following significant reports were released during Wave One:


Wave Two and School Reform (1986-1988)

Wave Two mounted in response to a growing realization that school reform could not be legislated. Decentralizing authority and responsibility at the local school level was the central focus of this wave. The unit of change shifted from state legislatures and district boardrooms to the schools and classrooms. To fix ailing public school systems, more was needed than intensifying what was already in place. The systems were broken. The problems were structural. To really repair, each system had to be completely overhauled. It had to be restructured (Bacharach, 1990; Education Commission of the States, 1988; Farrar, 1990; Firestone et al., 1991; Firestone et al., 1990; Jacobson & Conway, 1990; Murphy, 1990, 1991; Passow, 1991; Petrie, 1990). Fixing teachers and the tools they used was crucial. The critical role played by teachers, their training, skills, certifications, needs, working conditions, resources and incentives were given special attention during this wave.
(Futrell, 1988; Green, 1987; Hooper, 1987; Parker, 1987; Shulman, 1989; Southern Regional Education Board, 1986; Tom, 1987). Many of the education reports cast teachers as incompetent workers, lacking adequate training, skills and instructional materials. The profession of teaching became a public scapegoat. How could schools and students excel if teachers were inadequate? Who was equipped to help teachers perform better in their classrooms? (Boyer, 1985; Carpenter, 1985; Futrell, 1988; Mitchell, 1989; Murphy, 1990; Murray, 1986; Oakes, 1987; Presseis, 1985; Shanker, 1986; Warner, 1986).

**School Reform and School-Higher Education Partnerships**

Academia was the answer. Higher education was the change agent needed to improve teacher training and restructure the nation’s factory model public school systems. Higher education personnel were perceived as the educational experts. Their leaders had been major contributing authors to the school reform reports. Collaborative partnerships between elementary, secondary and postsecondary schools were needed to improve the quality of American public education (Fiske, 1991; Green, 1987; Hawley, 1988; Hooper, 1987; Ishler, 1986; Lieberman, 1992; Murphy, 1990; Negroni, 1992; Passow, 1991; Williams, 1986, 1987).

Similar partnerships had been recommended as early as 1892 by the Committee of Ten and after Sputnik in 1957. In 1983, the Board of Directors of the American Association of
State Colleges and Universities established the American Association of State Colleges and Universities Task Force on Excellence in Education. Their key charge was the development and promotion of partnerships with public elementary and secondary schools. They focused their collective energies on designing public school/higher education partnerships to improve teaching and learning outcomes (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1984; Maeroff, 1983; National Education Association, 1918; Zykrowski & Mitchell, 1990). Public schools and higher education institutions needed to overcome their traditional barriers, collaborate and become more aware and sensitive to the world and needs of their partner. Both shared a vested interest in improving public schools. Successful collaboration could be cost effective and mutually beneficial for all partners. Elementary and secondary schools developed and produced the student products, that post secondary schools hoped to consume in the future. If this product was faulty, higher education would lose by being forced to decrease its size or standards (Fiske, 1991; Ishler, 1990; Pine & Keane, 1989; Ryan et al., 1987; Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988; Wilbur et al., 1987, 1988; Williams, 1986; 1987).

Over 1,042 school and higher education partnerships were identified in a 1987 American Association of Higher Education survey. This survey found partnerships in every state and at each grade level. Major collaborative initia-
tives that continued throughout this reform period were teacher professional growth and training programs, policy, research and curriculum improvement projects and strategies to address the special needs of students (Ascher, 1988; Fiske, 1991; Futrell, 1988; Galligani, 1988; Ishler & Leslie, 1987; Mitchell, 1989; Mocker, 1988; Moore, 1989; Passow, 1989, 1990; Wilbur et al., 1988; Zykrowski & Mitchell, 1990).

Both Wave One and Wave Two reports promoted school/higher education partnerships. Yet, the primary partnership advanced during Wave Two was between public elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning.

Important Wave Two reports include the following:

Wave II Reports
1986-1988


Education, Illinois State Board of Higher Education.


Office of Educational Research and Improvement.


Wave Three and School Reform (1989-early 1990's)

Following the release of A Nation at Risk and other related reports, there was increasing concern that the search for educational excellence was overshadowing the nation's prior commitment to educational equity. This concern peaked by the end of Wave Two and provided the catalyst and direction for Wave Three (Achievement Council, 1985; Ascher, 1988; Ascher & Flaxman, 1985; Ascher et al., 1986; Bacharach, 1990; Bendersen, 1984; Comer, 1980; Cuban, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1985; Glenn, 1985; Kozol, 1988; Lauderdale, 1987; Levin, 1986; Lytle, 1990; Martin, 1991;
The education reform movement shifted from a "nation at-risk" to a "child at-risk" focus. Equity and excellence became the dual concepts promoted by many to improve the nation's schools (Butler, 1989; Children's Defense Fund, 1991; Doyle, 1993; Futrell, 1989; Murphy, 1990; Ornstein, 1991; Passow, 1989; Pink, 1989; Reagan, 1989; Schorr, 1988; Seeley et al., 1990; Tyack, 1992). This attention to the at-risk and the issue of equity was driven by demographic data that detailed the alarming national statistics and projected growth rates for at-risk children, youth and families. The facts regarding the plight of this critical population could no longer be ignored. Every student was going to be needed to ensure the nation's long term economic stability. Yet, the dismal data forecast that so many children and youth would not become productive contributing adults (Ascher, 1987; Ascher et al., 1986; Baker, 1989; Benjamin, 1989; Boyer, 1987; Cetron, 1990; Children's Defense Fund, 1991; Crosby, 1993; Hodgkinson, 1985, 1989, 1989, 1992, 1993; Illinois State Board of Education, 1988;
Jones, 1990; Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990; Natriello et al., 1990; Peng & Lee, 1992; Reed & Sautter, 1990; Usdan, 1984). America's track record in making education beneficial for its at-risk children and youth was poor. This underserved group tended to live in poverty, be racial or ethnic minorities and possess limited English-speaking skills. They were most likely to score in the lowest quartile on standardized tests and have the highest dropout rates. These endangered human species experienced the greatest negative impact from insufficient educational spending, poverty and dramatic changes in the American family (Ascher, 1985; Darling-Hammond, 1985; Green, 1991; Gruskin et al., 1987; Hodgkinson et al., 1991; Institute for Educational Leadership, 1986; Jenks & Peterson, 1991; Jones-Wilson, 1984; Kirst, 1993; Kirst & Gifford, 1988; Kozol, 1991, 1992; Marshall, 1993; Mayer & Jenks, 1989; McKitric, 1983; Medina, 1990; Nagler, 1991; National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1985; National Council of LaRaza, 1986; National Urban League, 1984; Oakes, 1985; Pallas et al., 1987; Swartz, 1989). The challenge faced in reforming America's public education systems was the improvement of educational opportunities for all of its children and youth, regardless of age, race, ethnicity, income level, gender, family structure, language or geographic residence. In order to effectively meet this challenge, reform policies and strategies had to address the unmet multiple needs of at-risk children, youth and their
families. The failure to meet these needs would not only thwart the school and life success chances of this group, but also the nation’s future. Something else had to be done to assist this population and the nation as a whole in achieving their fullest potential (Bacharach, 1990; Crosby, 1993; Gerry & Certo, 1992; Kozol, 1991, 1992; Morrill, 1992; Murphy, 1990; Natriello et al., 1990; Penning, 1989; Schorr & Schorr, 1989; Tyack, 1992).

**School Reform and School-Multiple Stakeholder Partnerships**


These newly-configurated partnership models included business, corporate and higher education representatives
working in partnership with community service providers, civic groups, elementary and secondary educators and parents. Business leaders advocated for a child investment policy that called for the development of all children to adequately address the national economic interest. New joint ventures, geared toward restructuring public education were advanced to meet the full range of needs from school readiness through school to work programs (Adams & Snodgrass, 1990; Blank, 1988; Bossone & Polishook, 1991; Bucy, 1990; Butler, 1989; Chion-Kenney, 1989; Goldberg, 1989; Jones, 1990; Lewis, 1988; Measelle & Egol, 1993; Murphy, 1990; National Alliance of Business, 1989, 1989; Siegel & Smoley, 1989; Timpane & McNeill, 1991). School staff needed more training to improve their skills in understanding, motivating and teaching at-risk students. Higher education responded by reshaping their pre-service and in-service programs to sensitize teachers to students' cultural backgrounds and special needs. Teachers were viewed as partners in the restructuring effort. Minority staff recruitment to enhance diversity was accelerated during this period (American Association for Higher Education, 1991; Baecher et al., 1989; Bucci & Reitzammer, 1992; Council of the Great City Schools, 1990; Graham, 1987; Hansen, 1989; Hawley, 1989; Johnson, 1990; Katz, 1991; Lewis, 1989; Lieberman, 1992; Marchant, 1989; Middleton et al., 1989; Midkiff & Lawler-Prince, 1992; National Association of Independent Colleges

Waves One and Two had failed to address the students' lives beyond the school. Little attention had been paid to their social, personal and health needs in the zest to legislate school reform and excellence. These needs had been viewed as non-educational, separate and distinct from student's academic needs (Cohen, 1989; Crosby, 1992; Jennings, 1988; Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990; Lytle, 1990; Marburger, 1990; Metz, 1990; Murphy, 1990; Passow, 1989. Wave Three reports and reform initiatives addressed the realization that students existed within the context of their families and communities. Where there were problems, those problems impacted their school life as well. Support services were needed to improve the social, economic and health conditions within their homes and communities to reduce barriers to teaching and learning (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1989; Davies, 1989, 1991; Decker & Decker, 1988; Dryfoos, 1988; Epstein & Scott-James, 1988; Farrow & Joe, 1992; Finn, 1991; Levy & Shephardson, 1992; Liontis, 1992; Marshall, 19193; Mayer & Jencks, 1989; Mitchell & Cunningham, 1990; Morrill & Gerry, 1991; Ornstein, 1991; Robinson & Mastny, 1989; Scott-James, 1989; Stone & Wehlage, 1992; Tyack, 1992; Wehlage et al., 1989). For schooling to be meaningful for at-risk students, stronger links were needed between the home, school and community. School staff

School Reform and School-Interagency Partnerships

During the late 1980's, reform strategies reached beyond the classroom to network with community service providers. Public schools and health and social service agencies restructured, linked and collaborated to provide
at-risk students and their families at a centralized loca-
tion, educators and providers sought to improve their over-
all educational, social and health outcomes. This push for
service integration and collaboration came from the fields
of education, health and social welfare. All three shared
the same clients (Hodgkinson, 1989). They needed to re-
structure in order to address the problems of fragmentation,
duplication and specialization; all of which are problems
that impeded service delivery and clientele outcomes. In
many areas the school-based model was expanded or adapted to
community-based models. These models were introduced to
promote access to groups who felt alienated from schools, to
broaden the range of services provided and to enhance commu-
nity empowerment. School and community-based interagency
partnership initiatives built bridges between families,
schools and community service providers. Agency and school
staff shared their knowledge, skills and resources to reduce
costs and enhance their service delivery systems. These
partnership models were cost effective approaches to out-
reach, deliver and track multiple needed services to at-risk
students and their families (Davis, 1989; Fullan, 1993;
George, 1991; Guthrie & Guthrie, 1991; Heath & McLaughlin,
1991; Institute for Educational Leadership, 1992; Jehl &
Kirst, 1992; Kunesh & Farley, 1993; Larson et al., 1992;
Linquanti, 1992; Melaville & Blank, 1991, 1992; Pollard &
Rood, 1990; Price et al., 1990; Robinson & Mastny, 1989;
Wehlage, 1992). School and community based integrated service models include itinerant staff, school-based health centers, multi-service, one-stop shopping sites, referral and case management programs and various combinations of the above models. Through these interagency partnerships, students and their families received health and social services and were involved in early childhood and extended day academic and enrichment programs. They received skills training in health education, parenting, literacy, language and cultural awareness and job readiness. The combined efforts of educators and service providers afforded them opportunities for mentoring, counseling, tutoring and job training and placement (Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, 1992; Chaskins & Richman, 1992; Conrad & Hedin, 1991; Davis, 1991; Epstein, 1991; Fox et al., 1992; Guthrie & Scott, 1991; Kagan, 1991; Kirby et al., 1989; Kirst, 1991; Melaville & Blank, 1991, 1993; National School Boards Association, 1991, Packard Foundation, 1992; Payzant, 1992; Pollard & Rood, 1990; Robinson & Mastny, 1989; Wehlage, 1992; Weiss & Halpern, 1991). The ensuing list is comprised of key Wave Three Reports:

Wave III Reports
1989-1993


Congress of the U.S. and Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. (1991). Children and youth: The crisis at home for American families. Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. United States Senate, One Hundred Second Congress, First Session. Examining services available to children and youth from impoverished families, focusing on ways to ensure that they graduate from high school, prepare them for the workforce, and/or help them get into school. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Congress of the U.S. and Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. (1991). Meeting the goals: Collaborating for youth. Hearing before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate. One Hundred Second Congress, First Session. On examining the need to provide comprehensive services to youth to help the nation meet the educational goals of school readiness, dropout prevention, improved school achievement, and drug and violence free schools and to examine what the federal government can do to support and expand social service programs for youth. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.


Economy.


National Youth Employment Coalition. (1989). *Investments in


School Reform/School Partnerships Overview

The Reagan and Bush administrations’ educational policies, combined with the multiple educational reports and media blitz, were successful. The reports triggered public discussion, increased stakeholder awareness and challenged the educational enterprise to form partnerships. From 1983 into the decade of the nineties, public education moved to the front of the class in the consciousness of mainstream America. During this period, a new public school reform and restructuring movement gained multiple, diverse and influential supporters and spokespersons. Most had not been previously associated with each other or with public elementary
and secondary education. Public school administrators, teachers, students, parents, community members, business, industry, higher education, civic, public and private service providers, community organizations, religious, philanthropic and government representatives all began to partner around the central issue of school improvement.

This reform movement differed from its predecessors in that it tried to address all aspects of schooling. This reform period was engulfed by three waves that splashed from excellence and centrally legislated reforms to decentralized authority and teacher professionalism and finally the storm continues to hover over restructuring schools and public and private services to meet the needs of at-risk children, families and communities.

Meeting the needs of at-risk students, families and communities remains a paramount educational, health, social and economic welfare policy issue. School-community networks are local initiatives that have attempted to tackle this issue through collaborative partnerships. Chapter III is comprised of case studies on the history, purpose and activities of three Chicago school-community network prototypes.
CHAPTER III
SCHOOL-COMMUNITY NETWORKS

Introduction

To gain insight into the extent and nature of activities found in the three Chicago school-community networks, 74 interviews were conducted with members and network documents and records were reviewed. The information obtained is presented in the following three case studies of Network O, Network R, and Network W.

City Overview

Chicago is the third largest city in the United States. Its population of 2,783,726 in 1990 had the following racial and ethnic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific/Islanders</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Eskimo, Aleut</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Chicago Department of Planning and Development, 1994)

The city's first permanent settler, around 1750, was a prosperous fur trader of African American descent (Chicago Department of Development and Planning, 1976). The irony
over two hundred and forty years later, is that race and economics play a major role in dividing and eroding this great urban metropolis. Chicago is a city of the 'haves' and the 'have nots', juxtaposing for resources, for survival. The 'have-nots' primarily reside in the predominately Black and Hispanic inner city communities. These communities are primarily situated on the city's south and west sides. Twenty percent of all city residents in 1990 lived below the poverty line. Yet, in these inner city communities the percentage of residents living in poverty ranged from 29 percent to as high as 72 percent. The children and youth who call these communities home are the most tragic victims of poverty. Forty-seven percent of all Black children and 30 percent of all Hispanic children were living in poverty in 1990 (London & Puntenney, 1990).

The children and youth of the city experience significant problems due to poverty, unemployment, family upheaval, substandard housing, poor health, school failure, the proliferation of crack cocaine and a marked increase in gang turf, drug control violence (Chicago Department of Human Services, 1992; Chicago Police Department, 1993, 1994; Metro Chicago Information Center and the Chicago Department of Health, 1993).

The city's future is intrinsically linked to its communities and its youth and children. Throughout the city, there are committed individuals, organizations, agencies,
businesses, and institutions working collaboratively to resolve the multitude of problems inner city children and youth experience. This chapter profiles three of these partnership efforts, school-community networks, operating on Chicago's west side.

**Chicago's West Side Overview**

This study focuses on three of Chicago's west side communities. Chicago's west side has a rich immigrant history. In 1889, Jane Addams established the Hull House there. Communities on Chicago's west side have been home to numerous ethnic and religious groups. The area has historically served as a way station for immigrants. Once established, each group moved on to be replaced by a newly arrived group seeking the American dream (Bryan & Davis, 1990; Hayner & McNamee, 1991; Johnson, 1990; The Chicago Plan, 1942).

The west side underwent a turbulent period during the nineteen sixties and seventies with riots and a mass exodus of the middle class businesses and manufacturers (deVise, 1980, 1980; Jencks & Mayer, 1990; Simpson, 1980; Weicher, 1990).

Now in this decade of the nineties, the west side's rich history, strategic location and physical resources have caused it to be rediscovered with some sections being revitalized. The challenge faced by old and new residents, organizations, agencies, institutions and businesses is to
create twenty-first century urban communities where all can prosper.

The west side for decades now has confounded the conscience and depressed the spirit. Its residents--and outsiders who are wont to approach it as a doctor might treat a terminally ill patient, with more pity that hope--have hardened themselves against the crack houses, the shuttered factories, the garbage--filled lots that circumscribe a prison for innocent and guilty alike.

And yet, the west side inspires. Dreams die there only when allowed to. Its sullen determination is beginning to pay dividends. There's more public and private money being invested in the west side now than there has been in probably thirty years, since the construction of the University of Illinois.

The west side is alive. If it's not careful, one day its chief worry may be that bane of prosperous big-city neighborhoods--blanching gentrification, which wipes out parking spaces and affordable real estate in favor of swarms of coffee houses, yogurt shops and townhouses with wrought-iron fences (Roeder, 1994).

Network 0

History

School-community Network 0 has been active in the West Humboldt Park community since June 1989, to keep the dream alive. The West Humboldt Park community is situated in the
Western section of the Humboldt Park community, Chicago’s designated community area twenty-three (see Network O Community, Appendix F). There is really not a designated community known as West Humboldt Park.

West Humboldt Park is really a misnomer (network member-current, 1994).

People who lived in this area felt underserved, isolated and unattached with no identity. They started calling their area West Humboldt Park. The name became a crucial identity issue (network partner-founding, 1993).

I was running programs in Humboldt Park, but I didn’t realize there was a West Humboldt Park. Network O put West Humboldt Park on the map (network partner-current, 1994).

In 1990, the Humboldt Park community had a population of 67,573. Its ethnic and racial composition consisted of the following groups:

- 50.5% Black
- 43.3% Hispanic
- 25.9% Other
- 22.6% White
- 1.1% Asian

Out of 77 Chicago communities, this area ranked as the sixteenth poorest, with over 33 percent of its residents living below poverty level. Twenty-eight percent of all births were to teens and 28 percent of all households received public assistance. Over 33 percent of these households were headed by single females (Chicago Department of Planning and Development, 1994).
This small statistical snapshot of one inner city community provides a glimpse of the interrelationship between poverty, race and gender. Add one more missing dimension, education, and the picture dims even more. But, it was education that rekindled the West Humboldt Park dream.

The primary impetus for Network 0 was the staggering school drop out rate evidenced at the community’s general high school. The class of 1989 had a sixty-five percent drop out rate (Chicago Public Schools, 1991; Martin, 1993). The network idea started out as an attempt to improve the high school. I was out there trying to get all of these school programs, yet scores and drop-out rates weren’t getting better. I realized that over fifty percent of our students were enrolled from our feeder elementary schools each year. To improve high schools you have to get elementary schools involved--to improve elementary schools--you have to get parents and the community involved--to get parents and the community involved you must improve community services and programs (founding member, 1994).

This premise became the framework for the creation of a school-community network. A connective entity was needed to make these crucial linkages. The high school had been adopted by a major bank, through the school system’s Adopt-A-School Program, initiated in the early nineteen eighties. This small school-business partnership was the seed for Network 0. The bank underwent major restructuring in 1988. A decision was made to focus their corporate philanthropic efforts on a single community. Due to the bank’s prior partnership with the high school, the West Humboldt Park community was chosen.
The new bank representative worked with the local high school principal to conduct a school community audit between January and May of 1989. The audit results identified the following impediments to school, family and community improvement:

- isolation of schools
- absence of public and private social services
- absence of after-school opportunities for youth
- absence of opportunities for parents and families (Network O documents and archival records, 1989)

Schools were isolated. There was no neighborhood organization. The neighborhood had been abandoned by the government agencies because there was no one there to work with (Martin, 1993).

The principal and bank representative met to discuss the audit results and developed the network idea. In June 1989, they hosted a luncheon for feeder elementary principals to present the network concept. Twelve principals signed on as Network O schools. It was the first partnership in Chicago between a corporation and a group of schools.

In June 1989, Network O was founded by the local high school principal and bank representative as a network of West Humboldt Park schools partnering with corporate, education and social service representatives to improve schools, families and the community at large. The following two principles guided the Network’s development and direction:
(1) develop school capacity to improve educational outcomes.

(2) strengthen the capacity of families and the community to support their children.

They fashioned the organization as a basic infrastructure for the West Humboldt Park community. The structure was designed to connect community schools with each other and with Chicago's rich educational, health, social services and cultural resources. The bank representative served in various roles that enabled the network to become viable and connected. The key role played was that of resource broker. Through corporate philanthropic influences, the bank representative was able to redirect and concentrate bank funded resources to Network 0.

The local high school principal was reputed as an educational leader committed to school-community improvement. Through the principal's excellent grantsmanship and collaboration skills, a school-based health center and infant child care program were opened in the high school. The principal was instrumental in outreaching and recruiting elementary principals for Network 0 membership (Network 0 documents and archival records, 1989-1993).

I got involved in the Network because the high school principal asked me to. He was a dynamic principal who got so much for his school (current member, 1994).

The network is structured with the high school functioning as the hub and the "feeding" elementary schools as the spoke of the community "wheel" (Spankeran, 1991) (see Network 0 Structure, Appendix G).
Network 0 is comprised of the local general high school and its twelve feeder elementary principals, working in partnership with the bank representative and educational and social service providers. The network founders' process for ongoing school-community collaboration was through monthly meetings. During the first two years, the network's leadership was primarily under the bank representative's direction. By the end of the second year, the structure of governance was changed to enhance principal leadership. Network 0's governance structure now consists of an executive committee of five principals, with two serving as co-chairs. Committee members plan and conduct meetings and work with other network principals and partners to identify, review, analyze, design, select, implement and evaluate school-community programs for the network (Network 0 documents and archival records, 1989-1993).

Purpose

The founders of Network 0 were concerned with addressing the dual challenge of improving educational and community conditions through school and community connections. Their twofold intent for making these critical connections were to provide a structure and a process that would allow schools to take a community-wide approach to educational improvement, and to make possible a comprehensive assault on the host of urban conditions endangering inner city students.
Network 0 members identified the following short, intermediate and long term goals to achieve their twin purposes:

- Help to improve student achievement in the critical early grades
- Connect elementary and high schools to provide continuity
- Connect all schools to work together on community-wide problems and to share ideas and resources
- Provide attractive and cost-effective ways for outside groups to provide services
- Provide structure and process that builds the capacity of schools to help themselves
- Reduce the drop-out rate
- Improve skill levels of students who graduate

(Network 0 documents, 1989-1993)

Network 0 Activities Overview

Through their unique school-community partnership, Network 0 has been instrumental in developing and directing a myriad of programs, services, resources, and opportunities into the West Humboldt Park community. Network 0 activities have involved students, their teachers, their parents, and the community at large.

Initial Priority Activities

The Network's first order of business in June, 1989 was the development of a comprehensive school-community needs assessment. The assessment survey was conducted by the bank representative to provide a clear focus for prioritizing network strategies. The priority issues identified were the
dangers students faced traveling to and from school and the need for school beautification.

1. Need for a program to help students be safe from gangs and drug dealers on their way to school and back to their homes.

2. Need for fine arts programming to add beauty and high-level interest to the school day, with results expected in increased motivation and improved attendance (Network 0 document, 1989).

School-Community Safety

The network’s first charge was to find a resource to address the issue of safety to improve the school-community’s climate. Principals recognized that student learning was hampered when they were constantly fearful of violence.

I found from the needs assessment that network schools needed everything. But, the number one need was safe passage for students between home and school (founding-current partner, 1993).

Everyone initially wanted to get involved for the few goodies. But a chance to address the safety issue really got their attention.

In those days, you didn’t have student identification cards. The high school was open campus. You didn’t have the guns like now. It was just the beginning of the deadly gang violence and drug activity (founding member, 1994).

They start selling drugs right out of the eighth grade. Drug dealer funerals are like parades. Kids look at the material items—the expensive cars, clothes, and jewelry (current member, 1994).

Students were in classrooms dealing with the fear of how he or she was going to get home. That’s a barrier to learning (current partner, 1994).

Through network outreach efforts an anti-gang agency was recruited to assist local schools in replicating their pilot
parent patrol program.

**Broader Urban Involvement Leadership Development (B.U.I.L.D.) - Safe School Network**

The program model is designed to serve two purposes: student protection and illegal and undesirable activity reporting. Local school parents are organized and trained to patrol the school area to reduce and alleviate the presence of gangs and drugs. Parents participate in monthly Safe School Network meetings to discuss safety issues with other parent-patrols and local and state law enforcement representatives. School-based drug and gang prevention workshops, gang crisis intervention support and community safe haven houses are all important program components (Network 0 documents; B.U.I.L.D. documents, 1989-1993).

The B.U.I.L.D. program has been the most responsive to the needs of my school. When you call them and say you have a potential gang problem, the crisis team comes right away (retired member, 1993).

**School-Community Beautification**

The second highest priority in the 1989 needs assessment results was the need for a response to principals' complaints that there was "nothing beautiful" in their schools (Martin, 1993).

The school was filthy when I arrived six years ago. Its important that students have an attractive clean environment to learn in. I just want my school to be nice (network-current member, 1994).

**Urban Gateways**

Through the bank representative's brokerage skills, the
first network wide program was commissioned in 1989. Students and teachers worked with a printmaking artist to create Afrocentric murals. These murals were exhibited at the West Humboldt Park community’s first art festival. The festival was held at the local high school. Since 1990, bank grants have been used to involve all network schools in a variety of fine arts programs.

These initial student safety and school beautification initiatives gave Network O visibility and accountability. They served as the impetus for a variety of network student, parent, teacher, and community involvement activities.

Student Involvement Activities

Students attending Network O schools have been the benefactors of several enrichment and support programs.

The network enabled the schools to expand their capacity to integrate human services (network partner-current, 1994).

Kids don’t leave their problems at the doorstep--they bring them into the classroom (network member-current, 1994).

You can’t run an inner city school without a range of support services (network partner-current, 1994).

The following programs have been available to students either at school or community-based sites through Network O:

Infant and Family Development Center. Between 1989 and 1991, the network contributed funds to support the high school’s teen parent drop-out prevention program. The center provides teen mothers and their children with educational, health and social services.
Project Bridge. This junior high tutoring program has been bringing bank volunteer tutors to Network 0 schools since 1989. Teams of volunteers travel by van weekly to provide tutoring and allow students to participate in field trip excursions with their tutors.

Math-at-Work-Math Corps. Volunteers from the bank began working with Network 0 schools in 1989 to assist teachers and students with connecting math to the world of work. The innovative curriculum exposes students to real life adult math problem solving situations.

Youth Service Project. Since 1989, the network has supported a drop-out prevention program for at-risk eighth graders. Students receive educational and support services to enhance their chances of elementary graduation and high school transition success. A violence prevention aspect was included in 1992, to provide students with behavior modification and aggression replacement training.

Annual Bank Book Drive and Donations. Annually, since 1989, bank employees have sponsored a book drive for one network school. The school receives thousands of books and monetary donations as well. The close relationship with the bank has also resulted in network schools receiving bank donated equipment, furniture, supplies, paintings, special event tickets and materials.

Chicago Cities-in-Schools. This national, school-based case management program for at-risk youth has been a Network
O affiliate since 1990. The program model trains and supervises teams of teachers to deliver intensive intervention and support service referrals to sixth through eighth graders and their families.

**Scholarship and Guidance Association.** Through Network O support, an agency social worker provided school based mental health services. Students experiencing emotional problems have received individual and group therapy. The social worker has also conducted staff training and parent counseling.

**Reading Partners.** From 1990-1992, bank volunteers partnered with primary grade students for reading, tutoring, and enjoyment.

**Fellowship of Christian Athletes.** A volunteer coach worked as a coach-mentor from 1990-1993, with high school and elementary athletes after school. His efforts were directed at promoting sportsmanship, gang and drug prevention, school retention, and college aspirations.

**Boys and Girls Club.** In 1990, Network O was instrumental in opening the community's first Boys and Girls Club extension site in a local church. Two years later, through the Network's efforts, the first new center was opened in the West Humboldt Park community. The Boys and Girls Club helped fill the void in positive leisure time opportunities for the community's young. Children and youth participate in recreational, sports and computer assisted academic
Career Beginnings/Key Club. This high school based program was originally designed for juniors and seniors in 1990. In 1991, it was expanded to all grades. Average students with good attendance are given college awareness information and motivational support to improve their after graduation options. Program components include college tours, mentoring, tutoring, and summer employment.

Museum of Science and Industry-Science Club. In 1991, this neighborhood science club was the pilot program for the museum’s city wide network of clubs initiated in 1992. Club activities are based in the new local Boys and Girls Club. Students earn badges for activity completion and field trip participation. The goal of the club is to promote an interest in science and technology through fun, hands out, non-traditional based approaches.

High-School Lighthouse Program. This controversial high-school drop-out prevention model, provided students with a chance to make-up their course credit deficits after school. The program was sponsored by the network from 1991 to 1993. An enrichment component provided activities for the entire community. As a community center, the program allotted space for support services, enrichment activities, meetings, adult education and cultural events.

Peer Motivations. The Peer Motivations program is a network sponsored high school peer interaction model, de-
signed to promote self, education and community responsibility. Since 1992, groups of low and high achieving students have been involved in weekly directed group discussion sessions. Sessions provide students with an opportunity to voice their feelings and concerns about issues in their lives.

**Marwen Foundation-Arts Program.** Beginning in school year 1992-93, the bank, network and foundation launched an after school arts program. Foundation artists worked with art teachers to implement a ten week curriculum designed to develop students' critical thinking, problem solving, self-esteem and cultural awareness skills. Students had the experience of showcasing their projects at a culminating family session held at the foundation's gallery (Network O documents and archival records/Network O school documents, 1989-1992).

**Teacher Involvement Activities**

In 1992, the network conducted its second needs assessment to ascertain school-community priorities. This time around, staff development was identified as the greatest need (Network O document, 1992).

Teachers needed major staff development. At that time central office programs were being eliminated (network current member, 1994).

Staff development is critical to improving teaching instruction and empowerment. Kids benefit from teachers passing on updated information (network current member, 1994).
Upgrading curriculum and instructional skills are crucial elements of school achievement (network partner-founding, current, 1993).

The network began addressing this need from its inception in 1989, with model staff development and curriculum improvement programs.

**Math-at-Work.** Since 1989, Network O teachers have received university training to implement the innovative Math-at-Work curriculum. The curriculum integrates newspaper employment and consumer information with math instruction.

**Community History.** In 1990, Network O teachers attended workshops to assist their students in developing neighborhood research projects for the Metro History Fair. Students displayed their projects at a community wide history fair held at the local high school and at a city wide event. Network O schools won top city and state awards.

**University Staff Development Partnership**

Through the corporate giving efforts and brokerage skills of the bank representative, the network entered into an intensive staff development relationship with a major local university. Network O teachers were offered a variety of staff development experiences beginning in 1992. After school, weekend and summer workshops and courses in science, history, arts and mathematics, exposed teachers to their peers, new content and instructional delivery strategies. Teachers collaborated within their local schools and with
their Network O member schools (Network O university partner documents).

The university had been receiving bank funding. They then requested that the grant be designated for Network O staff development (network current partner, 1994).

Community Staff Development Partnership

The Network has supported teacher creativity through the introduction of corporate and foundation small grant opportunities. Faculty write innovative teaching proposals to compete for implementation funds. Teachers have also been linked to major city resources for staff development. The Shedd Aquarium and Oceanarium have conducted on site staff development inservices. Teachers have received science kits and materials to improve their classroom instruction and student field trip preparation skills (Network O school documents; Network O documents and archival records, 1990-1993).

There are limited opportunities for teachers to learn from each other in most schools. The staff development programs enabled teachers to talk to each other (network current member, 1994).

Parent/Community Involvement Activities

One of the network's guiding principles is the strengthening of the family and community's capacity to support their children. Network O has established an array of programs to address this principle.

Parents are the absent dimension in inner city public schools (network current partner, 1994).
Parent Involvement Activities

B.U.I.L.D.-Safe School Network. The network's first parent involvement effort focused on principals' primary need for student safe school passage. In 1989, B.U.I.L.D. staff began working with network schools to organize and train parents to patrol the school neighborhood. The Safe School Network conducts monthly meetings where parents share information, strategies and discuss problems with each other, law enforcement representatives and other community organization members.

The parent patrol program needs to be replicated city wide. The situation is even worse now (network-current partner, 1994).

Building Blocks. This parenting skills building program has been facilitated through the network's university partner since 1990. School staff work with parents to promote decision making, planning and implementation skills. Parents develop school improvement proposals and apply for mini-grants to actualize their plans.

Parent Resource Center. In 1990, a parent coordinator was hired to assist Network 0 schools in establishing parent resource centers to enhance parental school involvement.

Parents are often hesitant about being in and around schools. They perceive that educators hold them in low regard due to their appearance or language (network member-current, 1994).

In many communities, we've lost a common place where parents can network. Schools are the most logical places (network partner-current, 1994).

The university's parent involvement program was expanded and
linked with their Network O staff development programs.

Parent workshops are conducted to provide parents with academic, homework and community information and resources to improve their role as first teachers.

The more the parent center connects with homework, the more the teachers like it. Home then becomes part of the classroom (network partner-current, 1994).

Early Childhood Education. Network O began addressing the community-wide need for early intervention in 1990. This need was evidenced at the primary grade level by numerous students enrolling with limited school readiness skills.

You have to start very early. An emphasis must be placed on infants and toddlers before they get to school (network member, founding, 1993).

Home Instruction Program for Pre-School Youngsters (H.I.P.P.Y.)/Lekotec Family Resource Center. These home and site based models engage parents and their pre-schoolers in child development, school readiness and interactive play strategies. Parents receive materials, information, resources and support as their child’s first teacher (Network O documents/Network O documents/Network O university partner documents, 1990-1993).

Community Involvement Strategies

Members of Network O consistently lamented the difficulties involved in addressing the multiple and complex needs of the community. Network O has served as a linking structure for community and city schools, social service agencies, organizations, foundations, parents and business-
es. To more effectively cope with community issues, Network 0 became a launching network for two new organizations, focused specifically on the community.

The problems are so great, you just can't focus on schools. You need to involve the families and community.

In order for schools to be healthy they need a functioning community (network member-current, 1994).

It was a burden for one institution, Network 0, to improve both the school and the community (network partner-current, 1994).

Community Arts Council

In support of the ongoing need for school-community beautification through fine arts, a network social service partner received bank funds in 1991 to spearhead the Community Arts Council. The Council is involved in promoting school and community based arts education through classroom instruction, teacher training, community performances and displays to showcase students' work (Community Arts Council documents, 1991; Network 0 documents and archival records, 1991).

The Development Council

In 1992, the bank partner provided technical, office and financial support to facilitate this Council's incorporation. Network 0 executive committee members serve on the Council's board along with other community partners. This spin off organization was created to develop solutions to the community's extreme needs. Areas under the Council's purview include employment, economic development, housing,
family support, early childhood, literacy, violence and substance abuse prevention. The Council was designed to be a separate entity aimed at building family and community capacity. As an organization geared towards empowerment, the long term Council goal is to involve the community in solving community problems. Any representative of a West Humboldt Park organization is eligible for membership. Structured as an organization of organizations, membership grew to eighty representatives in 1994. The Council's by-laws identify their following two purposes:

a) To improve the quality of life for residents of West Humboldt Park by working cooperatively to establish a community that is safe and that provides family and educational support, affordable housing, and economic stability.

b) To provide support for Network 0 schools.

Council Activities

The Council has been instrumental in opening a health center in a Network 0 elementary school. Students and their families receive a full range of health care services and education at their local school. The Council is currently building a multi-purpose community center that will house child care, health services and a library (Development Council document, 1992-1994; Network 0 documents and archival records, 1992-1994).

The network started with a focus of developing safety in student passage to and from school. We then expanded into curriculum issues, staff development programs and ultimately community development programs (Network 0 school document, 1993).
For five years Network 0 has engaged in numerous school-community involvement activities to promote school and community improvement. Their actions can be classified in accordance with Nettles' community involvement typology.

Nettles' Typology Review - Network 0

Saundra Murray Nettles (1991) conceptualized community involvement as a typology of four processes of social change: conversion, mobilization, allocation and instruction. These four processes were evidenced in activities undertaken by Network 0. An additional process, empowerment, was also identified.

Involvement as Conversion

A. Conversion refers to the process of bringing the student from one belief, or behavioral stance, to another (Nettles, 1991).

The primary intervention models used to convert students was through ongoing school and community-based program models. Conversion strategies included mentoring, coaching, specialized clubs, peer discussion groups, classroom workshops and group work sessions. Secondary interventions were periodic parades as rallies and classroom and assembly motivational speakers.

Conversion Actions

B.U.I.L.D.-Safe School Zone Network. Sponsors an annual parade and weekly classroom workshops to motivate youth to stay in school and avoid drug and gang involvement.

Fellowship of Christian Athletes. A volunteer coach
worked as a coach-mentor to motivate athletes towards positive life styles.

**Career Beginning/Key Club.** Provides students with mentoring and motivational support to pursue a college education.

**Science Club.** Engages students in activities to promote a career interest in science and technology.

**Peer Motivations Programs.** Involves youth in group discussions to enhance responsibility awareness.

**Youth Services Project.** Staff works with high risk junior high students to encourage school retention and modify aggressive behavior.

The preceding Network O student involvement activities were directed at providing participating students with positive lifestyle information, role models and experiences. The programs focused on changing students’ beliefs and behaviors towards substance abuse, gang involvement, violence, sports education, and work.

**Involvement as Mobilization**

B. Mobilization includes actions to increase citizen and organizational participation in the educational process (Nettles, 1991).

Network O served as a catalyst to mobilize school staff, residents, parents and resource providers to improve the West Humboldt community and its schools. Involving and connecting all stakeholders to reduce isolation and build capacity are important Network O goals.
Mobilization Actions

The Community Arts and Development Councils. The structure and activities of these two organizations increased stakeholder and city-wide participation in the community's schools. The United States Department of Education recognized Network O's efforts with an "A+" Education Award in 1992, for breaking the mold of typical urban education (Network O artifact, 1992).

B.U.I.L.D.-Safe School Network. Parents were organized in patrols to take action against drug and gang activity around the school neighborhood. The network's annual parade was entitled, Take Back the Streets.

Parent Involvement Programs/Building Blocks-Parent Resource Center-Parent Training. Parents were outreached and provided resources, space, leadership and information to improve home-school partnerships.

Staff Development Programs. Network teachers partnered with each other, university representatives and parents to improve curriculum and instruction at Network O schools.

The above citizen councils, school-neighborhood organization, parental, staff and provider partnerships were initiated to address the network's dual challenges of school and community improvement. These mobilization initiatives were directed at improving the community's resources, school-neighborhood safety, stakeholder involvement and parent and teacher access to educational information.
Involvement as Allocation

C. Allocation refers to activities wherein community entities provide resources (such as social support and services) to children and youth (Nettles, 1991).

Network 0 was created to address the serious void in resources available to the West Humboldt Park Community. Through corporate sponsorship, multiple resources, student incentives and support services were allocated to the community and its schools.

Corporate Partner

Through direct and indirect funding, the bank allocated human, material, monetary and programmatic resources. The key resource contributed to the network was the bank representative. As co-founder, the bank representative provided the time and talent needed to administer and brokerage network activities and resources.

Annual Bank Book Drive/Donations/Volunteers. Books, materials, equipment, special event tickets and monetary contributions were made to Network 0 schools. Volunteers from the bank have tutored students through the Project Build and Math Corps Programs.

School Based Social Services. Network 0 students receive individual, group and family counseling and case management services through the following Network 0 programs:

- Infant and Family Development Center
- Career Beginning/Key Club
. Youth Services Project
. Chicago Cities-In-Schools
. Scholarship and Guidance Association

**Summer Employment.** Students participating in the Career Beginnings/Key Club programs receive summer jobs.

**School Based Health Care Services.** Students and their offsprings involved in the Infant and Family Development Center receive school-based health care at the local high school's health care center.

The establishment of an elementary school based health center provided students with access to health services.

**School-Based Child Care.** The local high school's infant child care program is an integral component of the Infant and Family Development Center.

**Community Safe Haven Houses/Harbor Hosts.** Through the B.U.I.L.D. Safe School Network, students can find refuge from drug and gang violence in identified school neighborhood homes.

The above named resources promoted student access to instructional materials, equipment, supplies, health care, child care and sanctuary. Students in one program received summer employment as an academic and program participation incentive. None of the network's programs provided post-high school employment or higher education incentives. Five programs were designed to provide students and their families with social support services.
Instruction as Involvement

D. Instruction embraces actions designed to assist students in their intellectual development or in learning the rules and values that govern social relationships in the community (Nettles, 1991).

Network O's impetus came from the alarming drop out rate at the community's high school. Various school and community based network programs focused on improving students' academic and social skills.

Instructional Actions

School Based. Urban Gateways - academic/enrichment
Infant and Family Development Center - parenting education/life skills
Project Build - tutoring/life skills
Youth Services Project - tutoring/enrichment
Career Beginnings/Key Club - tutoring/leadership training
Marwen Foundation-Arts Program - academic/enrichment
High School Lighthouse Program - academic/enrichment

Community Based. Boys and Girls Club - academic/tutoring/recreation
Science Club - academic/recreation
Shedd Aquarium and Oceanarium Community Nights - academic/enrichment

B.U.I.L.D.-Community Safety. All but one of Network O's instructional activities occurred in organized settings. Academic tutoring, enrichment and recreational services were provided by school, agency or organization staff. The exception was the informal provision of community safety
instruction provided by B.U.I.L.D. parent patrols.

Involvement as Empowerment

Network 0 interviews, documents and records also disclosed activities that supported an additional social change process. The structure of Network 0 was designed to build the capacity of the community and its schools to help themselves. In the process of attaining this crucial goal, Network 0 engaged in empowerment activities.

E. Parent/Community empowerment refers to the process of building capacity in students' families and communities.

Network 0 parents, educators, residents and resource providers were mobilized and subsequently provided resources and opportunities to improve their community and its schools.

Parental Empowerment Actions

B.U.I.L.D.-Safe Network. The network affords parents an opportunity to address a serious community issue through their involvement on patrols and their discussions at monthly meetings. Parents dialogue with local and state law enforcement representatives at these monthly meetings.

Parental Involvement Programs-Building Blocks/Parent Resource Center/Parent Training. All three programs were designed to improve parenting skills and status as school partners and first teachers. A parent coordinator was hired from the community to assist parents in meeting their special needs.
Educator Empowerment Actions

Principals

Network 0 principals meet monthly to debate, decide, and implement the nNetwork's policies and programs. This collegial forum provides professional growth and leadership experiences.

Teachers

Staff development programs initiated by Network 0 are designed to improve teachers' instructional and student development skills. Teachers benefit from these experiences in the following ways:

Teachers are provided an opportunity for collegial interactions.

Teachers are members of staff development planning committees. They decide outcomes, materials and resources.

Teachers are given training.

Teachers train other teachers.

Teachers are given access to university resources, new research, projects and curricula.

Teachers are challenged to develop and implement innovative teaching and curricula proposals.

Community Empowerment Actions

The spin-off Development Council was created as a separate entity to involve all stakeholders in rebuilding the West Humboldt Park Community. This citizens' council brings multiple resources and various groups together to
address and problem solve community-wide problems.

Network O's empowerment actions provide parents, educators, community residents and providers with forums, information, opportunities and resources to become self reliant.

Network O - Nettles' Overview

During its five years of operation, Network O has been instrumental in implementing an impressive, extensive range of activities. These activities support all four of Nettles' social change processes, along with an additional one. The next case study highlights another west side school-community network, Network R. The community served by Network R is situated east of the West Humboldt Park Community served by Network O.

Network R

History

Public housing, conceived as a stepping stone out of poverty, has frequently deteriorated into islands of terror populated in large by brutal gang members, single mothers, pimps, prostitutes, drug dealers, and children, whose chances of escaping the urban jungle are overwhelmingly diminished by the negative role models who dominate their environment (McNulty, 1986).

Network R operated around a public housing development and its feeder elementary school. They are located in Chicago's near west side community, Community Area 28 (see Network R Community, Appendices F and H). This community is
situated in close proximity to the downtown area. An eastern glance reveals the city's beautiful skyline of towering buildings. Nestled within this community are the state university, a vast medical center complex, home to the new and old sports stadiums, and the area's expensive and successful regentrified neighborhoods.

The public housing development consists of fourteen buildings with a total of 1,113 units. The housing complex was built between 1958 and 1969 (Chicago Housing Authority, 1980, 1992) (see Network R Structure, Appendix I).

Network R members and housing development residents reflected on the way the development was in its earlier days. A sense of community permeated the development with neighbors socializing together and sharing resources and parenting responsibilities.

I remember how the development used to be. I want it to become safe like it used to be. Children could go anywhere.

The school staff were really like family. The principals and teachers made regular home visits. They tutored us and ate Easter, Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners with our families.

I'd love to see it back the way it used to be. It was just beautiful. I had no problem riding my bike and skating all around the development (Network R-current member, 1994).

Through the years, many of the original families moved away and resident screening and upkeep became increasingly lax. Young single females on public welfare became the primary lease holders. Multiple illegal occupants also
lived and spent time in and around the development. The
gangs flourished and wrecked havoc in the area, claiming
entire buildings as their turf. Bullets rang out day and
night.

Gang graffiti was everywhere. Sometimes the near west
side was like the Old West with daily shoots outs at
the OK corral, between the two gangs.

They walked around day and night with their guns show­
ing. It was like Dodge City all over again.

Everything was going on, you name it, the gangs were
doing it (Network R-current member, 1994).

Residents withdrew and became prisoners within their own
apartments, seldom venturing out due to the gang violence.

You were scared to let your kids out to play. Scared
to send your teenagers to school. Scared to go to the
store, the doctor, the laundromat. You were just
scared (founding-current member, 1994).

The two rival gangs recruited eighth grade male and
female students from the local elementary school. Relatives
and best friends since preschool suddenly parted company
after graduation as enemies. The gang leaders severely
restricted school attendance beyond the ninth grade. The
gang became your family, your teachers, and your only
friends.

Eighth grade was the dividing line. You had to make
your gang choice.

If your family lived in a rival building, or your
teenager didn’t belong to any gang, your family moved
or risked daily threats to their safety and well being.
The gangs controlled total access and movement in
"their" buildings. They called it, "holding the build­
ing down" (Network R-member, 1994).

All lights and elevators were cut off throughout the day and
night. Residents were forced to pay fees for gang flashlight escorts to and from their apartments and the outside world.

In the middle of a summer day, the stairwells were dark and scary. At night, you couldn't see anything or anybody without the flashlight. Imagine having to haul bags of groceries or laundry up all those flights of stairs in the dark (Network R-current member, 1994).

By 1988, thirty percent of the mothers were teenagers and eighty percent were single. In 1986, the development gained the reputation of being the city's most dangerous and notorious public housing development. That year, there were seventy-nine violent crimes per 1,000 residents and in 1987, eighty-four per 1,000 residents (Network R document, 1988). These extremely high crime statistics were attributed to the activities of two vicious, out of control, rival street gangs. Their illegal activities brought the development international attention. The public housing development had the unique distinction of having the highest crime rate in the city, even though it was the city's smallest public housing development (Chicago Police Department, 1988, 1989). The newly appointed public housing chairman went on a campaign to reclaim the buildings from the gangs. The development was chosen as a model for a pilot public housing crime prevention program.

Sweeps and lockdowns policies were initiated to enable people to get out to play, visit, work, attend school, shop and access services. A separate public housing police
department was established with twenty-four hour security. A sophisticated highly technological identification system was employed to control access of illegal residents to the building. The sweeps, lockdowns and accompanying security measures were new and controversial. Yet, most residents welcomed the long overdue attention to their safety and security needs (Casuso, 1988; Thornton & Pearson, 1988).

People came and called from all over the world to talk about the sweeps. They really worked.

The area was toured by the federal public housing secretary, the state's governor and the Chicago public housing chairman.

Until the sweeps, I hadn't sat out on my ramp for five years.

After the sweeps, we got a lot of different programs. That's when the network started (current member, 1994).

The violence and fear that enveloped the small development and the innovative and controversial crime prevention measures, became the impetus for Network R. On the day of the first sweep, public housing administration held a meeting at the local elementary school to inform service providers of the agency's new measures.

The agencies welcomed the new policies. None of them could do any business in the development. The library was never used (founding-current member, 1994).

During this meeting, a public housing agency representative broached the idea of starting a network with the local elementary principal. He proposed that the network be modeled after a pilot one that was operative around a large infamous South Side Chicago housing development.
It's too bad that all these community agencies couldn't get together and focus their efforts to improve the community. Let's try something (founding members, 1993, 1994).

Within a month, the first meeting was hosted by the principal and public housing representative. Over thirty community agency and organizational representatives were invited. Network R was founded in September, 1988 by a union of health and human services agencies, community organizations and the local elementary school. Membership was open to all residents and any agencies, institutions or organizations located in or providing services to the housing development residents. Throughout its six years, the network's membership rosters have included over sixty representatives with the following single and sometimes multiple affiliations:

- Local elementary school
- Local public housing agency
  - management/service providers
- Local public housing agency
  - elected leadership
- Local public library
- Local community college
- Local social service providers
- Community residents
- Local churches
- Local health providers
- Local elected officials
- City government
- Local community organizations
- Retired executives

(Network R documents/archival records, 1988-1994)

**Initial Priority Activities**

The network's first order of business was to develop and disseminate a resident survey on the development's needs
and solutions. One unanimous feedback response was the need to have more programs at the local elementary school.

The local elementary school came out as the one safe place in the development, where no one minded coming to (founding member, 1994).

The school was the only neutral zone for the gangs (founding member, 1993).

Residents would come to the school, but they wouldn’t go to any other agencies.

It was a safe haven (current member, 1994).

All the kids and most of the parents had attended the local elementary school. It was neutral ground (founding member, 1994).

The local elementary school’s leadership was deemed to be pivotal to the initiation and implementation of Network R.

The local elementary principal and his staff welcomed and worked with all parties to get the network operative and functioning (founding member, 1994).

The school had established a reputation and had gained the community’s respect. The principal and his staff were very cooperative (founding member, 1994).

My philosophy is that we’re in the community, our role is to be open to the community (founding member, 1993).

Purpose

The network members formulated bylaws to aid in structuring and focusing their efforts as an interagency community organization. The network’s mission is defined as followed in the bylaws:
The mission of the network is to improve the quality of human life in the community, to enhance self-reliance, to improve self-esteem, to provide educational opportunities, and to promote more effective utilization of the network services for community betterment (Network R document).

The network's mission was to uplift the lives of the people in the community (current member, 1994).

All the organization and agency leaders came together with their input, services, resources and skills to help the community (founding member, 1994).

The community groups got together to create a better housing development. The network helped us to understand the services others had to offer, how to pool resources and not duplicate services as much as we had been doing.

The network involved a cross mix of community members and service providers working to enhance service visibility and access for the residents (current member, 1994).

The network's bylaws call for the following elected officer positions: President, First and Second Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer. Terms are for three years with elections slated for the fall of 1994. The network is currently under the leadership of its third president.

Network meetings are held the first Friday of each month, during the school year, at the local elementary school. From time to time, network meeting minutes have reflected comments regarding changing the locale. Yet, there still continues to be a consensus to keep the meetings school-based.

Objectives

The network's following nine objectives, as outlined in its bylaws, provide a framework for the various committees
and programs:

a. To provide youth in the community with positive activities as an alternative to gang involvement and drug usage.

b. To provide a tutoring program with the purpose of increasing the academic achievement levels of the students in the community.

c. To provide adult education programs for the purpose of training young adults to qualify for college and job training programs.

d. To provide basic skills in sports and to understand the relationship of sportsmanship to daily living experience.

e. To provide arts and crafts that will make young adults well-rounded.

f. To provide a positive and worthy use of leisure time.

g. To provide wholesome, supervised educational and recreational opportunities.

h. To enlist resources that are present in the community.

i. To provide an outlet for the development of natural abilities.

Network R Activities Overview

In the past six years, the network has anchored its efforts on two key activities; the Lighted Schoolhouse and
the Annual Anti-Drug Rally/Near West Youth Fest (Network R documents and archival records, 1989-1994).

**Lighted Schoolhouse.** The Lighted Schoolhouse was opened in January, 1989 with the goal to further growth and development through satisfying and constructive use of leisure time so that residents may maximize their contributions to society (Network R document, 1988-1989).

The network Lighted Schoolhouse committee members collaboratively developed a proposal to fund a school-based evening center for residents of all ages. The evening center was modeled after social centers that had been operative in the past by the Chicago Public School system. Community residents and school staff recalled the model that had previously been at the local elementary school.

I remember what social center was like for me. The school was there in the evening for teens to socialize and have a nice time (current member, 1994).

It kept kids off the street and gave them some positive alternatives (founding member, 1994).

The Lighted Schoolhouse Program was staffed by network volunteers two evenings each week. Members pooled their school, agency, organizational, institutional and individual resources to provide community residents with a broad range of experiences and services.

The Lighted Schoolhouse was designed as a Community Family Evening Program. It offered opportunities for residents to further their education, socialize and enhance family literacy and recreational outlets (founding member, 1993).

**Adult Education Classes.** The Network R Ad Hoc Adult
Education Committee developed and conducted a resident survey to garner their input on desired courses. Residents enrolled in GED and basic skills classes taught by community college, local elementary, organization and social service agency representatives. The committee was instrumental in hosting community speak out forums as a vehicle for residents to express their issues, concerns and needs.

**Tutorial Program.** Residents received academic assistance from the public library, the public school, the community college, the local university and social service agency staff. Tutoring was offered to all ages in all subject areas. An important aspect of the tutoring program was the integration of computer education skills.

**Sports.** The Lighted Schoolhouse Program was the site for the first Midnight Basketball Program. Community males, seventeen and older, were provided an opportunity to play basketball in the school’s gym. The one provision was that they maintain order or the gym would be immediately closed. Two opposing gangs put down their weapons and played ball. There were no serious incidents during the program’s duration (current member, 1994).

The school’s other gym was used to provide school-age children with recreational sports, games and cheerleading classes. The local settlement house staff supervised these activities.

**Fine Arts.** Fine arts classes in dance, theater, drama, visual arts and music were offered to students. Each year a
holiday performance, Express Yourself, was put on for the school-community to showcase their talents (Network F flyers).

**Arts and Crafts.** Residents of all ages were given the opportunity to express themselves creatively through arts and crafts projects. Local senior citizens were involved in quilting, knitting and crocheting classes.

**Employment and Entrepreneurship Training.** Network R members from educational institutions, organizations and private industry provided residents with job readiness, career counseling, and business skills.

**Parenting Workshops.** Residents were exposed to a series of sessions designed to assist them in coping with the challenges of parenthood. Local educational, churches and social services providers coordinated this effort (Network R documents and archival record, 1989-1992).

**Lighted Schoolhouse Outcomes.** An evaluation of the Lighted Schoolhouse Program highlighted the following two indicators of success:

1. There was a very high degree of program success regarding participant enjoyment of the sessions and an increased interest in recreational and educational activities.

2. The program was successful in providing an alternative to gang involvement and activities (Network R document).

The doors to the Lighted Schoolhouse closed in 1992 due to the lack of continued funds. The network’s Grants Writing Committee is currently developing a proposal to seek funds.

The Anti-Drug Rally/Near West Youth Fest. This annual, one day summer event, was first spearheaded in 1988 at another housing development, by another near west side network. Some members were active in both networks and advocated for Network R to host a similar event in the school’s parking lot in 1990. The event was originally entitled the annual Anti-Drug Rally to encourage ten to sixteen year olds to remain drug free. The name was later changed to Near West Youth Fest to expand the network’s focus on a variety of issues facing the community’s children and youth. The fest provided community resource information, entertainment and food. The overall theme focused on involving the entire community in celebrating the spirit of community. Network members manned informational booths highlighting educational, employment, health, social services and recreational information and resources. Entertainment showcased celebrities, local talent and numerous activities for all ages. Participants enjoyed donated refreshments and door prizes. In 1993, the network applied for and received funds as a city sponsored neighborhood fest (Network R documents and archival records, 1990-1994).

Originally, it was a "Say No to Drug Rally". We don’t just focus on drug prevention. It’s an opportunity to have something nice for the development, by the development, in the development (current member, 1994).
Since its inception, the network has been involved in the following other activities:

School-Community Beautification

Community Political Forums

Health Care Services and Health Education

School-Community Beautification. Network R was instrumental in two efforts to aesthetically improve the school-community environment.

1992 - The network planted trees around the school in celebration of Arbor Day.

1990-1991 - The network worked in partnership with a neighborhood alliance to clean up and construct a modern school playground. An architect worked with a children's committee from the school to design their ideal playground (Network R documents and archival records, 1990-1992).

Community Political Forums. Political forums were hosted by the network to expose residents to candidates, provide an avenue for residents to voice issues and to promote voter registration and election day turn out.

Health Care Services and Health Education. Public and private health care providers delivered free school-based medical services and health maintenance workshops to local elementary school students and their parents (Network R documents and archival records, 1989-1992).

Nettles' Typology Review - Network R

The existence of Nettles' four community involvement social change processes was confirmed through Network R interviews, document and record reviews. This information
also uncovered an additional process, empowerment.

**Involvement as Conversion**

A. Conversion refers to the process of bringing the student from one belief, or behavioral stance, to another (Nettles, 1991).

The stimulus for Network R was the community's serious youth gang problem. The network's school based Lighted School House and community based rallies and fests were initiated as mediums for changing students' beliefs and behaviors regarding gang and drug involvement.

**Conversion Actions**

The Lighted Schoolhouse Program objectives addressed the need to change children and youth behavior regarding gang involvement and drug use towards an appreciation for positive and worthy use of leisure time. Sportsmanship as an ideal character was cultivated through the Midnight Basketball Program.

The Annual Anti-Drug Rallies were directed solely towards getting children and youth to say no to drugs. The later, Near West Youth Fests, incorporated multiple messages directed at positive healthy life styles. Children and youth received information and resources that persuaded them to stay in school, avoid sex, drugs and gang activity.

The network's school-community beautification activities were geared to advance a sense of pride and ownership, environmental respect and aesthetic values in the development's children and youth.
The above conversion activities incorporated coaching, rallies and fests with motivational speakers and school beautification discussion groups. Missing in Network R conversion efforts were mentorship programs, classroom workshops, and assembly motivational speakers.

Involvement as Mobilization

B. Mobilization includes actions to increase citizen and organizational participation in the educational process (Nettles, 1991).

Network R was created as a structure for assembling community resource providers and residents together to improve the quality of life in the community. The Lighted School House, rallies, fests and monthly school based network meetings served as forums for involving and bringing residents and providers together to address community issues.

Mobilization Actions

All of Network R's activities are centered around the local elementary school as the focal point of the community. Network meetings are held at the local school, which facilitates monthly member organization, agency, community and institution linkages with education.

The Lighted Schoolhouse Program was school-based, thereby fostering community-wide usage of the school as a community education and recreation center.

The Anti-Drug Rallies/Near West Youth Fests are held in the local school's parking lot. The entire community
participates and benefits from this annual informational-recreational event.

Residents were provided a platform to voice their concerns through the network sponsored Community Speak Out and Political Forums. Current and potential gang members were brought together under the neutral banner of the school to participate in sports. Through Network R's mobilization actions, the isolated, crime infested housing development underwent neighborhood organizing. The primary strategy employed was fostering partnerships between the school, residents and providers to increase participation and networking between residents and providers.

Allocation as Involvement

C. Allocation refers to activities wherein community provide resources such as support and services to children and youth (Nettles, 1991).

Network R's nine objectives outline the need to provide resources to residents of the detached housing development. The local elementary school served as the catalyst for school-community resources.

Network R is rich in human resources. The primary resource provided to children and youth by network members is volunteer time. Members serve on committees to plan, improve, and implement programs and services to the development. This ongoing effort to enlist resources for the development is a key network objective. Through the Lighted Schoolhouse Program and Annual Anti-Drug Rallies/ Near West
Youth Fests, network member and their affiliates provide staff support, supplies, materials, space, equipment, educational, health, recreational and social services to children and youth. Children and youth also benefitted from the network's planting of trees and coordination of the new playground's planning and construction.

Network R programs provided students and their families with school and community based programs. These programs served as respite outlets for the violence plagued housing development. A wide range of resources were coordinated and allocated to improve the school-community.

**Instruction as Involvement**

C. Instruction embraces actions designed to assist students in their intellectual development or in learning the rules and values that govern social relationships in the community (Nettles, 1991).

Network R’s mission and objectives identify the need to improve educational outcomes and social skills. The Lighted School House Program incorporated tutorial, and enrichment and recreational opportunities for the community’s residents of all ages.

**Instructional Actions**

The network’s Lighted Schoolhouse Program exposed children, youth and adults to an array of instructional opportunities. Tutoring, computer education, arts and crafts, fine arts, sports and recreational classes and sessions assisted children and youth in their intellectual and social skill development.
The Lighted School House program was in essence an extended school day community based effort. All of Network R’s instructional and social skills programs occurred in this setting. Network R affiliate organization, school and agency members assumed the responsibility for coordinating and conducting these programs.

Empowerment as Involvement

Through Network R interviews, document and archival record reviews, an additional social change process was revealed. Network R is engaged in activities to promote student development through parent and community empowerment. Empowerment activities focus on network strategies geared towards enabling parents and the community to become self sufficient.

E. Parent/Community Empowerment refers to the process of building capacity in students’ families and communities.

Two of the important missions of Network R, as outlined in its bylaws, are to enhance residents’ self reliance and self esteem. Network R activities extended beyond mobilization actions through their efforts to provide residents and providers with some of the means to improve their community and service delivery efforts.

Parent/Community Empowerment Actions

Network R is involved in a variety of activities designed to empower families and the community. Residents are outreached by network members to attend monthly meetings,
join the network and serve on committees. Through the Lighted Schoolhouse Program adults received G.E.D., basic skills, tutoring, computer, parenting, employment and entrepreneurship education. They participated in recreational and arts and crafts programs. Baby sitting services were provided. The political and community speak out forums involved adult residents in civic leadership. Adults received educational, health, social services, economic and parenting information at the annual rallies and fests. The events provide development-wide respite. The network's school-community beautification activities improved community resources (Network R documents and archival records, 1989-1994).

The school-community based organizational structure and programs of Network R, provide resources and opportunities that enable residents and providers to collaborate as school-community improvement leaders. The local elementary principal was a co-Network founder. He and other key school staff members play significant roles in facilitating and hosting network meetings and programs. Network R has not implemented any school staff development initiatives.

Network R - Nettles’ Overview

For six years, Network R has struggled with limited resources to improve the quality of life for students and their families residing in an isolated, chaotic public housing development. The activities of this network corrob-
orate Nettles’ four social change processes, along with a fifth, empowerment. This small school-public housing development-service provider partnership model, serves as a prototype for other school-communities faced with the challenge of improving life options for public housing development students and their families.

The last case study describes a school-community network that encompasses the geographic boundaries of Network R. Network R serves only one of the three public housing developments situated within this larger community area served by Network W. Both Networks R and W serve the area known as the near west side of Chicago, community area 28.

Network W

History

One of the best measures of a community’s overall quality of life is its infant mortality rate, the number of babies who are born alive, but die before their first birthday. The national infant mortality rate exceeded ten deaths per every one thousand births in 1985. This rate ranked the United States in last place among the twenty industrialized nations of the world. Among states, Illinois ranked forty-first with a rate over eleven. Chicago’s rate that year was near seventeen deaths per one thousand births. In Chicago’s inner city communities, babies fared worse than in some impoverished third world underdeveloped countries. On the near west side of Chicago in 1985, babies were dying at a

These alarming national, state and local quality of life indicators, spurred private and public sector responses. In 1985, the city’s corporate community sponsored a press conference to release a university report on a economic study of teenage pregnancy and infant mortality costs. The report estimated that Illinois tax payers spent more than eight hundred and fifty million annually (Reis, 1985).

At that conference, the near west side was highlighted for having the highest rates of teen pregnancy and infant mortality. Individuals attending that meeting with an interest and concern for the community converged. Their discussions led to a series of meetings with other near west side institutional, community and service providers. These collaborative meetings were the roots for Network W. On October 23, 1985, Network W was founded as an organization of health, education, business, community residents, organizations and social service providers (Kotulak, 1985; Network W documents and archival records, 1985).

It was a desperate area that needed a lot of help. Groups of people came together out of a desire to share and combat traditional isolation (network member founding-
The near west side of Chicago is a contrasting community of resources and poverty, hope and hopelessness.

I have a strikingly contrasting view from my office window. When I look to the east, there’s Chicago’s skyline and I see promise and opportunity. When I turn my head to the west, hopelessness and poverty are reflected in the towering public housing buildings (network member-current, 1994).

Network W has as its target population, the residents of three major public housing developments with a total of 6,347 units. The residents are disproportionally young, black, female and poor. In 1990, fifty-two percent of the community lived below the poverty level (Chicago Department of Planning, 1989; Chicago Fact Book Consortium, 1984).

People residing in these three developments are victims of poverty, poorly maintained housing, and high incidences of substance abuse and crime (network member-founding-current, 1993).

The near west side is also home to the nation’s largest medical center and medical school. The state’s urban university’s campus is situated in this community. The medical complex and proximity to the city’s downtown has escalated gentrification, with new and old property sales exceeding six figure sums.

This paradox of abundant resources, especially health, and an extremely high infant mortality rate perplexed and propelled community leaders and providers together. The media and political advocacy action plans of Network W and others to promote awareness and action to reduce infant
morality, resulted in a gubernatorial response. In 1986, the governor launched a state-wide initiative to combat infant mortality. The state’s goal, aligned with the federal goal, was the reduction of infant mortality to nine deaths per one thousand births by 1990. State-wide communities with high rates were invited to submit collaborative proposals to become Infant Mortality Reduction Initiative Programs. (The name was later changed to Families with a Future Programs.) Network W, already a collaborative organization, developed and submitted a proposal with over one hundred linkages of agreement letters attached. The proposal was funded and paved the way for Network W to hire an executive director and staff to support the volunteer board and advisory council in actualizing network goals, objectives and activities (Network W documents and archival records, 1985-1986).

Purpose

The founders of Network W set as their goal the establishment of a community-based service delivery model which would focus all available resources in the near west side community. The network’s primary objective addressed the need to improve maternal and child health outcomes through the development of a comprehensive case management system. The Near West community from 1981 to 1983 was ranked number one in the Chicago Department of Health’s maternal and child care services “need criteria” (Chicago Department of Health,
1985; Chicago Department of Planning, 1989). In addition to the maternal and child health focus, Network W founders identified the following other objectives:

. To evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs currently providing services in Community Area #28.

. To determine the success of a community-based linkage to available services.

. To develop new approaches which provide access for persons in need of a broad array of health and ancillary services to upgrade maternal and child health.

. To evaluate community conditions (housing, education, recreation, social service, employment, health) which can affect maternal and child health on a long-range basis.

. To implement new programs for upgrading the quality of life (Network W documents and archival records, 1985-1986).

The founding members had as a guiding principle that infant mortality was not just a health problem. The reduction of infant mortality was a complex public policy issue that required a comprehensive approach.

From the onset, Network W had a comprehensive strategy to transform the community - a village concept - I’ve done a lot of things here at this center for the community - sports, day care, social services, but my community was going to hell. I wanted to rebuild, transform the community (network member-founding-current, 1993).

Network W founders fashioned the governance and organizational structure to operationalize this approach (see Appendix J, Network W Structure). Network W bylaws call for a community advisory council and an executive board comprised of community public housing leaders, health, education, employment, youth and social services representatives.
Each executive board member chairs a community committee, charged with developing and implementing strategies to reduce the area’s high infant mortality rate.

The original six committees were health, education, employment, social services, housing and parks/gardens/recreation. Currently, there are five communities with health and social services merging and parks/gardens/recreation changed to youth activities. All meetings are public and committee membership is open to residents and providers interested in collaborative community problem solving, focused on the committee’s key issue. Committee information, resources and strategies are presented, debated and acted on at monthly executive advisory board meetings, chaired by an elected president and vice president. Over the past eight years, the board committee members and staff have been instrumental in developing and implementing a broad range of private and public funded programs aimed at improving the overall health of the near west side community.

Network W Activities Overview

For nearly a decade now, Network W has increased near west side services and resources through collaborative advocacy efforts. Community-wide support service access has been enhanced through public housing, school and community based program delivery models. Residents have been afforded leadership, training, employment and recreational activities
and have had access to case management, basic resources, shelter, jobs, social services, education, recreation, health and child care services.

During the executive board's 1992 retreat, discussion was riveted on the community's escalating poverty, drug abuse and violence. The scope of the problems and the sense of urgency led board members to create a spin off organization (Network W documents and archival records, 1985-1994).

The Consortium

In 1993, the Consortium was founded to expedite and coordinate community economic development on the near west side. Consortium members represent Network W, major community institutions and gentrified neighborhood organizations. Foundation and institution funding was secured to involve community residents in a planning phase. An important component of this phase was a series of network committee homecoming, visioning sessions. Held in the spring of 1994, these sessions engaged providers and residents in reflecting, redefining and refocusing Network W committees. The Consortium's objective is to create a coordinated ten year redevelopment plan based on an urban village concept. Network W and Consortium members have been involved in the construction of a eighty-four unit affordable rental apartment building, the first in the community in over fifteen years.
The near west side is a prototype of urban twentieth century communities, buttressed against an economically thriving downtown, rich with multi-institutions and poor with depressed public housing stock. The challenge accepted by the Consortium is to build on the strengths of all entities to transform the community for the twenty-first century (Consortium/Network W documents and archival records, 1985-1994).

Network W's activities and accomplishments have been acknowledged in a public television documentary, news and media releases and awards (Network W documents, archival records and artifacts, 1985-1994).

Education Committee Overview

The network’s comprehensive structure provides a framework and platform for attacking infant mortality on all fronts. Through the years, the Education Committee has been in the forefront as a school-community partnership, composed of multiple stakeholders vested in school and community improvement.

Education Committee Purpose

The committee’s purpose, structure and focus have changed during the network’s eight years of operation. These stages are presented chronologically, along with key committee activity descriptions.


The focus of the committee’s first three years can be best described as health education related. Committee members identified the community’s high adolescent pregnancy rate as a key infant mortality contributor. In 1985, over twenty-seven percent of the area’s births were to school age
Several model programs were designed to achieve the following objectives:

- to involve students in the development and utilization of Network W services.
- to enhance student access to health information and services
- to support the implementation of family life education in near west side schools
- to increase parents' awareness of adolescent sexuality issues and to promote parent-child sexuality communication
- to support parenting students attending the Near West Side's general and vocational high schools (Network W documents, 1985-1988).

**Youth Health Training Program - 1986**

In 1986, the freshman class of the local general high school were involved in extended day school and hospital-based workshop sessions. Network W members presented on topics related to adolescent health, infant mortality, public relations and public speaking skills. A component of the training was a cash award contest to create Network W's motto. The winning motto depicted two hands clasped with the wording, "The West Side's Future, it's in your hands." This motto was placed on buttons, t-shirts and flyers. Students were hired as community outreach workers to canvass their neighborhoods, wearing Network W t-shirts and distributing buttons and program announcement flyers (Network W artifacts).
Students really paid attention. They role played knocking on doors and posing questions about the community’s high infant mortality rate (Network member-founding, 1993).

The student who created the motto was an extremely talented young man. He really captured the mission of Network W (Network member-founding-current, 1993).

Community Family Life Education Training Program (1986-1988)

Through a foundation grant, the network hired a health educator to coordinate a community wide family life education training program. In conjunction with the public school system’s family life education department, a community-based school staff and parent family life education certification program was initiated. Features included staff training, parent workshops, a Network W speaker’s bureau, school based family life education consultation, and instructional materials and resources coordination.

School Based Health Center Advocacy Project (1986-1987)

Network W members played a key role in the selection, design, funding and construction of the city’s third comprehensive, controversial school based health center in the community’s general high school. Strategies included an high school image study, parent, community, student, staff and provider needs assessment canvassing, legislative, board of education and foundation lobbying and proposal development consultation. The health center opened in 1987.

Young Parents Teen Advocate Program (1988-1992)

Through corporate funding, the network hired a teen advocate to provide parenting near west side high school
students with parenting and case management support. Female and male students received individual group and family counseling, community resource service referrals and advocacy training. The constant demand for emergency shelter promoted Network W’s education and housing committees to plan and construct a near west side emergency shelter for mothers and children.

**School Reform Advent (1989)**

With the advent of legislatively mandated school reform, the Chicago Public School System restructured and the education committee focused its attention on school reform training. The network’s original member schools were now a part of a larger district that covered most of the city’s west side. In the wake of change, Network W conducted one of the city’s first community-wide school reform training programs from August through October, 1989.

**School Reform Support Activities (1989-1990)**

The primary activities undertaken by the education committee were to assist the expanded district schools with site based management, school improvement plan and budget development and principal selection and evaluation (Network W documents and archival records, 1985-1990).

Network’s W corporate partner, a consultant organization of retired executives, have been an integral network asset, since its inception. Prior to the founding of Network W, the organization created a special adolescent preg-
nancy and infant mortality project. A conference was convened by the organization in 1984 to address Chicago’s high mortality rate.

As catalysts, organizers, conveners, and consultants, their volunteer services have proved to be invaluable to the ongoing operations and expansion of the network. Representatives serve on the executive board, advisory council and have membership on all Network committees.

Working with the retired executives has been the most positive experience I’ve had with an outside agency. They do what they do because they want to (network member, retired, 1993).

As school-business partners on the network’s education committee, they provide leadership to special programs designed to achieve the following objectives:

- To expose students to the world of work and mentors.
- To promote student leadership and student community service development.
- To provide intensive career counseling to increase high school competition.

**High School Adopt-A-School Program.** The Network W education committee negotiated the adoption of the general high school by a major city bank. The adoption program provided students with cultural enrichment, tutoring, employment and counseling.

**High School Mentoring Program.** Retired executives are recruited and linked with the community’s general high
school students. These mentorship linkages are designed to foster student life skills, academic and career choice options awareness through tutoring, employment and cultural excursions.

Speaker’s Bureau. Coordinates retired executive career cluster presentations to junior high youths attending west side of Chicago schools. Students are exposed to career oriented motivational speakers.

Student Council Support. Provides school training to promote the development and coordination of west side elementary student councils.

Careers for Youth. Exposes students to job readiness and career preparation information. Coordinates school-based career days.

Local School Council Consultation. Works with local school councils and their principals to facilitate local school reform (Network W/Corporate member documents and archival records, 1982-1994).

Education Consortium (1990-1992)

In 1990, members of the network’s education committee entered into a partnership with the local community college, a local ministerial alliance and social service organization. The impetus for the new organization was a foundation’s initiative to fund collaborative grass roots school reform activities on the near west side. From the beginning, the fragile partnership was beset with suspicion,
turf, personality, racial and philosophical conflicts. A series of strained, all day, Saturday meetings resulted in each group developing a community college based school reform program.

    Partnering like parenting-ain't easy (Higher Education/education consortium member, 1993).

Reform Training Institute

    Through foundation support and in collaboration with the Education Consortium, Network W hired an executive director and staff to conduct community college based, local school council training sessions for administrators, staff, parents, and community residents and providers.

    The primary four elementary feeder schools to the near west side's general high school were provided with intensive school-based training and consultation. Principals and their local school councils participated in joint workshops and retreats. Schools developed proposals and received five thousand dollar school improvement grants.

    Between 1989 and 1991 the Education Consortium trained over thirty-one local school councils. In preparation for the 1991 election, the Education Consortium sponsored a variety of activities to promote parent-community member local school council candidacy. Activities included a student poster contest, candidate campaign literature and speech development support. The result was that the west side school district had the most successful parent candidate participation in the city.
The way the Consortium tried to involve the principals and local school councils in different training activities was important. The school reform law was asking untrained people to do some very professional kinds of things. Many of us were not totally prepared for what all school reform involved (Network member-current, 1993).

**Education Consortium-Student Development Component-Saturday and Summer Junior University**

The Reform Training Institute conducted Saturday student enrichment, tutoring and leadership development workshops for near west side elementary and high school students.

Elementary students from the four target schools attended a summer junior university program held at the local college. The program was designed to enhance academic skills and city cultural assets appreciation. Students took courses taught by target school teachers and participated in field trips excursions (Education Consortium/Network W documents and archival records, 1990-1992).


In 1992, the Education Consortium disbanded. Network W's executive board, working with the former director, created a spin off educational organizations to continue school reform support, student tutoring, leadership and enrichment activities and to enhance school-community partnerships. This third activity serves as the School-Community Consortium's cornerstone. Underpinning the School-Community Consortium purpose, goals, structure and activities is
the Communiversity Project concept. This ambitious vision aims at integrating elementary, high school, higher education, government, health, social services and businesses to improve the school and community. The school-consortium’s purpose as defined in the bylaws is as follows:

To create a bold concept in community, family and school empowerment through integrated service partnerships. Using schools as focal points for the redevelopment of communities; our purpose is to create schools as community lifelong learning centers providing education, training and social support for entire families. We know that education cannot occur in isolation and it cannot be focused on academic achievement alone.

School Community Consortium Activities

Three core projects are implemented by this Consortium to achieve its stated goals.

Youth Leadership Project. To stimulate the academic and social development skills of children and youth through academic enrichment and life skills workshop.

Local School Council Leadership Project. To strengthen the leadership in local schools, communities and homes by providing community adults with workshops on legal, fiscal, curriculum and school management.

School-Community Restructuring Project. To link schools and communities with governmental, private and institutional resources through principal professional growth opportunities, teacher staff development and the brokering of school and community-based interagency/organization/business/higher education programs.

Components include the following projects:
Principal's Institute Project. To provide a forum for principal networking, support, training and school-community linkages.

Legislative Advocacy Project. To discuss, draft and lobby for school and community improvement legislation.

Integrated Staff Development Project. To enhance elementary and high school instructional enrichment and alignment.

High School Hands on Physics Project. To improve math and science teaching and learning through school and academy partnering and integrative cooperative learning strategies.

High School Communiversity Life Center. To create a community life center within a general high school for the community-at-large. A full range of interagency, institution and community services are based in the school two full days per week (School-Community Consortium/Network W documents and archival records, 1992-1994).

Nettles' Typology Review - Network W

The many activities engaged in by Network R validated Nettles' social change typology. Empowerment as a fifth process, was also an apparent action undertaken by Network W.

Conversion as Involvement

A. Conversion refers to the process of bringing the students from one belief, or behavioral stance to another (Nettles, 1991).

Network W and its spin off educational organizations
implemented programs geared at impacting community students' health, educational and career pursuits, beliefs, and behaviors.

Conversion Actions

Student Network W/spin-off activities were designed to impact student behavior in the following ways:

. Youth Health Training Program to promote healthy life styles/community service responsibility.

. Community Family Life Program to promote healthy life styles/parent-child communication.

. School Based Health Center to promote healthy life styles/consumer responsibility/school retention.

. Young Parents Teen Advocate Program to promote parenting responsibility/school retention/consumer responsibility.

. High School Adopt-A-School Program to promote school retention/work ethic/higher education aspirations.

. High School Mentoring Program to promote healthy life styles/work ethic/school retention/higher education aspirations.

. Speaker Bureau/Careers for Youth to promote work ethic/school retention/higher education aspirations.

. Student Council Support to promote school-community service responsibility.

. Saturday and Summer Junior University/Youth Leadership Project to promote academic excellence/healthy life styles/school-community service responsibility.

Students in Network W schools were exposed to training, classroom workshops, group sessions, mentoring and motivational speakers. Rallies were not an aspect of Network W's educational programs.
Mobilization as Involvement

B. Mobilization includes actions to increase citizen and organizational participation in the educational process (Nettles, 1991).

Mobilization Actions

Network W is a community organization concerned with involving the community-at-large in community quality of life improvement. The education committee as a crucial component in the school-community improvement process, has engaged in the following mobilization activities:

. Network W development/organizing to involve the community-at-large in the reduction of infant mortality.

. Network W/spinoffs - structures to involve the community-at-large as board, advisory council and committee members.

. Youth Health Training Program - organized youth to inform community-at-large about Network W programs and infant mortality problems.

. School Based Health Center - created and initiated a community wide advocacy plan to support a controversial school-based health center.

. Young Parents Teen Advocate Program - organized young parents to advocate for school-community resources.

. School Reform Support - partnered with the community at large to provide school reform training, support and resources.

. Network W Corporate Partner - initiated and sustained a school-business partnership to enhance the participation of the business sector in education.

. School Reform Parent Candidate Training - outreached, trained and supported parents in their bids for local school council positions.
. Legislative Advocacy - spearheaded local effort to have school-community consortium schools designated as a state learning zone.

. High School Communiversity - mobilized community-at-large to advocate, support and actualize community-wide access to the community’s general high school.

Network W began as a grass roots entity to organize the community to address its acute infant mortality rate. The network’s advisory board, council, committees and programs are all structured to enhance partnerships, citizen participation, community organizing and school-community improvement.

Allocation as Involvement

C. Allocation refers to activities wherein community entities provide resources (such as social support and services) to children and youth (Nettles, 1991).

A crucial objective of Network W was the creation of collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders to access and link available services with the community. Providing resources to the community’s schools was an important aspect of this objective.

Allocation Outcomes

Students involved in Network W/spin-off programs were benefactors of the following resources:

Youth Health Training Program
stipends/t-shirts - buttons

Community Family Life Education
parent-child communication support

School Based Health Center
health education/services
Education Consortium

The feeder elementary schools received five thousand dollar school improvement grants. Funds were used to purchase computers, band uniforms and instruments, a school public announcement system, and to support students participating in an African tour.

The network's grantmanship efforts were primarily responsible for securing resources for the community's children and youth. Health education, health care, support services and career/employment counseling programs were designed to reduce students' access barriers. The network did institute job incentive programs, but did not provide higher education tuition incentives.

Instruction as Involvement

D. Instruction embraces actions designed to assist students in their intellectual development or in learning the rules and values that govern social relationships in the community (Nettles, 1991).

Since the initiation of the network, the involvement and delivery of instructional and support services to the community's students has been an important component of
Network W efforts. A range of programs have been implemented to enhance their intellectual abilities and social skills.

**Instructional Actions**

Instructional activities were provided to students participating in the following Network W/spin-offs programs.

- **Community Family Life Education Training Program**
  - sex education

- **Young Parents Teen Advocate Program**
  - parenting/advocacy education

- **High School Adopt-A-School Program**
  - tutoring/enrichment

- **High School Mentoring Program**
  - tutoring/life skills/enrichment

- **Speakers Bureau/Careers for Youth**
  - career education

- **Student Council Support**
  - leadership/community service education

- **Saturday and Summer Junior University/Youth Leadership Project**
  - academic/tutoring/enrichment/leadership/life skills education

The above instructional and support programs occurred in school and community based settings. Program facilitators included school, agency, organization and business staff. Community members and parents were involved as teachers in the Saturday and Summer Junior University/Youth Leadership Project.

**Empowerment as Involvement**

From its inception, Network W sought to involve all parties in reducing the community’s high infant mortality
rate. The network's structure and spin-offs incorporated parents, community members and educators as vital school-community resources.

E. Parent/Community Empowerment refers to the process of building capacity in students' families and communities.

Network W's activities provided resources, information and opportunities for students' parents, educators and community residents to collaborate on improving their community and its schools.

Parent Empowerment Actions

Community Family Life Education Training Program. Parents were afforded the opportunity to gain information and resources to improve their skills as primary sex educators.

Young Parents Teen Advocate Program. Young parents received parenting and advocacy education to enhance their early parenthood and adulthood transition efforts.

School Reform Support/Reform Training Institute/School Reform Parent Candidate Training/Local School Council Consultation/Local School Council Leadership Project. Parents participate in training sessions and receive consultation designed to enhance their involvement, contributions, leadership and management skills, as potential and actual local school council members.

Community Empowerment Actions. The thrust of Network W/spin-offs is to engage the community in improving the
Community empowerment activities have been integral to the following:

1. Network W/spin-offs structures designed to promote community ownership and capacity.

2. School Reform Support/Reform Training Institute/Local School Council Consultation, Local School Council Leadership Project.

Activities provide community-at-large with information and resources to manage local school control.

**Principal Empowerment Actions**

Principals have been key members of Network W’s education committee and its spin off organizations. They are viewed as crucial school and community leaders. Various Network W programs have been designed and implemented to support principals in their leadership roles. Principals have been afforded ongoing school management, local school council consultative services, professional growth opportunities, materials, resources, school based services and school-community linkages.

**Teacher Empowerment Actions**

F. Teacher Empowerment includes actions to improve the professional skills and growth of students' teachers.

School staff were involved in the following Network W/spin-offs activities:

- **Community Family Life Education Training Program.**

School staff participated in a certificated training program designed to support their delivery of family life education.
School Reform Support/Reform Training Institute/Local School Council Consultation/Local School Council Leadership Project. Teachers participate in training sessions and receive consultation to improve their awareness of local school reform and their leadership skills as potential or current local school council and professional personnel advisory committee members.

Integrated Staff Development Program. School staff are provided with a forum for collegial, professional instructional planning and development.

High School Hands on Physics Project. School staff are linked with science and math specialists and current research and materials to improve classroom instruction and learning.

The preceding parent, community and educator empowerment activities enable the community-at-large to not only mobilize, but to begin to take concerted actions towards improving the quality of the near west side community and its schools.

This chapter profiles the history, purpose, structure and activities of three Chicago west side school-community networks. The three case studies reveal multiple school-community involvement social change processes proposed by Nettles. Network interviews, documents and record reviews also provide supportive evidence of a fifth process.

The individual formation and development of the three
networks provide important school partnership information. Significant also are the similarities, differences, emerging trends and literature comparisons related to these collaborative entities.

The next chapter, chapter four, provides a cross analysis of the three school-community network case studies.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THREE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY NETWORK CASE STUDIES

Introduction - Analysis Overview

The preceding chapter presents three individual case studies on the history, purpose, structure and activities of the three Chicago school-community networks. This chapter analyzes those individual case studies as multi-site cases. The case study protocol referenced in chapter one, served as a guide for framing, selecting, collecting, analyzing and presenting both individual and cross network case study data.

What follows in this chapter is a cross network analysis of similarities, differences, emerging trends and literature comparisons attributed to the following eight key network case study areas and thirty-nine related components:

- Origin of the Networks
- Purpose of the Networks
- Structure of the Networks
- Members of the Networks
- The Process of Networking
- School Improvement Programs of the Network
- Community Improvement Programs of the Network
- Activities of the Networks
Origins of the Networks

Overview

The following section presents a cross analysis of the network study area, origin of the networks, and its three components: time, founding impetus and members.

Similarities

All three networks met this study's selection criterion, number five, of being founded prior to the October 1989 enactment of the Chicago School Reform legislation. All three networks were created voluntarily, without governmental mandates in accordance with this study's fourth selection criterion. Educators were founding members of all three networks. They were a high school and elementary school principal and a central office administrator. All three networks were founded by a few individuals concerned with addressing what they deemed to be a serious community problem.

Differences

The three networks have different founding dates. Network O was founded June 1989, Network R in September 1988 and Network W on October 23, 1985. The impetus for each of the networks differed. Network O was rooted in high school failure and drop out rates. Network R was founded as a result of excessive community gang violence and Network W was initiated to reduce the community's abnormally high infant mortality rate.
Founding members represented education, business, health, social service and recreation spheres. Network O was spearheaded by a high school principal and a administrator. Network W's impetus came from two retired business executives and four community service providers. One each in the fields of education, health, recreation and social services.

**Emerging Trends**

Networks appear to be long term entities lasting over five years. Networks are being initiated voluntarily with varied impetus issues. Educators play significant roles as network founders.

**Literature Comparisons**

Networks founders vary in their affiliations. They are visionaries who seek out partners to actualize their visions. In articulating their visions, founders must establish and build inclusive relationships built on equality, trust and mutual respect (Robinson & Matsny, 1989).

The timing and general impetus of this study's three networks, corresponds with the national school reform partnership movement of the 1980's (Bucy, 1990).

During this period, multiple partnerships were founded in urban inner city communities in response to the growing awareness of at-risk children, families and communities, the political climate and the perceived failure of schools (Decker & Deceker, 1988; Wehlage, 1989).
This growing awareness was further heightened with the reality that these at-risk factors and school failure were extremely complex, interrelated and costly to address (Center for Economic Development, 1987). Networks were founded on the premise that no one entity could effectively resolve these societal ills (Education Commission of the States, 1993; Hodgkinson, et al., 1991; Liontis, 1992).

The following seven leadership challenges were faced by founding members as they struggled to achieve their school-community improvement visions:

- governing community collaboratives
- defining roles
- modeling and promoting collaboration at their own work site
- building collective ownership and responsibility
- networking for systemic changes and resolving
- managing and resolving conflict
- developing collaborative leaders

(Institute for Educational Leadership, 1992).

Purpose of the Networks

Overview

The network study area, purpose of the networks, is cross analyzed in this next section in accordance with its three components: focus, community problem and purpose statements.
Similarities

In accordance with this study's second selection criterion, all three networks identify dual purposes of school and community improvement. The founders of all three networks recognized the interrelationship between the school and its community and the need for a dual focus to improve both. All three networks identified reducing a key community problems as an objective. All three networks formulated bylaws. The three networks incorporated some of the following in their individual bylaws; purposes, missions, guiding principles, goals and objectives. All three networks stated their purposes, goals and objectives. Common threads in the goals and objectives of all three networks are improving the quality of community life, school improvement and connecting resources to the school-community.

Differences

Two of the networks created spin-off organizations to specifically address community improvement. Each of the networks grappled with reducing a different problem. Network O sought to reduce drop out rates. Network R struggled with gang violence and Network W wrestled with infant mortality rates.

One network had a mission statement and two had guiding principles outlined in their bylaws. Each of the networks formulated intents specific to their community problem focus. Network O focused on school improvement and sought
to provide the structure and process necessary for schools to take a community-wide approach to educational improvement, and to make a comprehensive assault on the multitude of urban conditions endangering inner city students. Network R, beset with community violence, addressed improving the community's quality of life, residents' self esteem and self reliance and providing educational and support service opportunities.

Network W focused on improving maternal and child health outcomes, through a comprehensive coordinated community-wide case management system. Network W created a motto as a result of a student contest. This motto is displayed on T-shirts, buttons, flyers and other network print materials.

Emerging Trends

Networks are creating spin-off organizations. There is a belief that school and community improvement are massive undertakings, requiring separate concentrated attention. Networks are responding to a multitude of problems related to their key community network impetus problem. They are attempting to provide comprehensive services to address these problems.

Networks have formalized and formally documented their purpose, missions, guiding principles, goals and objectives. These intentions serve as frameworks and underpinnings for the network's philosophy and actions.
One networks' motto development has enhanced its visibility. Networks are using multiple mediums to engage the school-community.

Literature Comparisons

All three of the networks in this case study had the dual purposes of school-community improvement. The interrelationship between schools and the quality of community life, has been a common theme since the release of the report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for School Reform*. This report and the many that followed, called for community partnerships to improve schools. These reports highlighted the blighted conditions of inner city communities and the ineffectiveness of their primary service providers; schools (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1988; Lunenburg, 1992; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

The mutual purpose focus of school-community networks enhances collaborations. Members have similar missions and compatible goals (Intriligator, 1986). In addition to their dual school-community improvement purposes, networks inform their constituencies, inspire others to collaborate, stimulate the implementation of systemic change, ensure the institutionalization of system changes and programs, foster ongoing communication and leverage business and community resources (Serritella, unpublished).
Structure of the Networks

Overview

In this section, the network study area of structure is cross analyzed in relation to its six components: governance, committees, types, coordination, funding, and structural design.

Similarities

All three networks outlined their governance structure in their bylaws. All three have elected executive officials. All three networks identified committees as integral network components. They are cited as being instrumental in planning and overseeing network efforts. All three networks are voluntary in accordance with this study’s fourth selection criteria. Each of the networks identified the need for staff. Each of the networks engage in grantsmanship and fundraising. All three networks are affixed to a particular area and its schools. The three networks all serve west side school in accordance with this study’s third selection criterion. All three networks function as infrastructures to connect resources to their schools and communities.

Differences

The three networks differed in their governance structures. Network O is composed of an executive committee of principals with two as co-chairs. Business, higher education and support service providers are partners. Network R has an elected president, first and second vice presidents,
a secretary and a treasurer. Offices are held by representatives from all spheres. Network W has an executive board that consists of the chairs of each advisory committee. Each elected advisory committee chair serves as an executive board member, along with the elected leadership of the community’s three public housing developments. A president and vice president are elected from the executive board.

Networks R and W have community residents in executive positions. Network W’s committees constitute integral components for sustaining the network’s community input and involvement. Network R and O’s committees respond to a particular network effort.

Two of the networks identified the need for separate entities to directly address key network issues. They both launched voluntary, not for profit, spin-off networks. Issues addressed in these four networks are fine arts and community development for Network O and school-partnerships and community economic development in Network W.

Network O is provided coordination services through its corporate partner. Public school and housing staff provide inkind coordination and Network W has the coordination support of retired executives and an executive director.

Two networks have (5013 C) not for profit status and the third has applied for it. Network O is primarily supported by its corporate sponsor. Network W receives public and private grants and funds and Network R receives inkind
contributions.

The structural design of the networks varied. Network O is a wheel structure, with the local high school as the hub and the twelve feeder elementary schools as spokes. Network R is fashioned around a local elementary school and its surrounding public housing development. Network W is a component part within a comprehensive sphere, encircling one community and its schools.

Two of the three networks serve the same community. Two of the three serve a specific portion of a larger community and one serves an entire community.

Emerging Trends

The executive members of core networks are also serving in leadership positions on the spin-off networks. Due to their important functions, committees similar to Network W's are emerging as spin-off networks. Networks are exploring strategies to expand their funding sources and opportunities. Networks are seeking staff to assist in the day to day coordination of network activities. Retired volunteers and student interns are also being sought to assist with network coordination. Spin-off networks provide a unique opportunity to seek and manage funds geared specifically to targeted community issues. The spin-off networks are expanding the design of networks. These spin-offs appear like satellites linked to the core original network.
Literature Comparisons

Networks are structured as brokers to improve communities and their schools. They provide the governance, leadership and coordination of resources, information and services to reduce problems in a designated geographic area. (Melaville & Blank, 1991; Robinson & Matsny, 1989).

Networks act as connective infrastructure that enable schools, businesses, service providers, community organizations, residents and parents to plan at a common table, communicate and maximize school and community improvement efforts (Bucy, 1990; Linquanti, 1992).

Networks utilize schools as their bases for expanding programs. Schools as community hubs/centers support the structural base and dual purpose of networks (Davies et al., 1992; Jehl & Kirst, 1993; National Governors' Association, 1986).

Networks manage these interagency/one-stop organizational efforts in conjunction with school principals (Carnegie Corporation of New York and Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1992; Guthrie et al., 1993; Kirst & McLaughlin, 1990).

Network members benefit from the shared opportunity to address their mutual concerns about a common population at a common neutral site (Pollard, 1990, 1990, 1990).
Members of the Networks

Overview

This next section cross analyzes the network study area, members of the networks, and its components: founding, recruitment, affiliations, and member turnover.

Similarities

Each of the networks had a few founding members who represented various spheres. Founding members retention was found to be high in all three networks. All three networks engage in ongoing efforts to outreach community partners and focus on inclusion. Founding members of all three networks recruited network members. All three of the networks were composed of multiple stakeholders in compliance with this study’s first selection criterion. Former members reported leaving their networks due to retirement or job changes.

Differences

The principal co-founder of Network O has retired, but the corporate co-founder is still an active network member after five years. Network R has been in existence for six years now. Both of the founding members have retired. Network W, the oldest, with an eight year history is still fortunate to have its founding retired business consultants, the education, social services and recreation providers. The health provider changed jobs. Network’s R and W have local community leaders on their executive boards. Founding members reported special efforts to outreach and sustain
this group’s involvement.

Network membership rosters identified members with a host of affiliations. These include the following:

- elementary/secondary public schools
- public/private higher education
- social services
- health providers
- business/corporate sector
- religious
- community residents/parents
- public/government services
- youth recreational services
- volunteers/retirees
- community organizations
- grass roots organizations

Some of the members had multiple affiliations. Ministerial representation was evident on two on the networks.

Founding members in Networks 0 and R were replaced by the individuals who assumed their jobs. Former members were sometimes replaced by those who assumed their jobs or another individual in their affiliation sphere.

Emerging Trends

As network age, they lose the wisdom and experiences of founding members due to retirement. Networks are enhancing their outreach and recruitment techniques in an effort to broaden their bases and involve all stakeholders. In view
of escalating school/student problems, more service providers are being outreached as network partners. They represent private and public, traditional and non-traditional and community and city based services. The emerging school to work trend has reenergized and expanded business/corporate network involvement. Corporations/businesses and service providers are assigning staff to serve on networks to secure their ongoing school-community connections.

**Literature Comparisons**

School-community networks nationally are composed of a broad base of stakeholders, representing education, business/corporations, higher education, public and private service providers, community organizations, volunteers, parents and community residents (Ascher, 1988; Bucy, 1990; Davies, 1992; Pankake, 1991).

This broad based mix of diverse groups each assumed basic roles as network partners. Elementary and secondary school staff tend to have key roles in facilitating networks. They are perceived as critical links (Clark, 1991; Robinson & Matsny, 1989).

Business and corporate representatives provide schools with support to strengthen the curriculum, connect the worlds of school and work and promote future career awareness (Byrne et al., 1992; Rigdin, 1994).

Private and public service providers coordinate and delivery health, social services, recreational and enrich-
ment services to students and their families (Fruchter, 1987; Stone, 1993).

Members representing higher education work primarily with school staff to improve academic outcomes (Pine & Keane, 1989; Zykowski & Mitchell, 1990).

The need for broad based membership, inclusive of all stakeholders, especially parents and community members is a critical network issue. The perception of the exclusion of parents and community and residents as a finding of the national New Future Initiatives study, posed a serious collaboration impediment. Their "community collaboratives" were viewed as only representing the power elite (Wehlage et al., 1989). Networks need to share power, responsibility and leadership with parents and community residents.

The Process of Networking

Overview

The following section presents a cross analysis of the network study area, the process of networking and its components: meetings, locale, networking strategies, networking benefits, and networking barriers.

Similarities

All three networks have planned monthly meetings facilitated by their elected officers. Agendas, minutes and correspondences provide direction and documentation. The meetings of all three networks incorporated activity planning, professional growth and school-community information
and resource sharing. All three networks host annual meet-
ings that celebrate and promote community-wide network
awareness and involvement. All three networks hold their
meetings within the communities they serve. Interviews and
documents revealed all three networks engage in consensus
and team building, community surveying and committee plan-
ing. Members of all three networks discussed the extensive
amount of time they invested in network meetings and activi-
ties. Members of the networks reported the following in-
volvement benefits:

- information
- collegial relationships
- resources
- opportunities for schools, students, providers,
  businesses and the community

Interviews with network members and reviews of meeting
minutes and agendas, revealed issues related to time, trust,
communication, turf, personality, race, gender and philoso-
phy.

Differences

Two of the networks have open monthly meetings. One
network's monthly meetings are sometimes closed. In addi-
tion to the monthly meetings, Network R has hosted community
speak-out forums. Network W conducts monthly committee
meetings open to the community at large. These committee
meetings focus on improvement of a specific network issue.
Network O hosts meetings that include network partners and parents. Two of the networks traditionally hold their meetings in a local school. One holds meetings in different community settings. The three networks used different means to gather school-community input. Networks O and W used school-community audits and needs assessments. Network R used surveys, speak out forums, an image study, focus groups, retreats and homecoming/visioning sessions. Each of the networks managed their networking in different ways. Network O relied on the coordinating and brokering of the corporate sponsor. Network R was dependent on network members volunteerism and inkind contributions. Network W used retired business consultants, program staff and the volunteerism and inkind contributions of network members.

Network O has as its core, twelve elementary and one high school principal. This common affiliation has reportedly created personal and professional collegial benefits. Members report being able to call on each other for information, resources, support, mentoring and crisis intervention. Network W has had the longest relationship together. Members reflected and joked about their many shared positive and negative experiences. The principals of Network O cited the multiple resources from their corporate partner as a substantial benefit. Members of various networks identified their network membership as an invaluable learning experience that enhanced their overall job performance.
Members of various networks identified time as the biggest impediment to their network involvement. Principals in particular, spoke of being torn between network involvement and overwhelming school responsibilities.

Networks R and W identified the lack of funds and sustained parent and community resident involvement as significant barriers. Several former and current female members of one network perceived their gender as a barrier to networking. They reported feeling isolated from network male leadership and excluded from network decision making. Members of two network identified their suspicions regarding the real school-community involvement intentions of their corporate/business representatives.

Emerging Trends

The networks have designated an historian to maintain their by-laws, meeting agendas, minutes, correspondences and other documents. The networks make an effort to make meetings and activities community accessible. For two networks, the school is still deemed the most community accessible site. Networks use multiple means to gather community input. Involvement on networks is a time consuming endeavor. Networks use staff and consultants to manage some of their networking and addition to their members volunteering. Networks provide members with numerous rewards that sustain their involvement. Members perceive the opportunity to volunteer, improve the school-community and engage in colle-
gial relationships as positive networking benefits. Time, lack of full parent and community resident involvement, funds and gender were identified as the key barriers. Networks appear to not be developing strategies to address these barriers.

Literature Comparisons

The actions of this study’s networks incorporated collaboration processes. The collaboration process is defined by shared decision making. Intriligator posits that partnerships work only when the partners have the will and ability to collaborate. To be successful, collaboratives must have mutual needs and an understanding of the collaborative purpose and focus (Intriligator, 1986).

There are multiple impediments that restrict the success of partnerships. Barriers include the following:

- competitiveness
- dominating rather that sharing leadership
- discouraging group decision making
- being inflexible in scheduling meetings and activities
- lacking understanding about how schools, business, community agencies operate
- hidden agendas
- cynicism about the advantages of sharing information
- value differences
role pressures
perceptual differences
turf
time
trust
divergent goals
status threats
personality clash
lack of resources
change
communication barriers
regulations
need for consensus
dependence on one person/agency/organization institution for agreement

(Committee for Economic Development, 1982; McLaughlin & Covert, 1984; Robinson & Matsny, 1989).

In spite of these multiple barriers, collaboratives can be beneficial. Benefits have been identified by Otterbourg as followed:

Students' learning horizons are expanded, particularly in their awareness of the worlds of work, science, technology, and the arts as well as in their awareness of the relationship of school work to employment.

Students learn that adults care, develop increased
self-confidence, and receive important encouragement to stay in school, seek training after high school, and secure employment after graduation.

Teachers and staff perceive increased "caring" in people and organizations outside the schools, and increased communication and trust between education and the private sector.

Opportunities arise to access previously unknown but available resources from the private sector and community organizations.

Businesses are portrayed in a more favorable light, and the publicity they receive reinforces corporate and organizational efforts in the area of community relations, particularly community service.

As awareness of educational problems increases, businesses gain a greater appreciation of schools' strengths and weaknesses and in some cases, experience the satisfaction of successfully addressing problems through combined efforts.

The morale of company personnel at all levels of management and operations goes up.

Summer work forces often develop, providing opportunities for pre-training experiences for employment after high school.

Community members' awareness increases, especially
concerning the needs of schools and, more specifically, concerning the support and community resources available and necessary to help meet those needs.

A spirit of cooperation and involvement grows at a time when many citizens might feel alienated from the public schools.

Parents' involvement in and positive attitudes toward public education increase as the see their children benefiting from partnership programs.

The communications gap that often exists between parents and students and business and civic representatives narrows through their mutual concern and support for public education.

Many parents are served directly by adjunct partnership activities, such as health screening clinics (Otterbourg, 1986).

**School Improvement Programs of the Networks**

**Overview**

This section cross analyzes the network study area of school improvement programs and its five related components: student support, school staff development/professional growth, parent involvement, school-business, and school reform/restructuring.

**Similarities**

All three network instituted, Lighted School
Houses/extended day family support programs. All three provided students with tutoring, health and social services, arts and crafts, recreation and enrichment. All three networks involved school principals in leadership development experiences. All three networks provided parents with meeting participation, network membership, leadership opportunities and services. All three networks had businesses/corporation representatives. Through their networking efforts, each of the networks were able to institute job readiness programs. All three networks initiated programs geared at restructuring their schools.

Differences

Network O initiated a host of school based programs through interagency partnerships. These programs addressed safety, arts, drop-out prevention, adolescent parenthood, academics, social and health services, sports, higher education articulation, mentoring, peer support and jobs. Their community based programs provided student safety, recreation and non traditional education, along with the school-based extended day Lighted School House programs. Real and potential drop-outs received academic course credit in this network's Lighted School House Program. Networks R and W provided student support through their extended day Lighted School House Programs. Students in Network R's program had the opportunity to take classes in visual arts, music, dance and drama. Network O supported student drug/gang prevention
through an annual parade. Network R did the same through an annual Fest. Network W instituted Saturday and Summer programs to provide youth with academics, enrichment, leadership development and recreational support. Network W provides adolescent parents with school and public housing based case management services.

Network W provided school staff with community based sex education training. Staff received materials, access to a speakers' bureau, certification and consultation. Network W teachers participate in university and math/science academy integrated and physics staff development programs. Network O provides teachers with multiple content area staff development, linkages to city cultural resources and mini-grants. The network's university partner coordinates staff development activities.

Network O involves parents through safety patrols, safety coordination meetings, parent skill building training and school based parent resource centers. Their university partner coordinates the training and resource centers. Parents receive mini-grants for resource center activities. Network W has been involved in recruiting, training and providing ongoing local school council consultation to parents. Network W conducted parent sex education workshops to train parents on adolescent sexuality issues. Network O initiated home and community based early childhood education programs.
The business/corporate partner of Network O aided in implementing school-based programs that provide students with tutoring, math education, literacy skills and corporate donations. Network W's business/corporate partners coordinated school-based adopt-a-school, mentorship, speakers' bureau, student council leadership training and career awareness education programs.

Network W provides community based reform training for real and potential local school council and professionals personnel advisory council members. School based consultation is also provided to principals and local school council members. Four core Network W local school councils received $5,000 school-community improvement grants. Network W created a separate school partnership spin off network.

Emerging Trends

Schools are becoming used and viewed as community centers. Networks are providing activities to improve principal and teacher skills. Networks are outreaching, engaging and empowering parents as leaders and teachers. Businesses and corporations provide students with multiple support programs. Networks are involved in reforming and restructuring their community schools.

Literature Comparisons

Partnerships constitute a unique opportunity to create new school-community connections that restructure, roles, relationships and resources (Pallas, 1989; Pankake, 1991;
Restructuring strategies inherent in educational partnerships include staff development, parent involvement and early childhood education. These three strategies are important school improvement components in urban inner city schools (Davies, 1992; Oakes, 1987).

A superficial curriculum was identified as a factor in high school drop-out for at-risk youth (Wehlage et al, 1989). The involvement of higher education partners on networks, broadens curriculum and instruction innovation opportunities. Networks create a forum for capitalizing on the skills of school staff, business and higher education to improve teaching and learning. In successful partnerships, members share professional resources and services, engage in professional collegiality and training, focus on school improvement goals and have public support (Zykowski & Mitchell, 1990).

In addition to higher education members, networks are outreaching telecommunication partners to improve schools’ access to and use of technology. New educational tools include interactive television, interactive video, computer networking and satellites (President and Fellows of Harvard College, 1985; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1991).

Parent involvement is an important aspect of school improvement. Effective partnerships between the home and
school have been proven to enhance school achievement. (Barton & Coley, 1992; Erbe, 1991; Ziegler, 1987). The need for the two most significant adults in a students' life to have a positive relationship, underscores the need for parent-teacher partnerships (Swick, 1991). Parents not only need to be involved in schools as tutors, volunteers and paraprofessionals, but empowered to assume leadership roles (Davies, 1989; Epstein, 1992).

Research has documented the need for at risk students to have early intervention and prevention services prior to attending school. A strategy to reduce school failure and drop out, has been to enhance school readiness for at-risk preschoolers (Hodgkinson, et al., 1991; Oakes, 1987). A variety of comprehensive services, delivered at school-to-home and in the community are recommended to reduce early at-risk factors (Johnson, 1994; Slavin et al., 1993; Swap, 1993).

Community Improvement Programs of the Networks Overview

In this section, the network study area of community improvement is cross analyzed in relation to its components of community support, community involvement, school-community safety, and beautification.

Similarities

The Lighted School House programs provide the community-at-large with a community center. Programs are available
for all ages. All three programs incorporated health and social services, recreation, enrichment, arts and crafts, parenting and adult education and employment readiness training. All three networks provide meetings, services, and network membership and leadership opportunities for the community-at-large. All three access and link city and community resources to their schools and community. Various strategies to get input and feedback from the community are utilized by all three networks. All three networks structure their Lighted School Houses as safe havens for multiple positive leisure time activities. All three networks sought means to improve school-community environmental and facility conditions.

Differences

Through the Lighted School Houses of Networks R and W, parents were afforded child care. Network R provided forums for community issues and political information. Networks O and R supported the community's reduction of youth gang and drug involvement through annual parades and festivals. Network W provides Saturday and summer youth programs. Network O advocated for a local youth center and elementary school-based health center. Network W advocated for a high school based health center. Both Networks O and W created separate community improvement networks.

To enhance community wide involvement, Network O hosts an annual arts festival and parade and Network R hosts an
annual youth festival. Network W has involved the community in advocating for school reform and learning zone legislation. Networks O and W have community improvement spin offs created to increase community wide participation. Network W has involved the community in federal empowerment zone and enterprise community funding access.

Network O instituted a parent safety patrol program that includes training, meetings with law enforcement officials, safe haven houses and gang prevention workshops. Network R constructed a student designed playground to reduce community violence. Network O and R both conduct annual events geared at violence prevention. To improve their community's appearance, Network O instituted school and community based arts programs and Network R planted trees and constructed a new playground. Network W provided school-community improvement grants. Network O created a special community arts spin-off network.

Emerging Trends

Networks are creating spin-off organizations to improve and concentrate on addressing an array of community issues. Health care and early childhood education are critical issues. Networks are employing strategies to obtain input from and provide feedback and information to the entire school-community. Networks are partnering with law enforcement representatives to address community violence. Networks are partnering with government, horticulture, fine
arts, architectural and construction representatives to improve the physical appearance of their school-communities.

**Literature Comparisons**

Community collaboration is viewed as an effective means of empowering at-risk students, their families and communities. Networks as multi-sector collaboratives, provide a mechanism to sustain broad based community involvement, resources and change (Decker et al., 1990; Education Commission of the States, 1988; Himmelman, 1990).

Networks view every member of the community, along with its schools as valuable community improvement assets (Kretzmann, 1992; McKnight & Kretzmann, unpublished no date). The philosophy that frames community partnerships is that every adult member in the community is vested in and contributes to the improvement of the community and opportunities for its youth (Nettles, 1991; Odom, 1984; U.S. Department of Education, 1991; Wehlage, 1989).

Community partnerships are viewed on the national level as important catalyst for community revitalization. These partnerships can provide the social (human) capital needed to support community transformation (Prager, 1993).

The harnessing and coordinating of individuals within a community to rebuild their community, frames the federal Empowerment Zone Enterprise Community Initiative. Networks in at-risk designated areas will be provided economic incentives to transform their communities (U.S. Department of

**Activities of the Networks**

**Overview**

This next section cross analyzes the network study area, activities of the networks, and its nine components: range, location, target population, Nettles’ typology, conversion, mobilization, allocation, instruction, and empowerment.

**Similarities**

All three networks instituted multiple programs, projects, service and events. The settings for network activities were primarily in local community schools or organizations. The three networks geared activities towards all ages, from infants to senior citizens. Their primary targets were students and their parents. All three networks engaged in varied activities that did correspond with Nettles’ four social change processes: conversion, mobilization, allocation and instruction. Evidence from network member interviews, documents and archival records verify her conception of community involvement activities with schools as a typology of these four change processes. All three networks also demonstrated evidence of a fifth process, empowerment. Each of the networks designed programs to change student behavior. Integral to all three networks is a focus on promoting healthy life styles, education and work
ethics in students. All three networks engaged in actions to increase citizen and organization participation in the educational process. Network and committee meetings, community surveying, school reform partnerships and the Lighted School House Programs were network vehicles designed to involve the school-community. The primary resource provided by each network is human resources. Members' expertise and energy investments created and sustained the networks. All three sought support, outside funding and resources to enhance their school-community improvement efforts. All three provided health and social services. All three networks identified the need to address multiple student dimensions. Common to the three networks is the provision of tutoring, enrichment and student counseling services. Tutorial services were components of all three Lighted School House Programs.

Through the information obtained, an additional change process, empowerment was identified. This process appears to be the next phase of mobilization. Nettles defines mobilization as actions to increase citizen and organization participation in the education process. These actions include citizen participation, neighborhood organizing, partnerships for school reform and improvement, legal action and social movements. The targets of these involvements are institutions, political jurisdictions and geographic areas (Nettles, 1991). School-community networks are targeted at
involving schools as institutions within a specific community/area. Yet, once a network or organization is organized and citizens are involved as members, actions must be taken to sustain and enhance that involvement. All three networks involve parents, residents and school staff in empowering activities to improve their abilities, authority, means and opportunities to act.

Differences

The range of network activities varied. Network R focused on two key activities; the Lighted School House and Annual Fest. Networks O and W each sponsored multiple key activities. Networks provided services in settings beyond the local schools and organizations. Network O sponsored a street based safety program, a home based parenting program and a university based staff development program. Network W conducted programs based in the three local public housing developments. Network R provided school and community-wide activities. Network R instituted senior citizen activities in their Lighted School House. Network's O and W initiated both home, school and community organization based early childhood programs. Networks O and W conducted staff development programs for teachers. In allocating resources, none of the three networks provided students with post graduate jobs or higher education incentives. These incentives were identified by Nettles' as allocation actions (Nettles, 1991). Networks O and R utilized annual parades, rallies
and fests as vehicles to dispense multiple messages to youth, geared towards positive life style changes. Networks 0 and W initiated student mentorship programs. The networks incorporated various mobilization strategies. Network W sponsors ongoing school reform and restructuring training and consultation. Network's 0 and R host monthly school based meetings. All three networks varied in their choice of techniques to acquire school-community input. The resources available to each network differed. Network R lacked fiscal resources and is currently applying for not for profit status. The corporate connections of Network 0's co-founder are instrumental in their access to multiple services and resources. Network W's grantsmanship efforts enhance their ability to fund staff and programs. The spin off networks afforded the school-community with access to additional resources Networks 0 and W did provide after school and summer job incentives. Network 0 students received both regular and extended school day academic and social skills development. Activities occurred both at school and community settings. Networks R and W provided extended school day instructional and social skills development only. Network W did provide summer and Saturday activities. Networks O and R used school business and agency representatives to conduct activities. Network W used all the above in addition to parents and community residents. Networks varied in their provision of empowerment activi-
ties. Networks O and W provided principals with leadership and professional development. Parents in Networks O and W received training as teachers, school reformers and safety patrollers. Networks R and W provided community residents with leadership experiences. The spin off community improvement networks enhanced community residents' community improvement and school partnership involvement.

Emerging Trends

The scope of activities provided by core networks is narrowing. Spin off networks are planning, implementing, and assessing activities related to their specific community issue focus. Lighted School House programs are being incorporated after school in the Chicago Public Schools system, with community service provider linkages. This city's spiraling drug trade, gang violence, decreasing age of victims and perpetrators and burgeoning prison industry, cries out for network initiatives focused on the young black male. This endangered group tends to be neglected in community service delivery programs. The high drop-out rates and increased pressures to graduate students prepared for the workplace or higher education, are serving as a catalyst for networks to become more involved with school to work, welfare to work and college bound activities.

In the wake of rising children and youth violence, there is a need to teach character and values education. Networks are beginning to design these conversion activities
for children and youth. Two of the networks are involved in the provision of parent and staff school improvement training. One network has conducted school reform training since the advent of the Chicago School Reform Act. There has been limited organized local school council training originating from the school system. This limited training has been linked to some of the current problems some local school councils are experiencing. Networks are increasing their provision of community based school reform and restructuring training. Networks are competing for resources to improve their individual schools and communities. The content and delivery of academic instruction is being aided by staff development programs underway in Networks O and W. Network O has aligned its parent education program to expand the classroom into the home. Student and peer leadership models have been initiated by Network's O and W as a means of improving students' academic, social and leadership skills. Networks are trying more innovative instructional approaches.

Networks are exposing parents to teaching skills. Network principals are mentoring new network principal members. Teachers involved in network staff development programs are training other teachers. Parents, community residents and school staff trained in school reform are training others. Network members are empowering other.
Networks nationally implement activities to address the full range of issues confronting at-risk students, their families, educators and neighbors. These include the following:

- identification and prevention of social problems and needs
- adolescent growth and development
- parent involvement/advocacy
- adolescent sexuality
- child abuse/neglect
- health/nutrition
- social services
- early childhood
- social skills development
- enrichment
- recreation
- employment readiness
- drug and substance abuse
- violence/juvenile justice


The National School Board Association identified ten wholistic strategies needed to effectively respond to at-risk conditions. The networks in this study initiated all of the ten following strategies:
focus on children
_ collaboration
_ parent and adult volunteers
_ parent education
_ school/curriculum renewal
_ assisting immigrants with assimilation
_ equity ensurance
_ early childhood/child care
_ quality education for minorities
_ funding


One of the critical missing supportive activities was the absence of post high school graduation job incentives. This void has been attributed to school drop out (Wehlage et al., 1989).

The need for access to quality health care has also been noted in the literature. Networks across the country have been involved in providing this vital at-risk student and family support service, through school and community based health care initiatives (Dryfoos, 1988; National Governors’ Association, 1982; National Health Education Consortium, 1990).

This chapter’s analysis of the three school-community networks, provides an overview into their similarities, differences, emerging trends and literature comparisons.
Chapter five presents network future implications and recommendations.
CHAPTER V

FUTURE IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The intent of this study, School-Community Networks: Three Partnership Case Studies, was to provide insights into entities known as school-community networks. A qualitative case study approach was used to explore and describe three Chicago school-community networks; Networks O, R and W. This study was structured and guided by a case study protocol. General research strategies utilized to investigate the networks' history, purpose, structure and activities were as followed:

- historical overview of the 1980's school reform partnership movement literature
- in-depth personal interviews and questionnaire inquires with past and current network members
- collection and review of network documentary and archival evidences

The conceptual framework used for describing and classifying network student development activities was derived from Saundra Nettles' (1991) social change typology. Her typology identifies conversion, mobilization, allocation and instruction as the four social change processes characteris-
tic of school-community involvement. School-community networks constitute school-community involvement partnerships. This chapter discusses future network implications and recommendations related to this study's following eight key network areas and thirty-nine related components.

- Origin of the Networks
- Purpose of the Networks
- Structure of the Networks
- Members of the Networks
- The Process of Networking
- School Improvement Programs of the Networks
- Community Improvement Programs of the Networks
- Activities of the Networks

Future Implications

Interviews with members of the three networks and reviews of their documents, archival records and artifacts revealed a wealth of information about school-community networking. This chapter highlights some of those implications in accordance with this study's key network areas and related components.

Origin of the Networks

The longevity experienced by networks could result in them becoming institutions. As public and private funders require evidence of collaboration, more networks could be created in response to this requirement. As networks increase empowerment activities, parents, community residents
and school staff could assume more of a leadership role as network founders.

Purpose of the Networks

Due to the trend towards spin-offs, additional spin-offs could be created to focus specifically on a single community problem. These spin-offs could still be under the umbrella of the original core network. Spin-offs focused on a specific community problem could be created in communities across the city. These specific community problems spin-offs could become city-wide coalitions. Spin-offs could have singular purposes. Their missions, goals and objectives will be narrower and closely aligned with other related spin-offs across the city. The overall improvement of the school-community could remain a primary mission of the umbrella core networks.

Structure of the Networks

The governance responsibilities related to core and spin-off networks could eventually require networks to hire executive directors and staff. Networks in the future could move towards institutionalization. Committees as community forums or spin-offs could require separate staffing to facilitate their management. Networks could include both voluntary and mandated, both not-for-profit and for profit types, to address networks' grass roots funding needs. Networks could struggle with balancing their community and mandated alliances. The expanded scope of networks could
require enhanced networking grantsmanship and fund raising skills. Training and staffing needs will be escalated. Network members could be more involved in responding to proposals and grants and grantsmanship training. Networks could explore economic enterprise opportunities. Network structures could appear as core networks with satellite spin-offs, as they expand in scope and size. These structures could still be contained within a specific community.

Members of the Networks

Retired founding members could serve significant roles as retired volunteers and consultants. Their network experiences are invaluable. Continued empowerment activities could enhance the involvement of community residents and parents. Networks could become even more broader based. Businesses and corporations could continue to have a visible role in school and community improvement to enhance the work force and economy. The media, telecommunications and religious representatives could become more active and visible on networks. Higher education partnerships could escalate to enhance teaching and learning. Students could be included as network partners. The significant contributions of founding members could result in networks encouraging retired members to remain active on their network. As networks expand and spin-off, individuals who change jobs may still be able to remain or find a related network to be involved with.
The Process of Networking

The need to enhance network information access could result in meetings being telecast and information disseminated to the community-at-large via E-mail and Internet. As networks diversify, meetings could be held more at specific spin-off network related locales. An example could be community safety networks holding their meetings in the local police headquarters.

Networks could create uniform community input data collection instruments. These instruments could then be generated on a regular basis and used across the city in other networks. The aggregated data would provide city wide input from residents. Volunteers and student interns could be recruited through colleges, universities, businesses, civic, volunteer, sorority, fraternity, and senior citizen programs. Networks could enhance their skills in showcasing and marketing themselves. Network newspapers, media spots and even products could promote the benefits of network membership and involvement and heighten awareness of network actions. Network workshops, training sessions, conferences and courses could incorporate components to address time management, community and parent empowerment, leadership, grantsmanship, fund raising, sex equity awareness and conflict resolution. Networks could come together to identify, discuss and create strategies to address networking barriers in city-wide forums, conferences and retreats.
School Improvement Programs of the Networks

The extended day and time use of schools could require principals to expand their partnership efforts in order to manage. Principals and teachers could collaborate with higher education partners to identify, coordinate, integrate and assess staff development. School time, staffing and resources could be restructured to enhance staff development training and implementation. Parents could play a more active role in schools as co-administrators, teachers and service providers. Business/corporate involvement with schools to adapt curriculum and improve student work skills could require more time, staffing and resource commitments from companies and firms. As network schools articulate, link and share information and resources with each other and their community partners they begin to closely resemble mini-school districts. As mini-school district prototypes they could have an ideal structure for privatizing school management, materials, services and resources.

Community Improvement Programs of the Networks

In order to more effectively address health and early childhood, networks could expand their partnership bases to include health maintenance organizations and day care service providers. To enhance communication, networks could expand their partnership bases to include media, telecommunications and library representatives. Networks could create spin-off organizations in partnership with law en-
forcement, juvenile crime and child welfare representatives. Networks could expand their beautification efforts into staff development, curriculum integration and economic development initiatives.

Activities of the Networks

The escalating school and community problems evidenced in inner city schools and communities could accelerate the demand for multiple network activities. Schools as community centers could extend their hours and services. Networks service all ages. There is a need to target and design special programs for specific populations. These could include young black males and senior citizens. Providing high risk students with long term job and higher education incentives is an allocation action that could also incorporate conversion, instruction and empowerment activities. The increase in juvenile delinquency and child welfare cases could result in networks intensifying their efforts and strategies to change students' behavior. The recent legislative proposals to create charter schools and learning and empowerment zones, could provide citizens with additional reasons to participate in the educational arena. Schools could possibly have to rely more on network allocations as they face the challenge of meeting complex student learning needs with limited resources. The continued public outcry for school improvement could result in networks focusing more on instructional and support strategies to improve
teaching and learning outcomes. Networks need to expand their empowerment actions as a means of sustaining principal, staff, parent and community involvement. These actions could be linked to economic and career enhancement initiatives.

**Recommendations**

School-community networks will continue to be vital entities throughout the twenty first century. In this next section school community recommendations are presented. These recommendations are aligned with this study’s key network areas and related components.

**Origin of the Networks**

Networks should design and conduct workshops, training programs, conferences and courses on network development for all stakeholders. Current networks and their founders should document and preserve their histories and share this information with the community-at-large. Networks should enhance empowerment activities for parents, community residents and staff. Principals’ training should include network development strategies.

**Purpose of the Networks**

Each community should have an umbrella school-community improvement network, with spin-off networks addressing specific community problems.

Spin-offs should be created in each community to address the following community issues:
All networks should create community network awareness campaigns that include print and electronic media. Each campaign should incorporate network brochure and motto contests for adults and youth.

Structure of the Networks

Community-wide core networks should create a city-wide network coalition. An executive board representative from each core network should be elected to serve on this city-wide network coalition. Each core network should create spin-off networks to address the following key community issues.

- economic development
- housing
- health
- safety
- recreation
- child welfare/social services

Members of spin-off networks should create a city-wide community issue specific network with an executive board member from each spin off elected to serve on the city wide
coalition.

Networks should be able to have both for and not for profit components. As not for profits, they can generate funds to address specific community issues. As for profits, they could create economic opportunities they would empower and enable residents to address their community's issues with limited outside support. The city-wide core and spin-off executive network boards should petition city government to assign staff from related city services to provide network coordination. An example would be the city police department assigning coordination staff to the city-wide safety spin-off network executive board. Networks should create coalitions to expand their visibility, lobbying, advocacy grantsmanship and fundraising efforts. These coalitions would be able to provide the synergism needed to access human and fiscal resources to effectively address network issues at the community and city wide levels. The overall city design of core and spin-off networks should create three specific structural designs. One design should reflect each community area, its core and spin-off components. Another design should reflect the city-wide linkage of the city-wide core networks and the third the city-wide linkages of the spin-offs.

Members of the Networks

Networks should make special efforts to retain retiring founding members as active network members. They should be
used as historians and trainers. Networks should employ special efforts to outreach community residents, young males, retirees and senior citizens, the media, telecommunications, religious community representatives and students. None of the three networks have students/youth as network members. All networks should include students/youth in network leadership roles. Public and private employers should require and reward employee network involvement. Networks should partner with employers, promote their network, recruit employers and employees as network members and provide ongoing documentation regarding network activities and employee network involvement.

The Process of Networking

Networks should expand the use of technology in planning and conducting network meetings and activities and disseminating network information. Network meetings should be held in the most accessible and issue related setting to maximize resources, access and problem solving. Networks should utilize technological and city wide means to develop, disseminate, collect, assess and respond to school-community feedback. Networks should become business enterprises that produce and manager newspapers, radio and cable television shows and products. These products should be related to the network’s purpose and marketed to the community-at-large. Businesses and corporations should view networks as vendors and enhance their distribution avenues. Curriculum models
and books should be developed by network members to provide hands on networking information, experiences, strategies and antedotes. There should be city-wide conferences for network members to address networking strategies, benefits and barriers.

School Improvement Programs of the Networks

Schools in high risk inner city communities should be open year round as twenty-four hour community centers. They should provide academic, support and enrichment services to youth in school and drop-outs. Public and private staff and funds should be available to support and coordinate these centers. School time, staffing and resources need to be restructured. Networks should enter into partnerships with entities in the field of technology. The integration of technology in staff development and professional growth should be incorporated to expand staff skills in integrating technology across the curriculum. Networks should enhance their parent training efforts to incorporate degree and certificated programs. Business/corporations should work with network partners to create, support, monitor and assess actual school-community center based incubator businesses. These businesses should create and market wellness, early childhood and educational products. Business/corporation and government network partners should offer contractual quota job allotments for students, parents and residents of their target network community. Networks need to become
legislated learning zones. Networks need to engage in providing privatized school management services, materials and resources.

**Community Improvement Programs of the Networks**

Networks should create school-community based Wellness Centers to provide preventive and health maintenance. Networks should expand and enhance the availability and quality of home-school and community based child care services. Networks need to utilize technology to enhance their school-community communication techniques. The media, library and telecommunications representatives should all be utilized to provide the school-community with immediate access to information and resources. Networks should contract with law enforcement, juvenile crime and child welfare representatives to create and manage twenty-four hour community safe havens for children and youth who are at risk of or victims of violence, abuse and/or neglect. The police department should contract with networks to provide training and management of community police programs. Horticultural, fine arts and architectural representatives should collaborate with network school, higher education and business partners to design and institute the following school-community initiatives:

- greenhouses
- lawn care services
- gardens
creative writing/art/musical products
fine arts production
housing construction
maintenance services
housing management

Activities of the Networks

Core networks should narrow the scope of their range of activities. Core networks should partner with spin-off and related city services to identify and compile existing activities, design and implement missing activities and coordinate community-wide activity awareness and access. Schools should be open year round and twenty-four hours daily to meet the multiple needs of their school-community. Weekend school-based activities should also be available.

Networks should become community activity referral centers for individuals, groups, families, organizations, agencies and institutions. As they collect and compile data, networks should be able to assist all groups with accessing needed services. The three networks should consider programs that provide students with post high school graduation job and higher education incentives and opportunities. Networks should create twenty-four hour school and community based havens to provide high risk children, youth, parent and guardians with ongoing behavior change information and skills. As networks expand and increase their membership and visibility they will become powerful school-
community advocates and lobbyist. Networks should use their influences to shape legislative and political agendas and actions. The city's budget should reflect allocations to the executive spin-off network boards. Each city department should support spin-off network activities that relate to their specific city services. Networks should expand their partnerships to include representatives of the philanthropic community. Their intimate involvement with networks as members, could enhance allocations. Networks should become more integral to the day to day management of schools. In the wake of privatization, they should assume some school functions. Network schools should apply for learning zone status. Network schools already have relationships and some common policies, procedures and school improvement plan components. Networks should enter into higher education and school system partnerships with the goal of creating a certificated, school-based, parents as teachers training program. This initiative should enhance parental involvement and provide parents with an economically viable career skills. Networks should work in partnership with the school system to design and implement new principal orientation programs.

In the past two years, the Chicago Public Schools system has retired a large number of principals, due to early retirement incentives. New principals need small group and individualized assistance in their new site based
management role. Networks already play a significant role in supporting new principals. Aspects of a formalized new principal orientation program should include the following:

- local school tours
- local school document reviews
- hands on lump sum budget assistance
- coordinated staff development, principal professional growth and parent training
- resource brokering and referral assistance
- personnel training/referrals
- school plans development/implementation/assessment/support
- grantsmanship training
- networking training
- mentoring/emergency mentor principal access

The Chicago Teachers' Union should work in partnership with networks to develop teacher trainer programs. Teachers participating in these programs should receive special recognition and or certification as master teachers.

The Chicago Public Schools should work in partnership with networks to develop Local School Council and Professional Personnel Advisory Council training models that employ trained Local School Council and Professional Personnel Advisory Council members as trainers. Trainers should receive special recognition and trainer certification.

The preceding future implications and recommendations
capture the rich potential of school-community networks. As we enter the twenty-first century, school-community networks will continue to be significant school-community restructuring entities.
APPENDIX A

DISSERTATION OVERVIEW/TYPOLOGY INTRODUCTION
TITLE: School-Community Networks: Three Parternship Case Studies

INTERVIEWEES: Founding, Current and Former Members

FOCUS OF QUESTIONS: Network History
               Network Purpose
               Network Activities

A special focus on Network Activities designed to:

(conversion) *Change students’ behavior (i.e., speeches, rallies, mentoring)
(mobilization) *Involve parents and the community in the process of education
(allocation) *Provide students/schools with resources (i.e., money, services, equipment, supplies)
(instruction) *Provide students with instruction at home/school/community settings
TYPOLOGY INTRODUCTION (Community Involvement Framework)

In an 1989 article, Saundra Murray Nettles of John Hopkins University, conceptualized community involvement as a typology of four processes of social change: conversion, mobilization, allocation of resources, and instruction. The following information will be shared with network members in order to ascertain and classify network activities into these four categories:

A. Conversion - refers to the process of bringing the student from one belief, or behavioral stance, to another.

B. Mobilization - includes actions to increase citizen and organizational participation in the educational process.

Some mobilization actions are citizen participation, neighborhood organizing, partnerships for school reform and improvement, legal action, and social movements.

C. Allocation - refers to activities wherein community entities provide resources (such as social support and services) to children and youth.

Allocation actions have included the removal of barriers to access by providing school-based health care, altering the incentive structure through the provision of guaranteed college tuition and providing social support through counseling programs.

D. Instruction - embraces actions designed to assist students in their intellectual development or in learning the rules and values that govern social relationships in the community.

Instruction can occur in informal home and community settings, with parents and community members as teachers. It can also occur in organized settings, such as schools, churches, tutoring programs, clubs and teams.
APPENDIX B

FOUNDING MEMBER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
FOUNDING MEMBER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

NETWORK HISTORY - Structure and Activities

1. When was the network initiated?

2. How long have you been a network member?

3. What roles and responsibilities did you have as a founding member?

4. Who were the founding members and what groups were they affiliated with?

5. What factors influenced the decision to form the network?

6. What factors supported or inhibited network initiation efforts?

7. What were the network’s purpose and organizational structure during the early years?

8. What materials are available regarding the network’s history?

9. (Review Typology Introduction) What objectives did the network have to change student behavior?

10. What actions were taken by the network to change student behavior?

11. How effective were the network’s actions in changing student behavior?

12. What materials are available regarding the network’s objectives, actions and effectiveness in changing student behavior?

13. What objectives did the network have to increase citizen and organization participation in the educational process?
14. What actions were taken by the network to increase citizen and organization participation in the educational process?

15. How effective were the network’s actions in increasing citizen and organization participation in the educational process?

16. What materials are available regarding the network’s objectives, actions and effectiveness in increasing citizen and organizational participation in the educational process?

17. What objectives did the network have to allocate resources to children and youth?

18. What actions were taken by the network to allocate resources to children and youth?

19. How effective were the network’s actions in allocating resources to children and youth?

20. What materials are available regarding the network’s objectives, actions and effectiveness in allocating resources to children and youth?

21. What objectives did the network have to assist students in their intellectual, character and citizenship development?

22. What actions were taken by the network to assist students in their intellectual, character and citizenship development?

23. How effective were the network’s actions in assisting students in their intellectual, character and citizenship development?

24. What materials are available regarding the network’s objectives, actions and effectiveness in assisting students with their intellectual, character and citizenship development?

25. What message(s) would you share with others initiating a network?
APPENDIX C

CURRENT MEMBER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
CURRENT MEMBER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How long have you been a network member?

2. What roles and responsibilities have you had as a network member?

3. What group(s) are you affiliated with and what position(s) do you hold?

4. What is your group’s purpose and organizational structure?

5. What factors influenced your membership in the network?

6. What factors support or impede your involvement in the network?

7. What materials are available regarding your group’s purpose, organizational structure and network involvement?

8. What is the network’s current purpose and organizational structure?

9. Have there been any factors that prompted changes in the purpose or organizational structure of the network?

10. What materials are available regarding the network’s purpose and organizational structure?

11. (Review Typology Introduction) What are the network’s objectives regarding student behavioral changes?

12. What actions are the network taking to change student behavior?

13. How effective are these student behavioral change actions?

14. What materials are available regarding the network’s objectives, actions and effectiveness in changing student behavior?
15. What are the network's objectives regarding increasing citizen and organization participation in the educational process?

16. What actions are the network taking to increase citizen and organization participation in the educational process?

17. How effective are these actions in increasing citizen and organization participation in the educational process?

18. What materials are available regarding the network's objectives, actions and effectiveness in increasing citizen and organizational participation in the educational process?

19. What are the network's objectives regarding resource allocation to children and youth?

20. What actions are the network taking to allocate resources to children and youth?

21. How effective are these children and youth resource allocation actions?

22. What materials are available regarding the network's objectives, actions and effectiveness in allocating resources to children and youth?

23. What are the network's objectives regarding assisting students in their intellectual, character and citizenship development?

24. What actions are the network taking to assist students in their intellectual, character and citizenship development?

25. How effective are these student intellectual, character and citizenship development actions?

26. What materials are available regarding the network's objectives, actions and effectiveness in assisting students with their intellectual, character and citizenship development?

27. What resources does the network have? (Budget, staff, volunteers, inkind contributions, speakers bureau; etc.)

28. What resources are needed?
29. What materials are available regarding network resources?

30. What are the network's future plans?

31. What actions does the network plan to take in addressing student behavioral change?

32. What actions does the network plan to take in addressing citizen and organization participation in the educational process?

33. What actions does the network plan to take in providing resources to children and youth?

34. What actions does the network plan to take in assisting students in their intellectual, character and citizenship development?

35. What materials are available regarding future network plans?
APPENDIX D

NETWORK INTERVIEWEE FACE SHEET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Code#</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Locale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Founding</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Former</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Private Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Public Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Community Organization</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Public Agency</th>
<th>Private Agency</th>
<th>Community Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director/</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Volunteen</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

NETWORK DOCUMENT LOG SHEET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Source</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Document Study Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>membership</td>
<td>history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agency</td>
<td>roster</td>
<td>purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business</td>
<td>by laws</td>
<td>structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher education</td>
<td>meeting agenda</td>
<td>activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>annual plan</td>
<td>Nettle's (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td>report</td>
<td>social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>proposal/grant</td>
<td>processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>publication</td>
<td>conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>flyer-calendar</td>
<td>mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bulletin</td>
<td>allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brochure</td>
<td>instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>newsletter</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>media material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>directory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>statute/policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>procedural manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>linkage agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community demographic data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school improvement plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>board report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOCUMENT OVERVIEW**


APPENDIX F

CHICAGO COMMUNITY AREA

NETWORKS O/R/W
NOTE: City of Chicago, Department of Planning and Development.
APPENDIX G

NETWORK 0 STRUCTURE
THE O SCHOOL NETWORK

Diagram showing the O School Network with various elementary, middle, and high school sections labeled.

W Elementary
C Elementary
R Elementary
L Elementary
P Elementary
M Elementary
O Middle
N Elementary
P High School
M Elementary

APPENDIX H

NETWORK R/W AREA
NOTE: Chicago Associates, Planners and Architects
APPENDIX I

NETWORK R STRUCTURE
APPENDIX J

NETWORK W STRUCTURE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

NETWORK W

HEALTH / SOCIAL SERVICE

EDUCATION COUNCIL

HOUSING

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / EMPLOYMENT

YOUTH ACTIVITIES LEADERSHIP
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