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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problems of the urban school are bad and becoming worse. To state this truism requires no special genius. Reminders of the failures of urban education are poor reading scores, parental and community complaints, student sit-ins and boycotts and a general atmosphere of tension and trouble that affects fully three quarters of the nation's schools.¹

That this tension and trouble should be acted out against a backdrop of increasing federal outlays for education as well as a host of imaginative proposals for new approaches to learning is indicative of both the depth of the present crisis and the desperation of the search for solutions. In the final analysis solutions may not be possible except in concert with the solution of problems that go far beyond the educational structure to the very essence of life in industrial America.

In spite of computers and sophisticated electronics, today's large city school systems are simply not reaching and improving children the way they should. Centralization for efficiency is being forced to give way to decentralization for

relevance.\textsuperscript{2} It may be as Colin Greer points out in \textit{Saturday Review} that "the public schools have always failed the lower classes - both black and white."\textsuperscript{3} But the lower classes have found a political voice today that they either did not have or could not use before and they demand that urban education do for their children what heretofore it has not done and that it truly serve democratic ends rather than simply render lip-service to democratic ideals.

Out of this demand for relevance and achievement has come the whole notion of decentralization for the nation's big city schools.

Decentralization has gathered under its standard an army of supporters whose contingents stand together on very little else but who see decentralization as a solution to a host of vexing problems.

Black militants see in decentralization the kind of community control that will give black people a decisive voice in the education of their young. Reactionary whites see in decentralization a way of preserving the sanctity of a lily-white community. Sociologists and educators see in decentralization a way to make school systems relevant and responsible and

\textsuperscript{2}Evidence suggests that the limits of consolidation for efficiency have been reached and that the major concern now is for adapting educational programs to local needs.

\textsuperscript{3}Colin Greer, "The Myth of the Melting Pot," \textit{Saturday Review}, November 15, 1969, p. 84.
thus a way to improve the motivation to learn that materials and mechanisms alone have been unable to provide.

When decentralization became fashionable, around 1967-68, almost everyone jumped on the bandwagon to sing its praises. Professional journals almost without exception could find nothing but promise in the promotion of decentralization as the hope of the future as far as urban education was concerned. Since that time experience has somewhat mellowed the initial enthusiasm. It is not that educators have become disenchanted with the possibilities of decentralization, but rather that they are now more aware of the realities involved in its successful implementation.

It is apparent now that more has to be considered than the immediate goal of administrative decentralization. What, for instance, is the effect of decentralization on other social goals such as integration? How are conflicts between decentralization and parallel considerations of community control to be resolved? What is the attitude of the teacher unions on various aspects of the decentralization formula?

Failure to take account of these real social problems, especially as they affect minority groups, is bound to lead to conflict and frustration. Such was the experience of New York City in the Ocean-Hill Brownsville experiment, an experience that
has been repeated in various forms in several other places. School districts are proceeding more slowly now, in an effort to foresee some of the difficulties and prepare for them. Inherent in these views are contradictions and conflicts that pose serious questions for the educator and for all those who believe in an integrated democratic society.

An attempt will be made in this paper to examine in a comprehensive way both the theoretical problems and the practical experience of decentralization in four midwest urban centers with a view toward measuring over-all progress or lack of it. It is hoped that this examination will provide insight into the problems involved in the decentralization process as well as some possible remedies.

The cities chosen for this study are Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis and Cleveland. These are the largest midwestern cities. Chicago, the largest of the cities, has a school board appointed by the mayor. St. Louis and Detroit are both independent school systems like Chicago but have elected school boards. Cleveland has an elected school board of seven members.

Beginning with a definition of terms, this paper will proceed to outline the historical background of the decentralization movement in these cities, discuss the administrative structures.

---

in each, determine the nature of community involvement and analyze the efforts of each city to solve its educational problems through the decentralization process. Finally, this paper will attempt some judgment on the success or failure of each of these attempts. It is felt that a critical review of the practical experience of large urban centers in the process of decentralization can help to provide the basis for meaningful choices for school systems contemplating decentralization as an answer to urban educational problems.

"Definition of terms"

Dale reported that "'Decentralization' means different things to different people."\(^5\) Smith thought centralization and decentralization "two overworked and general words (which) have substantially different connotations to almost all who use or hear them."\(^6\)

What is the reason for this confusion? Surely, most would agree that centralization involves either (a) the reservation of certain kinds of decisions to higher levels in an organi-

---


\(^6\)George Albert Smith, Jr., *Managing Geographically Decentralized Companies* (Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, Division of Research, 1958), p. 13.
zation or (b) the merger of two or more organizational units into an integrated organizational structure. Conversely, decentralization ought to mean either (a) the delegation of some decision making to lower levels in an organization or (b) the division of an organization into two or more somewhat autonomous units.

An examination of the literature in this field soon shows that a good deal more precision is called for. Baum points out that "administrative decentralization ... is greatly different from functional decentralization." He then defined administrative decentralization as "the distribution, through delegation, of decision making authority within a bureaucracy." 7 Yet Kruisinga applies the same definition to functional decentralization. 8

Becker and Gordon viewed decentralization as "related to the degree of autonomy across organization units." According to this view, decentralization may be either functional or parallel. Functional decentralization would refer to the "organization of autonomous units around sets of different subgoals" whereas Parallel decentralization would signify the establishment of...


8 Kruisinga implies that functional decentralization is "the authority relationships existing between various management levels of the organization and implies as such the process of delegating managerial powers and responsibilities from the top of the hierarchy to executives down the line." Kruisinga, p. 3.
parallel bureaucracies so that each "bureaucracy can deal with a segment of the environment." This environmental segmentation may be made "on the basis of population or geographical differences or any other relevant characteristics." 9

Gulick, in dealing with "division of work" or decentralization or administrative operations, developed the theme of "centralized geographical subdivisions: and "decentralized geographical subdivisions." In the former case, subdivisions representing geographical areas were set up within the central office and in the latter, these subdivisions were actually located in the field. Dividing the operations or work on geographical lines, according to Gulick would invariably carry with it some measure of decentralized decision-making since there would be a greater attempt to adapt the total program to the needs of the areas since their cases would not have the advantage of interested advocacy as well as discretionary authority which such a division would imply. 10 In this case you would have both administrative decentralization, as Baum used the term and Kruisinga's functional decentralization, i.e. a share, however small, in decision-making authority.


In Truman's study of administrative decentralization in the Department of Agriculture, the examples of centralization and decentralization indicate that his focus is primarily on the level at which functions are performed rather than where decisions are made. In the instances cited, corrective authority and punitive action remained centralized whereas reports were "decentralized" but drawn up according to standardized procedures.¹¹

Baker and France included administrative decentralization in decision-making as well as work distribution.

Decentralization is used in this study only in relation to administrative decentralization, and is specifically defined as the minimization of decision making at the highest central point of authority and the maximization of the delegation or responsibility and authority in the making of decisions to lower levels of management.¹²

Thus, their use of "administrative decentralization" agrees with what Argyris called simply "decentralization."

Fundamentally, decentralization means pushing down authority and responsibility to the lowest possible level. The aim is


to have decisions made at the lowest possible point in the organization.\textsuperscript{13}

In view of this confusion of basic terms by so many of the writers on decentralization, it will be necessary to specify how these terms will be used in the present study. This can best be done by consideration of the purposes for which the decentralization program has been undertaken.

The source of disagreement about educational decentralization may be found in the purpose for which the decentralization program has been instituted or the purpose for which various groups with different interests think it has been instituted. These purposes in a large measure determine just what "delegation of decision-making to lower levels" means in actual practice.

School administrations, under attack as rigid top-heavy bureaucracies, see decentralization primarily as a means of making the organization more efficient by moving parts of the central structure closer to the field. In the black ghetto of large cities, parents' organizations and citizen's groups demand more community participation in determining staff (including emphasis on hiring of local administrators, teachers and subprofessional teachers' aides) and curriculum (including "Black Studies" courses). In predominantly white or transitional

communities of large Northern and Western cities, parents and other neighborhood residents have focused their demands for local control on "retaining the neighborhood school" and preventing measures such as busing to achieve racial balance. (Ironically, in many Southern cities where residential areas are less segregated than in the North, Negro organizations have advanced the concept of the neighborhood school to achieve integration.) Even students in secondary schools and institutions of higher education may see decentralization as a means of attaining greater influence in regulations, admissions policies, and disciplinary measures.

It would appear from an analysis of the positions outlined above that, basically, two different aspects of decentralization are being taken: administrative decentralization and political decentralization. Administrative decentralization involves a central decision-making board with administrative units moved close to the point of decision impact. These outlying units have more or less autonomy in school matters and may attempt to respond to local boards, advisory groups, etc., but with definite limits to their decision making power. This approach increases the power groups to which school administrators must respond but leaves the real power closely held at the central board level. The explicit goal of this approach is to improve administrative efficiency; the perceived result is simply an extension of the bureaucratic structure into the local
community. Administrative decentralization primarily affects school management rather than its governance.

Political decentralization, on the other hand, deals with power and school governance. In its purest form, it shifts to a local (or community) school board the authority necessary to govern local schools. It seeks to create both the mechanism for participatory democracy and the environment in which responsive school policies can be developed. This approach brings parents, teachers and administrators together for policy and management decisions. It allows persons with diverse values, backgrounds and lifestyles to sit on boards empowered to shape the nature of their own schools. Under optimum conditions, political decentralization vests power in a local school board and protects its decisions from veto by a central board. Political decentralization is the ultimate form of decentralization since both power and responsibility are placed in the hands of the local community. Responsibility, authority, and decision-making in a decentralized educational system of this type would be distributed as follows:

A. Lay responsibility and authority for educational policy decision making would be extended to local community boards -- the number to be determined by some definition of "community."

B. Professional responsibility and authority for the execution of policy would be in the office
of the local superintendent.

C. Influence on the local board would be reflected through the efforts of groups and individuals directed toward the improvement of education for their children.

For the purposes of this study, then, this dual definition of decentralization will be accepted. **Administrative decentralization**, by which is meant the movement of administrative units closer to the point of impact basically for the purpose of improved administrative efficiency and, **political decentralization**, by which is meant the shifting of the bulk of authority to local communities as a means of increasing the participation of parent, teacher, and administrator in achieving a more responsive, experimental, and effective educational environment.

Complete decentralization of urban school systems would, in most states, require substantial School Code or legal changes at the state level. Since no urban school system has achieved the theoretical absolute in decentralization, it will be impossible to discuss these two aspects of decentralization in isolation and undoubtedly subtle variations on each theme will be found in each of the major cities selected for study. However, it should be possible to determine with some accuracy the dominant theme and thus the direction that decentralization programs are taking in each city.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

When one reviews the history of public education in the United States, the difficulty of casting that history into centralization and decentralization molds soon emerges. It is certainly possible to point to the 1647 Massachusetts Colony Law making it obligatory for every township of fifty or more householders to employ a teacher for the instruction of its children,¹ as an example of centralized authority taking responsibility for education. When in 1766, the General Court of Connecticut allowed the towns "to divide themselves into proper and necessary districts for keeping their schools, and to alter and regulate the same from time to time"² it could be called an example of educational decentralization.

It might even be possible to point to the fact that the middle colonies of the South relied on religious and private groups as the basic purveyors of education as evidence of decentralized education. By then, however, it would be getting


pretty far afield. The historical pattern contains several threads that reach down to the present. First is the early acceptance, especially in the North, of state responsibility for education. Secondly, a centralization of rural school districts to increase efficiency and provide better services (a trend that continues) and finally, the movement toward decentralization in large urban areas. It should be noted, in passing, that before one can speak of decentralization of urban school systems, there has to be an understanding that at some time in the past they were first decentralized from state or county administration.

**Centralization of Education**

Inasmuch as the Federal Constitution made no provision for Federal control over education, the newly independent states acting under the provisions of the Tenth Amendment, were quick to set forth the responsibility of the state for education with Pennsylvania and North Carolina inserting such statements in their new constitutions in 1776. Georgia followed in 1777 and the New England states followed suit in the closing decades of the eighteenth century and the opening of the nineteenth century.

---

3 The Tenth Amendment provides that all powers not specifically granted to the Federal government nor denied to the states are reserved to the states.

By 1805, New York established a permanent school fund and beginning in 1912 began distributing the interest from this fund among school districts raising equal sums by local effort. The maintenance of school buildings remained the responsibility of each district. Thus, "a pattern developed where the state subsidized what was principally a local effort to maintain schools."\(^5\)

New York was also the first state to establish a governing body responsible for the development of a school system from the elementary grades through higher education with the establishment of the University of the State of New York and its Board of Regents in 1784.\(^6\) New York is also recognized as having been the first state to establish the state superintendency of schools in 1812.\(^7\) According to Butts and Cremin, New York's headstart in this area may have been due to the influence of the French.\(^8\)

In 1837, Massachusetts established an eight-man board of education with authority to appoint its own secretary. Horace Mann served in this post from 1837 to 1848. The basic duties of

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 248.

\(^6\)Ibid.

\(^7\)Roald F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, Ind., 1965) p. 52.

\(^8\)Butts and Cremin, pp. 243 and 255.
the board were to gather statistics and to prepare annual reports for the state legislature. By 1860 twenty-eight of the thirty-four states had chief school officers.\(^9\) By the Civil War, then, the states had asserted their authority over education though much of this authority "remained principally in the form of powers delegated to towns and similar districts."\(^10\)

In the century following the Civil War, the state governments continued to exercise more and more authority over elementary and secondary education so that by 1960, all but two of the fifty states had state boards of education. In a few of these, the boards exercised real power but in most instances the state legislature reserved to itself most of the authority exercised at the state level.\(^11\) Whether functioning through state boards of education and executive officers or directly through legislation and budgetary controls, the several states now wield great influence over decisions affecting the education program, personnel, school buildings, and financial support. With respect to teacher certification, all fifty states have enacted certification laws which reserve the right to award teaching certificates to the state in all but a few large city districts.\(^12\)

---

\(^9\) Edwards and Richey, p. 376.

\(^10\) Butts and Cremin, p. 257.

\(^11\) Campbell, Cunningham, and McPhee, pp. 56-57.

\(^12\) Ibid., p. 66.
The trend towards increased centralization in various states was evident in the efforts made throughout the country to consolidate small school districts into larger, more efficient units.\textsuperscript{13} Data presented in a report in a bulletin issued by the Research Division of the N.E.A. in 1970, give ample testimony to the rapidly accelerating pace at which consolidation took place in the thirty-seven year period from 1932 to 1969.\textsuperscript{14}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DISTRICTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>127,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>105,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>31,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>18,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate the drive toward consolidation has become a major goal in suburban and rural systems. Niederhauser, writing in 1961, reflected the views of many school administrators at that time:

> It seems manifestly evident that a far greater problem exists in the creation of larger basic school districts than in the decentralization of the limited number of such districts which may be too large for the most effective administration.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13}Butts and Cremin, pp. 430-431.


By the way of substantiation of Niederhauser's views, the Education Directory shows sixty percent of operating public school districts in the United States with an enrollment of less than 300 pupils as of October 1961. This, however, represented only four percent of the national total and by 1968, the number of districts enrolling fewer than 300 pupils has been reduced to forty-one percent; the number of pupils enrolled in such districts to less than two percent of the total (1.6%). Less than eight percent (7.8%) of the total public school population was enrolled in districts having fewer than 1,000 pupils each.

By 1968-69 seventy-nine of the public school districts reported enrollments of 50,000 or more pupils and twenty-five of these had more than 100,000 pupils each. Four districts reported more than 500,000 pupils each. New York City's schools now enroll more than a million pupils; Chicago more than a half million; Detroit more than 300,000; St. Louis, almost 120,000.

---


17 Ibid.


19 Ibid.

The Role of the Federal Government

It would be impossible to discuss either centralization or decentralization in the nation's public schools without concerning ourselves with the role of the federal government. Ostensibly, the educational function is one left to the responsibility of the states. Nevertheless, from the very beginning, federal influence has affected the direction of educational policy in the United States. In some cases, perhaps in most, that influence has tended toward greater centralized control, but it has also strengthened the hand of the cities at the expense of the states. Both of these effects have been achieved through the allocation of federal lands and monies stretching back before adoption of the U. S. Constitution.

The Land Ordinance of 1785 allocated one square mile out of each thirty-six for the support of education in the Northwest territory. This ordinance was to affect a total of some thirty states by reason of the later extension of these provisions. 21 Since that time, through land grants such as the Morrill Act of 1862, providing land for the endowment of colleges, teacher education acts, National Defense Education Acts, Elementary and Secondary Education Acts, monies to support special programs in vocational education, science, foreign language, etc, the Federal government has continually increased its role in the

educational function. The Federal establishment has moved a long way from the simple statement of purpose expressed at the founding of the Department of Education 1867. The department was established for "the purpose of collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information ... as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems." 22 Although this office had no real power in 1867, the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 indicates the extent to which that power has grown in the years since.

The 1965 act extends the list of federally endorsed activities which state and local units are being directed to sponsor in order to obtain federal money. The use of federal school funds to enforce other federal laws (e.g., civil rights) is being attempted through the threat of withholding. The growing national interest in education will develop controls designed to advance it; it also may develop controls which are not in the national interest. 23

The debate over the role of the Federal government continues apace, with some Americans viewing it as undue interference with the legitimate activities of the states, while others...

22 Butts and Cremin, p. 426.

insist that only through Federal intervention can equality of educational opportunity be extended to all citizens.\textsuperscript{24}

Whatever the dangers, real or imagined, Federal intervention is probably here to stay. Few school systems could tolerate what the withdrawal of federal funds would mean considering the present level of involvement. For example, the cities of Chicago, Detroit, and St. Louis received 99.2, 42.9, and 18.1 millions of dollars respectively, in the period 1963 to 1967.\textsuperscript{25} Chicago received more than sixty-two million dollars in federal aid during 1970 alone.\textsuperscript{26} The sum total of federal funds supporting education in educational institutions of all kinds approached eleven billion dollars in 1971.\textsuperscript{27}

We have, in fact, reached the point where federal aid to education, sanctified by law, has been accepted as part of the "American way of life." As Beckman put it:

\begin{quote}
Once the issue has been fought out and Congress acts, a new and highly stable framework of public opinion is established that accepts the government's new role ... Enactment and implementation
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., p. 523.
\textsuperscript{25}Gittell and Hollander, p. 228.
\textsuperscript{26}Chicago Public Schools, Facts and Figures, (Chicago: Board of Education, 1970) p. 75. This was 10.5 percent of the estimated revenue for 1970.
\end{flushright}
create legitimation.  

Although there has not been complete satisfaction with this new role, the battle has shifted away from the basic Constitutional issues. Congressman Albert H. Quie addressed these issues when he wrote:

With federal programs in education increasing, the debate on federal aid to education has shifted from the question of whether we should have it to what form it should take. Uppermost in my mind is the question: Are we to continue to move in the direction that is shifting educational decision-making away from its traditional base at the state and local levels and toward the federal level? Phrased in another way: Must the cost of attaining our national goal of equality and excellence of educational opportunity be at the expense of state and local autonomy, diversity, and creativity?

The professional educators, who see themselves as voices crying out in the wilderness, have attempted to preserve the independence of the educational structure by calling for general rather than categorical aid:

When the federal government provides aid to education, it should determine only the general conditions under which this aid is to be administered. The conditions should be in

---


the statement of broad policies designed to interpret and safeguard the legislative intent.

Additional federal aid to education should be provided. Much of this aid should be general in nature, distributed directly to states with only the broad limitations necessary to assure the appropriate expenditure of funds. 30

At the American Association of School Administrators' Convention in 1969, the call was for more federal money. The Associate Secretary of the Association said: "We're now talking about thirty-three percent when many used to say not any percent." Other speakers raised the same general one-third standard. 31

Comments at the same organization's convention in 1970 reflected continued dissatisfaction with the low level of federal funding and the high level of federal control. William J. Sanders, Commissioner of Education for the State of Connecticut, complained that the federal government was using too much "muscle" in its aid program. 32

The then Dean of the School of Education of the University of Missouri in Kansas City, Calvin Gross, made the same

The federal government is doling out bits of money with stringent requirements as if they gave a lot of support to education and it 'taint so. The relatively small federal support exerts a tremendous leverage.\(^{33}\)

These statements show a continuing concern on the part of professional educators for increased federal aid to education but decreased influence in the determination of educational policies. It does not appear that this point of view is making much headway against the current of increasing aid and increasing control.

Federal monies have greatly favored the centralization movement in the United States. Over and above, the greater centralization of control in Washington, which has followed a similar pattern already established by the states in their own "strings attached" policies, federal monies have encouraged rural areas to consolidate if only to make them eligible for federal programs. Although the intent of categorical aid from the federal government has been to upgrade the educational program by guaranteeing educational opportunity, these attempts have resulted in further centralization and control.

At the same time, federal programs have strengthened the cities at the expense of the states. This is a factor that demands closer examination.

\(^{33}\)Tbid.
Influence of Urban Centers

Large urban centers have always been a major factor in the expansion of education. Only in urban areas, with their relatively large potential tax base, could any independence in the form of educational decentralization take place. Cities led the way in both the diversification of the educational program and in the establishment of a trend away from consolidation of school districts so much in evidence in the rural community. Lest the impression be created that two contradictory solutions are being proposed for the same educational problem, it should be stated that cities pursuing policies of decentralization are doing so because they had earlier solved the problems for which rural areas now seek centralization, i.e. increased efficiency and improved economies of operation. They had in fact reached the point where their very bigness created the new problems of efficiency and economy. Further, there has been a growing recognition that the educational problems of the city differ in fundamental ways from those in the rural areas.

By 1900 more than two fifths of the population were living in urban communities and by 1970, the urban population had risen to 73.5 percent. This figure alone is indicative of the growing influence of urban areas on every aspect of American life. Almost every domestic problem of any consequence is related to the problems of urban living. Under these circumstances it is

34 Statistical Abstract, p. 17.
easy to understand the growing influence of the city in our national affairs. Politicians seeking national office can hardly ignore the demands of their big city constituents and with the one-man vote decisions of the Supreme Court, the representation of the states as co-equal entities in the federal system is weakened in favor of the city. 35

This growing influence is perhaps warranted by the growing problems of the city, which, in education as well as other areas, have aspects fundamentally different from similar problems encountered in rural America. In pre-industrial America, the main goal of the school was to provide literacy for the rural community as well as to offer a wealth of experience for the socialization and participation of growing youth. The pathway to adult participation was relatively direct and simple. The urban community, on the other hand, was cold and impersonal with little or no regard for the demand of youth. "The old institutional carriers of worth-while educational experiences functioned poorly or not at all" in this hostile setting. 36 At the same time, increasing demand for new urban and industrial skills and the opening up of new avenues of knowledge in the social and


36Edwards and Richey, p. 669.
natural sciences put a premium on the acquisition of new knowledge and new skills. In this complex society it was not possible to go the old route of direct observation and participation. If the processes of this new society were to be comprehended at all, some form of institutional study was necessary. Thus the urban areas were in the forefront of the fight for diversified curriculum and free educational opportunity.

Large cities, in the United States, have always suffered from a "poor press" in spite of the efforts of chambers of commerce and local politicians. They grew up as a result of the growth of industrialism after the War of 1812 without any of the great psychological attachments of citizenship or "place" that characterize European cities. Historically we have not even been proud of the growth of our cities. "Almost unanimously, from the colonial period to the present, Americans have either voiced deep suspicion of the city or have condemned it outright." We are all familiar with Jefferson's view that the growth of the cities would be the death knell of American democracy. Many historians emphasize the view that a primary reason for the Louisiana Purchase, was Jefferson's intention to secure for all future time the dominance of the farmer in

37 Ibid.
American politics. That this negative valuation of the city continues today can readily be seen by anyone in the market for a home. Almost everyone talks about moving to the suburbs where you can raise children free from the corruption and crime of the big city. Only economics seems to hold people to the city. People come to the cities not because they are viewed as the political, social and cultural centers of the country but primarily because they can get a job and earn more money there. At its most extreme, this attitude resulted in the poor, the depressed, the immigrant and the con artist alike looking to the city for economic opportunity while those that had achieved a degree of economic security were looking for a way out. The implications of this attitude are not only historically clear but they portend a bleak future for urban education. The Census figures of 1970 reveal that while metropolitan areas experienced a 17.7 percent increase in school enrollment from 1960, the enrollment of whites in the inner city fell by 4.2 percent. At the same time, Negro and other minority race enrollment in the inner city increased by more than 50 percent in the same period. 39

Joel H. Spring, writing in November, 1971 issue of School and Society suggests that this negative attitude toward the city

39 Statistical Abstract, Table #158, p. 106.
has helped produce the present educational crisis for educators themselves have become prisoners of their own educational reforms, reforms reflecting this hostile attitude toward the city. "In the schools, restless and bored students work under a system that is largely custodial, designed to occupy their time and keep them out of trouble." The desire to protect city children from their corrupting environment, in this view, allow the schools to establish summer schools, field trips to the country, playgrounds, parks, evening schools, and generally to extend their influence over more and more of the student's time. The schools became custodial and paternalistic and "their control became centered in a professionalized bureaucracy." 

The loss of local control of the schools in the big city, Spring contends, came about as a result of the reform of the ward system in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Whatever such reform meant to the elimination of local graft and corruption it resulted in a decrease in "local community power within the city." As the number of elected officials in the city became smaller, city councils and school boards became smaller and less representative of local areas. Pressures grew for more professionalization of educational administration at the local level.

41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
and for centralization of educational authority within the office of a school superintendent.

In spite of increased centralization and in spite of multi-faceted programs, the education of the inner city child has become worse. Although the superior resources and technology of the city provided new opportunities in vocational and professional education and opened up new vistas for adults, they are failing effectively to train the inner city child in the basic reading and computational skills. The federal government has recognized the special problems of educating the inner city child with funding of many special programs to improve the instructional program with new curricula, improved teacher training, multimedia approaches and, perhaps most significantly, by supporting programs designed to involve the community in the reinforcement if not the determination of the ongoing educational process. The Model Cities projects are significant attempts to affect the total environment for the purpose of improving educational achievement. What we are seeing is the gradual undoing of some of the old "reforms" and an effort to find a new basis of cooperation with the local community in hopes of improving educational achievement.

If student attitude is crucial in the attainment of these educational objectives, then the decentralization movement, insofar as it removes hostility toward a school system viewed as paternalistic and custodial, and insofar as it succeeds in "break-
ing the shield between the school and the community," holds promise of some measure of success. At any rate, the proponents of both political and administrative decentralization see it as a step in the right direction.

State funding, too, is now based upon the assumption of the greater needs of the inner city child. Illinois is one state that provides additional aid to schools on the basis of a "density factor" which is supposed to take account of the greater expense of educating children in the inner city. Thus this growing recognition of the greater needs of children in the inner city and the necessity of greater involvement of the community in the activities of the school has led to the consideration of the decentralization idea.

Decentralization would never have been considered if the educational system had not been under attack for bureaucratic rigidity and, most of all, for failure to perform adequately the major tasks assigned to it. In the pages that follow, examination will be made of the response to these attacks as expressed in the movement toward decentralization in the four selected cities.

Ibid.
CHAPTER III

CHICAGO

The Chicago Public School System is the third largest in the nation with 568 schools and a student population in excess of 560,000.\(^1\) It has grown 55 percent since 1953.\(^2\) The system employs about 30,000 teachers and has a budget that in 1973 stood at more than 850 million dollars.\(^3\) The Chicago School System is fiscally independent of the city government. The city council approves, but it may not change the school budget. The mayor appoints the board members with the approval of the City Council.

For a long time the city has been changing faster than the schools. Like other large cities, Chicago has witnessed the change in the urban poor it serves from basically immigrant stock to rural blacks beginning with the large scale migration from the South that took place following World War II. By September, 1972, the percentage of students of African or Negroid

---


\(^2\)Facts and Figures 1971-72, Chicago Board of Education, p. 54.

\(^3\)James F. Redmond, "Statement to the Board of Education, January 29, 1973, p. 1."
origin within the Chicago School System was 56.9 percent. The flight of whites to the suburbs has continued at an alarming rate further segregating the schools and reducing the tax base.

As the school population of Chicago has changed, the failures of the system have become more apparent. The schools have generally served the upper middle class child well and the immigrant child was helped by the addition of foreign languages. But in spite of some promising curriculum programs developed in the last ten or fifteen years, the performance of the "inner city" child when compared to national norms has been increasingly disappointing.

Faced with these facts, the Board of Education was bombarded by demands for change from several different directions. Liberals expressed the view that it was the school's responsibility to break down the walls of segregation that were growing up in the city. The Hauser Report describing the impact of segregation in the Chicago Public Schools was issued in 1964. The Board of Education responded with an expansion of a permissive transfer plan but with no radical departure from established practice.

---


5 *Report to the Board of Education, City of Chicago*, Philip M. Hauser, Chairman, Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools, March, 1964.
The stated reason for Chicago's Permissive Transfer program, started in 1963, is to relieve overcrowding. As such, all high schools operating at less than the city-wide average capacity for a particular year are open to students from all schools operating at more than the city-wide average. Under this program, transportation costs are borne by the parents of transferring students.

Over 6,000 students have utilized the program since its initiation in 1963:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Permissive Transfers Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above\(^6\) indicates that the number of transfers approved increased from a low of fifty-eight in 1963 to the peak value of 1500 in 1966 and has been declining since then.

The table below indicates that very few students have utilized the permissive transfer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sending Schools</th>
<th>Receiving Schools</th>
<th>No. of Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Schools</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>No. of Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7418</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8758</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8993</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7406</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A part of a Board Report No. 70-1058 on 1970 High School Permissive Transfer Plan reproduced on the following page shows that the number of transfers actually utilized is even smaller than the number approved.

From the preceding documentation only a very small fraction of the permissive transfer students made available by the Board is actually utilized and that the proportion is declining every year. The following is a possible explanation:

Some personnel administering the program feel that the requirements of good standing, good health, etc. in certain cases adversely affect the chances of getting a transfer request approved and should be deleted. It is also felt that while the abolition of such requirements would reduce the potential unfair treatments in the program, it would not result in a significant increase in the number of requests for transfer.7

Presents

Hereewith a report on the 1970 High School Permissive Transfer Program, and

Reports that in the past seven years a total of 5,301 high school students have utilized the permissive transfer program and that Board Report 70-136-2 adopted February 11, 1970 listed 18 sending high schools which could send a total of 8,258 pupils and 10 receiving high schools which could receive a total of 1,186 pupils in September, 1970.

Of the 499 pupils who were approved for transfer, 367 enrolled in the receiving high schools on September 9, 1970 and 341 of them were in attendance in the receiving high school on the 20th Day.

The report on this enrollment is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist. School</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Students Who Applied for Transfer</th>
<th>No. of Students Still in Membership on 20th Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Amundsen</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crane</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Englewood</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lake View</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Phillips</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Roosevelt</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Schurz</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Senn</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Steinmetz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Von Steuben</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND FURTHER</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,186</strong></td>
<td><strong>499</strong></td>
<td><strong>367</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports that the 158 students approved for transfer who did not enroll or who enrolled but were not in membership on the 20th Day were reported as follows:

| 59. Remained at home school |
| 11. Returned to home school |
| 33. Transferred to vocational or technical high school |
| 15. Moved to another high school district |
| 1. Transferred to parochial or private school |
| 4. Moved out of town |
| 3. Did not graduate |
| 34. No information at the present time |

Financial

No cost to the Board of Education.

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia F. Lewis, Assistant Supt.
Human Relations

James P. Redmond, General Superintendent of Schools
The Havighurst Report\textsuperscript{8} also published in 1964, on the quality of education in Chicago was only the third general study in the one hundred and thirty years of Chicago Public School History.\textsuperscript{9} The report clearly stated the alternatives facing the Chicago schools. Either the present trend could be allowed to continue with an even more segregated system with fewer and fewer white students or the Board must take positive action to stabilize the school population, retain white collar workers within the city and work toward residential integration.\textsuperscript{10} Unfortunately, the report gave no clear direction as to how these goals could be accomplished within the framework of the board's existing authority.

The implication of greater involvement in community action and conversely greater involvement of the community in the schools was not long in being recognized by all those forces seeking change in the school structure.

Complaints about the quality of education grew apace with black parents demanding community control, to include selection of principals and teachers as well as curriculum, and white

\textsuperscript{8}Robert J. Havighurst, \textit{The Public Schools of Chicago: A Survey for the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, 1964.}


\textsuperscript{10}Havighurst Survey, pp. 369-374.
neighborhood groups demanding a greater voice in defense of the neighborhood school concept. Demands for quality education sometimes became simple slogans to disguise racial polarization and ethnic antagonisms.

An understanding of the role that race has played in the decentralization of Chicago is essential to an understanding of the forces that finally moved the Board of Education off dead center in making changes in its administrative structure. These changes would begin in earnest in 1966.

James F. Redmond became the General Superintendent of the vast Chicago Public School System in October, 1966. Redmond, much more public relations conscious than his predecessor, set about conciliating his potential adversaries and trying to find ways to make the school system more responsive to local needs.

The Board of Education had already hired the management consultant firm of Booz, Allen and Hamilton to make a complete survey of the administrative structure and recommend improvements. When the report was presented in May of 1967, Redmond moved for its adoption and Chicago was on the road to decentralization of its public schools. This comprehensive plan was approved at the Board meeting of May, 1967. In June, 1967, the General Superintendent appointed an assistant to coordinate the Booz, Allen and Hamilton plan. The plan was implemented by the Board of Education in September, 1967.
The Booz, Allen and Hamilton report lists the following positive aspects of the then present organizational structure in managerial evaluation:\textsuperscript{11}

1. Despite organizational limitations, the job of education is being accomplished and the administrative requirements of the system are being fulfilled. This achievement is based on factors of individual capability, capacity, dedication, and the ability to work with others in accomplishing goals.

2. Basic strengths of the present organizational structure:

A) The combination of the various business functions of architecture, purchasing, plant operations and maintenance, and lunchroom services are under one associate superintendent.

B) To the Board of Education, report the general superintendent, the law department, and the office of the secretary to the Board.

C) Under the general superintendent are four associate superintendents whose responsibilities are for administration, instruction, curriculum development and teaching, and operations services.

D) Under administration, are personnel, pupil transportation, medical and school health services, research development and special projects.

E) Under curriculum development and teaching

are curriculum development and consulting, instruction materials, elementary and secondary education act program, publications production, radio and television, volunteer programs, sex education, research and evaluation.

F) Under financial services are budgeting, data processing, general accounting, auditing, and payrolls.

Apparent negative aspects of the then present organizational structure in managerial evaluation are as follows:

1. The organization of the Chicago school system has largely evolved, in response to factors unrelated to educational and administrative requirements. One of the most decisive influences on the systems' organizational structure has been the relative dominance and strength of the Board of Education and the general superintendent, and the resulting degree of control exercised by each. In the most recent instance, the relationship between the Board and general superintendent has had significant organizational impact on the Chicago school system. Emerging from this situation has been an organizational structure where responsibility and authority over concentrated in a relatively small number of people who administer the programs of the school system on a highly centralized basis. The organization, as a result, is designed largely around the capabilities of the people involved rather than on the educational and administrative tasks to be accomplished.

2. The Board of Education is unable to effectively discharge its general responsibility for public education. The School Code provides that, "The Board shall exercise general supervision and management of the public school system of the city ..." Two significant related factors serve as a fundamental basis for a comprehensive overview:
A) The Board cannot be expected to operate the school system; these responsibilities it must delegate.

B) The Board is the trustee of the general public in the conduct of the school system; it must provide the over-view and set the educational pattern for the city, assuring that the policies it establishes are implemented.

Investigations indicated that approximately 90 percent of the Board's time was devoted to administration and day-to-day operation decisions. Ten percent of the time was occupied in planning and policy making matters. This indicates that the Board is concentrating in those areas for which it is least equipped, and neglecting those areas in which only it should perform. Additionally, the Board is virtually without staff assistance, as well as, the effective use of committees as an organizational apparatus to investigate, condense issues, and make recommendations.

After Joseph Pois left his seat on the Board of Education, he recorded his insights on school board decision-making. Pois said that the Board did little policy-making and spent most board meeting time discussing trivial matters.\textsuperscript{12}

3. The general superintendent, by the very nature of the organizational structure, is too excessively involved in day-to-day operating matters. The general superintendent gives day-to-day direction to and coordinated the activities of the departments of curriculum development and teaching, instruction, administration, school planning, operation services, and financial services.

There is a requirement for a continuing interchange of information between these positions and the general superintendent in order for the administrative apparatus to function.

4. Responsibilities throughout the organization are not well defined. Position descriptions are not in general use. This was especially apparent in the case of district superintendents, where a lack of uniform opinion was obtained from central office personnel, who viewed the job of district superintendent quite differently than do the superintendents themselves.

5. The school system is too highly centralized. Central office personnel have responsibility for the development of educational and administrative programs, and direct the implementation of these programs in the schools. Relatively few decisions of substance are made in the districts for educational and administrative programs are provided by central office personnel. The central office maintains control over staff personnel in the field.

The Booz, Allen, Hamilton Report lists the following summary of needs for basic organizational planning in Chicago Public School System.13

A) A need for authority to make decisions to be entrusted to a greater number of people in the organization, and at levels lower than associate and assistant superintendent.

B) To separate staff and line functions - staff personnel to perform a supporting functional role and provide direction to educational and administrative programs which are system-wide in scope, and line personnel to implement the programs of the system.

13 (Relevant materials relating to the Booz, Allen, Hamilton Report may be found in the Appendix I Charts 1-5).
C) To establish increased staff resources to field personnel.

D) Provision of increased authority and responsibility at lower levels necessitates the Board of Education and the general superintendent retaining the means of measuring performance and evaluating results.

E) To redefine the respective roles of the Board of Education and the general superintendent which will effectively utilize the skills of each, and which includes only those responsibilities each is capable of performing.

F) A provision of job descriptions and administrative personnel throughout the system.

G) Creation, at all levels, jobs representing work loads which do not place intolerable demands on their capacity.

H) To clarify reporting relationships throughout the system, adopting a "one-man - one-boss" rule wherever possible. To bring together functions which are naturally related.

I) The size factor demands shorter and more direct lines of communication.

In short, essential elements of the recommended plan can be summed up in five statements.

1. The role of the Board of Education as a policy-making and program-approving body is underscored. Increased use of Board committees is proposed and the Board is provided with adequate staff support.

2. The function of the general superintendent is defined as that of chief administrative officer of the school system, with basic emphasis on planning, developing programs, and evaluating results. He also is provided with adequate staff in support of this role.

3. Responsibility for day-to-day management of the school system is delegated to a deputy superintendent who is, in effect, the chief operating officer.
4. The city is divided into areas of manageable size, each headed by an associate superintendent with a full staff of his own. Each area associate superintendent has under his direction the organizational equivalent of a major city school system.

5. Only those staff activities which are system-wide in nature or which can be most effectively performed at the headquarters level are carried at this level.

The study envisioned a basic reorganization of the administrative structure in order to simplify the chain of command and permit both the Board and the general superintendent to devote more time to basic policy formulation and implementation.

Beginning with the office of the general superintendent (chart 1), the report suggested that the day-to-day operational responsibilities be placed in the hand of a deputy superintendent directly responsible to the general superintendent. This would permit the general superintendent to concentrate his time and efforts on his job as chief administrative officer whose function it is to provide overall direction to the school system and assume final responsibility for the results within policy guidelines set down by the Board of Education.

Note that the lines of the chart indicate a reporting function only. The arrangements of departments is not indicative of either size or relative status. The six departments and their heads report directly to the general superintendent as does the deputy superintendent. All six plan future and evaluate present programs. They act as an advisory board to the general superintendent - the "Think Tank."
The number of assistants to the general superintendent as recommended by the Booz, Allen and Hamilton study may vary according to needs of the office.

The educational program planning department projects the total educational needs of the system, plan the overall programs, and improvements and researches alternative programs.

Facilities Planning determines what kind of school structures, equipment and space utilization are needed to carry out present and future programs. In this function it must coordinate its activities with the Area, Community and Human Relations staff as well as the other planning agencies.

The Financial Planning department is charged with the responsibility of determining the short and long term money requirements for carrying out the programs and for recommending how to get the money.

Operations Analysis is the department which evaluates the effectiveness and cost of programs at all levels. They are the internal auditors or "Watchdogs" of the system.

The Community Relations department is the publicity agency for the system. This department acts as news bureau and consults with field representatives on community relations projects. The Department of Federal and State Relations coordinates the legislative program which includes activities in both Washington and Springfield.
The Human Relations department helps the superintendent in the development of human relations and integration policy. The department consults with field personnel on development and implementation of local human relations programs.

The office of the deputy superintendent is somewhat more complex (chart 2). The deputy superintendent is the chief operating executive of the system. He is responsible for the day-to-day management of the school system. He heads the central staff and the area associates are directly responsible to him. Although he and his staff provide the general superintendent with the materials necessary for long range planning, their basic mission is the implementation and maintenance of the existing programs - including guidance to staff and field personnel.

Not all of the organizational recommendations of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton report have yet been carried out but the aim is for what is shown on chart 2. The departments shown represent the basic areas where system-wide guidance is necessary without interfering with the authority and perogatives of the area associates.

The Bureau of Pupil Personnel Services coordinates all pupil related services including: medical services, child study, guidance, social work, and special education programs.

The former adult education programs, including both elementary and high school programs, administered by the City of Chicago Board of Education, are now handled by the Adult Learning
Program of the City Colleges.

Government programs are becoming increasingly important to the schools and the Board needs a central clearing house just to keep track of all the possibilities, research new possibilities and handle all the required paper work. ESEA, Economic Opportunity and Vocational Education were all included under this department, but Vocational Education has not yet been removed from its independent status.

Curriculum at the central level is basically a research and development function giving direction to all areas of the basic programs in vocational education, pre-kindergarten, data processing education, art, music, health, sex education, and driver education. These are some of the areas of operation. Curriculum also maintains the central library facilities, recommends texts and audio-visual materials, researches new techniques in TV and operates WBEZ. The curriculum consulting staff has been transferred to area offices.

Operation Services now manages Board real estate, architecture, lunchroom services, plant operation and purchasing. Plant Operation within the areas is now supervised by the area office.

Control handles the day-to-day financial activity of the system, consolidates and administers the budget, and takes care of general accounting. This department also handles teacher payroll.
Systems Analysis and Data Processing is the section which handles all the computers as well as the manual systems for processing all the forms emanating from the various agencies and departments. Intensive reworking of the whole computer set-up was recommended by Booz, Allen and Hamilton and the system is finally becoming truly functional for the first time.

According to the study, the only way to reduce the work load of the system to tolerable levels and insure the needed flexibility and efficiency was to divide the city itself into areas of manageable size.

When it is considered that the Chicago Public School System is the third largest in the nation, behind New York and Los Angeles, has more than 560,000 students enrolled in more than 515 schools and 99 branches, and employs in excess of 44,000 professional and civil service employees, the enormity of the task of administering such a system can really be appreciated.

When it is further considered how widely divergent are community needs throughout this vast area, in terms of programs, facilities and special problems, the relevance of decentralization becomes immediately apparent.

What Chicago has done, then, is to divide the city and its 27 school districts into three administrative areas - A, B, and C. The following criteria were used in determining the

---

Board Report 73-828-6 of August 8, 1973, approves the district boundary changes within Area A. The other two areas are now in the process of realigning their districts.
A) The geographic scope of the three areas should be established to create balanced work loads. The two main factors in balancing load are: (1) size, measured in terms of number of students and schools; (2) socio-economic characteristics.

B) The associate superintendent in charge of each area becomes, in effect, the general superintendent of a sizable school operation. He represents the direct line of communication between the deputy superintendent and the field and is vested with authority to administer the educational program of the system in his area. And he has an adequate organization to carry out the program.

C) With few exceptions, the present central office staff groups which operate in the field should be assigned to the areas and grouped to bring together functions that have a natural kinship.

D) The typical role of a district superintendent under the plan should be that of an "assistant area associate superintendent," with responsibility for a group of elementary and secondary schools.

E) The deployment of area staff personnel should be done by the individual staff department heads, working with the responsible district superintendent.

F) While area staff personnel are distributed or shared among districts, they should not exercise line authority over school principals. This should be the role of the area associate superintendent and district superintendent.

G) Area staff personnel should receive functional guidance from their counterparts on the central office staffs.

The area staff (chart 5) consists of
the Area Associate Superintendent
the Director of Administration
the Director of Area Programs
the Director of Community and Human Relations.
the Director of Curriculum Services
the Director of ESEA
the Director of Pupil Personnel Services
and Special Education
the Director of Plant Operations (Chief Engineer)

These staff positions receive functional guidance from their central office counterparts but are directly supervised by and report to the area associate superintendent. The reorganization and decentralization of administrative staff does not include measures leading to separate boards of education as in New York City.

In a paper at an administrative institute held at Columbia University in July, 1968, Dr. Redmond stated:

At no time have we talked about multiple boards of education. I do not believe that these are necessary to an effective program of decentralization. The Board of Education can set policy for the city as a whole. It can be the watchdog of those centralized services which lend themselves to efficiency without interfering with education of a child. I do believe in community involvement and I do believe there are ways of achieving it. We are encouraging councils in the districts. They are oriented to problems indigenous to the district.15

Although locally elected school boards are not presently envisioned, the Chicago Board of Education is engaged in several innovative projects designed to increase the influence and involvement of the local community in the city schools. The Leucadoli Report - Design for the Future: A Recommended Long Range Educational Plan for Chicago, laid the groundwork for such projects as early childhood education centers or "schomes," middle schools, magnet schools and cultural educational clusters.

The Booz Allen Report provided the Board with a blueprint for administrative decentralization and its commitment to the basic outlines represented a victory for those who had so often criticized the centralized control that they felt was the source of so many educational problems. This commitment had other advantages as well. It took some of the pressure for change off the Board, at least for a time; it gave the Board a sense of direction and of active purpose rather than simply reacting to community protests and it held out the hope of more long lasting solutions to community demands than had heretofore seemed possible.

It would remain to be shown how much long run difference decentralization would make in the actual pattern of protest and more importantly, whether educational achievement, the basic purpose of any school system would show significant gains.

Those who saw in the Chicago decentralization program, an opening to community control of the schools were probably
misreading the intent of the reorganization. Their hopes were based on the existence of several experiments in community control and the establishment of a general climate of acceptance of this idea that in fact would result in the establishment of several avenues of participation that seemed to lead in that direction.

One of the on-going programs in community control was the Woodlawn Experiment Program launched in the 1968-69 school year. The Woodlawn Project Experimental Schools Project (WESP) was an ESEA Title III project proposed by the University of Chicago in collaboration with an already highly organized community group, the Woodlawn Organization (TWO). The purpose of the project was to improve the quality of education in three all black schools, an elementary, upper grade center and a high school. The project operated from July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1971.

From the standpoint of improving academic performance in the three schools, the project was not an unqualified success but as a means of strengthening the climate, and in some cases, the clamor for community control of the schools, the WESP was an important factor in the direction that decentralization would take. It was not the only factor working in this direction, however, and in the end, the WESP itself fell victim to the very community pressures it had hoped to direct. The original board was changed with the University of Chicago representatives and Board representatives being replaced under pressure by students.
and teachers.

The most ambitious and in many ways, the most influential of the community organizations, has been the Concerned Parents of the West Side. This group organized in 1965, originally represented three units of an elementary school complex on the West Side. Now it represents all the schools, some twenty in all, in District Ten, an inner-city district on Chicago's West Side.

In the short term of its existence, this group has been responsible for

1. establishment of a Prep Center to aid in the transition from upper grade centers to high schools

2. initiation of the community selection process for school principals

3. writing and securing funding for a dropout prevention program

4. securing the collaboration of Chicago State University in several innovative programs serving District Ten children

5. organizing a lobby in the state capital to secure additional funds for the Chicago Public Schools.  

This group has been the most successful of all community groups in the city. Starting as a somewhat noisy clique headed by a charismatic, vigorous leader, it has developed into a suave sophisticated organizational machine that has convinced the

---

establishment that it wants quality education and that community organization need not represent a threat to existing values. A current study of this group illustrates implications for community control.  

First, sustained interest in the management of school affairs by parents interested in improving the education of children is possible and constructive. Second, because school officials control the resources necessary for community participation, there seem to be limitations to the kinds of disagreements community representatives can have with those school officials. In a recent study of urban schools, Weeres found that community school politics were dominated by organizations not primarily concerned with the reform of current instructional practices. Weeres develops an explanation of why it is extremely unlikely that community organizations will concentrate within and contribute to the solution of educational problems. Long has suggested that vested interests groups and individuals are not concerned with the common interests of the metropolitan area but are seeking specific goals that will benefit themselves. Long suggests that change would "be realized through

---


institutional interaction rather than through self-conscious rationality of a determinate group charged with its formulation and attainment. ⑲

Since no organized pressure group speaks for the school as a unit, the struggle for power that is likely to characterize the seventies could seriously curtail the freedom of the school to make decisions affecting it and perhaps make a mockery of current drives to hold it accountable。⑲

One school district which has taken steps to enlist the community in the total program is the high school district in Oak Park-River Forest, Illinois. In this district, a citizen's council of forty-five (including not only public school parents but also non-parents, senior citizens, and parochial school parents) meets monthly for systematic study of questions which come from other citizens. This kind of program to develop closer ties with the community illustrates an important avenue of professional initiative in reducing indifference to educational needs and possibilities。⑳

---


Some have charged that increased community influence would result in subjecting education to petty bickering and partisan political influence of earlier times but others have pointed out that political influence may be an advantage for the schools. In a thoughtful article, Robert Salisbury, professor of political Science at Washington University, suggests that the "myth of the unitary community" may be frustrating large urban school systems in their effort to raise funds and improve educational opportunity. Educators have always acted to isolate the schools from the pressures of politics based upon the notion that education must be protected from the petty bickering and partisan politics that characterizes other institutions. This view of education denying the legitimacy of group influence over school policy has been important in the pursuit of some noble social goals such as integration, but it is a myth - a myth that the urban school may not be able to afford in the future.

As the role of the federal government grows in providing funds for urban education, the competition for resources will become more keen. It is crucial that the schools be able to compete effectively, and they will be more likely to do so, according to Professor Salisbury, if they have ties to the political structure. The mayor is the person who can most

---

effectively wield political clout in the interest of the schools and educators should carefully weigh the advantages. To the charge that politics would destroy the administrators freedom of action Salisbury replies that the opposite is more likely to be true. Studies seem to indicate that the problems and conflicts would be fought out in the political arena rather than on the steps of the school as they often are now thus leaving administrators free to "administer their programs while someone else takes the heat, and diffuses it."

Certainly these are thoughtful considerations that must be faced. As Chicago approaches the possibility of an elected school board, the era of political clout within the school system may be at hand. It is comforting to note there may be some advantages.

The most important reason for forming area offices and probably the most successful thus far is that of involving the community in decision-making. The area associate and his staff have made it possible for community groups and school organizations to have a stronger voice in school operations. One of the primary functions of the associate and his staff is to meet with responsible community representatives to discuss and try to resolve difficulties encountered at local schools. The two greatest accomplishments in this regard have been the formation of local school and district councils.

Citizen's advisory committees have been part of the
educational scene for a number of years. A survey conducted by the Education Research Service of fifty-two school districts having citizen's advisory groups, showed that over one-half were started after 1960.23

Herbert Hamlin believes that the increasing size of school districts has made the Board of Education less representative of the people of the community.24

Clarence Weber writes:

Our greatest single need in public education today is for more teachers and administrators who know how to furnish leadership to bring teachers, parents, board members, and citizens together in their thinking in respect to public education. Too many professional educators have assumed that schools can do a better job in isolation; too many have failed to observe the principle of proportional participation.25

Weber goes on to point out that the educational leader can no longer assume the public is too ignorant or complacent to be given a voice in making school policy. To emphasize this he has said,

Educational policies must be public policies


rather than statements of belief of college professors or of employees in public schools. 26

The literature concerned with citizen's councils has brought to light some precautions which must be taken in working with citizen advisory groups. One thing is clear, the main responsibility for the function and organization of an advisory committee lies with the board of education. The superintendent then serves as a "communicator" between the committee and the board. His responsibility is to utilize the citizen's group and work within the framework established by the board of education.

In order to adequately depict Chicago's success it will be necessary to include in this report a history of how the local and education councils were formulated and how each has succeeded in achieving its original purpose.

Statements such as the ones listed below indicate the need for the immediate development of local school councils as a basic part of initial decentralization.

There is a general lack of public participation in the creation of (Chicago) school policy. 27

... decentralization can provide a viable administrative approach to educational reform through bringing the decision-making process concerning schools closer

26 Ibid., p. 237.

to the school's beneficiaries and making the results of education accountable to those whom the schools serve.28

The schools must reach beyond formal education and integrate available community resources into the educational process. Participation in governance by all relevant interest groups must be a primary concern in bringing about education reform.29

Decentralization should enable many communities, and especially the black communities, and other minority communities, to develop an increased awareness and understanding of the power elements involved in school control. Further, it should aid them in coping with and directing the forces of black nationalism, separatism, and other "isms" affecting the traditional systems.

Councils were adopted to develop relationships between parents, community representatives, and school personnel which would foster the establishment of a more meaningful, intellectually productive, and personally-satisfying education program for children in Chicago. Most important, councils give parents a hand in the power element through an arrangement of check and balances on questions.

The first necessary step in organizing local school councils was to approve guidelines for their organization and


operation. This was begun in the fall of 1970. On December 9, 1970, fifty-eight percent of all Chicago public schools had local councils operating. Six percent of these councils were organized as early as 1967. Following much initial correspondence between the central office, the area offices, the district offices, and the local schools, an all-out campaign for every school to have a council organized and operating similarly was initiated. Revised guidelines for local councils were adopted by the Board of Education on July 28, 1971, and all schools without operating councils were instructed to form one immediately, and those already having functioning councils were instructed to revise them to meet guideline requirements. The purposes and requirements of the local council as indicated in the official guidelines are as follows:

To permit parents and school patrons to share in the process of arriving at decisions affecting local schools.

Membership in the local school council should be broadly representative of the community within the school attendance district and members should be residents of the school attendance district or the representatives of institutions located within the school attendance district. A minimum of sixty percent of the members should be parents of children in the school. School personnel and representatives of the community, religious, civic, social-service, business, fraternal, and youth service agencies could be included in the membership.

Principals may be members of, but may not select members of the council.
Officers of the council should include as a minimum; a chairman or president, a vice-president, and a secretary. The officers shall be elected annually.

By-laws for operation shall be drawn up as soon as possible. By-laws shall be on file at the school, the district office and area office. For voting purposes, sixty percent or more of the number determined to be a quorum should be parents of children in the school. A quorum shall consist of forty percent of the council members eligible to vote; or whenever another established school organization has been selected as the local school council the by-laws of that organization regarding a quorum shall prevail.

The council shall meet monthly during each school year. It shall operate democratically and shall be open to the public. However, only members of the council shall have voting privileges.

Any committee to select a principal (when a vacancy exists) shall have representatives of the local PTA and the Concerned Parents Organization among its members.

Studies conducted at regular intervals since the revised guidelines have become effective show the successes and failures of the local school councils as indicated by members and school principals on questionnaires sent out for this purpose.

The most frequently cited area in which the council idea has been effective was that of improved communication between schools and school patrons. Other Areas in which local school councils have been effective include increased interest in school affairs by parents and school patrons, increased involvement of
school parents in school policies and use of the council to disseminate reliable information about the school.

A major function of the councils which community members have found most beneficial is the forming of a principal nominating committee to fill a principalship vacancy. Candidates to be interviewed can be either principals who are requesting a transfer to a specific school or principals awaiting their first assignment. All principals must pass both a written and oral examination. A recent study claims that academic preparation has actually been found to be inversely related to administrative success. The authors, bringing together the results of research by several investigators, isolate five factors generally assumed to be related to effectiveness. Four of these (1) number of years spent in college, (2) number of years devoted to graduate study, (3) number of hours taken in under-graduate education, (4) number of hours in graduate education courses, are unrelated to effectiveness as judged by superiors and subordinates. The fifth factor, the total number of courses in educational administration, is inversely related to rated effectiveness!

It is apparent that the procedures and criteria for the

---

selection of school administrators must be subjected to careful scrutiny to eliminate the inadvertent exclusion of minorities and to develop selection procedures that be truly non-discriminatory and foster excellence as well.

Of the one hundred and fifty successful candidates of the 1970 Chicago Principals Examination, seventy-three were black, one was Japanese, one was of Mexican heritage, and the remaining seventy-five were white. This nominating committee consisting of council members and members of other school groups interviews all candidates for the principalship of their school and then nominates two qualified candidates who would best meet the needs of the school. This recommendation is passed through the district superintendent to the area associate superintendent and on to the deputy superintendent for presentation to the general superintendent and the members of the Board of Education.

Responses to questionnaires indicating failures of the councils were also received. A desire to include money-raising activities in council functions was revealed. Council members want power to select and evaluate all school personnel. Members want to be involved in policy-making decisions regarding all phases of school related activities. Councils want control of school budgets and expenditures. Many feel the council should

assist the Board of Education in decision-making activities.

The apparent desire of most councils to become more powerful and to have a larger voice in the educational set-up of the city indicates a definite success. Although each questionnaire was returned with many ideas for improvement of the councils, almost none indicated that the councils were merely set up to quiet the community by organizing a meaningless committee. Council members feel that their recommendations and complaints are heard and acknowledged, and that through the council they have been able to make changes in their schools which were impossible under centralization when schools only maintained a weak PTA for the purpose of informing parents and hearing their demands and complaints.

In May of 1972, presidents of local school councils, members of local school councils and principals were asked to complete a questionnaire designed to form a basis for recommending changes in the guidelines for local school councils. In addition, this questionnaire also provided data for evaluating the local school councils as they were then operating throughout the city. The data sought in the eighteen item questionnaire can be grouped in two major categories; the first being "Historical Information" and the second category being "Evaluative Information."

Principals were encouraged to make every effort to answer questions that presidents of local school councils or Parent-
Teacher Associations may have regarding these recommendations. Principals were directed to address questions they have regarding this Board report to their district superintendents. A copy of this questionnaire and a summary of the responses is available in Appendix II.

A logical extension of the local council has been the formation of District Education Councils. District Councils derive their impetus for organization and authority from a Board Report approved by the Board of Education in Chicago on January 26, 1966. That report gave the philosophy behind the organization of such councils with these introductory words: "The mechanism for determining ... the unique needs and aspirations of the people of a local community and for reaching agreement and for resolving conflicts which may occur should be the District Superintendent's Education Council." The following guidelines were cited in this report:

1. The purpose of the council should be to provide two-way communication between the schools and the community and to provide a mechanism for reaching agreement and resolving conflicts on school matters.

2. The council should be under the leadership of the district superintendent and advisory to him.

3. The council should be composed of not less than twenty and not more than forty persons. The initial one-third of the members should be appointed by the district superintendent, the balance to be elected by members of the council.
4. Approximately one-fourth of the council membership should be business and industrial personnel who live or work in the community; one-fourth should be parents of children in the schools in the district; one-fourth should be representatives of youth-saving agencies, cultural agencies, civic, or improvement groups, service or professional groups.

In January of 1966 only six of the twenty-seven school districts in Chicago had education councils. In September of 1969 fifteen of the districts had councils. By March of 1970 all districts had education councils.

During the organizing of district councils a problem developed because many of the more vocal persons on some councils refused to follow guidelines set up by the Board of Education. They insisted that their councils be a district board of education with the power to make policy decisions. There was also a wide-spread deviation from the original guidelines regarding the percentage composition of council members as designated in items three and four mentioned above.

Methods of selecting or electing council members other than the original members selected by the district superintendent varied from council to council. The most frequent practice was election by local schools, which was the mode of nine councils. Four councils had members selected either by the district superintendent or by existing members. Another four councils had their members either elected or selected by PTAs'. The remaining councils member election or selection varied among the following
practices: selection from community and service organizations, selection from agencies and schools, selection from steering committees, selection by PTAs and community members, selection by schools and current members, and selection by PTAs, principals and community organizations. Regardless of how members were selected, it is felt that they represent all facets of the community or sub-communities so that varying viewpoints are presented in matters pertaining to the district.

In September of 1969 the Board of Education approved the following revisions in the guidelines related to formation and operation of district councils:

1. Each district shall have one or more education councils.

2. The mechanics of the functioning of the councils shall be left to the district superintendent.

3. Councils shall participate in meaningful discussions and make recommendations in such areas as priorities for allotment of funds for purchase of educational equipment, priorities of allotment of funds for permanent improvements and repairs, qualities desirable in candidates for administrative positions, sites and educational specifications for school facilities, and attendance boundary adjustments.

4. Each district superintendent shall be provided with an assistant to enable the district superintendent to devote more time to the needs of the education council and to other professional responsibilities within the district.
In order to show how and why each of these changes in policy and procedure were enacted, each item in the September, 1969 Guidelines will be discussed separately. First, item number one resulted from statements by many district superintendents and many council members that more than one council was necessary within a district where there were bi- or multi-polar opinions.

Item two is logical since the district superintendent is most closely involved with his own council and with the members of his council. Therefore it is for him to determine the agenda for each council meeting.

Item three was the most sought after by council members. It seemed that after operating for several months council members became restless in their advisory capacity and wanted to participate in a more meaningful manner. In today's climate of increasing militancy of school patrons and increasing requests for community control, councils tend to want to plan an increasing policy-making or executive function. Article 34-8 of the School Code of Illinois provides that "The General Superintendent of Schools shall prescribe and control, subject to the approval of the Board of Education, the courses of study, textbooks, educational apparatus and equipment, discipline in and conduct of the schools ... appointments, promotions and transfers of teachers ... and all other employees in the teaching force shall be made, sites shall be selected, schoolhouses located thereon,
and plans therefor approved, and textbooks and educational apparatus and equipment shall be adopted and purchased by the Board only upon the recommendation of the General Superintendent of schools ..."

However, item three makes it possible for councils to make recommendations to district superintendents for transmittal to the area superintendents, the deputy superintendent, the general superintendent, and ultimately to the Board of Education.

For example, each district superintendent is allotted a flat amount to use within the schools of his district for educational equipment. It is now possible for an education council to make recommendations to the district superintendent for the order of priorities of allotment to the various schools in the district. If the council is reasonably representative of the district, varying viewpoints are presented and arguments on their respective merits are heard.

Another example, district superintendents and district supervising engineers are requested to list in priority order for each budget year requests for permanent improvements and school repairs. Opinions on this order of priority can now be the subject of discussion and recommendation by education councils.

In the case of personnel, education councils list qualities desirable in persons who are candidates for principalships and other kinds of supervisory and/or administrative positions
available in each district.

Council recommendations are submitted on sites for facilities and on educational specifications for these facilities. Education councils may make recommendations for attendance boundary changes and they may also participate in public hearings concerning such changes.

Item four has been temporarily postponed because of a shortage of funds in Chicago for the hiring of additional administrative personnel. When funding is available, an administrative assistant will be assigned to each district superintendent who will handle many of the clerical duties which are relatively routine but time-consuming.

Studies of district education councils in Chicago indicate that there has been progress made toward implementation of the goal of good communication at the district level between school personnel and school patrons. They also reveal that it is possible for education councils to participate in meaningful recommendations in several areas of school affairs.

Councils are now working to secure funding for their operation, either by the Board of Education, by foundations or other institutions, or both. This money is requested not only for meeting and mailing expenses, but also for hiring a community person to serve each district education council as an administra-
The following Guidelines for Operation of District Education Councils were adopted by the Chicago Board of Education in Board Report 73-470 on April 25, 1973:

1. By-laws shall be developed within the rules and policies of the Board of Education by each council which will set criteria for membership, organizing patterns for the council including officers, terms of office for officers, and methods of procedure for conducting business.

2. Methods of placing items on the agenda will also be regularized.

3. Minutes of proceedings shall be kept and distributed to members in advance of the next meeting. Minutes shall be distributed to area associate superintendents and to district superintendents.

4. Councils shall meet monthly during the school year with additional meetings called as necessary. They shall meet in places convenient to most of the members.

5. District Councils shall have at least one or more members from each local school council. The exact number shall be left to the councils themselves. Sixty percent or more of the membership of each district council shall be parents of pupils in schools within the district. The membership of the remaining forty percent shall be determined by the dominant sixty percent.

6. The roles of both the district superintendent and the district human relations coordinator shall be limited to that of resource consultants.

Neither shall be a voting member and neither shall hold office.

7. Meetings of district education councils shall be open to the public and will be announced one week in advance. Each council shall set for itself the limits of participation by members of the public who are non-member and attendant at the meetings.

8. Agenda topics to be considered at meetings of district councils shall focus more on district concerns including priority of items for budgetary consideration at the district level. There shall be a means for follow-up, either by committees or by members of the Council, of action taken at meetings of the district education councils.

9. The Chicago Region PTA will see that a representative from one of its 18 PTA Councils is named to each district education council. The representative of the PTA Council shall reside within the school district he serves. This section is not intended to reduce or to eliminate PTA members currently serving on district education councils as representatives of local PTA's.

Just as it is desired that local school councils will permit school patrons to share in the decisions that affect local schools, so it is hoped that citizens who are interested in schools will be afforded the opportunity to share in the decisions that affect operations in each district.

It has already been determined that most council members are reasonably satisfied with the operations of the council. The task in the future is to broaden the basis of membership and make the councils true forums in which wide decisions can be arrived at in democratic fashion.
The legal principle governing boards of education gives them the freedom to delegate administrative duties to local levels, but under most state laws boards cannot delegate decision making powers outside of the central board. Presently, the board can and does establish advisory groups or boards to discuss problems or policies and to suggest possible action, but the final decision as to action to be taken is retained by the Board itself. In other words, at present, the decentralization process only breaks down the administrative duties of educational programs, and leaves all decision making powers centralized.

Swafford cites three main goals in the accomplishment of successful decentralization. The first step is to develop a legal framework allowing individual communities within a school system a level of autonomy which would permit opportunities for education programs to be designed and tailored for the community to be served. Chicago is attaining this goal at present by forming local school councils composed of community members which meet regularly to discuss school problems or policies, and to submit their suggestions to the district superintendent. Also, Chicago local school councils have a voice in the selection of their principal. They are allowed to interview each candidate for the position, and submit their opinions to the district

---

The purpose of forming local councils in Chicago was not to give them particular powers, but to involve community members in the problems of their particular school, and to seek their advice in the solution of these problems.

The second goal is to identify responsibility for the total financial operation of the school system, including the establishment of tax rates, budget development and adoption, allocation and distribution of all school monies and financial accountability.

The third goal is to establish personnel policies covering the selection, employment, retention, discharge and transfer of employees (both certified and noncertified).

In summation of the article, the author points out that at present, the Board of Education for any given school system still retains final authority in the control, management and operation of the educational enterprise, even though it is undergoing the decentralization process. The sources of its authority come from the state constitution and statutes. Until these laws are changed or altered, delegation of discretionary powers cannot take place -- therefore true decentralization cannot take place.

In addition to the local and district councils, local, area and city-wide ESEA councils have provided for a greater decentralization of decision-making authority. Accelerating this development has been the growth of Board committees: some
of these have resulted in greater involvement of the clients of the system in school affairs. The expansion of the area boundary committee functions, in particular, has provided additional opportunities for community input, including not only parent, staff, and community leadership groups, but student input as well.

Although these developments are promising steps toward decentralization in Chicago, there are other factors which may yet determine the scope and the success of future decentralization efforts.

**Influence of Federal Government**

Government programs continue to play increasing roles in the education process in Chicago. Federal guidelines have introduced contradictory forces into the decentralization theme. As federal programs have continued to grow, the guidelines requiring much community participation in the formulation and implementation of these programs have become more comprehensive and sophisticated. At the same time, federal demands for citywide enforcement of these guidelines and uniform auditing procedures have necessitated more and more centralization of administrative functions.

A newly created Department of Urban Education within the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction is negotiating with the Board of Education to implement a program in local school decentralization governance. The three-year decentraliza-
t project seeks to determine the best methods for achieving greater community participation in the educational decision-making process. Once a district volunteers to participate, a determination will be made jointly between the school board of the district and the Department of Urban Education as to the particular decentralization plan to be employed. As an incentive, per-pupil grants of $100-$200 will be provided participating districts for students involved in the experiment. It is expected legislation for decentralized governance in urban school districts will result if the findings of the project are positive. At this time the Chicago Board of Education is asking the state to substitute the local school council instead of the elected school board as set up in the State's Guidelines. The proposal is now being studied.

It is interesting to note that the new policy of the Board of Education is to have local schools handle their specific problems at the local level. The policy direction of the Board has been to increase the involvement of the local communities in the decision-making process especially in matters that are peculiar to their situation. The kinds of solutions or proposals that are brought forward will produce greater satisfactions for those who are immediately involved and who will have to live with those decisions. It is clear that in all social structure, solutions are more binding and most satisfactory when those who are most intimately involved in the problem are afforded the
opportunity to play a major role in 1) proposing solutions, 2) establishing priorities about solutions, and 3) reading consensus solutions. Board policy and guidelines and federal and state requirements for government funded programs support and encourage involvement and decision-making at the local level.

Other aspects of the federal role have also introduced significant pressures against decentralization. The Board of Education's integration program, though consistent with the national goal of integrated education, has all but preempted any meaningful decentralization of personnel decisions. It is difficult to consider placement or transfer of teacher personnel on a case-by-case basis when the pressure of federal policy, and especially the time factor governing its implementation, require citywide conformity.

The next question to be asked is what implications decentralization has for integration. The Chicago Board of Education is committed to a policy of racial integration. A declaration of this policy is contained in the following statement:

Statement of Policy on Racial Integration

The members of the Chicago Board of Education believe that this city and this country would be healthier economically, educationally, and morally if Chicago,

---

Illinois and all sections of the country, reflected the kind of racial and ethnic diversity characteristic of the nation as a whole ...

Therefore, we reaffirm and publicly declare a policy of racial integration. We will endeavor to effect the development of a continuous program to achieve this goal.

At the same time, the Board is also committed to a policy of neighborhood stabilization:

**Policy Statement on Stabilization**

While the Board continues to search for ways to increase the interracial association of students, it also has a responsibility to help preserve, as far as possible, such associations in areas where they now exist.

Therefore, as one of our important objectives in the field of integration, the Board of Education hereby asserts that it is the policy to seek and take any possible steps which may help to preserve and stabilize the integration of schools in neighborhoods which already have an interracial composition.

Needless to say, given the realities of present day urban America, it has been difficult to implement programs which bring about desegregation but do not disrupt neighborhood stability. A strategy that has been tried in a number of places is that of "open enrollment."

An ad hoc committee has been formed to investigate various aspects of the open enrollment problem. Initially, the committee consisted of the following people:

---

In addition, after a framework for operation was developed by this committee, local school councils involving staff and community leaders were convened to develop local programs within the city-wide policy.

In order to understand the problems in designing an open enrollment system some historical background is necessary. Following World War II, but particularly during the past decade, Chicago has undergone major demographic changes. These changes are summarized below:

1. A tremendous increase in the metropolitan area population owing to suburban expansion.

2. A significant decrease in the central city population characterized by the out-migration of whites from the city to the suburbs and the in-migration of non-whites from the rural areas into the city.

3. Concentration of non-whites into inner city areas because of a closed, discriminatory housing market.
4. Increase in the non-white population and expansion of the existing non-white areas. 36

Although these trends seem to indicate that desegregation may soon be an impossibility, the Desegregation Report of 1967 37 states that a much more meaningful degree of integration is possible in Chicago; however, it goes on to caution that the Board and its administrative staff should not limit themselves to any single devise to achieve integration. No device whether it be busing, cluster plans, magnet schools, transfer schemes, or educational parks alone will provide a panacea for integrating a city of the size and the demographic make-up of Chicago.

The report proposes several strategies for desegregation, listing its recommendations in terms of their short, intermediate and long-range applicability. They are briefly summarized below:

1. Short-term policies:
   a. transfer programs
   b. boundary changes
   c. site selection
   d. school pairing plans

2. Intermediate term proposals:
   a. specialized magnet schools
   b. general purpose magnet schools

---


37 Increasing Desegregation of Facilities, Students and Vocational Education Programs, Chicago Board of Education, August 23, 1967.
3. Long-range plans:

a. educational parks

To date, this report has not been implemented.

On the other hand Calvert H. Smith and William R. Hazard view decentralization as an outgrowth of the integration movement that has taken place in every large city due to population growth. The integration movement provided the inner-city residents with insights into their exclusion from the school decision-making process. The struggle for integration exposed the political and educational failure of large city school systems.38

Smith and Hazard state that decentralization must take place in two segments - administrative decentralization and political or governance decentralization. Administrative decentralization involves a central decision making Board with administrative units moved close to the point of decision impact. These outlying units have more or less autonomy in school matters and may attempt to respond to local boards, advisory groups, etc., but with definite limits to their decision making power. This approach increases the power groups to which school administrators must respond but leaves the real power closely held at the central board level. The explicit goal of this approach is to improve

administrative efficiency; the perceived result is simply an extension of the bureaucratic structure into the local community. Administrative decentralization primarily affects school management rather than its governance.

Speaking to this point, when asked what the major achievement of the school system has been from 1966 to 1971, Dr. James F. Redmond, General Superintendent of the Chicago Public School System, replied, "Our most important achievement in the last five years, I believe, was setting the stage or providing the atmosphere in which this (decentralization) could occur." 39

Political decentralization, on the other hand, deals with power and school governance. In its purest form, it shifts to a local (or community) School Board the authority necessary to govern local schools. It seeks to create both the mechanism for participatory democracy and the environment in which more responsive school policies can be developed. This approach brings parents, teachers and administrators together for policy and management decisions. This mechanism allows persons with diverse values, backgrounds, and lifestyles to sit on boards empowered to shape the nature of their own schools. Under optimum conditions, political decentralization vests power in a local school board and protects its decisions from veto by a central board. This is what the Regional Boards of the Detroit Public School

system are seeking.

The main purpose of decentralization should be to obtain the participation of parents, teachers and administrators cooperatively. It should then follow that the probabilities of productive and satisfied participants are increased. Research indicates that when parents are involved in their children's education, the children are more likely to achieve at a higher level.  

There are many things which would attract parents into their schools. The essential ingredients as stated by columnist Hope Justus are:

1. Give parents something to do besides just sitting and listening to someone else talk.

2. Give them a chance to do or say something directly connected with their own children.  

Budget Considerations

There are over 44,000 employees in the Chicago Public Schools providing three basic types of service: administration (4.1%); technical/support (2.9%); or teaching (93%).  

---


The current (1973) budget of the Chicago Board of Education is over $850 million dollars, six times as much as it was twenty years ago. It is not enough to meet the current needs of the children of Chicago. There is a shortage of $69 million dollars in the Educational Fund, which contained the appropriations for the general operating costs of the schools.

Chicago is utilizing the PPB system which converts the organizational line-by-line format of the budget, as required by state statute, to eight major categories of appropriations. These categories detail the programs of service provided and indicate the anticipated appropriations in each as well as the percentage which each represents of the total budget. Most of these appropriations are for direct services to children, or for local school programs, or for facilities. For example, appropriations for Instructional Services, Pupil Services, Community Services, Human Relations, General Supportive Services, and Facilities Acquisition and Construction comprise 77.1 percent of the total budget - over 650 million dollars. (See chart #6 in Appendix 1.)

During the 1971 legislative session House Bill #2466 was passed which authorizes the sale of $250,000,000 in bonds, the proceeds of which are to be used for the rehabilitation of those Chicago Public Schools which are more than twenty years of age. The authorized bonds are to be sold at a rate of $50,000,000 per year for each of five consecutive years. The Rehabilitation Fund
can only deal with health, safety and sanitation, and towards this end inspections were made of electrical facilities, toilet provisions, central heating plants, fire protection, and structural defects. No attempt was made to deal with altering or adding facilities for educational needs.

To provide needed facilities without the financial limitations imposed upon it by the previous limited bonding capacity and a hard pressed budget the school board and the park district have entered into an agreement with the Public Building Commission of Chicago.

The PBC is empowered by statute and court decisions to issue non-referendum revenue bonds bearing tax-free interest of up to 7 percent and to use this bond money for the construction of public buildings which are then leased to the appropriate tax-levying bodies for 10 years. The rentals under these leases must be paid out of special tax levies, unlimited as to rate and size. At the end of the 20 year period, title to the property is deeded to Chicago, in trust for the park district and the school board.

Twenty schools, many of them sharing recreational facilities with the park district, are to be built under this program. Over $200,000,000 in bonds will eventually be issued in order to finance these projects.43

Collective negotiations with employee groups have resulted in demand for uniformity of the class size and of other programs that have greatly reduced the options of local administration. In fact, the pressure of these demands has resulted in the diverting of funds that might have been used for maintaining and improving the decentralization program to needs considered by employee groups to be of greater importance to their membership.

Through legislation of the 1972 session of the General Assembly, the Chicago Public Schools have changed from a calendar year budget to a September-to-August fiscal year. Besides coinciding the budget year with the school year and placing the system on a compatible position with the State and Federal Fiscal Year, this legislative action enables the system to develop its budget after the meeting of the Legislature rather than before. This change became effective in a January to August transitional budget in 1974.

The Board of Education continues to search for ways to reduce expenditures and to improve management procedures. The Governor's Commission on Schools: Business Management Task Force made 167 recommencations for the improvement of the business management and operation of the Chicago Public School System.

Just as the New York State's Fleischmann Commission, 44

A study of the cost, quality, and financing of education, created in 1969, recommends further strengthening of the community school boards, the Task Force suggests more active decentralization.

The attempt to operationally decentralize has not been successful as it might be. Personnel in the central office continue to hold on to many functions which would be better administrated by area or district personnel. Likewise, supervisory personnel have not been given authority for normal supervisory functions such as suspending insubordinate employees and providing some input towards their budgets. It appears many employees flaunt their civil service status.45

The following recommendations are made:

1. Delegate many of the board's operational functions to the staff.

2. Reduce the number of board committees.

3. Provide a training program for new board members.

4. Modify the code to permit the school board to hold executive sessions.

5. Establish the position of Deputy Superintendent-Business Management.

6. Establish a group comprised of persons from the business community to serve on a full-time loan basis for a period of one year or longer to assist the Deputy Superintendent-Business Management in renovating Chicago's school administrative system.

---

7. Raise amount of invoice requiring board approval to a more realistic amount.46

In a joint statement, Mrs. Judith Ditkowskii, Schools Chairman for the League of Women Voters of Chicago and Mrs. Elinoi Blan, President of the League, presented the following during the January, 1973 teachers' strike:

The most important conclusion to be drawn from The Governor's Task Force on Business Management Practices: A brief survey is that the bulk of the fiscal waste afflicting the Chicago Public Schools is the result of state and federal law and procedure. Nothing our Board of Education and staff can do will retrieve this money for the school system until the laws are changed.

The survey recommended hiring many new administrative staff members and engaging consulting firms, claiming that about $10 million worth of annual savings will result from expenditures of about $6 million, for a new benefit of $4 million the first year. Many of the so called savings envisaged in areas such as custodial and clerical will take several years to implement, and will require detailed studies of work load, etc., not made in this report. Lunchroom savings would seem to be smaller than claimed. Some of the suggestions offered are matters of policy, not business management. For example, a task force favors changes in the free textbook law, which would result in increased cost to pupils, and it opposes transportation of non-handicapped children to magnet schools or to relieve overcrowding. Savings in such areas are outside the scope of their mission.

Although the report is quite critical of many details of board management, which must be corrected, it can be read as a vindication of a staff working against the odds of legally enforced archaic practices, and without the benefit of the kinds of

46Ibid.
technical services that an operation handling over $850 million yearly normally would have as a matter of course. While it is incumbent on all to see that preventable mismanagement does not occur, the amount being lost is quite small, when compared with the waste frequently alleged for other branches of government in the county and state. In comparison with other school districts across the state, Chicago is one of the best managed.

There are many things that remain to be done before Chicago can really lay claim to a truly decentralized school system.

What Can Be Done Without Legislation

1. Involve area, districts and communities more directly in budgetary matters, i.e. establishing priorities for both improvement and cutbacks when necessary.

2. Establish independent committee to review and evaluate the course of the decentralization and to recommend ways and means of furthering its progress.

3. Reduce the size of central office staff by meaningful decentralization of personnel and authority - especially in the area of curriculum and special education.

4. Control of all divisions should be at the Area level for final approval and the district level for implementation. District superintendents can be delegated authority to make administrative transfers within district boundaries. Districts should also have a certain number of pool divisions to use on a temporary or emergency basis.

5. Principals should be given a larger voice in the selection of their own staff with information provided by Board of Examiners.

6. Move some facilities planning functions to Area. Provide an area position to assess needs and
recommend site selection and placement of temporary structures.

7. Establish clear definitions of line and staff functions.

What Should Be Done

In addition to those things that can be done in the immediate future we should be working on ways to implement:

1. Greater decentralization of funding, including provision for district level contingency fund in all categories including the temporary utilization of outside professional services. Long range movement toward complete autonomy in the use of funds allocated to the Area should be the goal.

2. Professional training for community leadership in the problems and procedures involved in running locally oriented school districts.

3. Each Area should develop long range plans for the improvement of educational services in the Area. These plans should be published and disseminated throughout the Area.

Yet in spite of continuing frustration and concern over fiscal crises, integration and federal involvement, decentralization continues to be of primary concern to the citizens of Chicago. At the recent Public Hearing on School Issues and Problems, out of all the topics considered decentralization ranked number one. There were presentations concerning decentralization followed by ten statements on open enrollment and eight statements asking for further study.

Whatever other values decentralization may have, its primary value must be that it serves children better. There is considerable evidence to show that Chicago has not been serving
its children as well as it should especially its inner-city children. There is further evidence to suggest, as Colin Greer pointed out in the November 1969 issue of Saturday Review, that "the public schools have always failed the lower classes - both black and white." But the inner city has found a political voice today that it either did not have or could not use before and it demands that urban education do for its children what heretofore it has not done and that it truly serve democratic ends rather than simply render lip service to democratic ideals.

Out of this demand for relevance and achievement has come the whole notion of decentralization. It is true, of course, that decentralization has not and cannot solve all urban school problems, least of all the financial ones. It is also true that even the small steps toward decentralization that have been taken have produced new kinds of problems. In the final analysis, it may be that solutions to some of the problems can be found only in concert with the solution of problems that go far beyond the educational structure.

Nevertheless, the proponents of decentralization argue that decentralization as practiced in Chicago, has served children better and has given the opportunity to look for answers in an environment at once more flexible and more promising than anything possible before.

What Has Been Done

1. Reorganization of central office administration
along lines recommended by Booz, Allen and Hamilton Report.

2. Division of city into three Areas headed by an Associate Superintendent with full staff complement. Area Associates report directly to Deputy Superintendent.

3. Formation of local and district educational councils which advise on the full range of educational problems and recommend candidates for school principalships.

They further argue that decentralization has provided the opportunity to improve services in a way not possible before partly through the use of discretionary funds available at the area and district levels.

Each of the three Areas has provided thirty hours of concentrated in-service workshops for its new teachers. The familiarity of the Area staff with both the teachers and the special problems of individual schools has enabled Chicago to tailor its in-service training to specific needs in a way that would have been impossible before. It is impossible because it is basically the Area organization within the concept of decentralization, that has given the staff that sensitivity to the needs of the community which has enabled them to zero in on problems of individual teachers, schools and districts. They have to deal with communities directly every day and therefore the staff has to be more responsive to their needs.

According to this view, it is at the Area level where instructional programs are coordinated to deliver the needed
impact; sites for new programs are identified; current instructional programs are adjusted; and services are balanced to improve the quality of classroom instruction. For example, in order to upgrade reading instruction in each Area school, teachers from differently funded programs were trained as reading resource teachers for at least twenty-five schools this year. These programs included sixteen Intensive Reading Improvement programs, nine Area Reading Priority schools, six Model Cities schools, three ESEA Target schools and three Bilingual/TESL programs. Coordination of effort and resources has produced favorable attitudinal changes in staff and community.

The Area staff, the decentralization proponents continue, has been able to produce results not only because they know the schools, the teachers and the students better, but because their closer proximity to the problems and their availability to the teachers make them more accepted. It is this accessibility which make it easier for teachers to accept staff as resource persons instead of viewing them as inspectors.

Finally, in the not too remote past human relations problems often turned our schools into scenes of disruption. These disruptions were born out of a sense of frustration on the part of many disorganized groups trying to find a way to make their voices heard. It was also the result of a general climate of tension brought about by problems beyond the reach of any administrative system to resolve. It is true that violent pro-
test is out of fashion now and that may be the chief reason for the present atmosphere. Yet the proponents of decentralization would argue that the decentralization process itself has given the schools mechanisms for the resolution of conflict unavailable before, and that this has been a significant aspect in the lessening of tension.

Local school and district councils now are constructively looking for ways to improve the quality of education for their children. They are working and cooperating with staff because they now know to whom they can go for help with their local problems and because they have some assurance that the people they seek out have some authority, however limited, to deal with those problems.

The Area staff is in continuous contact with the community leadership. The human relations staff can be dispatched in a matter of moments to help resolve human relations problems referred to us by the district superintendent or principal. Many misunderstandings that often resulted in protest marches on the Board of Education are not resolved at the local level. Members of Area staff meet with District Councils and other local groups to explain the basics of the budget, special education programs and many aspects of the regular program. Decentralization has given Chicago, for the first time, the ability to carry on an in-service program for parents and other community leaders which has resulted in a greater understanding of both the problems and
the possibilities of the education process.

If the Chicago decentralization program has been more successful than most it is partly because it has moved cautiously and has set for itself moderate goals. In spite of the successes and the feeling on the part of most administrators that decentralization has improved things, the program has not impressed the general public and its credibility remains low. Many staff members as well as members of the general public feel that all that has been accomplished is the addition to the system of further layers of bureaucratic fat.

Mark Krug, the distinguished historian from the University of Chicago, in a series of articles published in the Chicago Tribune, dealt with the continuing problems of the Chicago School System. In addition to the points already mentioned, Krug emphasized two major weaknesses of the decentralization program in Chicago.

First, according to Krug, the position of the principal has been seriously compromised in the decentralization process. Local school councils which were given authority to interview principals and to nominate candidates from approved lists have thereby obtained the de facto power to actually appoint the principal "... in practice they choose the principals because the General Superintendent has approved virtually all nominations."47

principals in these instances have not even had the benefit of constitutional protections of due process afforded either teachers or ordinary laymen. They have been removed by Board actions and transferred to meaningless jobs in the Area offices where their professional ambitions have been frustrated by meaningless assignments and by the scars of charges that make it difficult to obtain assignment in another school. Krug recommends that more power be given to the Area Associate Superintendent and the District Superintendent in this area to prevent the occasional abuse and that grievance procedures be established for the protection of all principals.48

Krug's remaining point is that Chicago needs some method of evaluating the progress of the decentralization program as well as other problems of the educational program. He recommends a task force of educators and community leaders to "evaluate the work of accused principals (and) ... to provide an evaluation of the Chicago decentralization program."49

If the limited success of decentralization in Chicago is based upon its moderate goals, it should be enlightening to measure the progress of the program in Detroit which began with much more ambitious goals.

48 Ibid.
CHAPTER IV

DETROIT

The Detroit Public School System has a student population of almost 300,000 housed in three hundred and eight school buildings. The system employs almost 15,000 teachers and in 1970, had a budget of almost 275 million dollars.¹

The black student population rose to sixty-four percent in 1970 from 45 percent in 1961. The city population has changed from 10 percent black in 1950 to about 40 percent today. Since the black population averages about ten years younger than the white population, it accounts for a large percentage of school membership.²

Since 1948, the school district of the City of Detroit, following a change in the state laws, has been an autonomous fiscally independent governmental entity, which, while coterminous with the boundaries of the city, is completely separated from it legally and operationally.³ About 40 percent of its revenues come in the form of state aid, allotted by the

¹Facts With Figures, Detroit Public Schools, 1971.
³Facts With Figures, Detroit Public Schools, 1971.
legislature annually on a per-pupil basis; about 50 percent comes from local property taxes; the remainder, from federal and miscellaneous sources. The Michigan legislature recently, March 1973, approved tax measures that will provide 75 million in state aid for the financially troubled school system this school year. But this is just for this year. More cuts to educational services for children and deficit financing seem likely next year.

Early History of Decentralization

July 1, 1958 - Three experimental regions were created. The school system under Superintendent Samuel M. Brownell established three school regions as an experiment to look at the advantages and disadvantages of having some decisions made at the regional level. Prior to that time all of the decisions affecting each individual school were made at the central school office. Superintendent Brownell was selected as superintendent because of his commitment to citizen participation.

July 1, 1959 - The experiment was judged a success, and the whole school system was divided into 9 regions and an administrator was named to head each region. Later this administrator became known as a regional superintendent who was in charge of the schools in his area, and the principals of each

---

4Birger Bakke, p. 124.

school reported directly to him. The regional superintendent reported to the chief administrator of the school system. On March 14, 1967, the then Superintendent Norman Drachler submitted a reorganization plan to the Board changing the title of the nine region executives to region superintendents who now would have two assistants. Previously staff help came from the central office. The region superintendents' functions included school-community relations, supervision of staff, and approval of major requisitions. They reported directly to the assistant superintendent for elementary education and to the deputy superintendent of administration. At this time Superintendent Drachler said a greater degree of decentralization was needed to include both personnel and budgetary control. The number of regions have changed over the past years. Presently the school system is divided into eight regions.

October, 1969 - The school administration set up a task force that was asked to advise the Board of Education on how it could move toward more decentralization.

On April 7, 1966, more than 2000 students of Northern High School, an all-black, inner city school walked out of their classes protesting what they considered an inferior educational program of their school. The Board immediately met with students from the school along with faculty representatives and

---

teachers' union officials to work out a solution. Then the Board appointed a Citizens' Study Commission to review not only the problems of Northern High School but also of all twenty-two of Detroit's high schools. A total of fifty-one citizens, representing the leadership of every stratum of the community, made up the commission. In 1966 the position of community agent was established to encourage community participation. Later the commission was expanded by appointing individual committees consisting of both area residents and students for each of the high schools, involving more than 500 people. The Commission was given office space in the central office and a director and an assistant as well as secretarial help. After two years of study, the commission presented the Board a three hundred and fifty-three page document containing one hundred and fifty-six recommendations. Divided into six parts, the report contained findings and recommendations on curriculum, finance, personnel, school-community relations, and the relationship between the central administration and the schools. In public meetings, the Board of Education acted upon the recommendations, item by item, approving most, rejecting some, and deferring others for additional study.

Besides this Citizens' Study Commission, the Detroit Board of Education since 1957 has had at least four major

---

citizens' advisory committees involving the community in school operations on a city-wide and high school constellation level. Before the Board could present its own decentralization program, State Senator Coleman Young introduced into the legislature a bill providing for the creation of Regional School Boards within the Detroit Public School System. Governor Milliken signed this bill into law, Public Act 244, in August, 1969. The Act required the Detroit Board of Education to divide its districts into not less than seven nor more than eleven regional school districts with not more than 50,000 nor fewer than 25,000 students in each district. Each was to elect its own board as well as one member to sit with the Central Board; each was to operate in accordance with "Guidelines" promulgated by the Central Board.

After receiving a Ford Foundation Grant of $360,000 to implement decentralization, the Board in November, 1970, hired consultants from Wayne University to develop several boundary plans and help a series of public hearings to receive suggestions and comments from the public on how the boundaries might be drawn. Realizing the decentralizing process would be complicated and confusing, the Detroit Board of Education in January, 1970, established the Office of School Decentralization

---

8Birger Bakke, p. 133.
9Senator Coleman Young, a black State Senator, was elected Mayor of Detroit, by a thin margin, on November 6, 1973.
to coordinate the development of the "Guidelines" required by the decentralization law; to coordinate the administrative implementation of decentralization; and, to inform and involve the public in the decentralization process. Having been established as a separate organization, the Office of School Decentralization reported directly to the Board. Immediately OSD with staff and community involvement compiled a statement of Goals for Quality Education that would guide their efforts to coordinate the decentralization process in the year to come.

In March of 1970, the Board of Education presented a Progress Report to the public which listed seven possible attendance boundaries drawn up by the community, Wayne State University consultants, staff, and individual Board members. The Board announced that it had to comply with legal requirements - substantially equal population within each district, so to meet the one-man, one-vote principle of the U. S. Constitution - racially integrated districts, required by both State and Federal constitutions.

As a result of extensive publicity in the media, hundreds of parents came to the Board meeting. On April 7, 1970, the Board of Education by a four to two vote approved a plan dividing the city into seven regional districts. Within the plan was included a recommendation from the Superintendent to change the feeder patterns of eighteen junior high schools, which over a period of three years would achieve greater
Integration for twelve senior high schools. This plan would have affected 3200 students starting September, 1970, and 3200 additional in each of the following two years. This was the first time the Board voted a two-way integration plan. The plan had the support of the Michigan Civil Rights Commission, the Detroit Commission on Community Relations, the NAACP, the Urban League, the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches. About half the students affected would be whites who would not attend majority black high schools. The white community affected by the plan erupted in a burst of both individual and organized opposition.

In presenting his recommendations, Superintendent Norman Drachler said in part,

"As an educator I support the proposed plan because I believe that it is educationally, morally, and according to our attorney, legally sound. Most of the research and scholarship I respect, both by blacks and whites, supports the view that integration - racial, religious, and economic - has a positive effect on the learning of all children in a pluralistic society." 10

A. L. Zwerdling, President of the Detroit Board of Education said in part,

"... The proposal before the Detroit Board of Education today is one which will continue to strengthen our commitment to quality education. It is one which provides an opportunity for the citizens

10Quotes taken from summary of action by the Board of Education at its meeting on April 7, 1970. Prepared by the Division of School Community Relations.
of this city together to solve the dilemma of racially isolated, segregated education - a malady which is gripping every major city in this country today. This is an opportunity for all of us to help advance the American Dream in an open society in which black and white together can learn and grow and live in peace...

But this plan is necessary not just because it meets legal requirements. It also gives the people of this city a powerful instrument for good which, if effectively used, can mean better schools for our children - schools more responsive to community needs and aspirations. It can mean improved personal relationships among all of the citizens of Detroit."¹¹

James A. Hathaway, Board member, said in part,

"Where can we find community control in regions that have 186,000 to 238,000 population? Act 244 ignores the pleas of the man in the street for a voice in the control of his elementary, intermediate and secondary school. It simply provides him with one more form of governance that may effectively deny his child an opportunity for quality education...

We may have a mandate from the Michigan Legislature, but the real mandate is from the people for community control not decentralization for the sake of decentralization ..."¹²

Andrew Perdue said in part,

"... although this does not give the black and the poor the maximum amount of control, maximum integration for our schools is important. Let's support this measure - with its imperfections - can move along to develop the kind of guidelines which will assure more meaningful involvement of our citizens in their schools."¹³

¹¹Ibid.
¹²Ibid.
¹³Ibid.
In a letter from Dr. Robinson, he states in part,

"... I have served on this Board for fifteen years and I have tried to represent all children fairly ... I believe in quality, integrated education ... deeply troubled by forces both black and white - calling for separation ... in pluralism there is strength ... in democracy there is hope."14

Darneau Stewart said in part,

"My conscience dictates that we must make progress in a pluralistic society. No group can make it alone. I have been watching integration in other communities in this country where there has been no controversy and it is succeeding. I feel integration is the wisest course for us to follow if we are to offer both students and citizens the best opportunities."15

Patrick A. McDonald, Board member, said in part,

"The action proposed by the Board tonight threatens to destroy this city. This hastily conceived move if adopted will deepen the credibility gap between Detroiters and their schools, between what is said and what is done ...

"During public hearings on decentralization thousands of Detroiters showed up to tell members of the Board of Education that - 1) they did not support the Decentralization Act (Public Act 244); 2) if all else failed they wanted districts that were compact and contained contiguous high school constellations and contained a community of interest."16

14Ibid.
15Ibid.
16Ibid.
Despite the endorsement of then U. S. Commissioner James Allen and of Father Theodore Hesburgh, then head of the United States Civil Rights Commission, a recall movement was started against four Board members who voted for the plan. Within two months the requisite 125,000 signatures had been filed with the election commission and the four were recalled by a two to one margin. The Governor appointed an Interim Board to serve until January, 1971, when the new thirteen member Board and the region boards would take office. Meanwhile a new decentralization measure was signed into law in July, 1970, Public Act 48, which amended Public Act 244.

Highlights of the Public Act are:

- Creation of eight Regional School Districts by January 1, 1971. (The Detroit School District is divided into twenty-one high school "constellations," each consisting of one comprehensive high school and the junior high school and elementary schools whose pupils ultimately attend it. These twenty-one constellations, are, in turn, combined to form eight units or "regions," each headed by a regional superintendent.)

- Drawing up of new region boundaries by a special commission appointed by the Governor.

- Establishment of five-member boards of education for each region.

- Expansion of the Central Board from the present seven-member board to a thirteen member board. Five members elected at-large, and the other eight from the eight regions, one per region.

17 Birger Bakke, p. 136.
-Naming of the chairman of the regional board on the basis of the largest number of votes received. This person to also serve on the Central Board.

-Payment of $20.00 per meeting to members of the regional Boards and $30.00 per meeting to members of the Central Board for not more than fifty-two meetings per year. The chairman of the region, who will serve as a member of the Central Board, will receive both stipends.

-Assumption by the regional boards of responsibilities in personnel, curriculum, and budgets, under guidelines set by Central Board.

-Retention by the Central Board of responsibilities for central purchasing, payroll, contract negotiations, property management, special education, bonding, allocation of funding for capital outlay and the determination of guidelines for regional boards.

-The boards elected on November 3 take office on January 1, 1971.18

A compromise between the more militant community control and the administrative reorganization program already taken, Public Act 48, suspended the "April 7 Plan" as it came to be called, and ordered that the Governor appoint three individuals to design new boundary lines. The Governor named a boundary commission which adopted a plan on August 4, 1970, which followed as closely as possible, existing school attendance areas.

At this point, the NAACP instituted a suit in federal court challenging Public Law 48 and asking that the school

system return to the April 7 Plan. The suit charged that the school system of Detroit was consciously and willfully segregated. The District Court refused to reinstate the plan, but when the NAACP appealed to the Federal Circuit Court, that Court ruled that state action unconstitutional.

In November Federal District Court Judge Roth requested of the Detroit Board of Education to present to the Court no later than November 16 a plan comparable to that of April 7 or one which would achieve no lesser degree of pupil integration. The Board presented three plans: 1) the "Magnet School Concept Plan"; 2) the "Magnet Curriculum Plan"; 3) the April 7 plan of the Detroit Board of Education already before the Court.

On December 3, 1970, Judge Roth decided on the "Magnet School" plan and also ruled that this desegregation plan should be implemented in September, 1971. Rather than work with the new school board, Superintendent Drachler resigned early in 1971. 19

In September, 1971, the opinion was handed down that Detroit school system is de jure segregated. Judge Roth ordered three actions: 1) that the Detroit Board of Education submit by October 3 a concise report on the progress of the Magnet Plan and an evaluation of the worth of the plan in helping to

bring about a higher quality of education; 2) that the Detroit Board of Education submit within sixty days a plan for desegregation of its schools; 3) that the state co-defendants submit a metropolitan plan of desegregation within 120 days. These were carried out. The Detroit Board of Education reacted to the State plan and presented its own metropolitan plan: the NAACP did the same. Hearings were held in June, and the court ordered a metropolitan plan based on the NAACP's proposal and including over fifty-two suburban school districts. The court named a panel to draw up details. These were completed in July. The appellate court then granted a stay.

The full Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has upheld a desegregation order requiring student exchanges between Detroit and fifty-two surrounding suburban districts. The case was sent back to the lower court. All affected school districts will be heard from before the district court works out a specific busing plan. Governor Milliken appealed the decision to the Supreme Court. A decision is expected during this term - possibly by June 1, 1974.

Meanwhile the Decentralization Guidelines which describe the separate and the interdependent functions of the central board and regional boards were officially adopted by the

---

The Detroit Board of Education on October 26, 1970. Guidelines for the City of Detroit are divided into the following sections:

Section A - Relationships among Central and Regional Boards

Section B - Regional Superintendents

Section C - Curriculum and Instruction

Section D - Administration

Section E - Personnel

Section F - School-Community Relationships

Section G - Federal, State, and other Special Projects

Section H - Budget Operations

Section I - Other Administration Support; and a Text of Public Act 48.

The guideline had involved three consultant work groups (community, students, and school staff) in developing these guidelines. The process by which people were made aware of the program was as follows:

- Consultant work group
- Community report meetings
- Speakers bureau
- Community mailing list
- External and internal publication
- Contacts with media
- Community resources
- Automated answering service
- Decentralization film

Over eighty-four percent of the population which read the public reaction draft favored the guidelines. Gittell's study of six urban school districts (Baltimore, Chicago,
Detroit, New York, Philadelphia and St. Louis) indicates that Detroit is the least insulated from the community. The school community concept is a vital aspect of school policy goals.21

Implementation of the Guidelines have been well underway through actions such as devising new procedures for changes in operation as well as orientation and training programs for staff, Board members, and community. Approximately 290 staff personnel have been reassigned from central office jurisdiction to regional jurisdiction. In addition to the regional superintendent, each region has a budget administrator and a personnel administrator along with the necessary clerical supportive staff.

Decentralization After One Year

Regional boards have selected their superintendents, established by-laws, scheduled semi-monthly meetings and formed local school community councils. Depending on the agenda topics, attendance at regional board meetings varies from fifty to four hundred people. This first year witnessed the evolution of relationships among regional boards and the central board. Interpreting guidelines, determining limits of jurisdiction, and developing cooperative interaction have been the major challenges of the central board and the regional board the first year. Several one day and weekend sessions were held with the central and regional boards together for specific purposes.

Mid-year in 1971 a meeting of the Central and Regional Boards of all forty-five board members was held in central office. As an outgrowth of this meeting, a new central board committee was charged with the responsibility of strengthening the relations and improving communication between the central and regional boards. At other meetings of this type desegregation plans, financial crises, etc., were discussed. The financial crisis has hampered any curriculum innovations and has made impossible additional staff to help execute the increased responsibilities of the region offices.

Despite these obstacles, decentralization has brought together board members, staff, students and community working as a team for the improvement of the educational program for all children.

**New Detroit's Education Committee**, a liberal civic group, says that decentralization has not functioned as planned. There has been no significant gain in student achievement or citizen participation. They claim that some community people view decentralization as another layer of red tape and bureaucracy that keeps schools static.

New Detroit staff has interviewed key central office administrative personnel along with a sampling of teachers, principals, Region and Central Board members, Region superintendents and parents to locate the strengths and weaknesses of
decentralization. The following questions were asked:

1. What's "right" with school decentralization in Detroit?

2. What's "wrong" with school decentralization in Detroit?

3. What can New Detroit do to enhance school decentralization in Detroit?

From all of the interviews conducted by the New Detroit staff, no one seemed willing to write off decentralization as a complete failure. There was general agreement among those interviewed relative to the promise of decentralization. Some promising aspects are as follows: 22

1. Decentralization provides a mechanism for informing citizens about education.

2. There is more of an opportunity for alienated citizens to be heard close to their homes.

3. Decentralization facilitates the development of an interest in education, as well as self-pride and a feeling of having developed a degree of self-autonomy.

4. It is believed that by involving those who have lost faith in education, the level of satisfaction with the Board of Education will improve.

5. Decentralization has increased the number of citizens participating in educational decision-making through the use of citizen advisory groups.

6. Curriculum decisions are being made closer to home by Regional Boards after considerable input from the community.

The following is a listing of the problem areas as identified during the interview process by New Detroit:

Budget Problems - Money is the number one problem limiting the effectiveness of school decentralization. A long-range financial program is greatly needed.

Board Relation Problem - Suspicion and mistrust cannot give birth to good decisions. Some Regional Board members do not feel their chairman adequately represents them on the Central Board. Legislative action is necessary to make any change.

Central Board Power - Public Act 48 and the Michigan School Code of 1955 clearly state that the Central Board has "control and government of all schools, school property and pupils." Some citizens advocate a redistribution of this power to the regional level. This change would also require legislative action.

Personnel Problems - The movement and replacement of staff across region boundaries has presented some problems. Some people suspect that there are too many top level administrators.

Bureaucratic Syndrome - The central office is still viewed as the "control center." Parents, staff and children look to the central office for leadership. The feeling of being powerless to change the system still exists within the community.

Community Relations - Regional Boards and their administrative staff have experienced some difficulty in negotiating differences that exist between community groups. Citizens are not pleased with the extent of community participation.

Communications Problems - Regional Board members report that the citizens don't understand decentralization. They make requests and demands of the Regional Boards that are impossible with the current guidelines. Since the citizens do not understand decentralization, they are critical of many actions at the regional level. For example, some citizens resent the regions spending money for regional office and additional staff.
Evaluations and Dissemination - The whole process and procedures that have emerged from decentralization are not being monitored. It is essential that the strengths and weaknesses of decentralization be discussed. This knowledge is important not only for the Board of Education but also for other urban school districts which are considering some kind of reorganization.

Political Problems - Citizens should be more aware of the political nature of the educational system and how it affects the decision-making process.

Student Safety Problems - There is evidence of vandalism. The presence of drugs in and around the school helps to compound the problem.

Decentralization - Now and the Future

The beginning stages of the decentralization process are now history in the Detroit Public Schools but the future of school decentralization is interwoven with the future of integration. Between 1962 and 1965 teaching personnel were shifted to balance staffs in all schools.\(^{23}\) One board member suggested that the legislature might do away with the citywide school district and make the nine regions independent.\(^{24}\) However, it seems that the federal courts will determine what happens more than any action of the legislature.

Integrationists fear that de facto segregation will polarize the races. However, James Farmer, former director of the Congress of Racial Equality, claims separateness is a prerequisite for racial pride.

\(^{23}\) Robert J. Havighurst, Education in Metropolitan Areas. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966) p. 213.

\(^{24}\) William Grant, Detroit Free Press, December 26, 1972.
"Thus I see decentralization and community control as really being a forerunner to integration; and, in a larger sense, a partner to integration. There really is no contradiction, no paradox in this statement. Control of the schools, an exercise in populist democracy, is essential for developing the self-image and self-respect of the black community. Only after the full flowering of the black self-image and after the elimination of cultural biases from all our institutions, can there be complete integration."25

Both central and regional board members complain of the many constraints placed on them - law, court decisions, and union agreements. Two years of decentralization has cost the Detroit school system $4.3 million, including money for sites and personnel.26

In May, 1973, recommended changes to the Guidelines were presented to the Board Committee on Changes to the Guidelines. In addition to asking for more power at the regional level and a more definitive evaluation of the progress of decentralization the following actions were recommended:

1. Abolish Teacher Tenure Act.
2. Institute Merit Pay System for administrators, teachers, and all school personnel.
3. School employees should live in Detroit.
4. Provision must be made to demand the Region Chairmen report all decisions of Central Board meetings.


5. Region Board members should visit each school once every three months to evaluate student achievement.

6. All employees of school system must have same benefits.

7. Parents and residents should be able to visit schools without appointments.

8. New Guideline
   When a Regional Board has taken a position on an issue, the Region Board Chairman must vote on the Central Board in accordance with the position taken by the Region Board.

9. Deployment
   The decentralization process would be enhanced by a further deployment of the operations which are presently centralized. The present Central staff should be re-evaluated so that only its residual personnel, those needed to maintain the First Class School District, remain in the downtown office. All other functions should be decentralized accordingly.

10. Use plain language in Guidelines.

11. Recommendation that any community or advisory group involve parent group first from the immediate district.

12. The eight Regional Boards of Education should be invested with additional powers which they retain now only in minimal areas. Powers invested in the Central Board could be better distributed to the Regions.

13. The eight Regional Boards now have only three vested powers; the funds necessary to house and facilitate region functions do not balance the limited work and decisions. Let the Regions have more power now vested with the Central Board.

The last public meeting of the Board Committee working on the changes to the Guidelines was in March, 1973. After examining suggested changes to the Guidelines, the Board Committee will proceed in implementing the recommendations.

The past two years has witnessed dissension between the regional boards and central board. Even though eight of the thirteen Central Board members are regional board chairmen,
they disagree among themselves leaving "power" with the Central Board. Yet at the local level, "There is a great feeling of community. No one can sit in a region school board meeting and say nothing has happened," said Catherine C. LaForest, a member of the Region Three School Board. But most of the board members and community would agree with Mrs. Carmen Roberts of the Carleton School Mothers Club that decentralization has been primarily a political exercise. She told the school board that in two years "the parents have learned more about political action and school management than the children have learned about reading and mathematics."

Region One's recently published study, A Look at Local School Community Councils in Region One is a good example of community involvement in each of Region One's forty-four schools. The study can be used as a tool in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of community councils and as a starting point for improvement of existing councils and for those who plan to begin councils. The findings of this study of opinions of a random sample of eight hundred and twenty-three respondents representing school-related people, students, parents, business leaders, and other community persons are summarized under three major questions:

27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
1. What are the educational needs of the community?

Responses: Highest priority items dealt with academic achievement followed by factors that promote learning and factors that have to do with good living.

2. What should the LSCC be doing?

Responses: High priority in the decision-making process was given to those issues not directly related to school and academic issues. More concern was given to student behavior than to selection of staff and instructional materials.

3. Are such councils effective?

Responses: Of the forty-five percent of the respondents who knew about the LSCC, thirty-six percent has positive statements and nine percent negative. Positive statements were promotes learning and school well-being and helps students. Negative statements were poor parent participation and lack of organization. Seventy-six percent of the respondents think that the LSCC will improve their school and community while fifty-one percent have noticed improvements. School-community needs will be serviced better as a result of the LSCC according to eighty percent of the school and community people and fifty-seven percent of the students.

Detroit has a combination of three basic patterns of decentralization: advisory councils, citizen control, and district boards of education.29

S. M. Brownell, former Detroit School Superintendent, states that there is a need for centralization on a metropolitan

state basis in planning certain aspects of financial support, curriculum, personnel tenure, retirement and racial integration. However, he favors authority and responsibility for civic decision making to reside with individuals and grass roots groupings. 30

In order to bring this civic decision-making to bear on the schools, Brownell suggests the following three decentralization concepts:

1. Integration and decentralization - balance is not the crucial element. What is more crucial is the commitment of the entire staff to the racial and socioeconomic integration.

2. Community control - citizens of the school area should have real responsibility and authority within established policies, just as school boards have power and responsibility within state laws.

3. School staffing and decentralization - a school council for prompt hearing of appeals by parents or school employees against administrative or teacher decisions offers more promise of safeguarding employee interests and preventing community resentment against school employees than the centralized operations of most cities. 31

Thus a decentralized school system would differ from a centralized school system in that there would be: greater citizen participation in determining policies for individual schools and constellations of schools; removal of most present responsibilities for school operating decisions from the city

---

31 Ibid.
board and administrative offices; allocation of decision-making powers to persons and groups who conduct school operations; encouragement of parent and citizen participation in the school serving their area; city-wide board responsibility for determining city-wide policies and holding subdistricts accountable for conducting schools in compliance with these policies; protection of minority and majority interests; protection of school employees' rights to exercise their professional judgment for the benefit of pupils even when not in accord with the views of a parent or a pressure group; and encouragement of innovation and cooperative programs.

A statement taken from the December issue of New Detroit, Now seems most fitting as we look to the immediate future of decentralization in Detroit.32

Decentralization of our public school systems may be only the forerunner in a series of efforts during this decade to decentralize governmental institutions that exist to serve the people.

It becomes increasingly clear that most people feel powerless in the face of today's giant bureaucracies. Whether the service rendered by the bureaucracy is good, bad, or mediocre, people who feel powerless do not try to alter the service because they feel the effort would be wasted, since the bureaucracy is too impersonal to hear or respond to their pleadings.

This, of course, encourages a bureaucracy to continue to grow and become less responsive because it is subject to fewer checks and balances from the people. Thus, the average citizen participates less and less in the democratic process, and those few who have major power bases control the destiny of society more and more.

Decentralization is an effort to bring democracy back into the lives of everyday people by facilitating their participation in managing and directing the institutions that affect their lives. The effect of this is to rekindle people's sense of responsibility for their environment and for the results they themselves achieve in life. This can only happen when people feel they have some control over the events that shape their lives, and you really can't fool many people today into believing they have power when they are, in fact, powerless.

So school decentralization promises to be an earnest experiment in democracy which will help to determine whether or not other major institutions will also move in the direction of decentralization. If decentralization works, it may save the cities. If it doesn't work, and those with power may not permit it to work, the people in the cities will experience increasing frustration and futility, and by the end of this decade major cities may be irretrievably doomed as significant social structures and governmental centers.

Detroit is farthest along the road toward true decentralization of authority, and has done this in spite of significant problems. If Detroit can succeed in this context, the chances of success in other large cities where racial problems are not so significant are encouraging.
Results of decentralization in the smaller cities such as St. Louis stand in stark contrast to the progress in Chicago and Detroit.
CHAPTER V

ST. LOUIS

St. Louis' 1970 population of 668,000 represents a loss of almost 200,000 people since 1950. St. Louis County surpasses the city in size and is still growing. Nearly 70 percent of public school students come from poverty areas of the city and 17 percent are from welfare families. In 1970, two of every three students in the schools were black. The student population is about 105,000 students.¹

The city's school system is fiscally independent, with a twelve member board of education elected at-large for six year terms in odd-numbered years. The state law calls for twelve board members to be elected at-large in St. Louis. That law was passed in 1897 to correct conditions that developed when board members were elected from each political ward. Teaching and administrative positions were sometimes granted as political prizes, some officials used school support personnel for their own private gain, etc. It seemed a solution then to remove the connection between school board

¹St. Louis Public Schools, A Tale of Two Cities, 1968.
St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis Scorecard, 1969.
membership and party or neighborhood affiliation. The notion was that board members should not represent limited or provincial interests but the interests of the whole community. Perhaps a persuasive case can be made for returning to something like the earlier arrangement, if strictures can be included that inhibit corruption or narrow application of board power. Even though the St. Louis school system has the greatest degree of fiscal independence, Gittell and Hollander found its school resistant to innovation, poorly financed, and the school board somewhat aloof and overly cautious.²

In the spring of 1971, the two members from St. Louis on the House Education Committee of the Missouri legislature (Representative James Conway who represents a poor white district and Representative Deverne Calloway who represents a poor black district) co-sponsored legislation which would have six of the twelve members of the city's school board elected by district instead of at-large. The bill did not suggest community control of schools, but it was an effort to deneutralize the board politically and to strengthen the power of neighborhood groups. Representative Conway stated:

"...the majority of parents and citizens are turned off concerning the board. They feel there has been little impact from parents and

citizens. They feel the board has responded on a 'we know what is best' basis and that communication with the board has essentially been undirectional."³

The fear of increasing partisan influence in the schools created an alliance of the city PTA, the Missouri State School Board Association, and the St. Louis Elementary Schools Principals Association which helped to defeat the Conway Bill again in 1972. Representative Conway hopes that his measure will still remain politically alive in the city.

The Board under the leadership of its president, Daniel Schlafly, marshalled extensive contacts in the legislature to lobby against the bill. The board insisted that the Conway Bill would bring back ward politics into schools and would thereby polarize the school board. The board said that the Conway Bill would do little to solve the two pressing problems of the school system, social segregation and financial crisis. To overcome this trend, the board proposed in 1968 that county and city school systems be merged. The metropolitan area would be divided into ten districts, each with an elected board that would have general personnel selection and curriculum powers. The Metropolitan School Board (MSB) would be appointed by the Governor from a slate nominated by three area university presidents. According to the proposal, the MSB would be

³St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 7, 1971.
authorized to recruit and examine personnel, engage in collective bargaining, maintain and construct all school buildings, provide accounting, research, and special services for the local boards, for the local districts, and set, collect, and distribute taxes.

The proposal asked that a powerful group coordinate education with decentralization of local boards of elected members. The plan was rejected both by the affluent suburbs and by the blacks who thought that their existing political influence would be lessened. Thus, the plan was quickly killed in the state legislature.

According to James Koerner, the whole idea of local control is often sabotaged from within the local boards themselves. Frequently boards are over cautious and fail to exercise even those powers that most authorities agree were theirs. Yet even when boards were less timid, they found their newly acquired powers hemmed in by a host of directives from outside interests. These interests included (a) the state board of education, (b) professional organizations, (c) accrediting agencies, (d) institutions of higher education, and (e) the taxing power of city governments. These interests do not appear to be growing weaker; the chances are that local board freedom in all but the large cities will be eroded even further.  

---

Reorganization for consolidation is occurring simultaneously with the movement for decentralization and community control.

This consolidation movement has two thrusts: (a) the pressure for increased services for rural areas requesting attachment to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA'S) and (b) the metropolitan movement for the desegregation of large cities.

Koerner believes that the civil rights movement is the strongest factor in bringing about metropolitanism just as it is with big-city decentralization. Metropolitanism, however, is a far more difficult change to bring about because it engenders so such potentially dangerous hostility on the part of elements within the white community. Many whites see the movement as a threat both to the quality of local schools within the city and to the "refuge" the suburban school has always represented.

There is no question that such resistance makes any change difficult in the public schools. To emphasize this point, Janowitz says:

The result is that the urban public school system is viewed by citizen leadership and even experts as an excessively rigid organization that has great difficulty in dealing with innovation, whether the issue be academic policy, vocational program or social climate. The rigidities of the system mean that is has a low capacity to meet the needs

---

5Ibid., pp. 130-137.
of whole groups of students as well as of individual youngsters.\textsuperscript{6}

He further described three views of the administration which are found repeatedly in all large city systems: (a) the inner city school is "highly overcentralized" and fails to meet the needs of both students and teachers with flexible and innovative programming; (b) the inner city school is mired in uniformity and routine with little capability for change; and (c) the public school system is "an organization that suffers because of the absence of standards of performance, that is, it lacks criteria for judging effectiveness and efficiency."\textsuperscript{7}

It should be noted, of course, that under the present arrangement in St. Louis, the board members being elected at-large, there is a fair distribution of membership across the city. Five of the twelve board members live in districts that qualify for ESEA Title I aid, and there are board members living in four of the five decentralized districts (Long, Enright, Turner and Northside).

The law as it presently stands requires the board to establish policy and administer the schools; that responsibility and the accountability for it cannot be abrogated or delegated, unless the law is changed. Law in no way restricts the board from soliciting the community for feedback, counsel, advice in


\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., pp. 287-294.
its deliberations. Within present law, the St. Louis Board of education has been able to create machinery to help achieve many of the desirable effects of community control, effects that we all want - regardless of legal prescription.

Formal action by the St. Louis Public Schools to decentralize the instructional administration began in 1953 when the directors of Elementary Education were transferred from the downtown office to offices in the reading clinics. The purpose of the move was to have the administrators in the field where they could become more alert and responsive to the needs and aspirations of the people in the various parts of the city. Each director was charged with the responsibility of coordinating and improving the educational programs in the elementary schools in his area.

In 1960 Parent Congresses were established in each of the five districts - Banneker, Long, Northside, South Grand, and Turner. The congresses were composed of parent representatives from each school in the districts; they met each month with the Directors (Assistant Superintendents - later) to effect greater understanding and cooperation between the parents and the school staff.

In 1962 the directors were designated assistant superintendents and given greater administrative responsibility over their districts. With the continued growth through the system, a sixth district, the Enright District, was established in 1964.
It was during this year that civil rights groups protested the school board's method of transfer of pupils from overcrowded segregated schools to underutilized white schools. Under the board program, complete classes of children were transferred together with their teachers only to be segregated within the receiving schools. As a result of the protests, the board modified its policy and transferred children in all grades from a given geographical area into integrated classes in the receiving schools.  

8 Crain notes that if there were no busing program at this time, the schools would have been quite segregated, with only ten percent of the Negro students and fourteen percent of the white students in integrated schools. However, during 1965-1966 the busing of 2,600 Negro students into predominantly white schools increased the number of Negro and white in integrated schools to fourteen and thirty-six percent respectively.  

9 Later the problem was handled by building new schools in black neighborhoods which did away with busing. Since that time massive population shifts caused by urban renewal along with the suburban exodus have substantially re-segregated the schools.

8 Gittell and Hollander, p. 156.

Moves to extend the assistant superintendents' responsibilities began in 1966 with a pilot program in the South Grand district. A vertical structure of supervision was established to include both the elementary and secondary schools in the district. The following fall the second pilot program was established in the Enright District. This vertical structure was made system-wide at the beginning of the 1968-69 school year. This structure eliminates the need for an administrator in charge of high schools in the central office. All schools at this time were administered from the field.

At this time each district served about 17,000 students. Each assistant superintendent has a staff which includes a district assistant or director, and two or three instructional supervisors. The six districts are served by system-wide departments in such areas as personnel, building maintenance, social work, curriculum development, testing and counseling, finance, food service, special and technical education. Yet the Report of a blue-ribbon Education Task Force of the Mayor's Council on Youth warned:

There is an undercurrent of dissatisfaction with the present educational structure in St. Louis ... The Committee is convinced that conditions exist in the St. Louis area which will emerge as a force for decentralization. While there is time, we strongly recommend that a worthwhile plan be developed for meaningful citizen participation.
Only about eleven percent of the 150,000 parents in St. Louis belong to parent organizations, and most of the members do not attend meetings. Probably the most famous community school program existed in the Banneker District in the heart of the ghetto under the leadership of Sam Shepard, a black educator, who began a series of programs in the late 50's aimed at increasing student motivation. His programs had nation-wide publicity. Parents were not only welcomed in the schools, but were asked to sign the Parent's Pledge listing ten ways they would support their children in school. To this day the Benneker parents are among the best organized in the city.

The Murphy-Blair District Education Board (DEB) began operation in December of 1968 having served as a pilot, a model of grass-roots participatory project. The program allowed, in a controlled manner, people to gain experience in community control.

The program began with a spontaneous request from the neighborhood for greater involvement in the school programs as they related to problems of urban living. With the cooperation of the Grace Hill Settlement House governing board and professional staff, the local, low-income residents of a Northside St. Louis area, embraced four public schools, and attempted to work out their own solutions to the problems they perceived. Among their various elected boards was a district education board consisting

10 St. Louis Scoreboard, Section VII, p. 3.
of 15 residents and 10 non-residents. This board included eight parents, two from each of the four public schools, and two representatives of the Catholic and Lutheran schools. The Northside district Superintendent and a member of the St. Louis Board of Education also served as members and provided a means of direct communication with the public school administration and the Board of Education.

The DEB gave traditional support to the schools as well as acting for a FORUM for alienated parents. In October, 1969, the DEB demanded the following in defining its role in a proposed new community school:

1. The Community School Board must be more than an advisory board. It should have the power and the means to do a survey to determine what kinds of programs the neighborhood wants and should have control of all programs.

2. The hiring of all Community School staff be done in accordance with procedure set by the Neighborhood Workers Council; i.e., the qualifications and duties of each position are to be evaluated and reviewed by the Neighborhood Workers Council; the job description is posted in the neighborhood for a certain length of time.

3. The hiring and firing of the director be done by the Community School Board.

4. The Community School Program seek to make the school the focal point, the gathering point in the neighborhood, where meetings of all kinds would be held and where other cultural and recreational activities would also be held.
5. The relation of the Model Cities' Community Schools to the other community schools run by the Board of Education be made clear, i.e., that the Model Cities' Community Schools have part in the overall policy-making done by the Board of Education's Advisory Board.

6. That the Block Captains System be paid to do a survey of the neighborhood to determine the desires of the neighborhood.11

In March of 1970, an agreement was finally at hand. The Murphy-Blair DEB did not receive any foundation money except for $5,000.00 from the Model City Agency for a neighborhood survey on directions for the new community school. The Agency stipulated that no money would be approved without community input for the development of the local community school. When the DEB rejected the School Board's proposal that a community school coordinator should meet academic requirement and be paid $14,000.00, the DEB's counterproposal won. The counterproposal called for a $10,000.00 coordinator and a $6,000.00 assistant coordinator as a resident-in-training for the job. The future of the Murphy-Blair DEB is not too hopeful in that federal agencies are less inclined to fund private groups in the inner city because of the scarcity of money. The Murphy-Blair like the earlier mentioned Banneker Project has provided an avenue

for a more active and responsive citizenry in meeting the educational needs of their children.

In January of 1969 the six assistant superintendents were designated district superintendents in order to reflect the increase in local responsibility and the more direct administrative relationships with the Board of Education. The six district superintendents attend the monthly meetings of the Parent Congresses and the irrespective districts, and are functioning in relation to these Congresses, in a manner similar to that of a superintendent and a Board of Education. In 1970, three of the six district superintendents were black, as were half of the principals and teachers. There are nearly 5,000 teachers employed.12

The district superintendents not only pick their own four-man staff, but they can also veto the selection in their district down to the level of department chairmen. They also prepare and submit the budgets for the schools in their districts and sit in on the budget-cutting sessions. The Superintendent with his staff and the district superintendent meet weekly to consider educational problems.

By action of the Board of Education, the six District Parent Congresses were given a formal structure and function. This was done to establish more direct parent involvement at the

---

12St. Louis Scoreboard.
local level in the planning and operation of the schools:

1. The parent representatives from each school are elected annually to represent the school at regular monthly meetings of the Parent Congress. Limit: not more than four per school.

2. The Parent Congresses meet on a regular basis each month; the agenda for each meeting is determined by members of the Congress with the assistance of the district superintendent.

3. Each Congress is providing an opportunity for any resident or organizational representative in the district to express suggestions and recommendations concerning school affairs.

By the above action of the Board of Education, two members of the Board were appointed by the President of the Board to serve as liaison members for each of the six District Parent Congresses. These Board members attend the monthly meetings of the Parent Congresses and have the assigned responsibility of reporting on the Parent Congress meeting to the entire Board of Education at its next regular meeting. The Parent Congresses have been urged to use the service of these Board members for ready and easy communication between the parents of the local district and the Board of Education.

In September of 1969 an appropriation of $5,000.00 for each District Superintendent to be used for special activities and programs for students and parents was placed in the 1969-1970 budget.
An experimental program for the school year 1969-70, locating a sum of money for each of the Parent Congress groups, the amount equal to one dollar ($1.00) per full-time pupil in each of the respective districts was instituted. Disbursements and expenditures of this Parents Congress money should be controlled by the officers and members of each Congress. The Congress should hear and consider requests from all elected representatives of schools in the district; it may decide to spend the money on the district as a whole, or it may give sums to individual schools in the district. Two irrevocable procedures must govern all expenditures of the money: 1. final decisions concerning expenditures must be made by the Congress subject to any statutory or Board of Education regulations, 2. the money must be spent for the instructional benefit of the children in the district. The district superintendents should be available for counsel in regard to all purchases by the Congresses; their function should be one of counseling and not decision-making.

In November of 1969, the Danforth Foundation sponsored a conference of over eight hundred delegates from different community organizations in the city. Held in the plush Chase-Park Plaza Hotel, the conference aim was to develop new participatory structures in the school system. The first three recommendations were:

1. The St. Louis Board of Education should be decentralized to provide a separate school board for each of the six school districts.
2. In addition to six district boards, there should be a Central Board of Education which should include two people from each district.

3. The Central Board would collect taxes, set the tax rates, and disperse funds to the district boards. District boards would have all other powers.\textsuperscript{13}

Early in 1970 William Kottmeyer, at age 59, resigned as superintendent. All were to miss his weekly broadcasts from his office over the school's radio station. The board chose Clyde Miller, a veteran of the school system, to replace him. Many people wanted a black man for the job. It was at this time that Sam Shepard left St. Louis. Two other blacks within the system were appointed Deputy Superintendent and acting personnel director.

In answer to the Danforth Conference, the board insisted that the Parent Congresses was one of the most promising grass roots structure in the schools. The board did issue its statement of the leadership's philosophy of decentralization:

Both the system and the community would suffer, we feel, from hasty and precipitous unloading of responsibility without preparing for it. Our intention has been to decentralize in phases, to plan the evolution. Recent experience in other large cities underscores the hazard of hasty and ill-considered changes. Our position is that the

\textsuperscript{13}A Response to the Recommendations of the Community Conference on St. Louis Public Schools, Division of Evaluation and Research, (February, 1970), p. 53.
changes can still be radical, if we train ourselves for them beforehand.\textsuperscript{14}

The Board also pointed with pride to the Murphy-Blair as a pilot project that "is allowing us, in a controlled manner, to gain experience in community control."\textsuperscript{15}

A step toward further decentralization was taken in September, 1970, with the reorganization of the school system into five districts consisting of ten administrative units, each containing two high schools and their respective feeding elementary schools.\textsuperscript{16} The move is intended to strengthen communications and make possible greater responsiveness to students, parents and teachers.

Each administrative unit (one high school and its feeding elementary schools) will have its own Parent Congress, and two units will be paired in a district, making five overall districts. Previously the school system had operated with six administrative districts, each with a Parent Congress.

Each district will have elementary curriculum committees at three levels; primary, middle and upper grades. Representation on the committees will include all schools in the district and will be selected by the local faculties. Formerly the

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 17.
\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 26.
\textsuperscript{16}St. Louis Reorganization Plan, Office of the Superintendent, June 9, 1970.
Teacher committees were appointed centrally from the six districts. It is expected that greater variation in curriculum and even in the adoption of textbooks will result from this diffusion of responsibilities. In addition to the district superintendent who will plan and be responsible for the total program for the district, each district will have two administrative assistants, each with direct responsibility for one high school and its feeding elementary schools.

The school system logically divides into ten administrative units based on the ten regular academic high schools. Units were paired for their geographic unity and the location of their feeding elementary schools. Previously some elementary schools fed into a high school located in another administrative district. Effort was made to equalize the size of the districts. Formerly the number of schools assigned to a district ranged from one high school and fourteen elementary schools or two high schools and twenty-eight elementary schools. O'Fallon Technical Center, Lincoln High, South Grand Work-Study High and all special schools will continue to operate on a city-wide basis.

As a member of the superintendent's staff, the district superintendent will meet weekly with the Superintendent and other district superintendents to establish city-wide policy and formulate administrative decisions. He will have the responsibility for preparing district budgets and controlling all expenditures in his district; coordinating the district's program with
city-wide policy; working with the Parent Congress of each administrative unit in his district; supervising curriculum committees, evaluating district personnel, and establishing and meeting with teacher advisory committees. He will attend all Board meetings and provide the Board with information that will interpret the district's needs and interests. The district superintendent will be responsible for the operation of one of the two administrative units of the district. He will be responsible for knowing and providing for the needs and requests of the school personnel, parents and students at the local level in both the high school and its feeding elementary schools. He will also assist the superintendent in the coordination of the district programs with various central agencies and services.

The curriculum committees of each district will study district problems and develop curriculum plans to meet the district's needs. The relationship of the curriculum division to the district curriculum committees will become essentially one of consultant service. The division is expected to provide research finds, new teaching materials, information on curriculum trends, and successes or failures of curriculum ventures. At the high school level the curriculum division will continue to coordinate the curriculum work of the high schools through regular meetings with the assistant principals responsible for instruction. It is assumed that unprecedented curriculum variations among the five districts will result from this reorganization.
Such variation will be the logical and inevitable products of the decentralization of administrative responsibility and the efforts to design a flexible curriculum geared to meet district needs.

Instead of a Parent Congress from each district, there will be one from each administrative unit. Members of the Parent Congress will represent the high school and the elementary schools in the unit. A representative of each of the ten Parent Congresses will attend Board of Education meetings and regularly report to the Board. The district superintendent will work with the Parent Congress much as the superintendent relates to the Board of Education, dealing directly with both Congresses. The establishment of a Parent Congress for each administrative unit will involve the parent group directly in the schools with which they are closely identified.

All these changes indicate increased decentralization and the hoped-for participation but a severe blow to the system’s gradual approach to decentralization was dealt by the loss of a tax levy of 1971. In the spring of 1971, the board decided to run a "decentralization campaign" to increase voter support. Leadership was left in the hands of the district superintendents rather than the parents. The decentralization strategy was unable to reverse the pattern of opposition to public school taxes in white neighborhoods and apathy in black areas. In St. Louis, increases in school taxes require a simple majority vote in a special election.
So the matter stands as of January, 1974. The press for
decentralization, in the absence of the catalyst of community
pressure and support, appears to be frustrated again.
CHAPTER VI

CLEVELAND

The Cleveland School System was initially chosen for this study as one of the original target areas for decentralization in the public schools of the Midwest. Since that time the entire program has floundered in a floodtide of problems over integration. So pressing have been these problems, that no formal decentralization program has yet been published and no community sentiment in favor of it has yet crystalized. It is apparent that neither administration nor community are pressing for any change toward decentralization at present. A brief summary of the present organizational structure of the Cleveland public school system and a summary description of their integration problems follow.

The Cleveland Board of Education consists of seven members who are elected for a term of four years on an over-lapping basis in biennial elections. There is no limit to the number of terms an individual may serve. A person wishing to be a candidate must file a nomination petition signed by at least one percent of the number of electors who voted in the last gubernatorial election. Because of weak financial support from the State of Ohio, the Board of Education is subject to great political pressures at the local level.
Broad demographic and social trends appear to bear major responsibility for racial isolation in the Cleveland public schools. The Cleveland Board of Education has a strong and continuing commitment to the principal of "neighborhood schools."¹

Cleveland has experienced immigration of Negroes and an exodus of white people to the suburbs in the past few decades. The Cuyahoga River walls the east and west side which contains about a third of the city's inhabitants. The West Side has remained white through its history. In 1965 Negroes constituted forty-six percent of the east side population, and less than one percent of the West Side residents.²

By the end of the 1962-63 academic year, Negroes constituted a majority of the pupil population in Cleveland public schools. Three decades before only about one-tenth of the student population was Negro. In 1963 one out of every seven Negro children in the Cleveland school system had literally no white school mates. The vast majority of both white and Negro pupils had virtually no contact in school with children of a different race.³

¹Administrative Code, Cleveland Board of Education, Section 505, 1963.
³Enrollment Report, Bureau of Child Accounting, Cleveland Board of Education.
The Catholic School System in Cleveland has also played a great part in school segregation as a very small percentage of Catholic school enrollment is made up of Negro children.

In the years 1958 through 1965, 17 elementary schools, 3 junior high schools and 1 senior high school were added to the Cleveland system. All of them were either nearly-all-Negro or nearly-all-white when they opened. During the same period, 15 additions were built to existing elementary schools. The racial analysis was the same.

Presently the Cleveland Public School System is composed of 138 elementary schools, 27 junior and 16 senior high schools.

Special Schools:

1. Occupational School - Thomas Edison
2. Vocational Schools - Max S. Hayes - boys
   Jane Addams - girls
1. Physically Handicapped - Sunbeam
1. Deaf and Mute Children - Alexander G. Bell
Bessie B. Metzenbaum Children's Center - grades 1 - 12
   Blossom Hill - grades 6 - 12.\(^4\)

The line organization of the public school system is indicated on Chart 1.

Paul Briggs, Superintendent of the Cleveland Public schools for more than ten years, has been sensitive to the problems of the community. He strives for quality education for all children. He presented the concept of neighborhood schools in positive terms, as a center of social and recreational life for the total community. Civil rights activists seemed drawn to Briggs, as were other community elements. Even though he was able to obtain different educational programs from the federal government he had directed little attention to the issue of school integration.

Joseph M. Cronin stated:

Paul Briggs actively cultivated the assistance of business leaders and the black community, whose support he won in part by promoting several dozen black professionals to administrative positions. Subsequently he worked closely with the white ethnic groups as well. The concept of community control and decentralization attracted little support in Cleveland, but neither did Briggs encourage any major plan to achieve racial integration in a city which has known considerable tension between races and nationalists.5

However, the Cleveland Public School System has worked to build a staff which is representative of the people it serves. The following statistics indicate the success of this effort.

### Professional Staff Statistics - Racial Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
<th>Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall'68</td>
<td>Fall'69</td>
<td>Fall'68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Central Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Superintend.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors, Supervisors, and Coordinators</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Admin. Staff (Psychologists, Visiting Tchrs., Tchrs. Assigned to Central Office)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Principals</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Asst. Prins.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Leadership Development</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Tchrs.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Prins.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Asst. Prins.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Leadership Development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5816</td>
<td>6212</td>
<td>3535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grand Totals</td>
<td>6480</td>
<td>6972</td>
<td>3967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

With respect particularly to the school in the urban setting, Superintendent Briggs has stated that:

The early years of this century, city schools found their outstanding challenge to be Americanizing the thousands of children of immigrant families. In the period since World War II, the urban school has faced the need to expand and adapt its program to another changing population. That was the period of mass exodus from the city to the suburbs, of greater migration into the city of rural poor, and the accelerated movement of blacks to large urban centers."

"Today's urban school enrolls increasing numbers of children and youth with a greater variety of backgrounds, interests, abilities, personality strengths and disabilities than at any time in the educational history."7

Community involvement in the Cleveland Public Schools has been expressed in the report of the Staff Council on Curriculum Design and Implementation entitled "Toward Dynamic Curriculum." This report was adopted on July 14, 1970. The report is a comprehensive plan which delineated the processes through which any program can be developed and evaluated in action. The implementation of the curriculum plan was initiated with the opening of the 1970-71 school year.

Copies of the report were distributed to all schools and offices of the Board as well as the Cleveland Public Library for

the use of the public.

The report was implemented through a city-wide advisory committee on curriculum priorities as well as local advisory committees at all elementary schools. The members of the advisory committees were elected respectively by the parents and staff of the school. In a series of meetings the principals, chairmen and secretaries of the local committees were introduced to the functions of their committees.

The system presented in "Toward Dynamic Curriculum" is operative and its viability has been demonstrated in action. More people are involved in the curriculum affairs of the Cleveland Public Schools than ever before. In June of 1971, Paul Briggs stated,

"...it was my privilege to present the report "Toward Dynamic Curriculum" to this board. At that time I indicated my unqualified personal and professional endorsement of the plan. A year later after working with the implementation of this program I am more sure than ever of the validity and feasibility of the proposal I presented to you in June 1970."\(^8\)

The school committees as well as the city advisory committee had been meeting since the adoption of the "Toward Dynamic Curriculum" report. It was apparent that confusion had existed at both these levels and that some school communities had

---

\(^8\)Toward Dynamic Curriculum, A Progress Report, James R. Tanner, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction, Cleveland Public Schools, September 23, 1971.
been apathetic to the proposal. A questionnaire survey of local
committee members was conducted in December, 1971 and again in
February, 1973. 9

Again the Progress Report of February 8, 1973, recom-
mended the following points to the local school advisory commit-
tees:

1. That their area of concern be
broadened so that they become
general advisory committees, with
perhaps a subcommittee specializing
in curriculum affairs.

2. That the requirement for monthly
meetings be changed to provide for
periodic meetings -- not fewer than
four per school year. 10

To date, the Board is considering these recommendations.

One of the more innovative features of the Cleveland
School System that has done more for inter-group understanding
than any of the frustrated decentralization schemes is the
Supplementary Educational Center. The Supplementary Educational
Center was established in 1966. Children from widely varying
economic and cultural backgrounds from all areas of the city,
attending both public and parochial schools, visit the center and
participate in an instructional program which includes Art and

9Fact Sheet, Local School Committees on Curriculum
Priorities, Cleveland Public Schools, 1972. (For complete Fact
Sheet see Appendix IV.)

10Toward Dynamic Curriculum, A Progress Report, James R.
Tanner, Cleveland Public Schools, February 8, 1973.
Music, Social Studies, Science and a combined summer program. The Center is also used as a meeting place for organizations such as the PACE Association in the development of a human relations course study.

There is developing community school cooperation in the Cleveland Public Schools with the establishment of various organizations with parents, teachers, administrators and students as participating members. The PTA has over 40,000 dues-paying members. Members volunteer for such positions in the schools as room mothers, library aides, tutors, lunchroom aides, etc. They assist in open house, parents day, awards day, talent day, etc.

In spite of these small signs of increasing public involvement, the General Superintendent of Cleveland Public Schools is not in favor of decentralization and no pressure for decentralization has been brought by any community group.\footnote{Joseph M. Cronin, \textit{The Control of Urban Schools}, p. 225.} Given the lack of community pressure, and the attitude of the General Superintendent, it is not surprising that decentralization in the Cleveland Public Schools has been given such a low order of priority.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Review of Decentralization Proposals

In spite of the absence of any genuine movement toward greater decentralization in the cities included in this study, few problems are of more concern for schools than the need for greater citizen involvement in educational decision making. The primary reason for this increased participation is to reduce the response time to problems calling for solutions. Educators in the 1950's thought they answered this problem through district consolidation. During the 1960's district reorganization shifted from district consolidation to decentralization of large city school districts. This transition seemed gradual at first, but by the end of the 60's everyone seemed to join the bandwagon.

Early in the decade, decentralization of large city districts was alluded to in articles on consolidation. Blanke did recognize the "unique" condition of large city school districts, although his entire article on school district reorganization is concerned with the problem of consolidation. He does have a high priority to preserve natural communities of interested citizens when consolidating districts.¹ Others have written earlier about

the need for administrative decentralization. The Commission on Urban Education, State of Illinois Final Report for 1971 summarizes some of them as follows:

Cillie (1940) in his study of school organization related bigness to inflexibility and powerlessness at all levels of the administrative structure.\(^2\)

Hicks (1942) noted that adaptations initiated by the central office will be less well understood and less extensively developed than those which spring from within the community. When cities are comparable in size and expenditure, those promoting the greatest extent of local freedom will rank highest in adaptability, and their teachers highest in the understanding of modern educational issues.\(^3\)

Mort and Vincent (1946) observed that education in many ways is hampered in the large city. Here, as nowhere else among American schools, education is centrally controlled. People have no voice, no control, questions go unanswered, "I'm sorry, but that matter is completely out of my hands, you will have to go to headquarters." But one never gets close enough to the man at headquarters who makes the decisions, and one gives up.\(^4\)

Wesby (1947) concluded that:

a. Local autonomy could neither be established nor assured by granting more power to principals and superintendents.


\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Ibid.
b. People in the community must have power to make decisions that will have a real effect on operations of schools and the means by which these decisions can be translated into action.\textsuperscript{5}

In the middle 1950's the decentralization movement could be seen in the Federal Renewal Program which required local communities to participate in the educational planning process. In 1959, the committee for Economic Development noted several disadvantages associated with excessive size. The report stated:

Really huge size may bring some administrative disadvantages, including the loss of contact of top school management with the school principal and teacher, and its greater inaccessibility to parents of pupils, as well as the difficulty of adjusting to the varying needs of children with different backgrounds in various sections of the district.\textsuperscript{6}

In 1962, Griffiths, Clark, Wynne, and Iannaccone suggested the internal decentralization of large city districts:

As a municipality increases in size from 100,000 to 500,000 population or more, the district should be divided into areas and the central office should decrease in size.\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid.


Not only did Campbell, Cunningham and McPhee stress the importance of consolidating educational agencies, but they pointed out the pitfalls of over-centralization. They wrote:

"We believe that every effort must be made to resist unnecessary tendencies toward centralization. This attitude does not rest on a false sense of democratic idealism but rather on a firm belief that citizens need the opportunity to participate in decisions which affect the welfare of their children."\(^8\)

Havighurst wanted the people to have power to influence decisions. His observations included the following:

"The move for local community control in slum areas, and radically segregated areas, is really an attempt by heretofore powerless groups to secure the same degree of control over their local schools as exists in practice for middle income groups."\(^9\)

Havighurst said each local district should have no more than 5,000 to 10,000 pupils.\(^\)\(^10\) Large cities would also need some

---


\(^10\)Ibid., p. 135.
"central power working for integration against the segregative tendencies of decentralization." 11

The importance of community involvement in major educational decisions was stressed in the Final Report of the Task force on Orban Education, submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on January 5, 1970. The Task Force noted:

"The community residents and students who are to be the direct participants in urban education programs must have an active role in the critical decision-making concerning such programs, whether this role should include full control by the community residents or a partnership arrangement with whatever educational agency is affected will be a matter which each urban area will need to work out on its own....Regardless of the particular form which community involvement takes, this role must include policymaking in the area of: (1) priorities for spending of available monies; (2) design of the curriculum and implementation of program components; and (3) employment of key personnel." 12

As can be seen, the 1960's brought the school reformers to a higher level of sophistication. For the first time large cities were beginning to publish reading scores. 13 People began

11Ibid., pp. 135 and 136


look more closely at student achievement and make the school more accountable to parents for both the results and resources of education. "Public education was never intended to be a professional monopoly." 

Both poor education results and the reluctance to implement integration in the 1950's and 1960's gave birth to the decentralization movement as a means of reform. Decentralization, then, is the necessary reorganization of a school system's administrative structure to bring decision making closer to the level of the individual schools and to give individuals more power to influence policy decisions. It reduces the number of bureaucratic channels through which one must negotiate before decisions are made.

In a recent study, Colin Greer examined the history of urban public schools and concluded that they never dealt effectively with the poor. Greer discusses two myths of American


education: 1) "that public schools did great and marvelous things for poor people in the past"; and that 2) "even if the miracles the public schools actually performed in the past were few, they could easily perform one now." Greer concludes that control has been invested in professional educators more concerned with their own interests than the children's needs.

Arguments For and Against Decentralization

This paper has described some of the different approaches toward decentralization in selected urban centers. The values of centralization and decentralization will be continuously argued. Arguments for and against decentralization are usually derived from the belief or value systems of the proponent or opponent. Strengths and weaknesses of centralization and decentralization can and will be isolated and argued. In some cases the controversy will be largely academic. However, running parallel with the arguments will be the strong criticism by the various power groups opposed to the present system. These power groups will continue to clamor for change from organizational control to a system that would grant local power centers more influence over the schools.

Miller and Woock stated,

We have discussed the most sensitive and crucial of urban problems; the relationship between the school and the community which it serves. Historically this relationship is

18Ibid., p. 153.
described as mutually supportive. However, this relationship does not characterize large city schools and especially schools serving minority communities.19

The Fourth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education indicates:

Many schools are now making an effort to bridge the gap between school and home but their efforts are often casual and misdirected. Only slightly more than a third of the parents with children enrolled in the public schools had attended any meeting (from September, 1971, through April, 1972) whose purpose was to show how they, as parents, can increase the interest of their children in school work, teach them how and when to do school work, and help in other ways to promote school success.20

In the past, action at the national level has been necessary to advance toward reality the concept of equality of educational opportunity. This has occurred in judicial decisions against racial discrimination and in the provision of financial assistance to local school districts. It now appears that leadership at the national level may be required to assure equalization of financial support of school districts within states though the Rodriquez Decision seems to indicate a reluctance on the part of the federal government to accept that role.


concurrently with this pressure toward greater centralization of leadership and support of educational systems at the national level, there is a justified demand by urban area parents and communities for greater involvement in a decentralized school system. Thus, both centralization and decentralization seem to be occurring simultaneously in a broad movement toward wider variation of individual parts within a better coordinated total system.

Both black and white movements favoring more decentralized control over schools appear to be part of a broader reaction against large, bureaucratic school systems in major cities. A characteristic common to many of the administrative proposals advanced is that they attempt in one manner or another to eliminate, or at least restructure, the existing educational bureaucracy. The Friedman proposal for granting a family credit line to be spent for education as each family pleases, whether in public or private schools, is one proposal that has been advanced.

Although there are many variables over which the boards and administrators of large educational systems have no control, they can learn through the mistakes of others and can plan

---


alternative courses of action. There is no need to repeat the problems that other cities have gone through in seeking decentralization. It appears that there will be no dearth of major problems for administrators to confront. It should be productive to attempt to predict some of the major problems that relate to further decentralization.

The most recent educational research stresses the importance of psychological needs to the learning process. Whether a pupil feels his efforts can influence and control his future - feelings of identity and self-worth - emerges as the prime learning factor. What a teacher expects of her pupils has great bearing on how much a child learns. Though no panacea for the ills of urban education, decentralization seeks to provide the necessary structure to respond to the particular needs of pupils. Without this structure, more money and more imaginative programs will have little effect.

That the condition of segregated education is in fact educationally damaging to minority children of deprived backgrounds was documented in the 1966 Coleman Report, which found:

Of the many implications of this study of school effects on achievement, one appears to be of overriding importance...That schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context; and that this very lack of an independent effect means that the inequalities imposed on children by their home, neighborhood and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities with which they confront adult
life at the end of school. For equality of educational opportunity through the schools is independent of the child's immediate social environment, and that strong independent effect is not present in American schools."23

To draw school district boundaries around relatively homogeneous areas is to reduce the opportunity for schools to introduce "different" kinds of children to each other. Recognition of this problem leads some to view decentralization proposals as calls for the "balkanization" of a city.24

John H. Fisher, President of Columbia University Teachers College, stated,

"A principal issue in respect to ghetto schools is whether the risks of segregation overbalance the probably advantages of local identification and initiative. Given the current state of race relations in the United States, I am persuaded that the arguments in honor of more local control are stronger than those against it. This is not to say that segregation should be our goal. It is to say that before racial integration is likely to produce the benefits it could yield, black Americans must have greater opportunities to assert their own preferences, to control their own destinies, to manage their own affairs."25


On the other hand, Professor Robert J. Havighurst of the University of Chicago expressed much greater optimism about the prospects of school integration in large cities, especially through metropolitan area-wide efforts. He asserted that,

"The further we go toward local community control of schools in the present big-city situation, the more difficulty we create for a policy of social integration. In the suburbs, there is too much community control for the health of the whole metropolitan area."\(^{26}\)

Charles V. Hamilton, Professor of Political Science at Roosevelt University, questions the legitimacy of the present education establishment and its attempts to achieve "quality education" by means that are not longer relevant to the black community.\(^{27}\)

The present system, he contends, has failed the black community and thus destroyed the only basis upon which any system achieves legitimacy—effectiveness. Since the system does not have the confidence or support of the black community, efforts to achieve quality education through integration and busing are seen as patronizing efforts to maintain white control in the face of growing demands for ethnic identification and

---


Mr. Hamilton's argument points out serious problems that face not only the relationship of schools and community but the whole institutional structure of American society.

It may be true, as Hamilton implies, that a serious cultural lag exists between the problems and their solutions as viewed by "experts" or institutions such as the Supreme Court and the problems and solutions as viewed by the local community. There is no question that in large urban areas, at least, the proposed solutions to the problem of integration have been frustrated, if not superseded, by demands for community control. Recognition of the legitimacy of many of these demands has muddied the once clear waters of liberal thought on this issue for both black and white alike.

One thing seems clear. If the educational system cannot respond to these demands in an effective manner, we will have to deal with the much more serious concerns of a fragmented society the direction of which runs counter to the whole thrust of Western civilization since the Enlightenment.

Thomas Green, Director of the Educational Policy Research Center of Syracuse University, has taken a look forward to see what the organizational structure of the schools will be like in 1990.\textsuperscript{28} In spite of what educators or other interested

Parties may wish to be the case, the polity of the school system is likely to be basically what it traditionally has been.

By polity, Green means "that set of institutions and social arrangements whereby power and authority are distributed." This polity is unlikely to undergo significant or radical restructuring basically because the five basic points at which change must occur to substantially alter the existing structure are themselves not likely to undergo significant change.

First of all, the schools are likely to continue to be viewed as specialized and differentiated from the rest of society in its educative role. Although there have been frequent criticisms of the school as irrelevant precisely because it is so highly specialized and differentiated from the community it serves; and although there have been efforts at reform to reverse this process, these efforts are likely to fail. As long as education is viewed, as it is by the vast majority, as too significant to be "trusted to change" and too "comprehensive to permit individual families to give it the needed time or effort" the more likely it is to continue to be a differentiated and specialized institutional arrangement.

Secondly, it is Green's contention that the existing value structure dictates little change in the polity of the schools. The schools are viewed basically as "managerial education" valued for its product rather than traditional or humanistic education. Although the traditional view of education as the
transmitter of the heritage and the humanistic view of education as the developer of human potential are both viable values within the school structure, they neither dominate nor are they likely to indicate the trend over the next twenty years.

Thirdly, the fact that the school provides access to opportunities in the greater society by granting credentials that communities view as important reinforces the managerial view of the schools and sustains its existing polity. The relations between school and community are often very poor where the quality of education is low, where school management is isolated, and where credentials are viewed as crucial. It is these three factors in combination that have been responsible for the emphasis on accountability and decentralization. Green feels, however, that plans for decentralization, educational parks, local boards, etc., will bear little fruit unless the managerial values of the present are successfully altered.

The credential and managerial values which operate to maintain the existing school polity are in conflict with the value of cultural pluralism which values different life styles and provides for their development within the context of the whole. The problem, of course, is providing for differing life styles without producing separatism. The idea is that significant differences in outlook and attitudes would be encouraged without those differences becoming so fundamental as to be divisive. This kind of society does not appear to be in the
A fourth factor involved in any basic change in educa-
tional polity is the rate of change in other institutional
structures. In spite of change in these other institutional
structures, the basic inertia of the school structure is likely
to resist any fundamental change.

Finally, educational technology itself is not as great a
force for change as is sometimes supposed. It has on the whole
simply been used to make the system more efficient rather than
to fundamentally alter its structure. He views the technology
question as one basically outside the main considerations since
it would serve any structure that the other forces would dictate.

In conclusion, the factors for change of a fundamental
nature are present but the inertia of the present system and the
value positions that society holds toward the school are likely
to prevent any fundamental reorganization of the school structure.

Special Problems of Decentralization

In all the cities studied, the school boards instituted
some kind of decentralization if only on an experimental level.
Greater participation in the educational system attracted support
of most educational interest groups.

At the December 1972 meeting of the National Council of
Urban School Administrators and Supervisors (NCUSAS), the topic
of decentralization rated a high priority on the agenda. The
following were areas in which decentralization created problems:

1. Curtailment of special services.
2. Present thinking in terms of financing education which is more centralization.
3. The establishment of racial quotas in hiring that had to be brought in to decentralized districts.
4. That it is an administrative remedy rather than an educational advancement.
5. The new role of the central Board of Education under the decentralized system.
6. Qualifications of lay people who served on community school boards.
7. Differentiated staffing and seniority.
8. Prohibitive cost of decentralization.
9. The destruction of subject areas of expertise and curriculum development.
10. Problems raised by contract enforcement.
11. The problems of negotiations.
12. The responsibility of decentralized districts under the law.

In the course of discussion, Detroit representatives pointed out that $20,000,000 of its $80,000,000 deficit is due to decentralization where each of the community school boards has bought a one million dollar building to house its operations and, although decentralization was mandated by the state legislature, no funds were provided for it. In Cleveland serious objection to decentralization has been raised because of the deterioration of special services particularly in the areas of Vocational High School and Guidance Services. The level of involvement of lay board members in administrative policies was questioned by

---

representatives from almost every city. Further study was suggested with a hope that a strong position would be taken. The whole legal status of decentralized boards with regard to collective bargaining and hiring practices was discussed. Differentiated staffing and the experiment of assigning principals to lead clusters of schools rather than one principal for each building was reviewed. The question of the increasing role of para-professionals was raised along with questions about voucher systems and the contracting out of the educational process. It was recognized by all members that the polarization of races as a result of decentralization was a subject which went beyond the normal concern whether decentralization is an administrative function or is an attempt at community control. Most cities felt that integration has been hurt by decentralization. The council decided that it would be premature to take a position with regard to decentralization.

The NCUSAS has appointed a committee to study the effects as well as the future course of decentralization. The Council is presently surveying each city at length on the subject of decentralization and community control and should publish its findings in the near future.

In each city studied, decentralization advocates found that legal requirements sometimes required interventions from the state legislatures. In Chicago legislation was necessary if elected school boards were to be provided. St. Louis chose an elected Central Board but Chicago voters turned down elected
school boards in a referendum by a 3-1 ratio. Detroit's decentralization program was initiated by the State legislature. Certainly decentralization has had an influence in the school politics in all the cities studied except Cleveland. Even though the Michigan legislature mandated decentralization in Detroit, the local boards have been given certain formal powers by guidelines. However, they have found these difficult to implement fully because of budget limitations, union contracts, and internal discord. In addition to these, the school busing controversy has been given the center stage of school politics.

Much support has been given the decentralization movement by various foundations. These have been able to provide money for experimental programs as well as technical advice to cities. Perhaps the most noteworthy examples are the Ford Foundation in Detroit and the Danforth Foundation in St. Louis. As reported in the study of the cities in question, strong impetus along with money was given at the beginning but unfortunately the interest died out along with the monty.

Decentralization and Accountability

The decentralization movement has been caught up in the current trend of accountability of the schools. Accountability is defined by Lessinger as follows:

At its most basic level, it means that an agent, public or private, entering into a contractual agreement to perform a service will be held answerable for performing according to agreed-upon terms, within an established time period, and with a stipulated
use of resources and performance standards. This definition of accountability requires that the parties to the contract keep clear and complete records and that this information be available for outside review. It also suggests penalties and rewards; accountability without redress or incentive is mere rhetoric.30

The concern for accountability has been recognized both in and outside official government agencies. The Legislature of the State of California enacted into law on July 20, 1971, the Stull Bill which mandates each district to develop and adopt specific evaluation and assessment guidelines.31

The Peoples' Board of Education of New York published an analysis of the school budget with the following concluding statement:

"Unless there is decentralization in which local schools accountable for how the money is spent, can introduce the local kinds of 'quality control' to make certain that local needs are really being met, it seems wasteful and undesirable to simply increase the education budget. Instead it makes more sense for a detailed decentralization plan, for the entire city, to be drawn up with the local groups involved in the design, so that next year education can receive top priority, and the money won't be wasted in artificial and fake programs."32


31The Stull Bill was Assembly Bill 293. See Statutes 1971 Chapter 361.

For the first time the State of Illinois through its revised program for Evaluation, Supervision, and Recognition of schools, Circular Series A-160 requires that school districts submit a written program plan by December 31, 1973.33

For the City of Chicago this means that each of the twenty-seven sub-districts must prepare its own local district program plan for submission to the Office Superintendent of Public Instruction. These different district program plans will be a basic document with which OSPI can carry out its evaluation in supervision program. Not only will these program plans serve as an avenue for improving communications in and with the local districts but OSPI will be more aware of the local needs of the districts before embarking on their Recognition and Supervision Program.

The following components of the planning process must be completed by December 1, 1973:

1. A list of student-oriented goals. These are long-range goals which state in very general terms the desired knowledge, skills, and attitudes of students.

2. A list of system goals broken into six (6) categories:

   1) Governance Policy
   2) Administrative Structure and Practice
   3) Rights and Responsibilities of Individuals
   4) Instructional Program

5) Support Services
6) Staff Development and Inservice Training
   System goals describe in long range, general terms the desired performance of the educational system. It is possible that a district would develop more than one goal in some or all categories.

3. An assessment of "inventory" of district needs in relation to the system goals only.

4. Development of performance objectives in the system categories only and only for identified needs.

5. A brief outline of how programs to accomplish the objectives will be developed in the future and a brief outline of how an evaluation design will be developed. Notice that the Office of the Superintendent is not asking that the programs and evaluation design be developed -- only a brief statement of how these elements of the planning process will be developed.

6. A brief outline of how the district will report the contents of the plan and district accomplishments to its various publics.

Evaluating Decentralization

There are diverse opinions as to the success or possible success of decentralization. Mario D. Fantini, a leading exponent of decentralization, sums up his feelings on decentralization as follows:

The first question (of the sceptic) usually is: What evidence is there that neighborhood control of urban schools improves student achievement? The answer is that if there is no evidence it is because there really are no community-controlled urban public schools.... However, what we do have ample evidence of is the massive failure that the standard, centrally controlled, urban school has produced. It is ironic, therefore, that those in control of a failing system should ask others offering construc-
tive, democratically oriented alternatives to demand results before there has been any chance for full implementation.\textsuperscript{34}

Terry Clark states the following:

What a considerable portion of the literature on decentralization to date amounts to is special pleading for a particular solution... Very little attempt is made to develop ideas coherent enough to warrant the term "theory," and the casual use of favorable examples seldom justify the label of empirical research. Where knowledge is incomplete but problems immediate... one can still expect generalizing intellectuals and amateur politicians to come forth with solutions.

... decentralization ... may ameliorate some pressing problems. Such efforts can serve as useful vehicles for social as well as social scientific experimentation. But unless there is more systematic social scientific analysis of these efforts than we have generally had to date, we may never understand their many consequences.\textsuperscript{35}

Allan Ornstein states:

There is no empirical evidence that decentralization or community control will reform the schools. Without quality research, we base our claims at best on bandwagon wisdom, at worst on political ideology. Lack of research, lack of comparable data, and lack of concrete evidence tend to work in favor of those who advocate change.\textsuperscript{36}


Ornstein is seeking a partnership between practitioners and action-oriented researchers, among the various interest groups if an honest breakthrough is to be made.37

Diane Ravitch in her article, "Community Control Revisited" comments:

Reading tests given to Ocean Hill-Brownsville students in 1971 (less than a year after the experimental governing board and district had been dissolved indicated results lower than those of the tests given to the same schools in 1967, before the experiment was initiated. The district had 580 professional staff members, making a ratio of one professional to every 8 to 10 pupils. After all the publicity and conflict, after all expectations, after all the bold rhetoric and after all the money spent, jobs allocated, new machinery and programs introduced, the children of the district cannot read as well today as they did five years ago.38

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, a member of the State Board of Regents, New York City, stated that school decentralization in the city was failing to improve education because local boards were more interested in power than in better schools.

"My assessment of the consequences of decentralization two, three years ago where we were fighting for it ... I personally do not see evidence that decentralization has resulted in an increased quality of education for the children in the schools ... those involved in decentralization have forgotten

37Ibid., p. 613.

what the purpose was ... The purpose was not a struggle for power or control ... not to scrap decentralization but suggests that we try to make it more effective means toward the goal and that we give it every opportunity ... 39

The then school chancellor, Harvey B. Scribner, commented: "I think he's a little hasty in saying that decentralization hasn't made progress. Power struggles are taking place in all segments of society. More time is needed."

In an article published in The New York Times in November, 1972, Dr. Clark advised the City Chapter Revision Commission to beware of "simplistic manipulation of bureaucratic structure" as a hope for improving city government ... the city's school decentralization experiment has been a "disastrous" experiment in which the basic issue, teaching children, has been submerged by selfish forces ... These include racial politics of small local groups interested in "physical control" and a powerful union that protects teachers regardless of their quality. 40

The following editorial appeared in the NEW YORK TIMES on Saturday, December 2, 1972:

Warranted dissatisfaction at the many things wrong with the schools does not


add up to convincing proof that decentralization is the cause. Decentralization in itself was never a promise of better education. Its purpose was primarily to remove the barriers which stood between the school bureaucracy and the classroom. The aim was to let local communities shape strategies suitable to the children's needs, with the help of educational leaders in whom the communities had confidence. Decentralization remains a promising answer provided it is not allowed to disintegrate into a continuous contest between power-hungry groups and interests. Continuity of able professional leadership is as important now as was the elimination of an inadequate or unresponsive professionalism in the period of excessive bureaucratic rigidity.

Dr. Clark's forthright criticism can help correct present abuses. In his dual capacity as educator and civil rights leader, he should remain a powerful influence in efforts to make decentralization work. This can be done only by putting the spotlight on instructional reforms and encouraging good teaching.41

Joseph B. Weeres states that since these established forces are likely to prevail, supplementary mechanisms for linking the decentralized participatory structures to the school board must be instituted; otherwise, these structures will fail as conflict regulatory mechanisms. One approach would be to create standing school board committees to meet regularly with community advisory groups, and then to permit these groups to play a direct role in the appointment or election of school board members. This plan would allow advisory groups to by-pass the administrative chain of command and would provide the local community

groups with some sanction over school board members. If this proposal were implemented, not only would it serve to regulate conflict, but it would also make the school system more responsive to the needs of local communities.42

In general, decentralization has increased the number of participants and changed the character of successful school activists. There are some indications of greater involvement, but even here an effective link between the boards and the wider public has not developed.

Little significant evidence exists about the relationship of decentralization to student achievement. However, evidence suggests that the extension of the school into the community is important in facilitating the academic performance of students.43 In Reed's study of out-of-school influences on learning there is a positive association between the availability and utilization of educational services located outside the formal school setting and in-school performance. Tutoring in academic subjects, private lessons in music, educational programs in churches, and participation in scout activities and the "Y" were activities directly associated with academic achievement. To the extent

---


that these findings can be generalized, schools should actively provide learning experiences throughout the community. The formal participation of community members on a volunteer basis has the added advantage of increasing community concern.

The Schools, the Poor and Decentralization

The revisionist educational historians with Katz and Greer are questioning the role of the public school in bringing about an improvement in the status of the poor minorities.

Colin Greer's recent book indicates that the schools never existed for the poor and that their problems were never effectively met if only recognized by public education system.44

Greer discusses the sources of the myth that the public schools "increased opportunity ... morality and citizenship ... encouraged a talented leadership ... maintained social mobility ... and promoted social responsiveness to social conditions."45

After presenting his findings on Chicago, Greer concludes, "from 1890 on, so far as quantitative evidence allows us to document, the schools failed to perform up to their role. In virtually every study undertaken since that made of the Chicago schools in 1898, more children have failed in school than have succeeded, both in absolute and relative numbers.46"

.... Bureaucracy is the structure that emerged for education because "men confronted

46Ibid., p. 108.
particular kinds of social problems with particular social purposes."\textsuperscript{47}

In \textit{CLASS, BUREAUCRACY, AND SCHOOLS}, Katz believes that the failure of educational reform movements to change the public schools indicates a need for a "re-ordering of the society." The goals the reformers seek require "fundamental social reform, not the sort of tinkering educational change has represented."\textsuperscript{48}

Educational reformers should begin to distinguish what formal school can and cannot do. They must separate the teaching of skills from the teaching of attitudes, and concentrate on the former. In actual fact, it is of course impossible to separate the two; attitudes adhere in any form of practice. But there is a vast difference between leaving the formation of attitudes unintended and making them the object of education.\textsuperscript{49}

...Emerging out of the search for an educational policy to uplift the poor and expand opportunity for the middle class, bureaucracy was committed to the standardization and systemization of urban education. The bureaucratic model required centralization of authority, graded schools, supervised teachers, and professional training. Behind it all, Katz writes, lay "a gut fear of a cultural divisiveness inherent in the increasing religious and ethnic diversity of American life. Cultural homogenization played counterpoint to administrative rationality. Bureaucracy was intended to standardize far more than the conduct of public life."\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., p. xxiii.


\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., p. 143.

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid.; p. 39.
Public schooling, Katz thus concludes, was founded on class and racial hostility "integral, not incidental," to its very structure. Katz favors the decentralization movement and even says it is visionary but thinks that it is unlikely society will be reordered through changes in the public schools. Schools should make individuals literate so they can function in an increasingly complex technological society. Also individuals should learn in small, friendly, and simple environments.

The revisionist educational historians were and should continue to question the efficacy of our schools for our children. But in questioning the productiveness of our schools, they should try to be objective and not let their own feelings be the basis for their conclusions.

Conclusion

In Chicago, St. Louis, Detroit, and Cleveland, as well as other large cities across the nation, we have seen the growing pains of a decentralization system. Although they may vary in intensity and in patterns of development, there are common threads running through each system.

In spite of possible opposition, reorganization of urban public schools is necessary. The present system dissatisfies too many groups and is actually failing to perform the task assigned to it by society.

\[51\text{Ibid.}, \text{p.} \, 40.\]
The district size is important in developing a beneficial climate. The then Philadelphia Superintendent of Schools, Mark Shedd, summed up the problem:

"...The most fundamental crisis in urban education today, as I see it, is a failure to produce organizations capable of adapting the program of a given school to the needs of a given child ... The trick, then, is to remake and revitalize through decentralization the quantitatively massive and qualitatively sluggish school systems ... to create a climate in which beneficial changes can flourish ... The involvement of the community in planning, operating, and evaluating the schools would do much to eliminate the isolation, complacency and irrelevance of urban education." 52

Marilyn Gittell, in her book, "Demonstration for Social Change," states:

Perhaps the major contribution of the experiment was in its exposing the complexity of achieving institutional change.

Experimentation with new programs offers a chance for finding the means of educational improvement, but improving the attitudes of students and teachers would appear to be more productive. Prior to the decentralization movement it was common practice to blame minority children and their home life for their failure; in the last few years the schools and the system are a more common and more acceptable target. The burden for the solution

has, therefore, shifted. Again decentralization is the modus operandi.\textsuperscript{53}

During the last three years, the cities studied have made limited but significant progress along the path of decentralization. Although community control of the schools was not the aim of plans which outlined the original decentralization programs, community influence in the educational program has grown rapidly. The Boards of Education have specifically recognized the growing influence by providing formal channels through which the influence can flow.

In December, 1970, the Board of Education of Chicago provided for the establishment of local school councils. This was a belated recognition of the fact that 58 percent of the schools already had functioning local councils. It was also an effort to establish guidelines that would bring a measure of uniformity to the councils and forestall claims to authority resting on de facto practices.

Specifically, the guidelines provided for the formation of local school councils in all schools, using as a nucleus, newly elected representative bodies or existing representative organizations such as concerned parents or PTA. Procedures were established for publicizing and holding elections, and for

\textsuperscript{53}Marilyn Gittell, \textit{Demonstration for Social Change}, (New York: Institute for Community Studies, Queens College of the City University of New York, 1971).
The purposes of the council as set forth in the guidelines are

1. To permit parents and school patrons to share in the process of arriving at decisions....

2. To inform ... to suggest how ... needs could be met.

In spite of this emphasis on sharing, the local council has gained considerable influence beyond what could be considered purely advisory, in the matter of the selection of principals. As long as the candidate has passed the principals examination, the council may recruit, and recommend his appointment. Under most circumstances, this recommendation is tantamount to appointment.

Nowhere in Board of Education guidelines is the council given authority to remove a principal but nothing so jeopardizes a principal's position as the loss of community support. As pointed out in the chapter on Chicago, some critics have argued that with the loss of community support, principals have sometimes lost rights of due process as well.
In other areas, budget limitations have effectively prevented continued administrative decentralization in matters of personnel and budget control. This has caused some resentment in the field and among decentralized personnel who have charged that key officials are not genuinely committed to the decentralization process.

If key officials are not committed, the Board of Education officially restated its support of the decentralization program in June of 1972 and mandated the General Superintendent go propose ways in which the program could be carried forward. Unfortunately, the Board members have been so preoccupied with pressing problems crying for immediate solution that they have been unable to devote the necessary time to assuring the success of decentralization in Chicago.

Chicago did not rush headlong into decentralization as did New York City. During the past five years the Chicago Board of Education has taken a cautious and methodical look at decentralization. On December 30, 1973, in an interview on T.V.'s "Meet the Press," John B. Lindsay, former mayor of New York City, said that decentralization in New York City was implemented too fast as was evidenced by the teachers' quick reaction on a strike. However, Mr. Lindsay did say that if decentralization was not implemented that fast the communities would have torn the schools down brick by brick. He does believe that decentralization has brought an openness of school policies to the commun-
ity. He stated, "Decentralization makes the staff face the media with what it is doing - then the rough spots will have to be met openly and honestly, hopefully to a smooth resolution."

From 1968 to date, the decentralization movement has expanded citizen participation by breaking down the large city school systems into the local neighborhood level. The cities studied vary widely in their degree of implementing decentralization. Several studies including that of Marilyn Gittell and Tim Parsons reporting in "Community Issues" indicate that there have been several advocates and proposals for decentralization yet there are few programs illustrating real decentralization and community control. However difficult it is to generalize the impact of decentralization in the selected cities, we can see major curriculum reforms, more bilingual programs and some ethnic studies. Locally the decentralization movement has involved the traditional school interest groups and neighborhood leaders. Harry Passow, in his study of the Washington D.C. public schools felt that this relationship between the school and the community


brought a proper balance between the professional and the layman in determining policy decisions.56

Detroit's decentralization is closely akin to that of New York City in that it was implemented through the State Legislature. The nation continues to watch developments in Detroit very closely since it has all of the problems of large urban centers throughout the country.

Decentralization in St. Louis is similar to Chicago in that it is being implemented step by step, evaluated and changes or additions made in the direction of greater local input in the school.

Cleveland, while the least advanced toward meaningful decentralization, has none the less developed curriculum councils and is studying methods to convert these councils to a more influential role in the determination and implementation of school policy.

School decentralization has sometimes been labeled as a kind of federalism if so:

The challenge of federalism in the urban context remains characterized by the search for solutions to common problems within a framework of fiscal constraint and shared powers. The 1970's will see experimentation with new forms of urban school government, including elements of both metropolitanism and community involvement at the local level.

The viability of these educational experiments will have important ramifications for the kind of federalism that will develop in other public service areas, and for the wider political struggles that involve the cities. 57

Decentralization can provide a viable administrative approach to educational reform through bringing the decision-making process concerning schools closer to the schools' beneficiaries and making the results of education accountable to those whom the schools serve. At the same time, decentralization school districts may aid in the development of individual communities, many of whom are at present stripped of any leverage in the established power system.

Goals of decentralization should be precisely defined and the methods for achieving them carefully planned. When decentralization begins, power should be handed out with extreme care. Children can only profit from a community working together toward common goals within a structure of mutual respect and share responsibility.

All cities would do well to recognize that there are no panaceas for any school problems. Cities will continue to have to wrestle with difficulties of major proportions if they are to effectively meet the challenge of providing the best possible

education for all our children. The faith that communities have shown in the decentralization process was based to a large degree on the assumption that this process would continue to develop.

Whatever success the decentralization program has had thus far, no one can yet claim that there has been true decentralization of authority. Decentralization should not be a strategy to forestall basic change; it must be a commitment to the development of judgment, initiative and improved morale in the interest of the children. Either the cities must be given the opportunity to pursue the goal of decentralization honestly by being given authority and the funds to make real decisions or the total city school systems will be continually frustrated by the power of vested interests in maintaining the status quo.

In conclusion the studies of decentralization in Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, and Cleveland indicate the following:

1. None of the cities studied has totally decentralized.

2. The form of decentralization varies from city to city but in all cases, with the possible exception of Detroit, decentralization has been limited to administrative structures.

3. In no case has decentralization resulted in actual community control of the schools.

4. State laws have limited decentralization programs even as state agencies have come to take a more active role in decentralization experiments - usually in pursuit of greater accountability.
5. Although some decentralization objectives appear to frustrate social goals regarding integration, the relationship between integration and decentralization has been more over-emphasized than clarified.

6. The implications of decentralization for the union movement, so painfully clear in New York, have not become apparent in any of the cities studied.

7. The decentralization program in all of the cities studied has considerably slowed and the more radical proposals have all but disappeared. This has been due in part to decreased availability of funds but in larger measure seems to reflect a waning of enthusiasm for decentralization on the part of both professional and lay activists seeking answers to the problems of urban education.

Implications for Further Study

Finally, up to this point most of the writing that has been done in the area of decentralization has been weighted in favor of decentralization. With several years of actual experience now on the record, there may begin to emerge that body of critical evaluation so necessary to the ultimate pursuit or rejection of decentralization as a basic strategy in the improvement of urban education. It seems apparent that such evaluative studies would have to include statistical data reflecting the success or lack of it in terms of both student achievement and community attitudes.
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CHARTS

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
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Chart 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Districts</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Membership 0/66 (Thousands)</td>
<td>570.4</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>179.0</td>
<td>174.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Membership 1971 (Thousands)</td>
<td>505.0</td>
<td>224.4</td>
<td>181.2</td>
<td>169.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Negro Students 10/66 (Thousands)</td>
<td>201.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>127.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English Speaking</td>
<td>19,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Survey 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and Branches 0/66</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teaching Positions 10/66</td>
<td>20,002</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>6,631</td>
<td>6,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.S.E.A. Positions 10/66</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Regularly Assigned Teachers</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percent Filled Teacher Absence 66-67</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Teaching Positions Not Filled Each Day 66-67</td>
<td>284.1</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Pupil Attendance 10/66</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Pupil Attendance 2/67</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Readiness Testing Fall 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More Than 50% Ready</td>
<td>14+</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less Than 50% Ready</td>
<td>13-</td>
<td>9-</td>
<td>5-</td>
<td>4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade Testing Spring 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Grade Equivalent</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Month Playgrounds</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadiums</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Centers-Oct.-May</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chart 5
### SUMMARY OF 1973 BUDGET BY PROGRAM AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Administration</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Operational Services</td>
<td>77.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Services</td>
<td>43.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Services</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Supportive Services</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Acquisition and Construction</td>
<td>14.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services and Appropriations</td>
<td>22.21 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 6
APPENDIX II

LOCAL SCHOOL COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE
AND SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LOCAL SCHOOL COUNCIL SURVEY

To be filled out by the principal and/or president of Local School Council

1. Date of community planning meeting? ________________________________

2. Was a Steering Committee formed? Yes ( ) No ( )

3. How many members were there on the Steering Committee? ____________

4. When was Local School Council formed? ______________________________

5. Did an already existent group become the Local School Council?
   ( ) P.T.A. ( ) Concerned Parent Group ( ) Other

6. How many members are there on the council? _________________________

7. The membership of the council is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>% of Total Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Community Organ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The officers of the Local School Councils are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President or Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President or Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Office)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Does the Local School Council have an Executive Board? Yes ( ) No ( )

10. How many members are there on the Executive Board? ________________________

11. Does your Local School Council have Standing Committees? 
    ( ) Yes ( ) No

   If so, please name them: ____________________________________________

12. How often does the Local School Council meet? ________________________
LOCAL SCHOOL COUNCIL SURVEY, cont'd

To be filled out by each member of the Local Council

13. Do you consider your Local School Council to be
   ( ) very effective  ( ) moderately effective
   ( ) not very effective  ( ) ineffective

14. Would you like to see the Local School Council
   ( ) continue as is  ( ) continue with changes  ( ) discontinued

16. Would you like to see the guidelines for the Local School Council
   ( ) changed  ( ) remain as they are

17. Would you like to see the structure of the Local School Council
   ( ) changed  ( ) remain as it is

18. What changes, if any, would you like to see incorporated in:
   a. The guidelines
   b. The structure of the Local School Council
   c. The duties and/or responsibilities of the Local School Council

NAME OF SCHOOL ____________________________ DISTRICT ____________________________

NAME OF PERSON FILLING OUT FORM ____________________________

In the first section, respondents were asked to provide that information which would help to determine if the councils were functioning according to the existing guidelines. This would include data as to the composition of the membership, the date of inception, how the Council was organized, as well as the existence of certain committees.

A review of the data for the first twelve items - Historical Information - indicate that the majority of the councils were formed in 1971 and that they now are operating within the guidelines adopted by the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, that is: 60 percent of the members are parents; there is an operative steering committee; leadership positions have been established (president or chairman, with some attendant officers) and the councils meet on a regular basis during the school year. A further analysis of the data shows that 62 percent of the councils were formed from an existing group; Parent-Teacher Association or Concerned Parent Group. It is significant to note, however, that this pattern was somewhat different in Area B where most of the councils were formed without benefit of an existing organization.

Items 13 through 18 solicited responses which tend to assess the effectiveness of the ongoing local school council operation as well as to make specific recommendations for changes
in the structure of the organizations or the organizational guidelines. More than 70 percent of the respondents indicated that they felt the councils were:

1. moderately or very effective
2. that the local school councils should continue
3. that the guidelines should remain as they are
4. that the structure of the local school councils remain as is

Items which were designated to elicit recommendations found:

1. few specific recommendations to change the guidelines
2. that the structure of the local school councils should be more inclusive to the degree that parents should have the major voice in the local school councils
3. the duties of the local school councils should be spelled out
4. local school councils should have a greater voice in the governance of schools

The responses are organized by questions and grouped by areas for the purposes of comparison, contrast, analysis, and interpretation in the following:

Question 1

In all three areas, the majority of schools held their community planning meetings in 1971; in Areas B and C, a few were held as early as 1967, while the first few in Area A were held in 1968.
Question 2

In all three areas, the majority of schools formed steering committees.

Question 3

In Area A and B, the majority of councils have between six and ten members on their steering committees, although a few have as few as one or as high as 25 members. In Area C, the median number of steering committee members is 13.

Question 4

In all three areas, the majority of local school councils were formed in 1971, with a few dating back as far as 1967.

Question 5

This question pertained to the organizational basis for the local school councils. In Area A, an almost equal number of councils were formed as a new body as were formed from an existing organization. Of the existing groups, the majority were identified as PTAs.

In Area C, a majority of councils were formed from existing groups; of these, the PTA and "other groups" were almost equally represented. In Area B, over twice as many councils were formed as new organizations as were formed from existing organizations. Of the existing organizations, the PTA were the predominant group.

Question 6

The number of members on councils ranged from a low of three to a reported high of 1200. In Area C, the median number was 91. In Area A and Area B, the majority of councils had a membership in the 10-30 range.

Question 7

This question pertained to the composition of the councils by groups. In all three areas, the majority of councils are composed predominantly
of parents, with staff and community organizations each making up less than 25 percent of the membership.

Question 8

Areas B and C did not report on this question concerning the leadership structure of the councils. Area A reported that most of its councils had a president, vice president and secretary; almost as large a number added a treasurer. (Note: Area B and C interpreted the question as a request for names of officers; Area A merely reported on the number of officers each group elected.)

Questions 9 and 10

All three areas reported that a majority of their councils have an executive board composed, for the most part, of between five and ten members.

Question 11

All three areas indicated an almost equal division, affirmatively and negatively, to the question about the existence of standing committees in their councils.

Question 12

Almost 90 percent of the councils in all three areas reported that they met monthly.

Question 13

In evaluating the effectiveness of the council, members in all three areas rated them on the whole, "moderately effective" or "very effective."

Question 14

In all three areas, a bare majority of council members would like to see the local council continue as is. The remainder would like to see it continue with some changes; only a few recommend that it be discontinued.
Question 15 - (Not included in survey.)

Question 16

In all three areas, between two-thirds and three-fourths of the members would like to see the guidelines for the local school councils remain as they are.

Question 17

In all three areas, between two-thirds and three-fourths of the members would like to see the structure of the local school council remain as is.

Question 18

This question was a request for suggestions for changes in the guidelines, structure, and duties or responsibilities of local school councils. The three areas listed their suggestions in rank order as follows:

Question 18 a in Area A

The 13 most frequently appearing suggestions, listed below in rank order, represent 30.7 percent of the responses.

1. Clarify the guidelines.
2. Council should have more power.
3. More free evening meetings.
4. Greater participation.
5. Limit membership to residents of the attendance area.
6. Council should control school personnel.
7. Council should control school funds.
8. Council should be more representative.
9. Council's duties should be taken over by PTA.
10. Council should have less power.
11. Council should have open membership.
12. Faculty representation should be reduced.
13. Council should disband.

Question 18 a Area B

Recommended changes listed in rank order:

1. The guidelines need to be made available to all members to be reviewed and discussed for clarification.
2. Need to be more specific in identifying goals and objectives.
3. Need to provide more freedom to function with a basis of power and authority in several areas.
4. Need to be developed by local school councils to provide flexibility to meet the specific needs of individual schools and communities.
5. Need to change the required percentages of representation of the membership to provide a broader more representative group.
6. Need to provide adequate space and evening use of school buildings for council meetings.
7. Need to coordinate guidelines at local, district and area levels for unity of purpose and focus of action.
8. Provide opportunity for choice between PTA by-laws and local school council guidelines as the basis for organizational activities.
9. Need more time to live and work with the guidelines in the local school council settings in order to determine their effectiveness and to identify areas where revisions might be needed.
10. Need for local school councils to follow the guidelines as stated.
11. Need to change eligibility requirements for voters and voting procedures.

Question 18 a Area C

The 14 most frequently appearing suggestions which represent 68 percent of the responses are listed in rank order.

1. More clearly define the guidelines.
2. More autonomous control.
3. Become or remain part of PTA.
4. Have school available for more meetings.
5. More parent participation.
6. Be allowed to raise funds.
8. Don't know enough about them to evaluate.
9. Allow local school council determine them (changes).
10. Expand areas to be explored.
11. Meet when necessary.
12. Coalition of all local school councils.
14. Open voting to all parents attending meeting.

**Question 18 b Area A**

The 12 most frequently appearing suggestions, listed below in rank order, represent 33.3 percent of the responses.

1. Greater participation.
2. Become a more representative body.
3. Council should have complete control of the school.
4. More power.
5. Broaden membership.
7. Change the number of delegates.
8. Include students.
9. PTA should take over councils' duties.
10. Council should be separate from the PTA.
11. More involvement.
12. Disband.

**Question 18 b Area B**

Recommended changes listed in rank order:

1. The structure of the council needs to be better organized in relation to defined goals and ordered priorities.
2. Needs to reflect the views of a larger percentage of parents and community organizations.
3. Need for broader and more open representation among the membership.
4. Needs community representation from the entire city to provide for local school councils of special education schools such as the EVG Centers and schools for the physically handicapped children.
5. Needs to provide a resource center for information pertaining to school programs and school system activities.
6. Needs to be more action oriented.
7. Need for more interested, willing and dependable persons to be in charge.
8. Need for group solidarity--either a local school council or a PTA--not two organizations, two sets of officers, and duplication of effort.
9. Need for separate school councils where there are branch buildings or separate primary and intermediate grade schools, due to the difference in the needs of the individual schools.

10. Need to involve the total council in meetings, projects and activities - not be dominated by strong individuals or special interest groups.

11. Need to limit the pressure groups and/or power blocs within the council.

12. Meetings should be scheduled in advance and held monthly with the knowledge, consent and attendance of the membership.

Question 18 b Area C

The structure of local school council. The 10 most frequently appearing suggestions are as follows:

1. More parents become involved.
2. Merge with PTA.
3. More representation from community.
4. Adapt to local needs.
5. More teachers on council.
6. Separate from PTA.
7. Larger council body.
8. More students on council.
10. Teachers at each grade level at meetings.

Question 18 c Area A

The 14 most frequently appearing suggestions, listed below in rank order, represent 41.5 percent of the responses.

1. More power.
2. Council should improve the school.
3. Clarify duties.
4. Council should control personnel.
5. Council should help the children.
6. Council should increase its activity.
7. Council should improve its public relations.
8. Council should improve school-community relations.
10. Council should evaluate teachers.
11. Disband.
12. Council should become more effective.
13. Council should be represented on the Board of Education-Chicago Teachers Union Negotiating Committee.
14. Council's duties should be assumed by the PTA.

Question 18 c Area B

Recommended changes listed in rank order:

1. The duties and responsibilities of the local school council should be well defined, understood and accepted by all.
2. The distribution of responsibilities should be broader and shared by more of the membership.
3. The council should strive to develop a greater sense of interest and responsibility in the members to attend and participate in meetings and/or activities.
4. The council should serve in an advisory capacity to the principal, the school, and the community, in all problem areas.
5. The council should strive to improve communication between the school and the community, and between the Board of Education and the local school.
6. The council should become more actively involved in developing policy and guidelines for the schools.
7. The council should have more power to make decisions which will be carried out.
8. The council should assist the Board of Education in decision making activities.
9. The council should direct its attention to the improvement of the educational programs in the schools.
10. The council should work for improvements for both the school and the community.
11. The council needs to improve the channels of communication to facilitate feedback and interaction between the school and the community.
12. The council should provide better publicity.
13. The council needs to hold monthly meetings at a regular and conveniently scheduled time and place.
14. The council should have a voice in the selection and evaluation of all school personnel, educational and maintenance.
15. The councils should coordinate district-wide activities and projects to improve the educational program within the district.

16. The council should make recommendations to the district and area councils for their consideration and action.

**Question 18 c Area C**

The 14 most frequently appearing suggestions are as follows:

1. Greater voice in school making decisions.
2. Get more parents involved.
3. Keep people better informed.
4. Determine duties locally.
5. Best interest at school.
6. Plan more interesting and structural meetings.
7. Should be more clearly defined.
8. Administration at school.
9. Choose and evaluate staff.
10. Closer contact with school board.
11. Serve as pressure group.
13. Advisory role.

The following recommendations concerning activities of local school councils were adopted by the Chicago Board of Education in Board Report #73-303 on March 28, 1973:

There is need for a local school council to understand the multifaceted operation of a school, with particular emphasis on the instructional program. A planned approach to involving parents in the school in positive and practical ways through formal meetings and informal get-together activities is suggested. The local school council will be most effective when it becomes a positive force by understanding education in the school. School council members and school staff should form a partnership for improvement of the education in each school.

Orientation of the local school council to the school program can be accomplished jointly by the
principal and staff in cooperation with the council. A suggested approach would be one in which staff members present information to the council:

**Planned Meetings**

1) principal should describe the school goals
2) teachers should describe instructional goals in reading, mathematics, science, social studies, art, music, etc.
3) special teachers describe specialized services such as the library, TESL, etc.
4) teachers should demonstrate, class groups, as to how they teach specific subjects, i.e., reading
5) principals should explain to the council how reading needs are assessed and why a particular reading program is selected
6) principals or adjustment teachers should explain pupil testing and pupil progress reporting
7) teachers should explain and demonstrate to parents how they can help in the education of their children and become a resource to give additional reinforcement in the home to the child.
8) principals should explain the school budget, and
9) the teachers' committee should explain textbook selection.

All of these topics may then become discussion items on the local school council agenda.

The local school council parent-education committee may plan special activities:

1) parent education with topics of concern in daily living, such as: wise buying, child development, child behavior, nutrition, medical care, city services, selective television viewing and building a home library
2) parent committees organized to make instruction materials - helping with field trips - helping in the library and lunchrooms - disseminating information about the school programs to parents who were unable to attend orientation
3) another important consideration would be the humanistic-social approach through school social affairs which bring parents, pupils and faculty together
4) arrange a calendar of council sponsored parent-teacher conference days.
APPENDIX III

DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY OF CHICAGO
Like every large city in the United States, Chicago has undergone major demographic changes following World War II. These changes have been particularly marked during the past decade and may be briefly characterized as follows:

1. A tremendous increase in the metropolitan area population owing to suburban expansion accompanied by a significant decrease in the central city population (Table 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, City</td>
<td>3,397 74.4</td>
<td>3,621 69.9</td>
<td>3,550 57.1</td>
<td>3,367 48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, SMSA</td>
<td>4,568 100.0</td>
<td>5,178 100.0</td>
<td>6,221 100.0</td>
<td>6,979 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. A substantial out-migration of whites from the City to the suburbs and the in-migration of non-whites from the south into the city (Table 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-White No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>3,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>3,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Concentration of non-whites in inner city areas because of a closed housing market (Chart #1).

4. Increase in the non-white population and expansion of the non-white ghettos at the edges of the existing non-white areas (Charts #2 and #3).

The changes taking place in Chicago's population are clearly reflected in public school enrollments. The following characteristics should be noted:

1. Table #3 provides data for the public school enrollment trends for the period of 1960-1972. It shows that total enrollment peaked in 1968 and is now steadily declining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elementary School Enrollment</th>
<th>High School Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>371,600</td>
<td>104,668</td>
<td>476,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>383,890</td>
<td>110,380</td>
<td>494,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>395,627</td>
<td>119,738</td>
<td>515,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>398,172</td>
<td>137,853</td>
<td>536,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>407,907</td>
<td>141,995</td>
<td>549,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>418,127</td>
<td>143,321</td>
<td>561,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>428,042</td>
<td>142,555</td>
<td>570,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>437,021</td>
<td>141,474</td>
<td>578,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>438,772</td>
<td>144,326</td>
<td>583,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>434,367</td>
<td>145,925</td>
<td>580,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>433,419</td>
<td>142,834</td>
<td>576,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>426,662</td>
<td>145,620</td>
<td>572,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>411,807</td>
<td>145,448</td>
<td>557,255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Table 4 provides data on enrollment trends of Negro students. It shows that the Negro enrollment is not only on the rise, but, also, constitutes the majority racial group as of 1966. It is important to note that for the first time the total Negro student population decreased 2,822 or 0.9 percent in 1972. Enrollment trends for general high schools are graphically presented in (Chart #4).

Table 4. Negro Enrollment Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>General High Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Regular Elementary Schools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Negroid</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Negroid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Negroid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number Negroid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>118,456</td>
<td>35,728</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>394,797</td>
<td>190,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>122,549</td>
<td>39,755</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>404,583</td>
<td>186,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>124,472</td>
<td>43,589</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>415,046</td>
<td>206,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>122,377</td>
<td>49,622</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>425,060</td>
<td>227,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>119,677</td>
<td>50,025</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>432,875</td>
<td>236,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>121,415</td>
<td>52,094</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>433,742</td>
<td>239,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>123,403</td>
<td>55,969</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>431,227</td>
<td>240,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>119,455</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>432,018</td>
<td>244,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>122,264</td>
<td>58,543</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>423,820</td>
<td>242,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>121,953</td>
<td>60,612</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>409,423</td>
<td>238,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 4

GENERAL HIGH SCHOOL RACIAL TRENDS
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APPENDIX IV

FACT SHEET

LOCAL SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEES

CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
1. What is Curriculum?

Curriculum is the continuum of potential learning experiences provided by the school to enable pupils to attain the learning objectives for which the school has either distinctive or shared responsibility. (p. 3)\(^1\)

2. What is the purpose of the Local School Curriculum Advisory Committee?

The committee is to function as an advisory body to the principal on curriculum matters (p. 96). Committee members may suggest school goals and objectives they deem relevant to the needs of their own local children. In addition to assisting and advising the principal in the area of curriculum, the committee should be instrumental in interpreting the school to the community, and the community to the school with emphasis varied according to need.

3. What types of assistance can the committee give?

The committee can recommend and/or develop programs such as curriculum workshops or studies, tutorial programs, in-service training for teachers and parents, volunteer programs, resource persons bureau, after-school programs. It can suggest types of summer schools geared to students' school programs and activities.

4. Is it necessary to have a curriculum advisory committee in a school in which there is a strong P.T.A.?

Yes.

5. Why?

The committee is a small group designed to focus its attention and efforts on the curriculum. The P.T.A. is a larger organization and has a more comprehensive role and function.

\(^1\)All page notations in this Fact Sheet refer to Toward Dynamic Curriculum.
6. **Should the committee concern itself with matters other than curriculum?**

   No. If the committee wishes to consider non-curricular matters, this should be done—at the discretion of the chairman and principal—at a meeting other than the regular committee meeting.

7. **How can the discussion be pinpointed on curriculum?**

   The chairman should stick to the agenda.

8. **Who should prepare the agenda?**

   The committee chairman and principal should cooperatively establish the agenda before each meeting. They may accept suggestions from other members.

9. **Should there be an agenda for each committee meeting?**

   Yes. An agenda will help ensure a constructive meeting and avoid many problems—e.g., confusion between curriculum and other school matters.

10. **Who is in charge of a meeting if the chairman is absent?**

    Each committee should determine the procedure which is acceptable to the majority of the committee membership.

11. **Is the principal a member of the committee?**

    No. However, the committee in its advisory role must maintain a direct and close relationship with the principal. The principalship is the main line of contact between the school and the committee.

12. **What should be the role of the principal?**

    The principal should function as an advisor, resource person, catalyst, liaison between parent and teacher members, source of guidance for committee operations, and interpreter of school policy.

13. **Should the principal be present at all meetings?**

    Yes. The principal is expected to be present at all meetings (unless sub-committees are meeting separately to work on assigned tasks). In the event that the principal cannot attend a meeting, he or she is expected to send representa-
tive. It is possible that the nature of some meetings would justify the principal's excusing himself or herself from this particular meeting. The option, however, rests with the principal.

14. **Does the principal have to act on all suggestions of the committee?**

Because the committee is advisory, the principal is not obliged to put into practice all committee suggestions. However, the principal should acknowledge and respond to all suggestions.

15. **How are local committee members chosen?**

Members of this committee should be elected (p. 98). School staff representatives are elected by the school faculty. Citizen or lay members are elected via procedures to be established by the principal of the school. Frequently, the P.T.A. provides assistance in the election process.

If a teacher member transfers, it shall be the responsibility of the school to have a re-election. If a parent member moves from the local school district, it shall be the responsibility of the chairman to appoint a replacement for the remainder of the school year (p. 99).

16. **When is the most appropriate time of the year to choose new members?**

Committee members may be chosen either in the spring (April-June), or in the fall (September-October). Spring may prove to be the best time in order to prevent further crowding of the schedule in the fall. In addition, members chosen in spring may have the opportunity to observe a meeting before actually taking part.

17. **How often should the required new members be chosen?**

Members shall serve for two years. Half of the committee shall be elected annually. No member is to serve more than two consecutive terms (p. 99).

18. **What are some effective ways to orient committee members to their role and function?**

Suggested orientation procedures include:

Orientation workshops for all members;
19. How often should new officers be chosen?
Office holders will have a one-year term (p. 98).

20. When is the most appropriate time to elect officers?
In the spring (April–June) or fall (September–October).
A spring election would have the same advantages mentioned in item #16.

21. How often should the committee meet?
Meetings should be held monthly (p. 99).

22. When is the best time to hold meetings?
The "best" time is the time convenient to the majority of members (p. 99). When it is possible to cover classes of the teacher-members, school time can be used. Otherwise, meetings must be held after school.

23. What records of committee meetings should be maintained?
The secretary's minutes should be submitted to the principal within one week after each meeting.

24. What kind of official report should be submitted to the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction?
A concise report of each month's meeting should be submitted to the office of the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction. The report should summarize the content of the meeting, and should specify clearly any questions or requests to which a reply is desired.
Each committee should select the method of reporting it judges most appropriate. Possible methods include:

• submitting committee minutes with comments by the principal;
• submitting a condensed form of the minutes prepared by the principal.

25. Who reviews the reports and responds to them?

Members of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction review the reports and provide responses to specific inquires accompanying any reports. One copy of the report is filed in the Division and one copy is forwarded to the Chairman of the Education committee of the Board of Education. Reports are available for study by the City-Wide Advisory Committee on Curriculum Priorities.

26. What committee activities have proven effective?

• Organizing week-end camping trips for pupils
• Exploring and researching new areas--drug education, etc.
• Investigating and suggesting summer school programs
• Sponsoring workshops, open meetings, etc. on topics such as the reading program
• Developing a library learning center
• Setting up volunteer math and reading programs
• Establishing a community resource program
• Promoting the school's nutrition program
• Using the assistance of college students in organizing after-school activities.
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