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Public alternative schooling is a strategy in American education which has recently gained considerable support in our school districts. As the number of alternative schools has increased, the need to share experiences, to exchange information, and to find answers to problems of alternative school development has increased. The intention of this study is to help to satisfy this need by offering a collection of information on resource utilization in alternative schools drawn from a sample of such schools across the country. The audience for which this information is intended is the alternative school in its early stages of development.

The information contributing to this study has been derived from two major sources. The first is a collection of books and articles which have provided the foundation and collaboration for the historical and theoretical view of alternative schooling presented in the first chapter. The second source of data is a series of taped interviews and questionnaires applied to fifty American public alternative schools. This information forms the foundation for topics in the main body of the document.

These topics include discussion of wide range of issues relevant to resources use in alternative schools, including per pupil budget comparisons, start-up monies required, community learning experiences, volunteer staff utilization, use of outside grants, transportation arrangements, preplanning and training concerns, administrative over-
head, and others. The method in which these topics are treated is to present the experience from the sample of alternative schools and to make summary analysis of these experiences.

Three major conclusions emerge from the study. The first arises out of the first chapter. It is that the public sector of education is ultimately the main source of support for educational alternatives on the elementary and secondary levels. The public schools must and can support significant educational options if the majority of American students are to participate in such options.

The second major conclusion, which arises out of the third chapter, is that alternative schools need not cost school systems more than the traditional schools. A reorganization of resources instead of an addition of resources is possible.

The third major conclusion is that it is possible for the alternative school planner to anticipate areas of financial concern and to develop strategies both to avert problems which may arise and to take actions which will minimize the financial burden of the school on its school district. Strategies on a variety of such areas of concern are presented to the reader.

Although a considerable number of the alternative schools are included in the body of data, the control of the data base is probably the greatest weakness of this study. The requirements for a school qualifying as a "public alternative school" are ambiguous in the mind
of the author. A secondary limitation of the study is the quality of
the data. Much of the information in the study consists of the esti-
mates or opinions of the respondee. Although this is important data in
that the intention of the study is to pool experiences and opinions of
alternatives schools, it does mean that some of the quantitative com-
parisons and estimates in the dissertation are subject to some reserva-
tion.
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CHAPTER I

There is a large and growing body of literature in the field of education which seems to indicate that American schools are failing many students and that research has found few useful clues for creating effective educational systems. A number of major research reports led by Coleman's *Equality of Educational Opportunity* have given compelling evidence that schools' resources are seldom determinants of mean student outcomes and that no particular school resource is consistently related to student outcomes. Works such as Cronbach and Snow's *Final Report: Individual Differences in Learning Ability as a Function of Variables* (1969); Michelson's *How Do Teachers Make A Difference* (1970); Groteluesch's "Effects of Differentially Structured Introductory Material and Learning Tasks on Learning and Transfer" from *AER Journal* (1969); and Rosenshine's "The Stability of Teacher Effects upon Student Achievement" from the *Review of Educational Research* (1970) indicate that no single variable of teaching style, class size, student groupings, etc., can be shown to be consistently related to student outcomes, although part of this problem is due to the ineffectiveness of educational research.¹

¹Cronbach and Snow have found significant and substantial interactions between intelligence and instructional method. Thus, they have found that Method A may be quite effective for students of high intelligence and poor for students of lower intelligence, while Method B may be quite effective for students of lower intelligence and poor for students of higher intelligence. They believe that using a random sampling of students, as most American research uses, will result in no significant differences between educational institutional methods, as the studies cited above indicate. They believe this explains much of the failure of educational research to find positive effects due to instructional innovation.
While there exists little evidence which leads us to effective educational systems, another body of evidence indicates that American schools as they presently function are largely failing our society. Silberman, Holt, Dennison, Postman, Neill, Lenard, and many others report with compelling regularity and increasing urgency that our schools are failing society; that our schools make little or no allowance for individual student needs or styles; that schools suppress the creativity and independence of our children; that schools insulate America’s students from the complexities and ambiguities of the real world, thereby creating an unreal and counterproductive existence and that schools impose cultural, ethical, and social perspectives on children that are inappropriate and often harmful to the richness of diversity of American society.

Over the last 15 years, a variety of attempts have been made at all levels of the American educational enterprise to remedy this problem of failing educational services.

Team teaching, curriculum innovation exemplified by the "new math," flexible scheduling, compensatory education, behavioral objectives, programmed instruction, non-graded education, educational technologies such as video-tape and television, the open classroom, and leadership training programs are all ideas which have recently been developed into major national projects. Support organizations such as the Regional Laboratory System (U. S. O. E.), Project Talent (U. S. O. E.), and E. R. I. C. (U. S. O. E.), have been created since 1955 to facilitate the flow of information amongst educational agencies and to stimulate
change in education at the local level. Many other ideas— from Illych's suggestion to eliminating schools completely to the Mott Foundation's community school idea—are proposed for implementation in American schools.

In spite of the wealth of attempts at changing American schools conducted over the last 15 years, of the evidence that the schools are failing many students in many ways, and of the evidence that indicates no particular advantage of the present methods of instruction, further evidence indicates that the attempts at improvement have largely failed\(^2\) and that the schools remain significantly the same as those in the 19th Century.\(^3\) Also, the incentives for these institutions to change significantly in the next decade is severely limited by three factors: the rise of teachers' unions, the increasing trend for authority in education being centralized in large bureaucracies, and the shrinkage of experimental funds for education. The Nixon Administration has eliminated a huge source of experimental monies for education by cutting Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E. S. E. A.)—an item intended for innovations in education, from the 1974-75 federal budget. Similarly, school districts' discretionary funds are being tightened by the reduction in schools' operating budgets due to shrinking student enrollment and a significant reaction

\(^2\)See Gorden, 1971; Cicierelli, et. al., 1969.

\(^3\)Silberman, 1970.
by the public at large against school bond issues. The experimental programs would naturally be the first to be cut from a district's budget because the vested interests of the existing teachers, administrators, and parents in the district exert pressure to protect themselves from the vagaries and insecurity of change.

The rapid growth in the scope and authority of teachers' unions reinforce the rigidity of the schools. A powerful interest represented by the unions has two basic aims: to control the size of the labor supply and thus protect or raise the wages of its earners; and to protect the teacher from the whims (or judgement) of his supervisor. Tenure, union-inspired work rules, and the political power which teachers' unions can exert on behalf of teachers' interests, all dictate an educational system primarily designed for the security and benefit of the teachers and not for the welfare of the student.

Similarly, large educational bureaucracies tend to be less innovative and responsive than smaller organizational units. Plans for merging school districts for racial integration purposes, plans to give greater funding authority to state agencies, and the concentration of

---

4 School Management, January, 1973, p. 21-44.


student population in urban school districts all lead to the conclusion that bureaucracy in education is a powerful influence against change in schools.

Why are the schools so insulated against change in the face of needs for such change?

Throughout history, prophets, philosophers, businessmen, politicians, and others have recognized that man is motivated by reward and punishment. The prophets promise eternal rewards for virtuous conduct and attitude and eternal regret for an immoral life. The businessmen promise material gain for diligence and competence, and destitution for slovenliness and sloth. The politician recognizes that satisfying those interests which put him in office is the means of staying in that office.

The educator in American public schools, however, is given few incentives to fulfill his basic purpose--to teach effectively. He will be paid if he is teaching effectively or not. If he has tenure, even the opinions of his supervisors need not affect him. His highest concern is discipline and order--an administrative goal which insures a relatively untroubled existence for the teacher's boss, the school administrator. In higher education, the incentives for teaching are so minimal as to cause a colleague of Silberman's (p. 425) to state: "I
resent having to leave my reading or writing to teach." Similarly, the material rewards for teaching have historically been low, thus discouraging the more able members of society from choosing it as their profession.

Educational services are analogous to any other service which any organization in our society offers. Through a market mechanism where competition exists for the favor of the consumer, the most effective system of incentives for allocating resources, insuring the diligence of the producer, and satisfying the consumer has been found. This notion of a consumer-choice market with competition in the production of goods and services entering that market is a cornerstone in the American value system. Then to what extent do these fundamental notions of competition and consumer choice exist in the field of education? Richard Kammann of the Bell Laboratories states it well:

"Imagine a town in which every family is arbitrarily assigned to one local doctor by a ruling of the Board of Health. Imagine that the Health Board assigns families only on the basis of the shortest distance from the home to the doctor's office. Imagine finally that if a family complains that the assigned doctor is not helping one ailing member of the family the Board of Health replies, 'Sorry, no exceptions to doctor assignments.'

"If this sounds like a totalitarian nightmare, stop and think. This is nothing less than a description of the way that Boards of Education assign children to schools and teachers. The fact that it is a time-honored tradition does not change the meaning of the process. In fact, a better case can be made for assigning families to doctors than to schools and teachers."
Alternative schooling attempts to bring choice into the educational services market—our public schools. Just as the hardware industry satisfies consumer demand by offering a variety of products to be bought or rejected by the consumer, the educational systems in America have begun to find that offering its "consumers" (parents and students) a variety of program options can satisfy a demand for new approaches in education.

There have been a number of attempts to introduce free choice into American public education. The idea most closely connected with these attempts is the voucher system. Currently the voucher system is in operation in a number of places around the country on a small scale with San Jose, California, being the most ambitious attempt to date. There, about 25% of the district's 16,000 students participate in the system. In the State of New Hampshire, a major attempt at using a voucher system will be attempted which may include all of the public and private schools in the state.

The idea behind the voucher system is that each parent will be given a certain grant to be used for the education of his child. Thus, if a parent receives a $1,000 grant and he (in consultation with his child) thinks that the local high school (which charges, say $1,000 per pupil per year) is less desirable than a certain private school (which costs $4,000), then he supplements his grant from the government with his own money and his child goes to the other school. The range of choices for the parent and child are limited only by the rules of the
grant\textsuperscript{7} and his ability to supplement the grant with his own money. In the San Jose experiment, the parents and students have the choice of going to one of six major high schools and twenty or so mini-schools which are available as options.

The major purpose behind the voucher system is to provide the educational system with a new set of incentives which are most closely related to its primary function--the satisfaction of the educational needs of children. If the teacher's livelihood is partly dependent upon satisfaction of the students' needs rather than upon his position in an educational bureaucracy or his collective ability to negotiate job security in the form of tenure, etc., then the teacher's diligence in teaching his students will increase.

A similar interest in free choice and optional offerings in public elementary and secondary education has been recently developing across the country in the name of alternative schooling. The first indications of the "alternative schools movement" came from the rapid growth of private "free" and "freedom" schools in the 1950's and '60's.\textsuperscript{8} Free schools generally recognize the innate authority and responsibility of

\textsuperscript{7}These "strings" can become real problems in curtailing options for the child. In San Jose, for example, the voucher system does not allow students to attend private schools.

\textsuperscript{8}Bruce S. Cooper, Free and Freedom Schools: A National Survey of Alternative Programs; A Report to the President's Commission on School Finance, November, 1971.
the individual learner, and this type of school generally serves a white middle class population. They are basically a reaction to the compulsory miseducation conducted by a system obsessed with control. Freedom schools serve a significantly different population in a significantly different fashion. They function in basically ghetto areas, and serve a largely low-income black population. The emphasis in freedom schools is on the community rather than individual needs. They represent a reaction to the failure of schools and local institutions in a manner similar to free schools, but they fulfill a significantly different purpose.

Perhaps as a result of the general dissatisfaction on the part of middle class youth represented by student unrest in the late 1960's and the rising consciousness of the ghetto neighborhoods in American represented by black political activism, urban riots, civil rights legislation and the rise of ghetto social programs fueled by the Great Society funds; the number of free and freedom schools in America

---

9A. S. Neill, *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing*


11Ibid., p. 10.

12Ibid., p. 11.
drastically increased from 1970 to 1972.\textsuperscript{13} Although data on the survival rate of these are small,\textsuperscript{14} evidence indicates that the average life expectancy of the free schools is less than 18 months.

The brief existence of private alternative schools is not surprising. Sending one's child to public school has an effective zero cost. On the other hand, sending a child to a private educational alternative to the traditional school costs, on the average and for tuition alone, approximately $450.\textsuperscript{15} Parents who would be willing to pay significant prices for a marginally more effective service must feel quite strongly that the margin of value between the traditional and alternative schools is large indeed. The large numbers of parents and students who have recently been committed to such schools indicates considerable demand for educational options.

Ultimately, the public school system is the source of educating the vast majority of American youth, however. It is the financial support of tax money, ($42.5 billion in 1972), and the power of the credentialling system which the public school system provides that is creating the main source of educational activity. With a

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 20., Cooper reports that 2/3 of the free and freedom schools reported in his study from 1956 to 1972 were founded in 1970 and 1971.

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 22.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 59.
rising demand for educational options\textsuperscript{16} represented by the free and freedom school movement, the public schools system's resources become the logical place to institutionalize non-traditional education.

A few landmark programs heralded the rise of public alternative schooling in America. The Philadelphia Parkway Program, the Harlem Prep School, and the Chicago Metro School gained national recognition as alternatives to the traditional public schools.

In Philadelphia, John Bremer gathered community and student support to open the Parkway Program in 1969. The basic notion behind this program has been to use the city as the educational environment and the students as a major resource in the organization and operations of the school. A small "headquarters" building was used as a base of operations, but the classroom and/or learning activities took place mainly in space or facilities in the community. The program gained national recognition by 1970, and provided the impetus for the development of a number of other free-choice options in public school systems around the country.

The Chicago Public High School for Metropolitan Studies—the Metro School--was founded by the Chicago Board of Education on principles

\textsuperscript{16}Mario Fantinni estimates that 60\% of the American students and parents are satisfied with the public schools, but that 40\% would like to participate in an alternative. It could be assumed that the relatively small numbers (in relation to the entire school population) who have gone to private alternatives represent an extreme portion of those who desire something different in their education.
similar to the Parkway Program (Nasbit, et. al., 1971).

1. Students must have control over directions of their own learning.

2. The resources of the entire city, including its businesses, its cultural institutions, and its community organizations, must become a laboratory for learning.

A variety of responsibilities for the school were given to the Urban Research Corporation, and the school began its first semester of operation in the beginning of February, 1970. The school currently serves approximately 500 students.

The Harlem Preparatory School predated Metro and Parkway. It was founded with the support of a variety of community, religious, and corporate groups in 1967 in Harlem, New York. The basic aim in this school has been to provide its students—who have all failed the regular schools—with a "quality education". The assumption implied by this philosophy is that the Harlem schools were failing at least some of their students. The philosophy has been borne out—the Harlem Prep, which has survived mainly through private funds and consisted of a feeder system of corporation-funded store-front schools which funnel students into the Prep, has provided its students with substantial skills and college entrance credentials. Its graduates are attending a range of colleges from Harvard, Oberline, etc., to the state universities. The Prep has, indeed, served a need in Harlem for compensation for the failures for the Harlem schools. Although the
school has remained a private institution funded by corporations, etc., it is now approaching the public school system for support.

These three schools established the national recognition of the validity of educational alternatives. The notion of options seemed to be the germ of an idea which could incorporate much of the compromised innovations from the past 15 years into a non-coercive framework for sweeping changes in segments of the educational system. In virtually every alternative program designed, no matter how immature in development, the applications to participate far out-numbered the slots available. People obviously want to buy into new types of educational services.

With the recognition of alternative or free-choice educational programs within the public school systems with programs such as Parkway, Metro, etc., a variety of other school systems around the country began to explore the possibility of options. Today, the estimates of the number of alternative schools or programs in the country vary from 600 (Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973) to 3,000. Although my experience has shown that many programs called "alternative" programs are, in fact, non-voluntary programs for "problem" kids, it is clear that many systems around the country have been persuaded by pressure and reason that options in an educational establishment is an idea worth supporting. A number of systems around the country have supported this notion to a level which is quite advanced.

By 1975, the Minneapolis, Minnesota, elementary school system will be divided into eight regions. Within each region (which is chosen for
facilitating transportation) parents will be able to choose amongst five schools to send their children for education. This scheme is bringing the notion of competition and choice in education quite far—the schools will prosper to the degree that they provide "buyable" services.

In 1971, the Berkeley, California, school system received a 3.6 million dollar grant to develop a number of educational options in the schools in Berkeley. Thirty different types of schools, mostly consisting of secondary schools, were developed. These are optional programs which approach a wide range of student interests and needs, from Black House to Casa De La Roza, a school centered around the family concept; to Community High School, a multi-cultural school model; to the School of the Arts; to East Campus, a school heavily weighted in basic skills and self-concept.

In Seattle, Washington, a network of 13 optional programs, again focused largely upon the secondary level, developed as a result of a cautious history with alternatives in the form of dropout programs and free school programs and as a result of community pressure. The central school offices in Seattle have made a substantial commitment to the idea, as is reflected by the staff of 12 individuals concerned with the city's alternatives who work out of the district's central offices.

In Philadelphia, a number (10-15) of alternative schools and programs have developed as the grandchildren of Parkway. Again, an indication of the acceptance of the idea on the part of the school system is the institutionalization of a central staff charged with coordinating
Louisville, Kentucky, has used the idea of free choice to meet one of its most controversial issues--bussing. A number of learning centers became open to both suburban and urban kids for their education. Integration is achieved without coercion. The test of hypotheses in the controversy--student achievement levels in mixed environments, etc.--can take place in these cooperative educational environments.

The appeal of the notion of choice in the methods of education to be used by conservative as well as liberal or radical groups has been borne out in places such as Grand Rapids, Michigan. This very conservative Dutch community has also spawned a number of optional education programs to satisfy the diverse needs of its populace.

The situations which I am describing are, perhaps, the most outstanding examples of educational systems which have recognized the need to respond to the pluralism and the advantages of choice in their communities. They have spawned what I call "second generation" alternatives--a wide range of options which are developed after experimentation with one or two. Many other school systems across the country are in the first stage of exploration of the idea.

Hundreds of school systems have experimented with the first stage: developing one option. I would characterize this stage of the development of options by the struggles of a group of committed people to establish the validity of differentness in educational programs. Many programs which result are small schools of 50-150 staffed by dedicated
people struggling against the narrow conceptions of educational quality held by the school system and the majority of the community. The motivating impulse for these programs most often consists of one or both of two forces: the desire by the school system to get rid of its "problem" kids or the desire of a group of students and parents to participate in an alternative type of education.

In the first type of alternative, the "drop-out prevention" alternatives, I have seen the most disturbing examples of the educational establishment negating an innovative idea. When a program designed to give the dropout or problem students a better chance is staffed by people who believe in the potential of their students, then good things happen. Harlem Prep and a huge number of street academy-type schools have demonstrated this fact dramatically. When a school system simply wants to dispose of a certain type of student by shoving him into a program staffed by people who do not see the potential of their students and who feel that their main duty is similar to that of probation officers, then the "alternative" program can become a destructive influence rather than a constructive one. The stigmas of failure created in the traditional school are reinforced when no new norms are created, and success in such an atmosphere of failure is tremendously difficult, if not impossible. The potential of the idea of "alternative" to have destructive separating effects does not stop here, however. I am afraid that the potential to use this idea for racial segregation may be too tempting to resist in this society plagued with racism. I am also afraid that the notion of alternative schooling could foster an elitism in our society which is even more pervasive than white racism. The
test of these dangerous influences again ultimately resides in choice. Hopefully, students and their parents would not choose to function in a more comfortable-but-stigmatized environment. Unfortunately, many of these programs function on a referral rather than voluntary basis. I have seen enough of these systems-initiated programs to have many moments of pessimism of the ultimate value of "alternative" schooling.

On the whole, the programs which grow out of the second motivating impulse--pressure by parents, students, and/or teachers within the school system--appear to function much more positively than those initiated by the school system. In this type of situation, a group of teachers, parents, etc., form groups designed to explore optional educational environments. In Sharon, Massachusetts, for example, a parent group lobbied and planned for two years to establish an alternative school and finally was granted funds and approval for their plans from their school district. The basic reasons for the relative success of these programs are that they are conceived and operated as a positive alternative to the traditional schooling and they are supported with the extra effort and commitment by the respective sponsoring groups necessary to make the program a success. In effect, this support and commitment mobilizes additional resources for the school, gives a positive identity to the school, and provides a political base for the school which is often necessary to overcome the inevitable pressures facing its program.

After these initial "trail" alternative programs overcome the skepticism and pressure from the school system and the community at
large, and as the notion of \textit{choice} ("You don't have to send your kid to this type of school, but you certainly shouldn't deny my right to do so.") becomes ingrained in the awareness of the parties involved in the program, then the potential for expansion into a "second generation" alternative situation is created. Overcoming this trial period is by no means easy or universally successful, but in many localities around the country such has been the case. A new range of options is explored and offered--ranging in Seattle from "the super traditional to super liberal" as Mike Hickey of Seattle's school district explains. The National Alternative Schools Program has cooperated with a number of alternative programs which have been increasingly accepted and sponsored by their local districts in this manner, as have the examples which were have briefly touched upon previously.

As data in this study indicate, the vast majority of alternative today are of two types: dropout programs or free of open schools.

As might be expected after years of monopoly in educational practices, one major problem which I perceive in alternative schooling is that we often don't know what to do when we are given the chance of doing something different. Many of us know what we are against--many of the practices of traditional schooling. Not enough of us know what we are for, however. Thus, many first-generation alternative schools are characterized as "anti-schools;" meaning opposition to the traditional schools without advocacy of a new norm. Often people with significantly different and often opposing philosophies of education are
thus lumped together under the common charge of creating a more humanistic environment for learning. Hopefully, as the general population becomes more aware of educational possibilities and more sophisticated approaches to education are developed, these problems will be outgrown.

It is difficult to predict the future of free-choice options in American public education. On the one hand with the mass of our public who are aware of and questioning educational practices, the power and simplicity of the basic idea, the background of years of attempts of change in our schools, and the declining confidence in our public school establishment to smoothly run its affairs, and the genuine concern of educators to improve the quality of their basic task, give encouragement to the development of a modest educational marketplace with an enlightened "consumer" group. On the other hand, the encroachment of a powerful conservative element (in the negative sense of the word) in the union movement, the mistakes of innovative attempts in the past due largely to a consensus strategy where people were inevitably pushed into accepting change, the general tightening of efforts for experimentation (often confused with creating alternatives) due to budget cutbacks and restraints, and the potential stigmas and misconceptions attached to the meaning of alternative schooling give rise to pessimism.

One central condition for the success of public alternative schooling, however, is clearly in the realm of finances. With federal, private, and local monies for experimentation shrinking, with an increasingly skeptical public turning down bond issues and causing tightening
school budgets, it is clear that in the near future no major national effort to change schools can succeed if large amounts of money are required. Recognizing these facts, most advocates of alternative schooling state that creating options in education requires no additional funds; that rearrangement of existing resources can accomplish reform through options. The bulk of this document will analyze this issue.
CHAPTER II

The Study

Groups interested in alternative schooling have attempted to gather together in national consortia such as the National Consortium for Educational Options at the University of Indiana and in regional networks in order to exchange information, to share experiences, and to find or offer answers to problems of alternative school development. A variety of conferences, information sharing publications, and organizations have sprung out of this common need to exchange ideas and information about alternative schooling. The intention of this study is also to pool experiences, advice, and information from a large number of public alternative schools. This chapter is designed to provide the reader with a general description of the schools represented in the pool of data and the methods used in its collection.

Data Collection

During the winter of 1972-1973, a tentative position paper on financing public alternative schools was produced by the National Alternative Schools Program (NASP) at the University of Massachusetts. (See Appendix A.) In order to further explore the topic, a rough questionnaire was designed in the middle of February in consultation with members of NASP and of the Center for Research at the School of Education. It was used as the basis for a series of interviews with a number of alternative school personnel which began in March, 1973. Eleven
interviews resulted. The questionnaire was subsequently revised four times as a product of these early tests of content and form, and the final questionnaire resulted. (See Appendix B.) This questionnaire was distributed to 96 alternative schools not already covered in previous interviews. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed in this distribution, which went out in two batches on May 27, and June 1, 1973.

The alternative schools and/or programs which were included in these mailings were selected from the mailing lists of the National Alternative Schools Program in Amherst; The Center for New Schools in Chicago; and the National Consortium for Educational Alternatives Project in Bloomington, Indiana. These three groups maintain the most comprehensive lists of public alternatives in the country. A list of the people who received and returned the questionnaire is in Appendix C.

In addition to information collected in the questionnaire, the series of taped interviews which were conducted beginning in March, 1973, and continuing through May were included. The interviews were structured according to the finance questionnaire in part, but the majority of time during these sessions was spent in a general discussion of finances for alternative schools and of the interviewee's particular financial situation. The programs which were interviewed are noted in Appendix C.

The purpose of the interview was three-fold. First, it was structured to test the appropriateness, validity, and completeness of the
questions designed for the finance questionnaire. Secondly, it collected a large volume of data on a particular alternative school, which could then evolve into a case study for inclusion in the dissertation. Thirdly, it provided a mechanism for viewing the data base in the dissertation in a more wholistic manner.

Altogether, the data which contribute to the analysis and conclusions in Chapters III through VI has resulted from 50 interviews and questionnaire responses. In addition to these specific data sources, I will periodically refer to two situations which are important efforts in creating educational options in America, but which I have intentionally excluded from my data base. They are the Berkeley, California, network of 30 alternative schools and the San Jose voucher plan network of high schools. I have excluded these situations for a single major reason: both situations are expensive experiments (federally supported, 13.2 million in Berkeley and 2 million in San Jose), and thus, outside of the realm of my definition of an alternative program.

In my definition of educational alternatives, I require four basic conditions:

1. That the schools or programs are supported by public funds.
2. That students enroll in the program by choice.
3. That the program is significantly different from the other schools in the district.
4. That the school is not viewed as a laboratory or experimental school which costs considerably more than the other schools in the district, but rather an educational option.
Since I am familiar with most of the programs which responded to the questionnaire or which I interviewed, and since 33 out of 36 questionnaire respondees included a description of their program, determining whether a particular program fits into my definition of an alternative program has not been difficult.

Three respondees to the finance questionnaire were eliminated from the data base. Two are private schools--The Children of the Rainbow and The Montessori Neighborhood School--and the third school, The Vocational Technical School in Easton, Pennsylvania, is not yet opened.

One huge segment of alternative schools within the public sector which I have largely excluded from the study is the technical schools. In New York City, for example, there is a network of 27 trade or technical high schools which students can choose. I do not have substantial data on these vocational schools in America, but I suspect that the experience of these schools is long and varied. This area of technical schools is one that the people involved in alternative schooling seem to forget about but which provide students in many cities with substantial options to the traditional schools.

The schools or programs which are included in this study range in the following geographical distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obviously, this distribution indicates a sampling heavily weighted towards the East Coast. This is due to the fact that the National Alternative Schools Program has more thoroughly explored the alternatives in its geographic region. The Midwest is fairly well covered due to the fact that the Center for New Schools and the National Consortium of Educational Options both operate out of the Midwest and both have contributed to the mailing. The West Coast is reasonably well covered if San Jose and Berkeley are considered because of the liaison between the National Alternative Schools Program and the Pasadena Alternative School. The South has spotty returns because the communications between NASP, the Consortium, and the Center with programs in the South has been limited and because there simply appears to be little activity in this region in terms of alternative schools.

The programs which received the finance questionnaire and those which responded do not represent a comprehensive list of the alternative programs in the country. Most of these names resulted from the programs' representatives attendance of a conference or workshop sponsored by one of the three organizations referred to above or from correspondence. The list is naturally limited by these circumstances. However, from my conversations with individuals experienced in alternative schooling, from my own visits to programs across the country, and from

1 The National Alternative Schools Program corresponds with alternative programs in a resource and technical assistance capacity. The National Consortium corresponds with alternative programs in an information gathering, sharing, and dissemination capacity. The Center for New Schools conducts research on alternatives.
the size of the sample, I believe that it is a representative sample of alternative programs.

Figure 1, on the following page, indicates the age of the schools included in the study. It shows the largest proportion of schools to be relatively new.

Seventy-seven percent of the schools contacted have been in operation for three years or less. This sample is excellent for the purposes of the study in that the focus of the conclusions of the study is intended to serve the interests of the alternative school planner. On the other hand, there is a sizeable number (12) of alternatives that have been in operation for four or more years, thus serving as a data base for the question of longer-term conditions of alternative schools.
FIGURE 1
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Figure 2 demonstrates the distribution of student population of the schools in the study. (Data is presented in Appendix E.)

**FIGURE 2**

Student Population of Programs Represented in Study

Number of Examples

Size of Sample 50
Average Student Population 218
Median Student Population 90
Fifty-four percent of all the alternative schools in the program are of 150 students or less. Of the programs with more than 300 students, four consisted of discrete sites with 150 or less: The St. Paul Learning Center Program, The Satellite School Program, The Denver Metro Youth Education Centers, and the Madison Learning Center Program. This fact has implications for the ability to acquire central facilities and the necessity to use community facilities or facilities of other district schools which will be discussed later in the dissertation. To typify the majority of programs described, however, one can say that they consist of mini-schools which are relatively close in terms of student and staff identity with the school itself.

The programs included in the study can be also loosely categorized into the six areas indicated by Figure 3.

FIGURE 3
Program Characteristics of Sampled Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Examples From The Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Prevention . . . . . . . . . . 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Classroom . . . . . . . . . . 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Without Walls . . . . . . . . . 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Schools . . . . . . . . . . 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Problems . . . . . . . . . . 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncategorizable . . . . . . . . . . 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Dropout Prevention category refers to schools or programs for dropouts, disruptive students, and general "problem" kids. In many instances, the program is established by the school district with the covert intention of getting rid of the undesirable element. Such programs are often given a negative stigma by students, teachers, and administrators in the district. In this type of situation, I see the greatest potential for perversion of the idea of alternative schooling into a divisive force which dooms certain students to failure in the same way as the tracking system does. These types of "alternative programs" often serve as detention centers for the school district.

On the other hand, many of these dropout or problem child programs are exciting and valuable educational alternatives for students who simply may refuse to fit into a school system which is viewed as boring or stupid. Certainly such programs as Harlem Prep, the Denver Street Academy, the Albany Street Academy, and the Open Doors Program are positive and powerful programs which provide their students with valuable services. These programs and the many similar programs manage to create new norms to which the staff and students can vitally relate. It is my experience that those dropout programs which are staffed by individuals who believe in the potential of the students and who do not view them as failures become quite successful in providing a vital education option.

The "Open Classroom" category refers particularly to elementary level programs with an open learning environment for the students patterned on the British Infant Model.
"Schools Without Walls" refer to those programs in which learning takes place almost completely outside of the headquarters of the school. These schools differ from other community-oriented programs only in degree. In the school-without-walls concept, the student spends almost 100% of his time learning in some outside (community) facility.

The "Open School" category refers to those programs which serve a comprehensive range of needs but which emphasize the student's role in the direction of his education. Thus, the student is given more responsibility, flexibility, and choice in this type of situation than in the regular school in such matters as dress, conduct, academic program, etc. A second common characteristic of these schools appears to be an emphasis on humanism, self-awareness, and self-development. In most cases, these schools attempt to satisfy standard curriculum requirements in non-traditional manners.

It should be pointed out that this large category (45% of total) is considerably loose in its definition. Programs ranging from the Self-Directed Learning Center at New Trier High to the St Paul Open School in Minnesota to the Murray Road Annex in Massachusetts serve considerably different student populations with different types of programs. However, the common elements of student-centeredness, humanism, and comprehensive student needs do seem to hold true.

The "Special Problems" category refers to two rather unique purposes which have appeared in a number of alternative school situations.
One is the integration model of the St. Paul Learning Centers Program and the Louisville Learning Centers (not a respondee) which create programs on the edges of different communities. Each community sends students to the program. In this way, parents and students can voluntarily achieve an integrated educational environment without the resistance and problems attached to forced bussing. The second special problem area is the creation of optional programs for pregnant students. These types of programs seem to provide a valuable service to a segment of the student population with special learning needs (i.e., child care, counseling, home economics, etc.)

The "Uncategorizable" category consists of programs which have provided little or no description or definition of themselves beyond the fact that they are public, different, and voluntary.

Figure 4 outlines the average age of the different types of programs included in the study.

FIGURE 4
Average Age of Study Programs by Type

I. Dropout Prevention .......... 3.6 years
II. Open Classroom ............ 3.0 years
III. School Without Walls ...... 2.3 years
IV. Open Schools .............. 2.3 years
V. Special Problems ............ 3.5 years
The only categories listed in Figure 4 which have a large enough number of items to draw significant conclusions from are I and IV. It appears that the alternative schools movement is relatively new in terms of the open school notion as compared to the more established dropout programs. Robert Barr of Indiana University would attribute this information to the growing grass-roots nature of many public alternative programs being developed through groups requesting programs of their local school districts rather than starting their own open school outside of the school system.

The grade levels of the programs included in the sample are indicated in Figure 5.

FIGURE 5
Grade Level of Sampled Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 7, 8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The heavily weighted high school category (56% of total) is indicative of the balance of student populations of which I have heard or visited.
Thirty-six percent of the alternative programs included in the study incorporate junior high school aged children. This is a difficult age, and the reports received by NASP, through many of the alternative schools that I have visited, and by the other regional support institutions is that there are relatively few alternatives developed for children in this category.

I believe my experience of traveling, corresponding, and talking about alternative schools confirms that the data base for the study is a good representation of alternative schools in America within the limitations which are mentioned above.

As I have mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, this dissertation is intended to serve a useful purpose for alternative school planners. For this reason, I plan on using additional information gleaned from basic school financing texts and on putting the main body of conclusions in the dissertation in a form convenient for practical use.

**Form**

The basic format of the results of my data analysis will be to present information on financing alternative schools in four sections outlined in Figure 6 on the following page. Each section will provide data and analysis. Many of the conclusions and applications rising out of this analysis should be drawn by the reader as is appropriate to his situation.
FIGURE 6

Outline of Presentation of Data

Section I  Do Alternative Schools Cost More?
Section II Community Resource Utilization in Alternative Schools.
Section III Alternative Schools Grantsmanship.
Section IV Planning Issues in Alternative Schools.

In this manner, the study will attempt to present the prospective planner with a survey of how finances are managed in alternative schools now, and how it is possible to arrange finances in an optimum fashion as gleaned from examples from the sampled programs. Through these two approaches I hope to give a fairly comprehensive picture of the realities and possibilities of alternative school financing.
CHAPTER III

Do Alternative Schools Cost More?

Advocates of alternative schooling have advanced the argument that creating options in public education requires reorganization of resources rather than the addition of new resources. We are experiencing a period of shrinking school enrollment on the elementary and secondary level, of taxpayer reaction to school funding referenda and bonds, and of shrinking federal monies for use in education innovation.\(^1\) In such economic circumstances, presenting a case for major educational innovation through alternative schooling without asking for major new sources of discretionary monies is clearly a wise strategy. Prior to this study, however, little information has been collected to substantiate the hypothesis that "alternative schools don't cost more." Those who doubt this hypothesis could point to the $3.6 million federal grant for the Berkeley, California, school district's development of alternative schools, and the multi-million dollar O. E. O. grant for the San Jose, California, high school district to develop their voucher plan as examples of the high costs for developing alternative schools. Many individuals feel that alternative schools have such high concentrations of staff resources that it would be prohibitively expensive to generalize the alternative school idea beyond a small number of experiments.

\(^1\)As evidenced by the drastic cut of Title III of E. S. E. A. in the 1974 Federal budget.
This chapter is designed to present the reader with information which indicates how much money alternative schools actually do cost their local school districts. Specifically, it compares alternative and traditional school per pupil costs; it compares and analyzes the student-teacher ratios of alternative and traditional schools; it approaches the question concerning the costs of older vs. newer alternative schools; and it presents data on start-up costs for alternative schools.

Comparative Average Per Pupil Costs

Calculation of per pupil educational costs is complex and based on no uniform national standard. Capital expenditures are often excluded and central administrative overhead is often excluded if the estimates are made by particular schools. These same problems exist in estimating and comparing the per pupil costs incurred by traditional and alternative programs. As interviews with a variety of school administrators and alternative school staff have indicated, however, the per pupil estimates made and reported by the schools included in this study are a fairly accurate indication of comparative costs between schools in a respective district. A major limitation of the 44 estimates of per pupil costs included as data in this analysis is the frequent exclusion of grants from sources outside of the respective school district in the estimates. For the purpose of comparing the relative costs of alternative schools to the local districts, however, the information is good.
My data indicates that, on the average, alternative schools cost less than traditional schools:

**FIGURE 7**
Comparative Average Per Pupil Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Schools</td>
<td>$ 970/child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Respective Districts</td>
<td>$1,116/child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>$1,016/child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size: 45 alternative schools
Sample Range: $400-$2,100/child/year for the alternative schools

Considering the fact that many alternative schools (32%) attempt to satisfy the needs of problem children in dropout prevention programs, this evidence of equal or less per pupil costs becomes more compelling.

Per pupil costs of dropout prevention alternative programs ($957) are lower than those of the open school alternative programs ($996) but are fairly similar, and the districts in which dropout prevention programs operate are, on the average, less wealthy than those in which open school programs proliferate ($1,000 vs. $1,231).

---

2See Appendix D for full listing of data.

Student-Staff Ratios

FIGURE 8

Comparative Student-Staff Ratios

Student-Staff Ratio for Alternative Schools . . . . . 20.1/1
(Paid Staff)

Student-Staff Ratio for Traditional Schools . . . . . 22.0/1

The data on student-staff ratios in alternative schools comes from 44 schools sampled in the study. These situations ranged from the City School in Madison, Wisconsin, with a paid staff-student ratio of 1/33.3 to the Aurora Street Academy in Aurora, Colorado, with a paid staff-student ratio of 1/8.3. The average paid staff-student ratio of the alternative schools is a typical 1/20.1, including administrative and clerical personnel. In a variety of situations, such as in the Murray Road Annex in Newton, Massachusetts, no individual is designated as Director. In these cases, administrative responsibilities are shared by the staff as a whole or in part.

The source of staff in the alternative schools which causes a relatively high average total student-staff ratio of 11.0/1 is volunteer personnel. The bulk of the staff of the Bent Twig School in Marion, Massachusetts, consisted primarily of volunteers--many of whom were students from Princeton University, Oberlin College, and a variety of

---

4See Appendix E for listing of data.
other colleges. The St. Paul Open School in St. Paul, Minnesota, profits from the services of 110 volunteers. Seventy-six percent of all the alternative schools in this study benefit significantly from volunteer services. Chapter IV will analyze in detail the extent, methods of recruitment, perceptions of usefulness, and types of these volunteer personnel.

As Figure 9 indicates, the paid staff level of alternative schools of different sizes does not vary significantly.

As Figure 9 indicates, the paid staff level of alternative schools of different sizes does not vary significantly.

FIGURE 9
Student-Staff Ratios by School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Average Paid Student-Staff Ratio</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>18.9/1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-150</td>
<td>18.9/1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200</td>
<td>20.8/1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>20.2/1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 300</td>
<td>20.0/1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 10
Student-Staff Ratios by School Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Operation</th>
<th>Average Student-Staff Ratio</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>20.1/1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>20.8/1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>19.9/1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>18.7/1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 years</td>
<td>14.5/1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although a slight increase in staff resources is indicated in staff resources as indicated in Figure 10 as the alternative school grows in age, the sampling problems and the relatively small differences between the averages make the difference insignificant.

**Comparative Per Pupil Contribution by Local District by Year of Operation**

Although alternative programs have shown considerable success in eliciting financial support from their local school districts, it appears that a period of development and establishment is necessary to gain equitable funding. Local school districts appear to be able to establish alternative schools with a relatively small financial commitment in the beginning of the school's operation. (See Figure 11 below.)

**FIGURE 11**

Alternative School Funding by Year of Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One Year</th>
<th>Two Years</th>
<th>Three Years</th>
<th>More Than Three Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than prevailing per pupil allotment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal to prevailing per pupil allotment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller than prevailing per pupil allotment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data which contribute to Figure 11 consist of 45 sample alternative programs which have reported their comparative per pupil allot-
ments to this study. Except for one additional school, these are the same programs which were included in the average per pupil cost figures quoted previously.

Seventy-one percent of the schools just beginning in 1972-1973 received less than the prevailing per pupil budget allotment from the school district, compared to only 38% for second year programs, 27% for third year programs, and 14% for the programs of three or more years of operation. Conversely, only 28% of the first year programs received per pupil costs equal to or greater than their local district's, while 61% of second year programs, 72% of third year programs, and 85% of older than three year programs received funds from their local school districts equal to or greater than the prevailing rate.

As an alternative school establishes itself over a period of three years, it clearly can expect greater financial support from its local school district. After three or more years of operation, only 22% of the alternative schools cost the school district more than its traditional schools. However, these programs are often of the type that would normally require higher costs.\(^5\)

\(^5\) All of the schools which received greater than prevailing per pupil budgets from their local school districts are dropout prevention programs. One could expect that the educational costs of working with "problem children" would be greater than average in any case; therefore, these examples might not indicate extraordinary costs to their districts in the sense used here.
Start-up Costs

Although the average alternative school needs no extraordinary operating subsidies in order to survive, many need subsidies during the first years of planning and operation in order to start up. Particularly in light of the subnormal financial support of the school's operations by the local school district during its first three years, these initial financial resources are critical to the establishment of the school. The two major categories of expenditures of start-up costs are planning and staff training, and building renovations.

The average amount of money spent on planning and staff training for an alternative school is approximately $2,760. Sixty-one percent of the schools received $2,000 or less for their preparation, and 23% of the schools received no money at all. (See Figure 12, below.)

FIGURE 12
Funds for Initial Planning and Staff Training

Sample Size: 50
Sample Median: $2,000
Figure 13 demonstrates the range of grants to alternative schools for building renovations. This range is extreme. Sixty-three percent of the schools received $2,000 or less for building renovations. Thirty percent of the schools received more than $5,000. Two schools actually received new $1,000,000 buildings; and of those schools which received more than $5,000 for renovations, the average costs were $235,363. Of these rather expensive situations, however, the data indicate that approximately two thirds of the costs would normally be absorbed by the school district due to normal expansion of district facilities, etc. In fact, only 63% of all schools included in the study incurred total start-up costs which would not normally be absorbed by the school district as a part of ongoing staff development, capital expenditures, improvement of facilities, etc.

FIGURE 13
Money Spent on Building Renovations

Sample Size: 33
Sample Median: $2,000
For those alternative schools which did incur extraordinary start-up costs, a significant proportion (64%) of these costs were subsidized by funds outside of the local school district. (See Figure 14, below.) Although the local school district is the largest source of start-up costs for alternative schools, a variety of other sources play a significant role in defraying their initial expenses.

**FIGURE 14**

Sources of Start-up Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Cases From the Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocated Operational Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Contributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local College(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Sacrifice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Conclusions

**QUESTION:** Do alternative schools need to cost their local districts more than the conventional schools in their districts?

**ANSWER:** No. Of the 45 alternative schools which have provided data for this conclusion, 92% operate on per pupil budgets less than or
equal to the prevailing district rate. (See Figure 11.) The average costs of these 45 alternative schools are $970 per pupil per year, while the average costs of the conventional schools in their local districts, probably including debt maintenance and capital outlays, are $1,116. (See Figure 9.) Although a few older schools (8% of the total) do cost their districts more than the prevailing rate, there is a substantial rationale for the extra expense in these situations when the type of student population served is taken into consideration. All of these situations are dropout prevention programs, which one would expect to cost more than the typical academic program. Clearly, it is possible for the development of alternative schools to cost school districts equitable levels of resources. The alternative schools do not need to be expensive laboratory or experimental schools.

QUESTION: How much does it cost a school district to start up an alternative school?

ANSWER: Around $4,000, depending upon the size of the school and the circumstances. Mean start-up costs for planning and staff training are under $2,000, and under $2,000 for building renovations. (See Figure 12.) These figures should be taken in light of a mean school size of 150 students. Larger schools may need more money for start-up purposes. Special circumstances may also influence these costs. Two schools which contributed data to Figures 12 and 13 moved into new, $1,000,000 buildings. In these situations, an expansion of facilities was planned by the district irrespective of the development of the alternative schools; the existing buildings became inadequate to serve the district's student population. Similarly, one would expect
to spend more money than the mean for staff training and planning if the staff were unfamiliar with each other. The $4,000 approximation costs for staff training, planning, and building renovations should be adjusted in light of these types of circumstances.

QUESTION: Can the local school district expect the alternative school's start-up costs to be subsidized by outside funds?

ANSWER: Yes. A significant proportion (63%) of the alternative schools included in this study received some monies for start-up costs from outside funding agencies. See Figure 14 for the major sources of these funds.

QUESTION: What is the paid teacher-student ratio in alternative schools?

ANSWER: A fairly typical 1-20, (See Figure 10.), in spite of the fact that many alternative schools serve students who would normally require closer supervision than the average student.

QUESTION: Does the use of volunteers represent a potential savings for alternative schools?

ANSWER: Yes; probably the greatest savings possible. Eighty percent of the typical school budget is spent on personnel. In alternative schools, approximately one full-time volunteer for every 25 children is available for work. (See Figure 10.) This effectively doubles the staff resources of the school.
CHAPTER IV

Community Resource Utilization in Alternative Schools

A major theme of many alternative schools is that the role of the school should be more closely intertwined with the life of the community at large. The value of this extra-school involvement is often seen as providing the student with a more "realistic," "relevant," or interesting educational experience which encourages a more mature and responsible understanding of the students' social role than exists in the traditional education setting. The purpose of this chapter is not to analyze the educational value of such experiences, but to present information about such experiences which influence resource utilization in alternative schools. It is the intention of this section to indicate the methods of mobilizing community resources, the common sources of such resources, the degree to which community involvements in alternative schools contribute to the overall resources of the school, and the perceptions of people involved in alternative schools of the quality of various community resources in their programs.

Volunteer Personnel

Personnel expenses constitute approximately 75% of the typical school's operating budget. It is in this area of personnel costs that alternative schools have been able to operate most efficiently. They have done this by mobilizing a large number of volunteer services into their programs.
Figure 15 demonstrates that each student in the alternative schools included in the study benefit from eight hours of volunteer work per week (roughly equivalent to 1/5 of the personnel requirements of the school) to less than one hour of volunteer work (roughly 1% of the total personnel requirement of the school). If the personnel cost of the alternative school is 80% of the total cost, this represents a savings or addition of between 1 and 16% of the total resources available to the school. To a school with a $200,000 annual budget, this means again of between $2,000 and $32,000.

\[1\text{Part-time volunteers = 5 hours per week.} \\
\text{Full-time volunteers = 35 hours per week.}\]
The size of the school or the age of the program did not appear to significantly influence the level of volunteer utilization. Older schools used volunteers at least as much, on the average, as younger schools. Larger schools also used volunteers extensively, although on the average, slightly less than smaller schools. Of those 12 schools which used an insignificant number of volunteers (less than one hour per pupil per week), approximately half did so because of union and political pressure. In these situations, the use of all credentialled personnel is considered a necessary position to show either the public, administration, or unions, that their programs are acting "responsibly." The balance of those schools which use no significant volunteer personnel either haven't become organized enough to capitalize on such resources or consider the efforts at supervision and training of the volunteers to be greater than the advantages of their use.

Although there is no substantial data to indicate as such, it appears that a significant number of alternative schools use older children to teach younger children. The Open Living School in Jefferson County, Colorado, uses high school kids as the chief staff resource for elementary school kids. The Philadelphia Parkway Program depended upon students to organize and implement program resources. In other schools, I have seen student tutors are used to a small extent. This source of volunteer personnel is not indicated in data presented, but it is an exciting and substantial possibility for alternative schools to explore.

A number of schools have indicated that volunteers are of two types: those who enter the school and take charge of the situation,
and those who expect their input to be completely organized for them by the school. It is the latter group which requires the most supervision.

A number of schools have also mentioned that it is important for alternative schools to be selective in the types of volunteers which are accepted. A variety of systems for this screening process exists, from the judgement of a designated staff member to the evaluation of a panel of staff members and students. A small amount of effort in this regard appears to avoid a large number of problems later on.

Overall, the staff perception of the quality of volunteer personnel services in alternative schools is quite positive, as Figure 16 indicates:

FIGURE 16
Perception of Volunteer Help

Number of Cases
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Perception of Quality of Help
Three schools (which had no significant volunteer help) responded to the question related to Figure 16. It appears from other data in the questionnaires of these three schools that their programs are not organized well enough to use volunteers. This is partly understandable because they are relatively young (one or two years old) schools.

Figure 16 indicates a very favorable response to volunteer personnel services, although the lack of any case at the highest extreme and the large number of cases which fell between "mixed" and the "excellent" entry indicates that there is a tradeoff involved in using volunteers. The data indicate that the tradeoff is between the disadvantages of energy spent on supervision, selection, and training, and the advantages of a wealth of free labor of a group of outside friends of the school. The majority (76%) of schools consider the advantages to outweigh the disadvantages.

How were the volunteer personnel recruited into the schools?

FIGURE 17
Methods of Recruitment of Volunteer Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Word of Mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recommended by parents, students, staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Newspaper articles about the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Visits to the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Active recruiting by parents, students, staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parent meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other media spots (TV, radio, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Appeals to colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Community volunteer talent organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five most common methods of recruiting volunteer staff—word of mouth; recommendations by school staff, students, and parents; newspaper articles about the school; active recruiting efforts by parent, student, and staff groups; and visits to the school, all center around the school having a good public image. The most successful schools (in terms of recruitment of volunteers) have developed good relations with local media and have "spread the word" about the school through all channels available to them. This type of effort has attracted volunteer support as well as general community support which is transformed into other instructional and political resources for the school, as I will discuss in a later section. Hussein Adieh of the Harlem Preparatory School says that there are two keys to positive public relations: (1) never create enemies (be nice to everyone), and (2) always say positive things about your school (in spite of your problems).

A few schools have made use of community organizations which serve as "volunteer talent scouts" and funnel their clients into various community agencies. Particularly for schools which have less access to general media, periodic parent meetings can become a medium for recruiting and asking for help and suggestions of volunteer staff.

What types of people typically serve as volunteer staff in alternative schools? Figure 18 outlines some typical sources on the following page.
## FIGURE 18

Sources of Volunteer Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Business Representatives</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Representatives</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intern College Students</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church People</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all of the alternative schools utilize student teachers from various universities as personnel in their programs. The key to acquiring these students is to make a concerted effort to negotiate with teacher training institutions for acceptance as a student teacher training site. This mostly requires legwork and a person who either knows or is willing to get to know the appropriate people at the colleges. A surprisingly large number of alternative schools use local business representatives as instructional staff. In most cases, the particular business gives some of its personnel time off work for teaching in the school. This is done as a community service activity. The individuals which volunteer in this manner are generally quite knowledgeable in their field of instruction (it's their job) and among the best-received volunteer types included in the data.

Parents are another large source of personnel support, but approximately ten comments were made by the schools that the suggestions, demands, and opinions of the parents of the children in the schools can sometimes be a burden to the staff. Complicated interrelationships
between staff, students, and volunteer parents can arise. On the other hand, cooperative and constructive parental involvement can create a sense of unity and an integration in the educational experiences of the child with his larger environment.

The next largest source of volunteers comes from local service organizations--the police department, fire department, town or city government, community agencies such as the park district, welfare agencies, library, chamber of commerce, etc. These groups tend to offer short-term services to alternative schools rather than long-term volunteer involvement.

**Community Learning Experiences**

Most alternative schools give the student an opportunity for community experiences which are also official school experiences. Figure 19 indicates the amount of time spent in such activities by the average student in 49 alternative schools.
The average time that a student in an alternative school spends in the community is 23%, or 1-1.5 days a week. This is a considerable amount of time in which the resources of the community are used rather than the resources of the public school district, as well as providing what many educators feel is a valuable educational service.

It is interesting to note that in the two major types of alternative school programs--dropout prevention and open school--there are significant differences in the extent of community learning experiences. The average student in the dropout prevention programs spends 18.6% of his time in the community, while the average open school student spends
27.6% of his time in outside experiences. There also appears to be a qualitative difference in the types of experiences in which each student participates. The dropout prevention program students often hold jobs as their community activities, while the open school student spends more time in apprenticeships, general learning experiences, etc. These distinctions between the programs may or may not be necessary or beneficial.

Figure 20 indicates that the amount of time which the student spends in the community is inversely related to the age of the school. In other words, the older the school is, the less it sponsors community learning experiences for its students.

FIGURE 20
Average age of Schools by Percent of time Spent in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Time in Community</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Sample Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 30%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%–30%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%–20%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%–10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Director of the Area H Alternative School in Los Angeles explains this phenomenon as it applies to his situation. During the first year of the school's operation, it had little or no central
facilities. The students, in effect, spent almost all of their time in community learning experiences by default--there was nowhere else to go. After the school moved into a relatively comfortable facility, the time spent in the community radically decreased. This was not due to any disappointment or disapproval of community experiences, but because the new facilities were so comfortable that there was less enthusiasm or incentive to go outside. Thus, as the programs get older, more firmly established, and more strongly supported by local monies, the incentive to go outwards decreases, although even the 12 programs over three years old average between 10% and 20%.

In spite of this slight decrease in community experiences as the schools become older, Figure 21 indicates that none of the schools polled actually want the level of community involvement to decrease:

FIGURE 21
Intentions for Future Community Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase ............ 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain the Same .... 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease ............ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overwhelming vote for greater concentration on community experience indicated in Figure 21 must be considered a vote of confidence for the value of community involvement in alternative schools. Seventy-eight percent of the schools desire increases in such involvements,
while none of the schools want to decrease them. The only qualifying comments made by any of the schools was that they could concentrate more on planning good, high-quality experiences rather than accepting the opportunity for any possible involvements. Most of the schools complied with Bob Peterkin's (Albany Street Academy) comment that it is "impossible to exploit all of the possible important community involvements for our school."

What are the methods which alternative schools use in organizing and soliciting community learning experiences? Figure 22 indicates the most common techniques:

**FIGURE 22**

Methods Employed in Arranging Community Learning Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively Lobied Local Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published Requests Through Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized on Offers; Little Active Seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish full-time Staff Coordinator(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish &quot;Community Activity Committee&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Yellow Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Agencies for Rent of Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as with the methods used in finding volunteer personnel, the most common mechanism for finding community learning experiences is word-of-mouth. A large number of schools pay a full-time staff member to coordinate community experiences or set up committees of parents,
students, and/or staff to fulfill this function. A few schools have hired two full-time staff people for this purpose. The most typical type of active recruiting of community resources is as follows from expressed student interests. The six schools which mentioned consulting the "Yellow Pages" of the phone book as a method of pursuing community resources found this to be a particularly convenient and effective technique.

The range of actual experiences which alternative schools have arranged is vast. A partial list of the types of experiences which the schools have organized for their students is presented in Figure 23, below, in order to give the alternative school planner a flavor of the possibilities available.

FIGURE 23
Examples of Cooperative Resource Arrangements with the Community

- Imaginary family buys house, insurance, etc.
- Field trips to:
  - Places in country.
  - Places throughout the world.
  - Places in the community:
    - Local industries.
    - Courts.
    - TV studios.
- Camping.
- Students working at:
  - Local car sales office.
  - Hospitals and community health centers.
  - Recreation Department.
  - Cemetery.
  - Airlines.
  - Machine shop.
Blue Cross/Blue Shield.
Museums.

- Apprenticeship with:
  Silversmith.
  Photographer.

- A local college professor and one of his students organizes a course on design for use by the school.

- A study of the community by second graders by visiting and talking with a variety of local institutions.

- Seminars with:
  Historical groups in town for fourth graders studying history of the community.
  Manufacturing firms.
  Banks.
  Electric Company.

- Students studying:
  In chemistry labs at local university.
  In City Skills Center (training program).
  Through local churches and synagogues.

- Various Internships:
  As teacher aides in public schools.
  In Police Department.
  In Lawyers office.
  In State Orphans Home.
  In Welfare Department.
  With local newspaper.
  With State Legislature.
  In child care center.
  With an acoustical engineer.
  With an auto mechanic.
  With a farmer.
    US Senator.
    Architect.
    Goldsmith.
    High school principal.
    Theatre groups.
    Sierra Club.
    Political groups.

- Use of conservatory of park system.

- Design local church.

- Study points of interest by topographical map.

- Community task force teaches students about the community as well as providing service to school.

- Learning at an air pollution control station.

- Working on political campaigns.
- Math students spend a day or two in business of relevance or interest.
- Volunteer services in the community.
- Working with community service organizations.
- Courses at local colleges and institutions such as stock brokerage agency.
- Tutoring in different schools.
- Students established Cinnaminson Head Start Program.
- Extensive elementary school aide program.
- Physical Education in rented facilities.
- Bowling alleys for Physical Education.

Figure 24 indicates that the vast majority of alternative schools consider student learning experiences in the community to be successful and worthwhile.

**FIGURE 24**

Perceptions of Success of Community Learning Experiences by Percent of Student Time in such Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Sample Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PRETTY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF CASES
On the whole, 39% of the schools consider the educational value of community learning experiences to be in the "Excellent" and "Very Good" range. Only one school felt negatively about such experiences.

Donation of Materials

Some alternative schools receive donations of materials from the community in addition to volunteer staff. Figure 25 indicates that the level of these contributions is generally a small percentage of the total materials cost of the school. This data indicates, however, that this source of materials is a major source (more than 20%) for a few of the schools. In many cases, however, this data can be misleading because the materials or equipment are often loaned to the school instead of donated permanently.

FIGURE 25
Percent of Materials Costs Donated by the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
FIGURE 26
Sources of Materials Donations

Number of Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Businesses</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaveging</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Social Institutions (Church, YMCA, etc.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Social Agencies (Police, Fire, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scavenging is a category in Figure 26 that represents a wide range of sources. Some examples are: defunct free school auctions, city dumps, other auctions, scraps from building sites, junkyards, etc.

Figure 27 is a list of examples of materials donated by the community to alternative schools:

FIGURE 27
Examples of Materials Donation

- Books and periodicals
- Lumber for building renovations
- Photographic supplies
- Workshop tools and lumber
- Playground materials
- Furniture
- Pianos
- Food for social functions
- Projector, tape recorder
- Vehicle for transportation

- Money for field trips
- Food for classes
- Art supplies
- Auto parts and motors for shop
- Carpeting for the school
- TV sets
- Refrigerator
- Instructional supplies
- Clothing for the students
- Stage for experimental theatre
- Old boat from a local man
- Magazine sale proceeds
- Recycled paper
- Banks give supplies, monies
- Kiln
- Local printer has volunteered time and materials to do engravings for student creative expression publications
- Commercial products of related value
- Yarn from local factory
- Paint
- Air conditioning
- Office machines
- Donations from local merchants for a fund-raising auction
- Farmers offer land for gardens, etc.
- Laboratory equipment and glassware

Volunteer personnel, materials donations, and student involvement in community learning experiences represent a wealth of free resources available to most alternative schools—as Figure 28 on the following page confirms this idea. It indicates that the majority of alternative schools consider their community involvement to be a major resource to their program.
FIGURE 28
Perceptions of Importance of Community Involvement in Terms of Resource Input to the School

Distribution of 50 Comments
CHAPTER V

Alternative School Grantsmanship

A large percentage of alternative schools benefit from grants outside their local school district. Three major factors may be attributable to this situation. The first is that in its early stages of development, alternative schools represent a few experiments in American education. With few schools competing for available funds, and with the idea of alternative schooling fresh in the minds of funding sources as experiments worth supporting, the odds of a particular school receiving monies has been good. Secondly, many of those schools which have been unable to acquire outside funding have been unable to start up and operate, thus making the percentage of existing schools which have received grants higher. Thirdly, the total available monies for experiments in education has been high in the mid-sixties to early seventies.

Two of these conditions are no longer as prevalent today as they were a few years ago. As many more districts around the country attempt to implement alternative schools, there are more schools competing for existing funds. Tighter budgets in the area of innovations in education and in the educational system in general have reduced the total amount of funds available. These facts make the odds for particular alternative schools to acquire outside funding smaller. Whatever the outlook, however, presenting information on the experiences of alternative schools which might be useful to alternative schools...
contemplating the acceptance or pursuit of outside grants is the basic intent of this chapter.

**Degree of Grant Utilization**

Figure 29 indicates the level of grant utilization in alternative schools. Although the majority of the schools sampled used only 0-25% of their budgets from outside sources, a large number (26%) of the schools used grants for 50% or more of their expenses.
The older alternative schools appear to be the most strongly supported by their local school districts. One half of the schools (25/50) received between 0% and 25% of their budgets from outside their district, while only 14% (7/50) received more than 75% of their budget from outside their districts.
The alternative schools considered any money which was received through the local district to be public monies calculated in Chapter III. For example, the Albany Street Academy is a publicly supported school in that the School Board serves as a legal broker for a variety of federal, state, and private grants to the school. Little money is given to the school directly from the district's tax revenue. However, the Academy reported a district per pupil expenditure on the school in Chapter III as its total operating budget. In the cases of the other six schools which receive 75-100% of their budget from outside their local district, the same situation applies.

Slightly over one third of the first year schools received all of their support from their local school district, while at least one half of the older schools received all their support from the school district. This evidence supports the point that outside support is more important to newer alternative schools than to the older, more established alternative programs.

Perceptions of Advantages of Outside Grants

The alternative schools included in this survey made a broad range of comments concerning the advantages of their securing outside funds. As Figure 30 indicates, one of the most common themes of these comments deals with the beginning period of starting and operating the school while the local district phases in its support.
Participant Comments on Advantages of Outside Funds

- Necessary for starting and surviving for the first year.
- Provides a buffer while the district picks up the school's costs—"if they support us, then you should."
- Provides money for special or unusual programs which the district would not normally support but may in the future.
- Establishes a better bargaining position for independence of the alternative school.
- Greater flexibility in the use of these funds.
- Provides a motivating impulse for evaluation in the alternative school.
- Assures a specific amount of money over a specific amount of time.
- Provides a psychological boost to the school.
- Provides a mechanism for information dissemination about the school.

A few schools mentioned that their sources of outside funds were necessary not only for their short term but also for their long run survival. They are having trouble gaining local funds which do not have so many strings attached as to compromise their programs. Another comment, made by Larry Paros of the Alternate Learning Project (ALP) in Providence, Rhode Island, is that his funds are easily renewable and dependable. Another school mentioned that its outside funds allowed the school to cycle other teachers in its district through the school as a staff development service. This provides a very positive public relations tool for the school.
On the whole, the 27 alternative schools which made comments on the advantages of outside funding in their situation underscored its primary importance as survival and independence for the school while the local district phased in its financial support.

Perceptions of Disadvantages of Outside Grants

More negative comments concerning the use of outside grants were made by the alternative schools than positive comments: 44 negative vs. 36 positive. Thirty-two schools made negative comments, while 27 schools commented positively. The main theme in the negative comments centers on the lack of dependability of grant money. One director of a large midwestern alternative school said, "You can't be sure of money from most funding agencies until after you have it, and even then it is sometimes shaky." A significant percentage (15-20%) of the alternative schools had had bad experiences with funding agencies which had made commitments and then withdrew them later on.

In general, five themes stand out in the comments made on the study's questionnaire and the responses to the taped interview questions:

FIGURE 31
Comments on Disadvantages of Outside Grants

1. Lack of year-to-year dependability.

2. It can be enormously burdensome to secure outside funds for the alternative school in terms of the staff time and energy required. For example, Hussein Adieh of Harlem Prep in New York is in charge of raising funds for the
Prep. It has been a constant, nerve-racking battle over the years to raise funds to keep the school open. All of the staff has been involved in this effort at one time or another.

3. Keeping in touch with and justifying actions to the funding agency can be trivial, time-consuming, and counterproductive.

4. The local school district has less incentive to pick up the costs of the school when other funding agencies are supporting it.

5. Oftentimes a particularly tight-budgeted school may accept funds for the development of a program which is not planned and not appropriate, but which is accepted simply because of the attractiveness of the available money. Morale and effectiveness can go down in such a situation.

Sources of Outside Grants

Figure 32 outlines the major categories of funding agencies which contribute to the alternative schools included in the study.

FIGURE 32
Sources of Outside Grants of Participant Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agencies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Donations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In many cases, these funds from colleges and community groups are, in fact, federal monies which are passed on to the alternative schools.
The federal sources of contributed monies to the schools were mainly Title III of ESEA (9), OEO, and Title I of ESEA (5). Title III monies went largely to drop-out prevention schools. Minneapolis, Berkeley, San Jose, and Seattle all received substantial grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and Experimental Schools to develop their systems of alternative schools. The types of state grants varied, but a large number of schools have found that anti-crime and violence-type programs have large amounts of relatively available funds. Drop-out prevention programs are particularly suited to get these types of funds. A broad range of private foundations contributed funds. Local colleges, businesses, private donations (mostly parents), churches, and community action organizations contributed a significant amount of money. The taped interviews indicate that a larger number of these local sources of funds contributed than actually were represented by the answers in Figure 32. This is partly due to the fact that the school need not write a formal proposal for most of these donations.

In general, federal agencies offer grant monies for a three-year period. The amount of money granted to the school phases down to the third year, when the local district should theoretically shoulder the entire cost of the program. Similarly, business and private foundation grants are generally of short (2 year) duration. None of the funding sources mentioned take on permanent support of the schools.

Bake sales, auctions, benefit concerts, etc., have been sponsored by a number of the alternative schools. These activities are a source
of flexible funds and school enthusiasm. Harlem Prep has explored a wide range of funding sources, from students raising money for the school on their own, to presentations on behalf of the school at local churches followed by donations, to large corporate grants to private donations from wealthy New York liberals to federal monies, etc.

Mr. Adieh relishes a story where a representative of the Prep gave a speech about the school from the pulpit of a Harlem church one Sunday during the sermon. The first time that the plate circulated through the congregation the money went to the church. The second time that the plate circulated through the congregation the money went to the school.

Examples of colleges supporting the development of alternative schools exist in the Wilson Campus School in Mankato, Minnesota; the Pasadena, California Alternative School; and the Worcester, Massachusetts Alternative School. In the cases of Worcester and Pasadena, the schools were strongly supported by paid personnel and materials from the University of Massachusetts. The Wilson Campus School benefits from a similar relationship with Mankato State College.

Advice on Grantsmanship

Many of the participating alternative schools had words of wisdom to convey concerning the acquisition and use of outside funds:

1. Concentrate on local funding; use grants only as seed money. In the long run, the local school districts' financial support will be your only chance for survival. Although grants may be important to give your alternative school an initial period in which to prove yourself
to your local district. In the long run, however, know that the district will determine your survival.

2. Have an individual connected with your school become a specialist in fund-raising. This person should be well-connected with the appropriate funding agencies. Have him spend nearly all of his time looking for grants for the school. If there is no individual who fits the requirements to do this, have the school set up a well-connected advisory committee which can help in fund-raising for the school.

3. Learn to refuse funds. If your school can get by without taking funds designed for purposes in conflict with your own, then simply refusing the funds is the best answer. Compromise of your school's direction and purpose by taking money with such strings attached should be avoided when possible.

4. Develop a good relationship with the media. With a positive and supportive media, doors will be opened for funding agencies. They often like to support those situations which are the best-known and will give them the most public mileage for their dollar. The media is the best channel to get this notoriety.

5. Always be positive about yourself. Whenever you deal with anyone outside the school, be positive about the school, even if your problems are getting you down. This sort of projection will get around and pay off in the long run.

6. Try never to be dependent on grants. If grants are not necessary, ignore them. They are difficult to get and use.

7. Keep trying; investigate all leads. Follow-up and persistence are tremendously valuable.
CHAPTER VI

Planning Concerns

This section is designed to present data on a variety of topics related to planning that bear directly upon resource utilization for alternative schools. A few topics, such as the transfer of district instructional personnel into the alternative school, are critical to the establishment of alternative schools which do not financially burden their districts. Other topics, such as transportation and planning time, give the prospective planner information which can help to set his expectation in certain areas of alternative school development.

Central Administrative Overhead

Although there are indications that the schools were confused by the question in the study related to this topic, it is true that a number of alternative schools have caused their district's central offices additional expense in administrative overhead. In six situations, a central office administrator has the coordination of alternative education written into his job. Philadelphia, San Jose, Berkeley, and Seattle all have central coordinating organizations for the purpose of monitoring and controlling alternative programs within their jurisdiction. Seattle provides a full-time staff of 12 in its central offices of evaluation of its alternative programs. Similar situations exist in San Jose, Berkeley, Philadelphia, and Minneapolis. In those districts which are just beginning a small number of alternative schools, it is
clearly not necessary to have more than a part-time administrator in the central offices overseeing the alternatives. Normal procedures and administrative resources suffice.

It is true, however, that those alternative schools which hire a coordinator and other administrative staff who would not have normally been hired by the district if the alternative school children attended the regular schools are incurring additional administrative costs to the district. Alternative schools such as Murray Road Annex in Newton, Massachusetts; The Aurora Street Academy in Denver, Colorado; and the Bent Twig in Marion, Massachusetts have avoided these costs by either surviving with a half-time director, or sharing administrative responsibilities with individuals throughout the school.

**Transferred District Staff in the Alternative School**

Approximately 75% of the average school's budget consists of personnel expenditures. If the staff of an alternative school consists of personnel transferred into the school from other district situations, then no additional personnel expenses will be incurred by the school to the district. On the other hand, if the staff for the alternative school consists of personnel hired separately by the district and not in lieu of retired district personnel, then a large proportion of the school's expenses will duplicate expenses for the school district. In this case, the alternative school would entail extraordinary costs to its district. The advantage of utilizing existing or replacement district staff in the alternative school becomes great in light of this
situation. Figure 33 indicates the degree to which alternative schools have been able to effect such transfers.

FIGURE 33
Distribution of Percent of Paid Staff Transferred from other District Schools

This data indicates that in 24% of the 50 alternative schools sampled, none of the staff are transferred into the school from within the district. An identical 24 percent of the schools are staffed by all transferees from within the district. On the average, 47% of the staff of a typical alternative school consists of transferees. Fifty-three percent are hired outside of the district and represent an extraordinary expenditure by the district.
The data which contributes to these calculations are strongly biased to the extremes. Forty-eight percent of the schools have either all district or all outside personnel. Of those 12 schools which consist of all newly hired personnel, 10, or 83% are open school programs. On the other hand, only 7, or 58% of those programs with all transferred staff are open school programs. Some educators connect the identity of the open school alternatives with the rebellion of American middle-class youth against established institutions. The relative insularity of the open school programs in this sample, as indicated by the large percentage of alternative schools staffed by 100% newly hired staff, reinforces this perception. These schools are also the most expensive to their local school districts in that their personnel resources are duplicated in other schools in the district.

These data indicate that the ability of alternative schools to attract and transfer district personnel into their programs is relatively low. There are a number of possible explanations for this situation: i.e., technical difficulties in making the transfer, district teacher hesitancy to move into a less secure and known educational environment, lack of concern for the issue on the part of central administrative officers, etc. In some cases, the school district may have decided to enlarge its staff and to allocate some of the new staff slots to the alternative school. However, the fact is that the

1Dwight Allen warns against "anti-school" alternatives which are against established educational practices but which are not for any particular techniques or principles.
relative inability or unwillingness on the part of alternative schools to establish a staff which consists of predominantly transfer or replacement district personnel is the single largest extraordinary cost of alternative schools found in this study.

Using Money in the School

The manner in which the alternative school is able to use its money can be extremely important to the effectiveness of its program. Figure 34 outlines the perceptions of alternative school administrators of this area of the procurement and use of monies.
Thirty-four (68%) of the schools consider the methods of procurement, or the manner of use of their money to be of significant importance. Only 8% of the schools considered this area to be unimportant.

Since these questions were mainly answered by alternative school administrators, the meaning of the term "importance" is questionable. The taped interviews indicate that importance mainly means the bureaucratic headaches of filling out forms, etc. The ability to get flexible
money is a close second, however. Flexible money means funds for a particular project in the school which may not fit completely into the line items of the districts money and funds which can be raised quickly. An example of the potential difficulties to alternative schools of disadvantageous procurement procedures was clearly given in an interview not included in the fifty sampled schools. This particular alternative school was located separately from the district schools, and it served one fifteenth of the local high school population. The School Board granted it a corresponding 1/15 of the high school operating resources. The methods by which the alternative school gained access to those resources made it extremely difficult to take any program initiatives or advantage of their budget allotment, however. The authority for making the majority of the purchase decisions was made by the high school's department heads. Thus, if the art department head ordered 15 paint brushes, the alternative school received one. Although the staff of the alternative school had some influence with the various department heads in the decisions made, it soon became clear that the resources available to the alternative school through the high school's departments were intended for the high schools rather than the alternative school's use. It became nearly impossible for the staff of the alternative school to make plans and gather resources around the plans. As friction developed between the alternative school staff and the high school, the modicum of influence on the decisions of the department heads was lost. These were major conditions which led to the collapse of the school. This type of problem is typical of all school administrators to some degree, but it is
even worse for alternative schools. Part of the special problems facing alternative school administrators are due to a lack of experience which is often the case, an ambiguous institutional role which the alternative school often plays in the school system, and an anti-establishment image which often exists in alternative schools.

Since Figure 34 indicates a subjective evaluation by 50 schools of the importance of the technicalities of using money in alternative schools, it can only offer the alternative school planner a glimpse of the troubles which he can expect from this area without careful consideration and preventive action.

The best advice given by the schools included in the study with regard to the transfer of funds is to clarify and negotiate who is accountable for the school's funds and how the allocation decisions are made before the school opens.

Alternative schools may be able to use some of its personnel funds in a manner suited to their needs. Figure 35, on Page 86, presents four possible uses of the personnel funds available for a school of 100 students.
FIGURE 35
Example of Flexible Uses of Personnel Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100 Kids</th>
<th>100 Kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 teachers @ 10,000</td>
<td>1 coordinator/teacher 13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 staff teacher 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 sec/clerical assistant 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 aides @ 2.50/hr x 6 hrs x 180 days 5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 university interns @ 1,000 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer staff planning/ training session 2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 total 40,000</td>
<td>9 total 40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools-Within-Schools

Schools within schools are programs that operate out of a section of another district school. In many cases, a wing of the building is completely isolated physically from the rest of the building; in others, the division is less formal. Figure 36 indicates the extent of this type of situation for alternative schools.

FIGURE 36
Percent of Schools Within Schools

YES ................ 48%
NO ................ 52%
Of all 50 alternative programs sampled, almost one half are schools within schools.

Figures 37 and 38 illustrate the advantages and disadvantages of operating within another school (Figure 37) and in a separate location (Figure 38).

FIGURE 37
Perceptions of Influence on Program of those which are not Schools Within Schools

Unknown ................................................................. 11
Positive Comments (Freedom from constraints) ............... 9
Negative Comments (More exposed to criticism from the community) . 1

FIGURE 38
Perceptions of Influence on Program of those which are Schools Within Schools

Unknown 6
Positive Comments
4 - Generally easier to make cooperative arrangements with other district programs.
3 - Access to facilities and courses in the parent school.
2 - Better communications between staffs.
2 - Ability to effect positive change on the parent school.
1 - Encourages support from the local school district.

Negative Comments
4 - Negative constraints on the behavior and style of the program.
4 - Serve as the scapegoat for the parent school.
4 - Too tied to traditional school's schedules and policies.
Most all of the information collected for this study indicates that when the alternative school is significantly different from the traditional schools in philosophy, behavioral norms, schedules, operating procedures, etc., that it is better to operate from a separate location. Wayne Jennings of the St. Paul Open School observes that "It's hard enough beginning an alternative school without the additional hassle of interacting with the perceptions of a regular school program." This is the perception of the majority of the schools in the study. For some alternative schools which exist within a section of another district school, the pressures on the alternative school can be tremendously destructive.

On the other hand, working from within a parent school improves the possibility of convenient transportation, cooperative arrangements between programs, and increased support for the program by the staff and administration of the parent school. Dwight Allen, Dean of the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, recommends that schools within schools define the areas of interaction between the alternative and traditional schools and create rules in these areas to cause the least amount of friction with the school possible. For alternative schools which are significantly different from the traditional schools in terms of behavior, etc., this is the best advice available to this study besides finding a separate location.

Figures 37 and 38 included a large number of unknown responses (17 out of 50, or 34%), particularly from those schools which are not a school within a school (SWAS). This appears to be caused largely by
the format of the question: When a school answers negatively to the YES or NO SWAS question, many simply went on to the next section thinking that they had satisfied the requirements for this section. Those programs (nine in all) which perceived no significant influence of their integration or isolation from a parent school appear to be a mixture of programs which simply have no opinion, feel that the advantages and disadvantages are equal, or do not feel that their location influences their program significantly either way.

**Transportation**

It has been reported that when the Minneapolis elementary schools divide into geographical blocks of alternative schools, transportation to any school within a particular block will be provided free of charge. A number of alternative schools would find this situation much better than their own. Providing students with convenient, cheap transportation is a problem in many alternative school situations. Figures 39 and 40 illustrate this problem.

**FIGURE 39**

Quality of Regular District Transportation System for Carrying Students Between School and Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20/50) (30/50)
Four alternative schools in the study are subsidized by their school district for student use of public transportation facilities (busses, subways, etc.). In this manner, the student's schedule need not be influenced by the district's bus schedule. All four of these schools are in city school districts--a fact which makes use of a substantial public transportation network more practical than in less densely populated areas.

The district bussing systems are inadequate (60% in Figure 39) for simply carrying students to and from school, and they are even worse for transporting students to and from community learning experiences. The extra costs for transportation can be considerable (Figure 41).
Per Pupil Extraordinary Transportation Costs
Absorbed by Alternative Schools

FIGURE 41

Average Extraordinary Costs to the School: $20.50 Per Student
Alternative schools expend this money for school vans, drivers, public transportation, etc. The five schools which mentioned their possession of a school van also mentioned the value of their vans as a focus of school spirit. Three schools had cars which were donated to their schools by parents and/or local agencies. Almost all of the schools depended at least in part upon the students to find some way to get to school on their own. Many schools commented that this situation placed a considerable burden upon the students. Those schools which depended entirely upon the students' initiative for transportation made no estimates of the costs incurred by the students' family for such transportation.

All 50 schools responded to the questions concerning transportation. While per pupil transportation cost estimates are fairly rough estimates based upon approximate total costs divided by approximate student population, they do indicate a useful range of transportation expenses which the schools have incurred. Of those eleven schools which presented no extraordinary costs for transportation, a few appear from written comments and interview questions to have, in fact, laid the considerable burden of transportation on the student with no subsidies from their district.

Cooperative Resource Utilization with other District Schools

Because of the relatively large number of small alternative schools, it is often difficult to invest in high-cost capital expenditures such as gymnasium, special laboratories, etc. To compensate for
this inability to effectively develop and use a broad range of specialized facilities, most alternative schools develop cooperative arrangements with other schools in their respective districts. Seventy-two percent of the alternative schools sampled in this study have developed such arrangements. It is obviously less costly to the district for the alternative school to utilize existing facilities from within the district than to duplicate the expenses of building the same facilities within the school.

Figure 42 indicates the major resources which alternative schools use in other district schools:

FIGURE 42
Facilities in Other District Schools Used by Alternative Schools

Library .................. 25%
Special Laboratories ....... 32%
   Language
   Workshops
   Typing
   Science
Gymnasium .................. 26%
Computer Center ............ 4%
Auditorium .................. 4%
Classrooms .................. 8%
Instructional Materials Center .... 4%
Drivers Education ........... 10%
Team Sports .................. 6%
Band .................. 4%
Classes .................. 20%
Audio Visual Equipment ....... 6%
Any and All Facilities ....... 26%
Planning and Training Time

Data presented in Chapter III indicated that there is a wide range of costs incurred by alternative schools for pre-planning and staff training which contribute to the start-up costs of the alternative school. Five programs spent more than $7,000 on such planning and training, while ten programs managed to become established without any money spent for these purposes. The characteristics of these two extremes reflect significant differences in student population but not in program type.

FIGURE 43
Comparative Characteristics of Planning and Training Cost Extremes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Student Population</th>
<th>Characteristics of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than $7000</td>
<td>221.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.5% Open School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dollars</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.0% Open School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that the planning and training costs go up sharply as the size of the proposed alternative program increases.

Irrespective of the size of the program itself, however, it is possible to make much more efficient use of planning and training resources. Figure 44 indicates, in most cases, there appears to be never enough time to plan, irrespective of the amount of time which is actually available.
FIGURE 44

Time Spent and Desired for Planning

Number of Cases

Average time spent: 10.3 weeks

Average time desired: 20.2 weeks
The data indicate that, on the average, alternative schools want about twice as much time as they have for planning. The staff of the Bent Twig School in Marion, Massachusetts spent the first three quarters of their planning time tremendously inefficiently. The last quarter of their time was by far the most productive. This is a common situation for alternative schools.

Of the 50 schools included in this data, Figure 45 shows characteristics of the 11 which were satisfied with the amount of time spent in their planning and training.

**FIGURE 45**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Data Code Number</th>
<th>Staff Size</th>
<th>Time Spent</th>
<th>School Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 weeks</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>104 weeks</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data in Figure 45 indicates that there is no significant correlation between the amount of time which a particular school spends in planning and how satisfied the staff of the school is with the planning done. Thus, within a range of six weeks to one year, a typical alternative school should allocate planning time based on either an intuitive
judgement of the time required to get organized or on the constraints of the environment.

Politics

Figure 46 demonstrates that nearly all of the alternative schools in this study considered public relations and district politics to be of significant importance in their overall financial health.

FIGURE 46

Perceptions of Importance of Public Relations and Politics in Overall Financial Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety percent (45) of the schools considered these dimensions to be of importance, and 36% (18) of them considered them to be of critical
importance. A few of the schools commented that the importance of politics tends to come in relatively short periods of time--that once the particular school receives its funds, it is fairly free of the influence of politics in terms of money.
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NASP offers this paper as a first step towards a basic understanding of finances in public alternative schools. It consists of advice and ideas rising out of our experience which we hope will be of some use to alternative school planners. Later this spring a more major effort in this area will be finished. We hope eventually to produce a document which will provide alternative school planners with a fairly comprehensive, action-oriented guide to healthy finances.

This introductory statement is organized around four topics: "Do Alternative Schools Cost More," "Why Invest in Alternative Schools," "Fiscal Planning in Alternative Schools," and "Alternative School Grantsmanship." If you are interested in these topics, we hope that this paper will help in your work.
DO ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS COST MORE?

A strong selling point which has been used for alternative schools has been that they cost no more than the conventional schooling; that the alternative school(s) simply requires the same per pupil expenditure as the other schools in the district. Other proponents of alternative schooling have advanced the argument that the schools cost less than the per-pupil requirements of the conventional schools. Experience in this realm is mixed; indeed, some alternative schools have cost the same or less than the traditional schools, but many have also cost more. The factors which contribute to these figures are complex, and this section will begin to outline some considerations which contribute to such calculations.

I. Why would the alternative schools cost less?

The single largest cost in the school budget is for personnel. It is in this realm of personnel utilization that alternative schools can realize the most substantial savings. Alternative schools have the potential to mobilize volunteer staffing personnel from a variety of sources, including parent, community agencies, the local business community, and teacher training institutions to teach in various capacities in the school to a much greater degree than the traditional schools. If the students themselves are given some legitimate teaching roles in the school, then other personnel resources are mobilized. Most alternative schools have capitalized on such possibilities as significant inputs to their learning environments.

Alternative school planners should be aware of at least two dimensions of personnel utilization for their schools. First, it is important that the personnel budget allotment for the school consist either of transferred district staff or funds for replacement staff. Otherwise, the staff for the school will be an additional cost to the district and will undermine the per pupil costs argument. Planners should be aware of the procedures for making such arrangements.
Secondly, if personnel funds become available, then there should be considerable thought as to how many and what kind of people it should be used for.

The use of the community as an instructional resource is another factor in many alternative schools which contributes to substantial savings. Learning experiences in the community through such groups as social agencies (police department, social service organizations, hospitals, museums, etc.), local businesses, and private groups (parents, churches, etc.) can mobilize a vast range of rich educational settings at minimal cost. Indeed, some alternative schools, such as those designed around the school-without-walls model, depend upon such experiences as the major component of the school program.

Donations of materials, equipment, etc. from the community can significantly add to the resources of the alternative school. Alternative school people are generally proficient scavengers of instructional resources—a parent donates a tape recorder, a church donates an old television, a library donates books—situations such as these often result in significant contributions to the resources of the school. We have found seven sources to be particularly rich:

1. Parents can be important sources of teaching supplies and other resources. Enthusiastic parents will pop up in the alternative school as time goes on. If some system is developed in the school for plugging these individuals into the program, there will be a whole range of benefits, from an exciting, participatory learning and teaching environment to a supportive parental political force, to a strong resource-gathering group. Particularly involved parents may serve as a lobbying force in support of the school on all levels of its existence. To capitalize on this potentially huge source of resources, the staff of the alternative school should be sensitive to such possibilities and be flexible enough to incorporate them into the school.
2. Cooperative arrangements for sharing facilities with other schools in the school district are often possible. Libraries, high-cost equipment such as video tape units, physical education facilities, special area laboratories, etc. are often not used to their full potential in district schools. Some schools have surplus supplies. Access to such resources can often be negotiated.

3. Local teacher training institutions can be a source of teaching personnel in the form of interns. Although selectivity is very important, many teacher training programs can offer interns to alternative schools as the practicum component of their programs. Also, technical assistance can be negotiated with other components of the colleges.

4. Businesses can be a surprisingly rich source of input. Many businesses are trying to find ways to serve their communities. Some are quite open to donating facilities and personnel for instructional input to the schools, particularly if it is for an innovative effort.

5. Government surplus outlets give tremendous discounts to schools. If you can get some formal documentation from your school district, then you can get some great materials at low prices from government surplus outlets.

6. Charitable and community institutions such as the church, YMCA, police department and other local governmental institutions, etc. can be another source for personnel, supplies, etc. As with all the rest of these sources, the key to marshalling such resources is to mobilize the staff, students, and parents to go out and get them.
7. Most alternative schools make arrangements for more effective sharing of facilities than conventional schools. An example of this type of arrangement is an alternative school which uses the local YMCA as the site for physical education.

In the long run alternative schools may be able to offer the school district some services which would otherwise cost additional resources. If, for example, an alternative school were able to develop a solid, community-oriented program, then after some period of time the school may be able to offer other schools in the district such services at no cost. Long-run tradeoffs such as this should be delineated by alternative school planners.

II. Why would the alternative school cost more?

Start-up costs for the alternative school can entail additional expenditures. Start-up costs may include funds for release time for staff members who are planning the alternative school plus miscellaneous planning costs, funds for staff training before implementation and after the school is operating (the transition into the alternative school will often entail major readjustments in staff attitudes and behaviors), funds for equipment if no co-operative arrangement between the alternative school and other schools in the district is made, and funds for building rent or renovation if necessary. As is indicated by these comments, some of these costs may be avoidable, but if they are incurred, significant additional funds may be required for the implementation of the school.

If the staff of the alternative school does not consist of transferred, district personnel, then the additional personnel costs would have to be absorbed by the school district. It is often difficult to release staff from the traditional schools to serve in the alternative school, particularly if only a few students from each school volunteer for the alternative school. If this were to be the case, then the funds for hiring additional personnel for the alternative school would constitute an added expense. As has been mentioned before, this expense is the greatest proportion of the school budget.
Transportation costs can be greater for an alternative school than for the conventional schools. Getting the students to and from the community learning experience can entail additional transportation costs for the alternative school. Also, getting the students to the school itself may entail extra expenses if the students come from a variety of districts or localities within the district.

The alternative school may have a student population which is too small for efficient use of central resources. Many alternative schools are in the 50-150 range of student population. This size may imply an inefficient use of equipment and facilities in the alternative school. Also, many of the fixed administrative and other district costs may be duplicated in the school. Although schools normally budget a teacher for every 25 students, an alternative school often adds a director or two to this personnel allotment.

III. The myths and realities of per pupil costs.

As the comments in this section have indicated, calculating the exact costs of the alternative school is a complex process for the school district. In many cases the alternative school budget could be operating on a level equal to or below per-pupil expenditures district-wide, but many of these costs may be duplicating expenditures in the district. In other cases the operating budget of the alternative school may accurately indicate the per-pupil costs expended for the alternative school students by the district. This discussion simply indicates that selling the idea of the alternative school from the perspective of equal or less per-pupil cost may or may not be appropriate, depending upon the local circumstances of the planning and implementation of the school. If this simplistic promise or prediction is made, the survival of the school may be in jeopardy as the real costs become evident. The costs and benefits of the alternative school need to be outlined as clearly as possible to everyone involved.
WHY INVEST IN ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS?

This is the first question which any School Board or administrator will ask when confronted with the possibility of supporting an alternative school. Beyond the basic educational appeal of the idea, (which should by no means be played down), the alternative school should be a sound investment. This means that if the School Board should support the idea, then there should be some real payoffs to it in the form of economic, psychological, or political assets. It is important for the alternative school planner to clearly lay out what these benefits will be when asking for support for the school. This section will outline some of these tradeoffs within four categories: payoffs to the school district, payoffs to the students, payoffs to parents, and payoffs to the community.

I. Local control and incorporation of educational alternatives can create a basis for effective district change. Change in school districts generally requires consensus in order to be implemented. Combined with the fact that the school district represents an absolute monopoly in the educational affairs of its locality, this fact inevitably leads to the compromise of educational innovation. A commitment to the concept of alternative education provides an opportunity for total institutional reform within a variety of alternatives available in the district. The continuity of educational experimentation which this situation creates can give the conventional schools a comparative perspective on all facets of their operations. In this manner alternative education provides the school district with a framework for constant evolution of educational techniques.

Establishment of alternative schools creates the possibility of marshalling outside funds.

The school district can begin to more effectively serve the needs of students and parents. The growing pluralism in our communities demands educational options to be available for our diverse needs. As these options become
Why Invest In Alternative Schools?
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available, the educational system can begin to satisfy a greater number of families. With more satisfied "customers," the budgets and referenda of the Board will have a greater chance for support.

II. If parents feel that they have a real voice in the type of education which the schools provide their children and that the school district is attempting to satisfy their needs, then they will become better integrated into the educational effort. Parental alienation from the education process is easy to understand:

Image a town in which every family is arbitrarily assigned to one local doctor by a ruling of the Board of Health. Imagine that the Health Board assigns families only on the basis of the shortest distance from the home to the doctor's office. Imagine finally that if a family complains that the assigned doctor is not helping one ailing member of the family the Board of Health replies, "Sorry, no exceptions to doctor assignments."

If this sounds like a totalitarian nightmare, stop and think. This is nothing less than a description of the way that Boards of Education assign children to schools and teachers. The fact that it is a time-honored tradition does not change the meaning of the process. In fact, a better case can be made for assigning families to doctors than to schools and teachers.

- Richard Kammann
Bell Telephone Laboratories

If parents could become as involved in their children's educational process as they are involved in their children's health and medical care, then the entire educational process would be invigorated. Alternative education opens up this possibility.

III. Children have different learning needs, and no single program yet devised can meet all educational needs. If the student is provided with a variety of positive learning options, school will be a more vital place. This is an extremely hopeful possibility to most students. It is reasonable to expect positive changes in behavior and motivation in this new situation.
FISCAL PLANNING IN ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

A vitally important aspect of the financial position of the alternative school is to make its fiscal plans clear and understandable. If the expectations of all those involved in the alternative school effort are created ahead of time, the alternative school will gain credibility and there will be smoother and more fruitful relationships created between the school, district administration, school board, and community. In order to facilitate such relationships, this section outlines a few tips to individuals making fiscal plans for their schools.

Be as exact as possible in your budget. To the extent possible, be explicit as to how you will use the funds which you request. This will not only give your program more credibility and "investibility", but it will also guard against unnecessary expenditures. You may be spending money unnecessarily on resources which could easily be provided from other sources if your plans were made clear. The process of delineating expenditures will also add clarity to your program. This budgeting strategy does not mean that you should make your funds completely inflexible; indeed, a line item of "mad money" with suggestions of different contingencies for its use seems reasonable. It does mean, however, that you should make it clear which funds would be discretionary, what the reasons for the funds are, and what the other funds will be used for.

Make honest and accurate predictions of the financial needs of the school as it progresses through different phases. This activity will entail planning some years (3-4?) ahead. Again, the alternative school will benefit from specifying the financial needs for its future stages because the planning will entail defining some clear, long-range goals and directions for the school. This type of planning can orient the alternative school to a broader context of its development which will solidify its foundation. The school district, in turn, will be able to consider the needs of the alternative school in its long-range fiscal planning. Again, this planning should not be so inflexible as to exclude new factors which may arise, but it should provide a useful framework
Make it clear who is accountable for the funds. It should be clearly defined as to who keeps the school's books, who has authority to make expenditures, and where the funds come from. In one case, an alternative school which did not negotiate an advantageous situation in this regard found itself subjected to a debilitating process of procurement of supplies. The school enrolled 1/15 of the high school population of the district. It, therefore, had access to 1/15 of the resources of each department of the high school. If the high school art department head decided to buy 15 paint brushes, the alternative school received 1. The department head held authority for making such purchases. Although the alternative school staff had some influence in these decisions, the degree of their influence varied from department head to department head; the flexibility of the alternative school resource requests was limited. Of course, this situation poorly affected the entire program of the alternative school. By making the arrangement of the transfer of funds as clearly defined as possible, these types of situations can be avoided.

Make a clear statement concerning the cost effectiveness of the alternative school. It will be worthwhile to spend some energy making some specific estimates of the cost effectiveness of the school for presentation to the appropriate committees of the Board. Figure out items such as the deferred costs of vandalism, etc. in the school, savings on building costs, etc. which can be expected in the school. Social costs, (deferred costs of arrest, confinement, etc. for the percentage of dropouts who will be expected to get into trouble, etc.), are also reasonable to present. Being organized and thoughtful in this area of cost effectiveness will be extremely helpful in all your negotiations.

Have options available for the above. When presenting your fiscal plans, have options available for consideration if your initial plan is for some reason unacceptable. Never compromise to the extent that the basic quality of your program will be in jeopardy, but make sure that you do not pin all of your hopes on one plan.
Create a framework for analyzing the alternative school costs which you can defend on your own terms. Do not be afraid of presenting arguments which don't conform to the standard rationale; make clear, forceful arguments as to the analysis of costs which are logical and which address your situation. If you gain acceptance of your rationale at the beginning, then you will have a sound basis of discussion later when possible problem situations arise.
Most people involved in alternative schools actively seek out grants from sources outside their local school districts. This section attempts to outline some of the advantages and disadvantages to alternative schools in participating in such grantsmanship.

I. Advantages in grants from outside sources.

The alternative school which receives substantial grants from outside agencies is in a good bargaining position for negotiations with the School Board and district administration. In order for the concept of alternative schooling to be a viable strategy in public education, the integrity or autonomy of the alternative schools must be preserved. In order for the alternative to provide a really different educational program, traditional norms will be changed within the alternative. Although the local educational system accepts this concept in supporting the alternatives, complications and serious constraints often arise. If the group proposing the alternative school has substantial financial independence, it is in a better position to negotiate beyond such constraints. In many cases, this effect has been clearly demonstrated—alternative schools with substantial outside support succeed in establishing viable alternatives more than those alternatives conceived and directed solely from the local educational system. It should be mentioned that this dependence on outside funding can and should be a short-termed (1-3 year) phenomenon. After the integrity of the alternative is established its payoffs become evident and the district becomes acclimated to the idea. Thus, the need for fiscal independence diminishes. Even at the beginning of the school, the dependence on outside funding sources should not be complete—there should be a process where the district seriously invests in the idea.

With outside funding, many of the start-up costs of the school can be absorbed without costs to the school district. If many of these costs, which were outlined briefly in a previous section, could be absorbed, then the
commitment on the part of the school district to support the development of the alternative school will be reinforced. In many cases, absorbing these costs may be essential for the district to support the school.

The uniqueness of the alternative school program can often attract funds for the enrichment of the educational program of the alternative school and the district as a whole. If the alternative school specializes in a field which is a category for funding of some agency, then the school, and indirectly the district as a whole, may stand a good chance to receive such funds. This, of course, is an attractive prospect for the school district in that it adds to the total resources in its domain.

Accepting outside grants can have the effect of building in evaluation of the alternative school program. In many cases, evaluation is one of the most difficult issues for alternative schools to come to grips with. New assumptions about learning and the products of the educational process result in difficulties in assessment of the accomplishment of proclaimed aims. Oftentimes, the alternative school does not spend enough time or energy in considering this issue. With the stipulation of evaluating the use of outside funds, the school's consideration of evaluation is often facilitated.

Receiving outside monies in support of the alternative school gives it prestige which can be important in the development of alternatives in the district. As the community and the local educational system see that their alternative school(s) receives recognition and funds from outside sources, the acceptance of the validity of diverse educational processes serving different student learning needs is reinforced. These people will inevitably go through an educational process which will change their views about education to a view more consistent with a changing society and school system. This type of process is important for the evolution of the educational system as well as for the survival of the alternative school.
II. Disadvantages of outside funding.

Grants tend to be an unstable source of income, and the alternative school would do well to avoid dependence upon them. Grants are generally given for a one year period with some sketchy promise for continuation which may or may not be realized. Some funding agencies are notorious for leaving projects "in the lurch." Unless the alternative school has someone who is extremely well-connected and competent in grantsmanship, the income from such agencies is susceptible to yearly fluctuations. This lack of dependability can create a harrowing atmosphere for alternative schoolers who already are occupied with building an entire institution in a short period of time.

Proposal writing and fund-raising can be extremely time and energy consuming. Alternative schools staff tend to be overcommitted, full-and-a-half time workers simply in keeping the alternative school program going and growing. Proposal writing and fund-raising can be activities which take large amounts of time. Many alternative schools simply cannot afford this energy.

The alternative school program may be compromised by accepting funds for activities outside of its priorities. In many cases, the "strings attached" to grants to alternative schools may not be within the priorities of the school. The money may be so badly needed that the decision makers in the school accept it in spite of its incongruities. This type of departure from the defined purpose of the school program can be dangerous to the effectiveness of the school.

Generally, the attitude towards grants should be to use them on your own terms, and to avoid depending on them. They should be levers to achieve the objective of local support of the alternative school as a permanent, semi-autonomous institution.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
We hope that you will spend a few minutes going through this packet and answering its questions. By the end of the summer, NASP will have provided a major guidebook on alternative school financing. This document is designed to be a method of gaining information on this topic.

The questions in this packet will not take more than 15 to 20 minutes for you to answer. Mailing them back to NASP will be easy with the self-addressed envelope which is attached to the packet. Most all of the questions will simply require a check in the appropriate spot. If our experience with these questions is any indication, then you should be able to get a few helpful ideas on this topic for your situation while you are answering the questions.

We will make a copy of the report on financing public alternatives available to you when it is finished.

Of course, if you are not presently running an alternative program -- that is, a significantly different program that is based upon volunteerism for students' admissions -- then you can ignore this request.

We appreciate your effort, and we hope that all is well with you. We will be in touch with concerning this questionnaire in the next few weeks.

Sincerely,

John Theroux
Executive Committee
GENERAL INFORMATION

1. How large is the student population in your school?
   
   [ ] 0-50
   [ ] 50-100
   [ ] 100-150
   [ ] 150-200
   [ ] 200-250
   [ ] 250-300
   [ ] More than 300
   [ ] Other

2. How large is your staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time paid teachers</th>
<th>Part-time paid teachers</th>
<th>Full-time volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time volunteers</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is your per pupil budget allotment from the school district?

   [ ] 0
   [ ] 250
   [ ] 500
   [ ] 750
   [ ] 1000
   [ ] 1250
   [ ] More than 1250

PLEASE PUT THE NAME OF YOUR PROGRAM AND A BRIEF DESCRIPTION ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.
4. What is the district-wide per pupil cost (if available)?

0 250 500 750 1000 more than $1250

5. What percentage of your budget consists of funds granted to your school outside of your local school district?

100% 75% 50% 25% 0%

6. If possible, please attach a copy of your school's budget to this questionnaire. If this is not possible, please make some rough budget estimates on the back of this sheet.

7. Year of operation

_____ 1st
_____ 2nd
_____ 3rd
_____ 4th
_____ More than 4th year (specify)

8. How much do you think that the health of your financial position is dependent upon politics (p.r., etc.)?

absolutely dependent
important, but not all-encompassing
mostly dependent upon legal and technical problems

9. How important do you think procurement procedures (how you get money from the system, who keeps books, etc.) is to the health of your financial condition?

absolutely critical—the most important issue
important, but not tremendously important
mostly dependent upon politics and p.r. technical aspects of funding aren't that important

10. Do you want the information in this question kept confidential?

_____ Yes  _____ No
1. How do you feel about any volunteer personnel in your school?

| bad - they cause more problems | mixed - some work out very well and others are a real hassle | really good - they provide a valuable resource |

1.a. How many of your teaching and administrative staff transferred into your school from other schools in your district?

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | more than six (specify) |

1.b. What percentage of your budget allotment is spent on the staff referred to in 1.a above?

| 0 | 25% | 50% | 75% | 100% |

3. Has there been any change in teaching load, class size, course offerings, etc., in the traditional schools due to any personnel being transferred into your program?

   Yes   No

4. If there are volunteers on your staff, how were they recruited?

   ___ Newspaper articles about the school
   ___ Visits to the school
   ___ Word-of-mouth
   ___ Recommended by parents, students, staff
   ___ Other media spots about the school
   ___ Active recruiting by parents, students, staff
      (Explain on back of page)

5. What types of people are involved in the school as volunteers or minimally-paid staff?

   ___ Student teachers
   ___ Parents
   ___ Local business representatives
   ___ Churches
   ___ Public service organizations (police and fire department, etc.)
COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS

1.a. What percent of your average student's time is spent in learning experiences in the community?

   ____ 0-10%
   ____ 10-20%
   ____ 20-30%
   ____ 30-40%
   ____ More than 40% (specify)

1.b. Do you think that your school will ____ increase  ____ decrease  ____ continue at the same level, the opportunities for community learning experiences for its students in the coming year?

1.c. How has your school made arrangements for learning experiences in the community?

   ____ Actively lobbied local agencies
   ____ Published requests through the media
   ____ Capitalized on offers, little active seeking
   ____ Paid agencies for rent of facilities, etc.
   ____ Used word-of-mouth by parents, students, staff
   ____ Established committee for organization of experiences (explain)
   ____ Other (explain on back of page)

1.d. Give two examples of the type of community arrangements you have made.

1.e. How successful and worthwhile do you consider the community learning experiences?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   Very successful and worthwhile Not very effective and too much trouble
2.a. What percent of your materials costs (for building supplies, instructional materials, etc.) are donated to your school from the community?

- 0-10%
- 10-20%
- 20-30%
- 30-40%
- More than 40% (specify)

2.b. What are typical sources of donations of materials?

- Parents
- Students
- Local businesses
- Local community organizations (fire and police department, etc.)
- Local social institutions (churches, women's leagues, etc.)
- Yourself (staff)
- Other (specify)

2.c. Give two examples of the types of donations mentioned in 2.a. which you have experienced.

3. How significant do you think the use of community resources has added to your programs' resources?

| major addition to program's resources | not significant addition to program's educational resources |
STARTUP COSTS

1.a. How much money did you use for staff training and planning workshops before your school was implemented?

| 0 | 500 | 1000 | 1500 | 2000 | 2500 | 3000 | 3500 | 4000 | 4500 | 5000 | 5500 | More |

1.b. How much time did you leave for staff training and planning?

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 24 | 1 | more than 1 |

week | weeks | weeks | weeks | weeks | weeks | year |

1.c. How much time would you set aside for pre-planning and training if you could start over again?

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 24 | 1 | more than 1 |

week | weeks | weeks | weeks | weeks | weeks | year |

2.a. How much money did you invest in equipment and building renovations as the school was implemented?

| $0 | $500 | $1000 | $1500 | $2000 | $2500 | more than $2500 |

(explain on back)

2.b. If there is any money indicated in 2.a. above, would the school district have normally needed to make such expenditures?

___ Yes  ___ No

3. How did you acquire funds for the startup costs of your school?

___ Private foundation or federal agency
___ Local school district
___ Local sponsor(s)
___ Sacrifice on the staff's part
___ Other (specify)
TRANSPORTATION

1. Is the normal school district bus system sufficient for getting your students to and from school?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

2. Is the normal school district bus system used to get your student to and from their community learning experiences, if there are any?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

3. What is a reasonable estimate of the per year expense of transportation for your school over and above the normal district expense?

   
   0 500 1000 1500 2000 2500 more than 2500

(explain)
SHARING FACILITIES

1.a. Does your school have cooperative arrangements made with other schools in your district for use of central facilities such as libraries, gymnasium, etc?

_____ Yes _____ No

1.b. If so, list the facilities in other district schools which your school uses.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.

2.a. Is your school located in a section of another district school?

_____ Yes _____ No

2.b. How does this fact influence your program?

[ ] Very negatively [ ] Not at all [ ] Very positively

Explain:

2.c. How do you personally feel about this?

[ ] Very negatively [ ] Not at all [ ] Very positively

Explain:
GRANTS FROM OUTSIDE SOURCES

1. What percentage, if any, of your budget consists of grants from outside the local school district?

[0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%]

2. List the advantages of grants to the operation, survival, and future of your school.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

3. List the disadvantages of accepting grants in the operation, survival, and future of your school. Give examples, if appropriate.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

4. What are some typical sources of outside funds which are available for you.

- Local colleges
- Business grants
- Private Donations (specify)
- Private foundations
- State agencies
- Federal agencies (explain type on back of page)
- Charitable groups
- Community organizations
- Other (specify)

5. What are some lessons which you have learned in searching for sources of funds?
1. Check the following facilities which exist in your school:

- [ ] Substantial Library
- [ ] Gymnasium
- [ ] Lunchroom
- [ ] Video tape unit
- [ ] Media lab
- [ ] Music room
- [ ] Science labs
- [ ] Other

2. Has the existence of your school caused the district's central offices to hire additional administrative staff?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Explain

3. Does your school get full use from its central facilities?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Explain:
APPENDIX C
MAILING LIST FOR
QUESTIONNAIRE

* means questionnaire returned or interviewed
* The Community School
   P.O. box 47
   West Hartford, CT 06119

* Union 32 HS
   Rural Route 2
   Montpelier, VT 05602

* Home Base School
   465 Mt Auburn St.
   Watertown, MA 02172

* Aurora Street Academy
   1540 Boston Street
   Aurora, CO 80010

* Montessori Neighborhood School
   2555 Euclid Heights Blvd
   Cleveland Heights, OH 44106

* Cambridge Pilot School
   1700 Cambridge Street
   Cambridge, MA 02138

* Woodstock Inc.
   35 Monument Square
   Leominster, MA 01453

* Transition School
   600 Reservoir
   Norfolk, VA 23504

* Street Academy of Albany
   224 North Pearl Street
   Albany, NY 12210

* Alternative Learning Program
   6520 Georgetown Pike
   McLean, VA 22101

   Richmond School
   Team 4
   Hanover, NH 03755

* Learning Centers Program
   St. Paul Public School System
   400 Sible Street
   St. Paul, MN 55101

Action-Boxboro Jr. High
Charter Road
Action, MA 01720

Omnibus Program
Box 741
Woods Hole, MA 02543

New School
13263 Cedar Road
Cleveland Heights, OH 44106

Independent Learning Center
Old Rochester Regional HS
Mattapoisett, MA 02739

Washington Urban League School
1424 16th Street NW
Washington, DC 20018

New Morning
65 West McMillan Street
Cincinnati, OH 45200

Eisenhower Elementary School
School Dist. # 117
Jacksonville, IL

The Center for Self-Directed Learning
New Trier East HS
Winnetka, IL 60095

The Nova Project
Seattle Public Alternative HS
Seattle, WA

Model School
4 South Gifford St.
Elgin, IL 60120

School Within A School
1327 Sir Francis Drake Blvd
San Anselmo, CA 94960

Omnibus School
1835 Cunningham Avenue
San Jose, CA 95122
Copley Square HS
150 Newbury Street
Boston, MA 02101

The Alternative School
East Elm Street
Brockton, MA 02401

School Within A School
110 Greenough Street
Brookline, MA 02146

C.I.T.Y.
675 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Holyoke Street School
405 Main Street
Holyoke, MA 01040

New Community School of Greenfield Area, Inc.
Greenfield, MA 01301

Education Without Walls
251 Waltham Street
Lexington, MA 02173

The Alternative Program
609 Webster Street
Needham, MA 02192

Murry Road
35 Murry Road
Newton, MA 02165

S.A.S.S.I. Prep
17 Pearl Street
Springfield, MA 01109

Worcester Alternative School
31 Elizabeth Street
Worcester, MA 01605

The City School
Madison, WI 53715

Baltimore Experimental HS
504 Cathedral Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

St. Paul Open School
1885 University Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104

School District of the City
1916 Elm Street
St. Charles, MO 63301

SHANTI School
480 Asylum Street
Hartford, Ct 06103

S.A.N.D. Everywhere School
45 Canton Street
Hartford, CT 06103

School Within A School
250 Court Street
Middletown, CT 06457

Yale Volunteer Services
404 A Yale Station
New Haven, CT 06520

High School In The Community
Dixwell Avenue
New Haven, CT 06510

Lee High School Annex
100 Church Street South
New Haven, CT 06519

Stafford Alternative School
160 Orcuttville Road
Stafford Springs, CT 06076

McCarthy-Towne School
Charter Road
Action, MA 01720

Cinnaminson Alternative School
Pomona Road
Cinnaminson, NJ 08077
Booker-bay Haven School
Bay Haven Campus
2901 W. Tamiami Circle
Sarasota, FL 33580

Pupil Services and Alternative Education
Board of Education
143 Bostwick Ave. NE
Grand Rapids, MI 49502

Newport Harbor School
600 Irvin Ave.
Newport Beach, CA 92663

Metropolitan Secondary Program Center
Witchita Public Schools
751 George Washington Blvd.
Witchita, KS 67211

Vancouver School Building
1595 West 10th Ave.
Vancouver #1, BC
Canada

Daly City Alternative School
1311 Skyline Drive
Daly City, CA 94015

Open Doors Program
Alameda, CO

Area H
Los Angeles, CA

Bent Twig
Marion, MA

Pasadena Alternative School
South Oak Knoll
Pasadena, CA

City School
Madison, WI

The Satellite Schools
Arlington, MA

Madison Learning Centers
c/o West Area Director
Madison Public Schools
Madison, WI

The Montessori Neighborhood School
2860 Drummond Road
Shaker Heights, OH 44120

Willow Run High School
Ypsilanti, MI 48197

Career School
Quincy Senior High School
Box 203
Canton, MO 63435

West Area
Madison Public Schools
545 W. Dayton St.
Madison, WI 53705

Title Three Project SOS
North High School
17th and Fremont N.
Minneapolis, MN 55411

Alternative Education Center
1024 Ionia NW
Grand Rapids, MI 48502

Malcolm Shabazz High School
314 N. Sherman Ave.
Madison, WI 53705

Teacher-Innovative Program
Quincy Senior High School
30th and Main St.
Quincy, IL 62301

Rochester Alternative Schools
Mayo High School
Rochester, MN 55901

Metropolitan High School
8237 South Lawrence St.
Chicago, IL 60619
X Program
Oak Park and River Forest High School
201 West Scoville
Oak Park, IL 60302

Rainbow School
YWCA
232 E. Front St.
Plainfield, NJ 07060

Rock Point School
Burlington, VT 05401

Sympatico
Box 482
Wakefield, RI 02879

Shaker Mountain School
545 S. Prospect
Burlington, VT 05401

Alternative Staffing Project
Hinesburg Central School
Hinesburg, VT 05401

Montpelier Education Facility
Box 311
Montpelier, VT 05602

Project Onward
Lake Region Union High School
Orleans, VT 05860

Rutland Alternative High School
187 North Main St.
rutland, VT 05701

New Ways Learning Center
231 West Grand Ave.
Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494

Lebanon Learning Loft
75 Bank Street
Lebanon, NH 03766

Scarsdale Alternative School
45 Wayside Lane
Scarsdale, NY 10583

Denver Street Academy
2250 East 16th Ave.
Denver, CO

Denver Metropolitan Youth Education Centers
Denver, CO

Open Living School
Jefferson County Public Schools

Harlem Preparatory
Harlem, NY

Cherry Creek "I" Project I
4700 South Yosemite Street
Englewood, CO 80110

Lynchburt Learning Center
Part Ave. and 8th St.
Lynchburt, VA 24501

Walk in School
1716 Williams St.
Columbia, SC 29201

Pioneer High
North Miami Beach Senior HS
North Miami Beach, FL 33162

Eisenhower Learning Center
2800 Drew St.
Clearwater, FL 33515
Indian Hill JR/SR High School
6854 Darke Road
Cincinnati, OH 45243

Rural Experimental Schools
Project
Douglas County District #19
Myrtle Crkke, OR 97457

* Vocational-Technical School
Kessterville Road
Eaton, PA 18042

Marple-Newton Senior High School
Newton Square, PA 19073

* Alternative Learning Project
108-82 Pine St.
Providence, RI 02903

Flower Mound New Town Ltd.
B18 North Saint Paul St.
Dallas, TX 75201

Learning Center
Box 162
Orford, NH 03777

* Children of the Rainbow
121 West 5th St.
Plainfield, NJ 07060
APPENDIX D

PER PUPIL ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL AND DISTRICT COSTS
## PER PUPIL ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL AND DISTRICT COSTS *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Alternative School</th>
<th>District Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 (Part-time program)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Per Pupil Alternative School and District Costs, Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Alternative School</th>
<th>District Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Since the estimated district average includes the alternative school budget, any differences between the two will tend to be underestimated.
APPENDIX E

STAFF-STUDENT RATIOS
## Staff-Student Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Paid Staff/School Size</th>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Paid Staff/School Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/ 125 (17.8)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7/ 150 (21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/ 60 ( 8.2)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4/ 100 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11/ 175 (15.9)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19/ 300 (37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/ 150 (30.0)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28/ 500 (17.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27/ 500 (18.5)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9/ 150 (16.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9/ 100 (11.1)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15/ 300 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/ 75 (10.7)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9/ 100 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8/ 160 (20.0)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/ 50 (16.6)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>104/1600 (15.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18/ 250 (13.9)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6/ 130 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24/ 500 (20.8)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4/ 100 (25.0)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7/ 100 (14.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5/ 130 (26.0)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12/ 150 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>34/ 300 ( 8.8)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4/ 100 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12/ 250 (20.8)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23/ 300 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18/ 500 (27.7)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>124/6500 (----)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3/ 50 (16.6)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8/ 105 (13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6/ 160 (26.7)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5/ 150 (30.0)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8/ 100 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20/ 400 (20.0)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1/ 50 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6/ 200 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>21/ 300 (14.2)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25/ 500 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7/ 100 (14.2)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11/ 150 (13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>9/ 150 (16.6)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7/ 150 (21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7/ 150 (21.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Student Teacher Ratio = (20.1)

Average Student-Teacher Ratio = (20.1)
APPENDIX F

YEAR OF OPERATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Operation</th>
<th>School Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44, 41, 9, 4, 8, 2, 14, 26, 25, 23, 28, 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>36, 50, 43, 11, 13, 7, 5, 6, 22, 20, 19, 17, 18, 27, 29, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48, 49, 12, 33, 24, 16, 30, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3, 15, 21, 32, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS FROM SAMPLE PROGRAMS
DESCRIPTIONS OF BERKELEY'S ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS
In the following pages are brief, descriptive profiles of the 18 alternative schools that make up Berkeley's federally funded Experimental Schools Program. Parents interested in learning more about these schools should contact the sites directly. The community is encouraged to visit the schools, talk with staff, and observe. Parents should feel comfortable in going directly into the schools to find out first-hand about the many efforts being made in the name of educational options for Berkeley's youth.

The descriptions that follow include addresses and phone numbers of the respective schools.

Six additional alternatives will open in the fall. Parents interested in knowing more about them should contact the directors, who are now working to build their respective programs and to bring in staff and students. Names and phone numbers of the six new alternatives to open this September are:

Junior Community
Mary Anne Kojan, Director 644-6274

KARE
Carol O'Gilvie, Director 524-7505

New Ark
644-6352

West Campus Alternative 9-C
Ken Roberts &
Susan Lom, co-Directors 644-6192

West Campus Alternative 9-D
Donald Mar &
Arnold Lockley, co-Directors 644-6192

Willard Alternative
Robert Collier, Director 644-6397

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Samuel S. Markowitz, President
Marc H. Monheimer, Vice President
W. Hazaiah Williams, Director
Mary Jane Johnson, Director
Louise Stoll, Director

Experimental Schools Support Office
1720 Oregon Street
Berkeley, Ca. 94703
644-6352
With the inclusion this spring semester of an Asian teacher, this alternative has achieved its goal of ethnic parity in staff, student-body and curriculum. The students represent equally these racial groups: Black, Chicano, White and Asian. A staff member representing each group heads up each of four ethnic studies units. A Multicultural Experience class is held daily and is offered in four sections. All students take all four units, rotating monthly. The course involves Black, Asian, White and Chicano history. This semester there is heavier emphasis on skills. All morning classes are held daily and include math and reading labs. Director Ellane Esquer reports there is more structure this year and attendance is high. This alternative continues to stress openness with students and inclusion of them in decision-making.

Agora, located in a wing of classrooms in C building on the Berkeley High School campus, began in the spring of 1971 under the name of Community II. During a summer pilot project, the program took on a new direction, became rooted in ethnic studies and awareness, was renamed Agora and now represents a diverse curriculum offering in both ethnic studies and basic skills. Student population: 167.
This alternative now has 60 students. The curriculum is tight and centers around Black Studies. Three sections of reading are in operation. Other offerings include music, art, African history and culture, sewing and Black people and the law. Most students take all of their courses in Black House. Student and staff meetings are held bi-weekly. Personal commitment to social needs continues as a major theme. Frequent field trips are made to nearby prisons. The Black House facility is becoming more a community center. Evening meetings on Black survival techniques in America are held weekly, open to the community. Numerous groups meet in Black House. Staff reports students are more involved and there's more consciousness of the program. Consultants serve the school in the areas of dance, African culture, African literature, drama, biology, chemistry and reading and writing.
CASA DE LA CASA
Grades: K-12
King Junior High, Bungalows 74, 75, 76
Telephone: 527-1983
Victor Acosta, Director

A 36-member board of staff, students, and parents makes all decisions for Casa. The school is made up of about 50 families. The program is based on the family concept. Curriculum activities include creating laser beams, rockets, go-carts, and a cloud chamber. Students are creating booklets and participating in a two-hour radio program on the school. Three student-initiated classes are conducted, two of which are student taught. The governing board meets monthly and an executive committee of two students, staff, and parents each plus alternates meets weekly. Staff functions include a coordinator for secondary and elementary education respectively. At least five persons work at the school daily and between 20 and 30 volunteers on a consistent basis. The director reports staff is beginning to zero in on individual needs. Students from the University of California and nearby colleges are providing individualized instruction. Mandatory inservice training in instructional approaches is conducted for staff, with students and parents participating on a voluntary basis. Casa student population: 150.
Purpose of this new alternative (February, 1972) is to motivate students to read and to prepare them, through an Afro-American orientation, for college. Subjects taught, through both ability and heterogeneous groupings, are math, history, and English. The latter is stressed and includes intensive, multi-teacher workshops in reading skills. The 100 students are all sophomores. Other grades will be phased in after the alternative has a chance to come together and staff has some experience with the program. To be in College Prep, students must take at least three courses in the school. A 16-member student advisory board has been formed to increase communication between students, staff, and parents; to plan cultural activities and future curriculum content; to help operate the school; and to initiate policy. The director cites as strengths of the new school: close contact with students, field trips, occupational counseling, strict attendance expectations, focusing in by staff of student needs, a black perspective, and sensitive teachers.
Changes have been made in Community High this semester. The tribal structure has been eliminated. A governing council comprising eight teachers and eight students votes on all matters to do with the running of the school. Enrollment stands are 40 black, 109 White, 14 Asian, 5 Chicano, 4 American Indian and 2 other. As of this semester, the school has a heavy multi-ethnic stress. Seventy students are currently enrolled in a daily cross-cultural course on ethnic awareness which all students in the school are being asked to take at some point in their Community High School experience. Course content is related more this semester to the effects of institutional racism. Students and staff meet twice weekly to formulate recommendations on school policy. These are then submitted to the governing council. A parent representative voting contingent is now being created, to be added to the governing council. Minority staff has been increased and the ratio now stands at 19 Third World of a total of 36. The director reports that the change in Community High School has resulted in an increase in teacher accountability, higher expectations of students and a stronger basic skills curriculum including intensive workshops in reading skills.
This alternative has 175 students. Basic skills continue to be the major stress, with a heavy, four-hour offering each morning. A staff of 12 teachers is supplemented by four college students and five volunteers. Three counselors from Project Digit work with students weekly. A Chicano intern is also providing counseling services. The school counselor conducts trips to local colleges. A University of California volunteer is surveying health needs of the students. Members of Bridge Over Troubled Waters come to the school regularly to talk about drugs. Twelve parents attend weekly evening meetings on the problems of raising adolescents. Fifteen women students participate in "rap" sessions one day and one evening each week. The thrice weekly staff meetings continue. All students have been assigned to put their aspirations in writing. The strong theme this semester is: "Where do you want to go?" The program is being moved toward individualized instruction, with subject matter tailored to where the students are. Students are making more of the decisions.
This alternative is organized into three clusters -- Asian, Bilingual, and Multicultural. There are four classes in the Asian component, three in the Bilingual, and four in the Multicultural. All together, 320 students are involved out of a total Franklin student population of 970. A curriculum rooted in ethnic awareness is at the base of the Asian and Bilingual clusters. The former is heavy on creativity and relevance to the present or the past. The Bilingual component relates to the Chicano perspective, is staffed by aides and special bilingual teachers, and contains 30 Chicano children, 28 Black, 26 White, and 8 Asian. The Multicultural cluster has individualized instruction and study of the humanities as goals as well as ethnic awareness. This component contains an equal number of Black and White children (60 and 59), three Chicanos, and thirteen Asians. The Asian cluster serves 35 Asian students, 66 Whites, and 29 Blacks.

Approximately one-third of the 200 University of California tutors assigned to the school are used by the alternative for one-to-one help in reading. This new (last September) and large alternative is still in the process stage at the same time it is in day-to-day operation. The special identity of the Multicultural cluster is still being developed.
A staff Senate has been created, chaired by a staff member. Staff meets weekly, across model lines, chaired by a staff member. Much effort is being spent on the need to communicate better with parents on all levels. Parents have been invited to attend staff meetings and have begun to participate. Parents' participation and communication are being dealt with on the classroom level as well as on the model/staff level. The three models will probably each deal with the problem differently. Some parents want to be able to help make budget and program decisions; some want the school-staff to take care of things for them and some parents just want to know what is happening and why. One model is discussing requiring parents to come to the classroom twice a year or more often to observe and eventually get involved. A series of meetings with Black parents, classroom by classroom, is being initiated by the director to identify ways in which to better serve Black children.

A consultant and a resource teacher assigned to each model continue to support the respective programs with guidance, materials and the creation of special projects. Student enrollment in the three models is: Multicultural-Bilingual, 234; Individualized-Personalized Learning, 217; Traditional, 149.
reading and math. A consultant spent a week at the school working with staff on curriculum and use of space. The alternative is structured around learning stations — physical centers for the study of language arts, math, science and art. Emphasis is on small-group and individual instruction and activity experiences. Central to the alternative is staff development. The program is centered around the open-classroom concept. There is a high degree of individualization, with heavy stress on language development and science. All but several classes in the school are in the alternative. Size of the alternative is based on the number of parents who elected to be part of it.

**KILIMANJARO**
Grades K-6
1820 Scenic
Telephone 644-6349
Stephanie Staples

All decisions regarding the school are made at weekly parent meetings. The teachers follow the directives of the parents. Parent dialogue at present revolves mainly around the issues of discipline and structure. Of the 50 students, 20 are non-White and 40 of the total are new enrollees as of last September. The 50 students represent 30 families. The staff of one full-time and two part-time teachers is supplemented by required parent participation, community volunteers and Field Service students from the University of California. The school has a heavy creative and experiential stress. There is much writing, painting, dramatic and poetic expression and many trips and out-of-school experiences. A Kilimanjaro News booklet is issued regularly and displays the wide range of creative experience of the students.
The program is structured to deal with basic skill training in ability clusters in the morning. In the afternoon, students are regrouped according to activity projects of their choice. The alternative now comprises four classrooms of 120 students. Curriculum continues to be based in the real environment of the children. Basic skills are taught through the study of those areas vital to their environment. Students opt in to twice weekly experiences with drama, sewing, cooking, photography, music and swimming. Two other afternoons are spent on such social issues as community organization, drug abuse and civil disobedience and in the areas of science, social studies, history and geography. There is a strong homeroom connection between students and teachers. Each Friday each teacher works with his/her own students.
This school has been restructured, a process which began last summer when the directorship moved from Herb Kohl to Bob Wilson. A wholly new staff came to the school last fall and since then has turned over about 50 percent. Curriculum has been redesigned to be responsive to minority students and to ethnic diversity. All but 12 of the school's 61 students are non-White. The purpose of the school now is to deal with the effect on minorities of institutional racism; to deliver reading and math skills through awareness of where each individual student is; to eradicate feelings of ignorance and unworthiness. The school offers a two-part curriculum -- heavy stress on basic skills and a strong grounding in ethnic culture, including Asian, Eastern, and Chicano as well as Black. The school is open to all races. The format of the revamped program has more structure, including controls on and requirements of students.
Of the school's 415 students, 125 are involved in daily double periods of work on reading skills. The alternative serves all grades. The bulk of them are tenth and eleventh graders. The number of units required in Model A decreases as the student moves up the grades. Tenth graders must take at least 20 units; eleventh graders, 15; and twelfth graders, 10. In the overall, Model A students take about 70 percent of their courses in the alternative. The 14 full-time and 8 part-time teaching staff cites as a major strength of the school the basic skills program; the interdepartmental team-teaching academic classes; the double period of coeducational outdoor physical education, which includes bowling, pool, sailing, canoeing, ice skating, and skiing; the required Study of Man intensive course in the humanities; a wealth of volunteer tutors helping in the skills labs; and the tutoring 60 MSA students are giving on a regular basis to elementary-age pupils at a nearby school. The school is located in a string of side-by-side classrooms and is therefore able to maintain a kind of community between staff and students.
This alternative has 92 students, 15 more than last semester, and there is a waiting list of 80. A new format provides substantive courses in the morning -- math, science, and English -- and afternoons geared to volunteer work experiences in the community, such as at hospitals, nursing homes, schools, and stores. Course offerings at Odyssey span cultural, social, and academic subjects. Excursions and experiences in the community are frequent. Classes draw upon a wide range of events in the community as an extension of the school experience. One group of students has created its own class, geared to community involvement on a regular basis. Numerous parents and college students serve the school as volunteers. Parent-teacher-student meetings are held bi-monthly to deal with school issues. From within a three-part advisory council, pilot groups have been formed to deal with such areas as budget, discipline, curriculum, and evaluation. A major effort of the school is to try to deal with basic differences. The director reports the students are enthusiastic and supportive. A strong part-time staff of a variety of disciplines gives a strength to this program in offering a broad range of experiences. Students from widely varied backgrounds are contributing greatly to the education of each other.
ON TARGET
Grades 10-12
Berkeley High School Campus
H Building, Room 101
Telephone: 644-6347
Robert Rice, Director

This alternative is still getting off the ground. At this early stage of its development, it is operating more as a supportive program supplemental to the main school than as a self-contained educational option. A student qualifies for membership in On Target with 15 units of OT offering. Subjects in the school are science, math, business, industrial arts, and home economics. Field trips are central to the program, which is geared to job-awareness experience as an extension of class work. Some 35 field trips have been conducted since the program began last September. Berkeley High School's Career Center is heavily utilized. Students frequently do on-the-job observation and actual experience in such places as hospitals, special schools, and nursing homes.

SCHOOL OF THE ARTS
Grades 10-12
Berkeley High School Campus
Community Theatre Building, Room 102
Telephone: 644-6846
Robert Pearson, Director

This is one of two new alternatives that opened this semester. This one has 200 students, recruited through school notices and parent-student meetings. Curriculum and philosophy were developed last semester through weekly staff meetings representing the areas of drama, music, English, dance, and history. Approximately 50 percent of the students were not formerly in the Performing Arts Department, the division which created the school. Most students take between three and four classes in School of the Arts and the rest in the regular Berkeley High School. Weekly convocations are held involving all staff and students. Frequent field trips are made to cultural events. Staff is hoping to use the convocations (performance workshops) as a means of pulling students together into a community. The
WEST CAMPUS MULTICULTURAL HIGH POTENTIAL
Grade 9
1222 University Avenue
Telephone: 841-1093
Robert Scrofani, Director

The more than 300 students in this school take only a part of their courses in it. Consequently, a goal is to establish common experiences for them, to bring them together into some kind of community. This program is attached to a one-year school and staff must start with a totally different group of students each year. A major purpose of the program is the improving of teacher-to-teacher relationships. Weekly meetings, afternoon workshops, and all-day planning sessions are among the means taken to try to achieve this. Subjects are English, history, science, language, math, music, and shop. Staff and students recently met in separate groups to create next year's curriculum. They are now meeting jointly. All parents have been sent a request to respond to program content.

WEST CAMPUS WORK STUDY
Grade 9
1222 University Avenue
Telephone: 644-6192
Arnold Lockley, Director

This alternative was designed to extend over only one semester each year. By phasing students gradually into their afternoon jobs, the director managed to save enough funds to start up again this semester with a different group of students, coming this time from retentions at the junior high schools as well as those not making it at the ninth grade West Campus school. Original concept was that keeping students a year in the Work Study alternative would be too stigmatic -- too much a way of saying, "You're not as good as the others." That concept is still advocated but the program was regarded as so successful last semester that the staff wanted to continue the service to other students this semester. All but three of the 57 students in the program were moved into the high school level in
February and 36 more were taken in for this semester. The program continues to offer approximately 10 hours a week of afternoon paid employment; a heavy morning course of basic academic subjects; individual, consistent, and personal contact between staff and students and staff parents. Friday all-student meetings are designed to motivate students to view themselves as important, achieving, and worthy of high aspirations.
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Students in the secondary school present many challenges to educators today, which necessitate modifications in educational philosophy and in program: if such schools are to meet the needs of all youth. The "I" Project, in its inception, was designed to accept these challenges and seek new strategies by providing different means of reaching an important segment of youth prevalent in today's high school. These are the academically capable, undermotivated, disinterested, potential dropouts.

In the fourth year of the program we will continue to employ methods in an interdisciplinary student-centered educational program aimed at meeting the needs of identified secondary students who are educationally handicapped.

In the third year of the project, the program was expanded to reach more students. For the most part, the goals and objectives were better understood by the staff and great strides were made in meeting the needs of the students in the program. Now that federal funding has ceased, it behooves us to analyze costs and make the program as viable as possible under the district's ability to maintain the program.

Continued efforts will be extended by the staff to broaden the parameters of the concepts of developmental interdisciplinary and individualized instruction. Now that the model of methods, strategies and technique is established greater efforts will be made in diffusion of the total "I" Team concept.

The 11-12 program housed in the cottage will continue with a fourfold approach. Emphasis will be stressed in a laboratory approach in reading and math, mini-courses, counseling, vocational education and field experiences.

The 9-10 program staff will seek to solidify methods, techniques and strategies appropriate for their level of student. It is recognized that not all of the techniques successfully implemented in the first three years of the program are applicable to 9-10 level students. Hopefully 1972-73 school year will bring cohesiveness, success and recognition to the 9-10 program, which it deserves.

Through District and State support, the staff and students who participate in this project will renew their search for alternative modes of educational change. And on this perception of reality they will continue to work toward meeting disappointment with encouragement as well as sharing their successes.
I. PHILOSOPHY

If students are not to stop short of effective living, they must learn to take measure to translate their concerns and their judgments into socially acceptable and useful action. The "I" Program will help the student to go this complete circle—caring about unrealized human potential, deciding what will improve conditions and taking meaningful steps in creating better conditions.

We believe our work begins with individual students. In the "I" Program the student comes first! We encourage pupil involvement, pupil-staff interaction and community experience.

We will work diligently to make education more relevant for these students in relation to their life goals, the community environment and the real world.

We subscribe to the idea that . . .

"What is valuable in any experience is that which, although intangible, is left behind as a part of others or carried away as a part of yourself."
II. ABSTRACT

Cherry Creek's Title III "I" Project, an interdisciplinary approach to the educationally handicapped, undermotivated, disinterested, potential school dropout, was born of unmet educational needs recognized by the staff of Cherry Creek Senior High School in November, 1968. A committee was commissioned to study and develop means and methods for solving the identified problem.

In December of 1971 the Board of Education of Cherry Creek Schools accepted the program and placed monies in the 1972 budget to continue it at the level at which it operated under Title III ESEA funds.

The primary objective of this program plan is to continue to provide a substantially different school program for educationally handicapped secondary school students who are presently not sufficiently motivated by the traditional secondary school program. It suggests a continued effort in seeking new instructional strategies which, if correctly applied, can help, we believe, meet the students' unmet educational needs.

This will be accomplished through staff involvement, established diagnosis and prescription procedures, counseling, larger community exploration, mini-courses, a basic skills laboratory, a concentrated curriculum-building effort and a more adequate evaluation process.

This program will provide an interdisciplinary, student-centered educational program. Curriculum experiences will be directed toward what is real and meaningful to today's youth and particularly to this group. Instructional strategies will be developed around student interests with structure and performance criteria applied as a basis for assessing educational success.
Evaluation of learning experiences by actual performance criteria will indicate students' progress in conceptual areas. Community human and non-human resources will become an integral part of the educational program.

Study of learning disabilities by the Program staff and the development of appropriate prescriptive and assessment models are of great importance.

The staff is committed to working toward a individualized prescription and assessment model which is relevant to the students they serve.

Ultimately, this model of teaching, learning and curriculum development could have much broader application than to the educationally handicapped. Presently, however, their great unmet needs are the object of this program.
III. RATIONALE and OBJECTIVES

There exists at Cherry Creek Senior High School as well as other secondary schools throughout Colorado and the nation a relatively large group of students who fail to respond adequately to traditional methods of teaching or traditionally structured curricula and programs. These students become obvious to faculty, counselors and administrators and are generally recognizable by manifestations of poor attitudes toward school and school programs, failure to adjust to expected attendance patterns or school rules and procedures, general lack of success in the courses pursued in their program and misbehavior toward the school.

These students who are educationally handicapped are considered a potential waste of human resources. Young people such as these, with few skills and with hostility toward what they believe is an alien authority, have emerged as disruptive elements in the American culture. The comprehensive high school, with its size and formality, has become anathema to those students who are educationally ill-equipped to cope with its demands. Especially disturbing is the number of educationally handicapped intellectually capable of completing school. Recent studies indicate that the academic system of the majority of American secondary schools is not meeting the needs of these students.

In these students there appears to be a distinct gap between their apparent ability and their success in their school program. Existing programs, including traditionally structured vocational education programs, have not satisfied their
needs largely, we believe, since these are structured and approached in the same manner as the remainder of their program. New and substantially different content, methods and materials must be sought, implemented and evaluated.

A. GENERAL OBJECTIVE

The general objective of this program is to provide a more meaningful, responsive educational program for a group of educationally handicapped\(^1\) students who do not presently respond to the secondary educational program available to them and, as a result, have essentially "dropped out". The program will continue to explore the thesis that students so described can be more successfully educated in a school program provided that program is different and so designed and approached as to relate to the lives of these students and to be meaningful and relevant in their judgment.

It is the goal of the "I" program to provide an acceptable educational alternative for participating students who manifest specific learning disabilities. It is within this educational alternative that the "I" program provides, along with a school identification, unusual opportunities, a friendly, helpful atmosphere and diagnosis and remediation of each student's learning disability.

---

\(^1\) Educationally handicapped students described herein are defined as in "Administrative Procedures for the Special Education Program", Colorado State Department of Education (unpublished revision of 1965 edition), Chapter II.
B. **SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

Specifically, the following teacher objectives are sought from this program:

1. Teachers involved with the program will continue to build a curriculum for developmental interdisciplinary, student-centered learning experiences for educationally handicapped students. This model will be tested in practice, evaluated, revised and used as a basis for planning curriculum development activities for future years of operation.

2. Teachers will develop instructional methods and materials to fit student-oriented learning situations. These methods will be utilized in practice, evaluated, revised and used as a basis for planning curriculum development activities for future years of operation.

3. Teachers will develop prescription and assessment practices.

4. Teachers will provide the student with an environment which will lead to successful educational experiences. This environment will provide the opportunities for increased achievement levels, successful adjustments and attitudinal changes toward education through program modifications and student-centered learning situations.

5. Teachers will provide learning experiences which will help students to remediate their learning deficits to a degree that will enable them to return to the regular school program with reasonable success. This objective is aimed basically at the ninth, tenth, or eleventh grader who, after participating in the program, would return to regular school classes.
The following student objectives will be stressed:

1. The student will demonstrate an average increase in his reading ability by a minimum of one year as indicated on a pre- and post-standardized achievement test.

2. The student will demonstrate an increase in math skills by a minimum of one year on a pre- and post-standardized math test.

3. The student will participate in field experiences including paid and nonpaid work and volunteer services.

4. The student will participate in and complete mini-courses to meet requirements and student interest areas for credit purposes. Teacher evaluation of student progress will indicate satisfactory completion. Credits will be based upon progress, performance, attendance and teacher evaluation.

5. The student will reflect a more favorable attitude toward himself as an achiever.

6. The student will attempt new activities, even those at which he may fail.

7. The student will report a more positive attitude toward education and learning activities.

8. Students will be more involved with the development of the vehicles (instructional situations). (11-12 Program only.)

9. Students will develop self awareness and responsibility through school, community, and vocational participation.
10. Students will demonstrate positive attitude & behavior changes through group interaction and interpersonal relationships with participants in the program. (9-10 Program only)

IV. PROCEDURES

Education for the student who is apparently able to respond but is not doing so, is a meaningless thing. His history of experiences with the institutions called schools has left him cold in his response to what it offers. It does not relate to his life. It is unreal. He is jammed into a predetermined curriculum of isolated discipline in which he can see no value, no purpose. He rebels at this environment choosing not to expend his energies there.

A new approach is required if education is to be meaningful to him. This approach must be student-centered. It must evolve from the situations students themselves create—those in which they express interests. It must concern their daily lives. It must involve the student—for involvement is a key to his learning. It must be viable, flexible, fluid.

A. COUNSELING-ORIENTED APPROACH

The "I" program functions as a counseling-oriented school. It must also be able to provide an academic program for participating students. The "I" program is flexible and able to adapt to the unique needs of each student to a greater degree than is possible in the large high school. Because of the uniqueness of each student, a highly individualized instructional program is offered and, indeed, necessary.
B. STUDENT-ORIENTED APPROACH

In a student-oriented approach we will take the student where he is and help him develop his potential into a contributing citizen at the highest level within his ability and personality.

The day the student enters the program it is our obligation and responsibility to plan for the day when he will go out on his own and begin a life of independence. All our strategies, methods and techniques must be geared toward this end. The program is not meant to create an unreal situation . . . an unreal world of concern, but creates team work in a realistic human sense.

Academically oriented, practical life experiences will take place both in and out of school. A bus and private autos of the teachers for trips to any place in the community or immediate area will be available. An inside-the-classroom resource center will provide materials to stimulate and assist the student. In a very real sense, their school will involve the community and the community their school.

The students, through the counselor-teacher relationship and their own interests and motivation, will establish objectives to make these learning experiences more meaningful. The mini-course approach will offer the students a variety of worthwhile content options. Mini-courses and project-type activities also will lend themselves toward the formation of small groups of learners.

In addition to the small group instruction offered in the mini-courses, individualized instruction in the basic skill areas of reading, writing and
mathematics will be offered for every student. The laboratory setting will provide the academic center for all instruction within the program. The basic diagnosis and prescription of each student [which is a function of the laboratory] will be available to all mini-course teachers so that a continuity of instruction will exist. This will serve to increase individual strengths and to remediate basic weaknesses. Furthermore, mini-courses will utilize and further enhance the organization of skills developed in the laboratory; reciprocally, the laboratory will provide time as a part of each individual contract for the student to read an assignment or a book or to solve math problems related to his mini-courses or work experiences. The individual "learning style" of each student must be considered as well as the individual teaching style of each staff member.

All work in the laboratory will be individualized. Prescriptions will be based upon emphasis of a student's strengths and the remediation of his weaknesses.

Prescriptions will vary depending upon the student's individual needs and motivation. For example, a student with reading skills centering around a third or fourth grade level has much need of a remedial type program with some emphasis on some type of learning disability. However, a student with senior high or college level in reading may pursue an individualized program utilizing books, magazines and other materials within a major interest area. Math will be prescribed for those students whose test results are below a 9.0 grade level. These students will work at an individualized pace in which
the student encounters a set of behavioral objectives, a pre-test, work upon a skill and a final evaluation for each defined math skill. Each student will begin at the point which is indicated by his diagnostic evaluation.

All individualized prescriptions will be success oriented to help the student overcome learning disabilities and feelings of failure. Since development of self-image is a prime goal of the program, each student will assist in the diagnosis of his own needs and capabilities and in the preparation of his contracts. Thereafter, the teacher and the student will continuously evaluate work and performance. The student will be evaluated formally in a post-test situation in the areas of reading and mathematics and credit will be given according to individually acquired gains.

The "I" program will provide individualized programs of counseling, tutoring and work experience. Community service, interest-centered activities and classes outside the "I" program will be arranged. Experiences will include paid work and nonpaid services.

C. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

As a participating Cooperative G vocational education program the "I" program will continue to expand the concepts of voluntary as well as paid work experiences through local educational and business enterprises. Students in the program will be encouraged to take advantage of existing vocational offerings at Cherry Creek High School whenever possible. Work experiences will be encouraged in the afternoon and evening hours, especially for 11th and 12th grade students.
Instruction in the vocational education areas will be developed on an individual basis through independent study and group instruction in the classroom.

Credit for work experiences will be awarded on a performance basis.

Employers will be contacted for evaluation purposes.

In order for vocational education to be a viable part of the total "I" program students will meet with teachers regularly for counseling concerning their employment and the vocational choices open to them.

D. **STAFF-ORIENTED APPROACH**

1. The program will be staff-oriented. The staff will function as a team.

   They will bring their special areas and skills together to help each student. They will work together as a team, consulting with one another! Growth and maturation are recognized processes, therefore the team's expectations will increase as each student assumes more responsibility for his activities and himself. The team will look at each as an individual with all the dignity and value that it implies. See pages 14 & 15, Table 1 & 2, for the student-staff interdisciplinary team staffing models.

   Staffing designates a plan for better utilization of manpower in a laboratory classroom concept not found in traditional high school patterns. A distinctive feature of this staffing is the identification and establishment of roles for those involved in an interdisciplinary team effort. Each role carries with it designated responsibilities and duties associated with the teaching/learning tasks and/or other professional and nonprofessional functions.
2. Purposes:
   a. to facilitate a more individualized school program
   b. to build and utilize a developing interdisciplinary approach for enhancing student learning experiences
   c. to provide a team of teachers who can relate to students
   d. to assemble and maintain a staff team who can give love, understanding and knowledge to students.

The teacher-counselor team of specialists will draw upon the regular teaching faculty of Cherry Creek Senior High School and the Metropolitan Community to provide interdisciplinary approaches such as mini-courses and subject matter support for the "I" program. The mini-courses will be of short duration in subjects of particular interest, need, and requirement of the student. These courses will be student-centered, success-oriented experiences.
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INCEPTION

Spring & Summer, 1970

The need for an alternative high school was expressed by the Watertown community during the Watertown Charrette in May, 1970. The Charrette was a federally-funded week-long planning session open to all members of the Town and was the culmination of several months of study by committees of citizens concerned with such areas as taxes, education, recreation, and government. The participants of the Charrette, agreed on the following assumptions about education:

1. That those who must live with decisions should play an active role in making them.
2. That people can learn in many places outside school buildings.
3. That the Greater Boston Community had many resources which could be tapped and
4. That the school should involve members of the community as much as possible, and proposed to the Watertown School system the establishment of a small alternative high school of 100 student volunteers and 6 staff in facilities outside the existing secondary schools.

Action on the proposal came in July. At its meeting the School Committee, in cooperation with the Superintendent of Schools appointed a Watertown resident who had been active in the Charrette Process, as a part-time administrative assistant to coordinate a feasibility study of the school. The balance of the summer was spent identifying the following as major concerns:

1. How many students were interested in the idea? How would they be selected?
2. How many of their parents would give permission?
3. Were there other schools like the one proposed? If so, what were they like?
4. Would students in such a program be accepted in college?
5. Were there community resource people interested in working with students in such a program?
6. Could such a program be adequately staffed?
7. What would it cost?
8. What might some student programs look like?
DEVELOPMENT

School Year 1970-71

The first steps involved compiling data in answer to the questions. Community members who had participated in the Charrette cooperated in completing the study, and a final proposal was presented to the School Committee in November. The School Committee approved the proposal in December; after budget considerations were worked out, the School proposal contained the following elements:

1. Six staff certified at the secondary level, one in each of the following areas:
   - Guidance Counselling
   - Humanities/Arts
   - Language Arts
   - Mathematics/Sciences
   - Social Sciences
   - Technical/Vocational

2. One of the staff members would serve as a co-ordinator of the team.

3. 100 students, 25 in each of grades 9-12, selected at random from volunteers having written parental permission.

4. Facilities located out of the existing secondary building.

5. A full-time secretary.

6. Car and driver to facilitate travel to field experiences.

7. Money for MBTA fares to facilitate travel to field experiences.


9. Two weeks of summer planning time for the staff.

The Town also applied and received approval for funds from ESEA Title III to supplement the planning money and to develop an evaluation design appropriate for this unique kind of school.

Upon approval of the Home Base School budget, six staff members were selected whose qualifications included certification in one of the above six areas and team leadership ability. Staff selection was completed by March with five of the six positions being filled by people from Watertown schools.

During the Spring, the new staff began meeting weekly to plan for the
school. It was strongly believed that almost all final decisions regarding structure of the school and its curriculum should be held until students have been selected and consulted. At this time the staff members informed every eligible student about the Home Base School through visitations to all English classes in the 8th-11th grades. Interested students were given information for their parents and a parental permission form. Meanwhile evening meetings were held for parents who desired more information before deciding. There were more than 200 applicants from which 100 were selected by drawing names from a hat, 25 students per grade. The remainder were placed on a waiting list in the order in which they were drawn.

Thus the school community was complete, and the long process of working out exactly what the school would be began. A series of large and small group meetings were held with students, parents, and staff to clarify goals and needs for all involved in the Home Base School.

In late Spring, members of the Home Base School staff began discussing with members of the faculty of the new Graduate Program in Open Education at Newton College of the Sacred Heart to explore possibilities of collaboration between the programs.

Summer, 1971

A formal three week summer workshop was held to design the basic structure of the school--two of these weeks included as many students as could be there. The issues addressed included the following: (1) new roles and responsibilities, (2) the design of the course, (3) the planning of individual programs, (4) the identification of resource people and places, and (5) the decision-making process to be used in the school. The staff portion of this workshop was used to develop an outline of an evaluation design; consultant help was utilized in this process.

It was decided to form a Community Advisory Committee to facilitate interaction between and among the various constituencies of the Home Base School. Membership included members of the School Department, parents, students, and community resources. In addition to including a representative student, parent and staff member from the school, efforts were made to involve people not otherwise connected with the Home Base School.

The original discussion with the Newton College Graduate Program resulted in a summer Planning Grant from the New England Program in teacher Education. As finally developed, the project called for hiring four Newton College graduate students as interns on the Home Base School staff with specific responsibilities to facilitate the sharing of resources among the Home Base School, the Newton College Graduate Program, and the people of the Watertown Community. The interns were also to work closely with resource people to help make their experiences as resources of maximum value to both themselves and the students. The proposal was developed by faculty and staff at both the Home Base School and Newton
College and by the four graduate students subsequently appointed as inter¬
terns. At the end of the summer the project was funded and the interns
were appointed. In addition to teaching some courses, each intern had a
series of tasks specifically related to the project, among them: (1) the
establishment of a data bank of resource people, (2) arranging visitations,
(3) scheduling and running meetings of resource people, and (4) responding
to mailed inquiries about the Home Base School.

Facilities were leased for the school year from the Saint James
Armenian Youth and Cultural Center in Watertown. The space includes one
room used as a school office, one large multi-use room, one lounge,
and three classrooms (one of which is used primarily for music, arts,
and crafts.)

The full-time staff included the original six staff, four graduate
interns from Newton College, one secretary, and one driver; part-time
staff included two evaluation consultants and one administrative assistant
to administer the fiscal aspects of the Title III Grant and the grant from
the New England Program in Teacher Education.

THE FIRST YEAR

School Year 1971-72

The Home Base School officially opened in September 1971 with the
biggest job of all ahead—putting ideas into practice. Many of the areas
below will reflect the changes in the school structure that occurred in the
attempts to meet the goals of the school.

Programs - Student programs are constructed by the students with guidance
from staff members and parents. These programs have a dual focus—inward
toward the school and outward towards the community. Between the courses
and programs offered at Home Base and the field experiences and courses
available in the Boston community, the needs and interests of each student
can be met. It is the belief of the school that this balance between
school and community is essential to the educational experience of stu¬
dents. Learning experiences vary from fairly normal-sounding courses like
"Algebra I" and "Grammar and Composition" to unique programs at the school
like the experimental theatre, music theory, photography, karate, to
field work at the Franklin Park Zoo, Coombs Motors, the Boston University
Medical Center and Perkins Institute for the Blind. Some of these are
offered by staff, others by resource people from the community. There are
more than 90 resource people listed on file; more than 50 are active
currently. Students are encouraged to take at least one course outside
the Home Base School. The evaluation of an individual's performance in a
learning experience is expected to be a process involving both the resource
for the experience and the learner. The evaluations are written and
placed in a student's folder; copies are given to the students to be trans¬
mitted to their parents. In January students re-organized their programs
with staff assistance, bringing in new resource teachers and developing many
new community-based experiences.
One of the important programs offered at the school is the experimental theatre, providing several beneficial functions not foreseen in the fall. At its inception, it was meant to be a program to offer lighting and set design, acting, directing, dance and the basics of carpentry and electricity as components to technical theatre. As the year progressed, it was found that the theatre involved many students from widely differing backgrounds and interests until approximately 50% of the school was involved. For those whose energies and/or talents were artistically predisposed, for those who had no theatrical interest per se but found a chance to work on technical skills involved in building the control booth with its lighting and sound consoles, and for those who felt an uneasiness with their new non-structured freedom, and found some security in the self-discipline demanded in the theatre, the Home Base Experimental Theatre proved to be reasonably exciting and fairly cohesive. During its first year the Company produced Shakespeare’s A Midsummer Night’s Dream, a production whose audiences included Watertown’s elementary school students. Antigone by Sophocles, whose costumes were photographed and included in a book on design soon to be published in New York, and Summertree which included on the program a satirical revue written, choreographed, directed and costumed by the students.

School Groups - The summer workshop established a complex Town Meeting form of school government in which most discussion and voting was done in small groups—the large group being reserved for presentation of issues and for sharing small group conclusions. The decisions from this form of government were deadlock so often that people lost interest and eventually tried a simplified version of the Town Meeting—with elected moderators, a published agenda, and discussion and voting on the floor of the large group with a majority of those present and voting sufficient to carry a decision. This method also died, since students began to feel if they weren’t at the meeting to register dissent, then the decision did not apply to them. A student came up with a proposal for the present government in early Spring. It is a representative government consisting of 3 parents, six students and two staff. This government has agreed to terminate in December to be evaluated and reorganized if necessary. The group meets weekly to deal with issues affecting school policy.

Another outgrowth of the summer workshop was the establishment of weekly discussion groups to provide a forum for non-directed student discussion, a place to “let off steam” in the hopes of fostering a sense of community at Home Base. These groups were co-led by a student and one of the original six staff and each contained approximately one-sixth of the students. The co-leaders met weekly in a seminar in group leadership skills run by a sociologist at a local university, the staff co-leaders receiving local in-service credit for the seminar and the student co-leaders receiving credit in the social sciences.

The parents established a Council of Home Base School parents and elected an Executive Committee that meets at least once a month with members of the staff and student body who are both interested and available. This group has sponsored some fund-raising efforts and is invaluable
in getting information out to parents. They are co-ordinating efforts
to reach local groups through speaking engagements at meetings, and
are planning other activities involving themselves in the day-to-day
operations of the school.

A review board, consisting of students, parents, and staff was
established to review student programs and to establish criteria on
course credits and minimum programs.

Evaluation - Two evaluation consultants, who were familiar with the
goals of the school and experienced in evaluation methodology were hired
to develop an evaluation design appropriate for the unique program of
the Home Base School and to conduct the evaluation. The emphasis of the
evaluation is on both the product and the process of the school and the
methodology utilizes a sociological and anthropological model rather than
a systems model.

As part of their design, the evaluation consultants developed the
Intervention Team, which reported to the School areas needing immediate
attention or reorganization within the school. Thus the evaluation be¬
came a tool for change during the school year rather than merely a look
backward at the year's end. One of the significant changes initiated
by the Intervention team was the abolition of the discussion groups
established at the beginning of the year. These groups had been used for
advising and keeping track of what individual students were doing as well
as for non-directed student discussion. Since the groups were not a
satisfactory way of meeting individual student problems and needs, and
given the frequent opportunity for informal student-student and student-
staff contact in the school, the Intervention team recommended discarding
them. In their place the team recommended the Advisor system. Under
this system each advisor is selected by ten student advisors. Each student
thus receives counseling individually from the staff member he chooses.
The system started slowly, but by May it was deemed of critical importance.
It has helped students plan programs objectively and has provided an outlet
for their ideas and frustrations.

Planning for Next Year - Staff, students, and parents participated in the
selection of a new program Chairman and new staff members for the coming
school year. Prospective students were given information about the
school, and random selection was used to select twenty-five new students.
Graduating students were assisted in developing their future plans—all
students interested in college were admitted, and most of them were
admitted to their first choice; students who were interested in employment
have been placed in jobs in their field.

Formal procedures were developed to permit secondary school students
in Watertown and other alternative schools to participate in course work
at the Home Base School. Procedures were also developed to assist local
universities in placing student teachers at the school. In particular
a reading program has been arranged through Northeastern's Graduate School
of Education, and practice teaching through Boston University's Foundations
of Education program.
SUMMER, 1972

During the summer, staff have been involved in selecting evaluators for the program, and developing a design for the evaluation. Consultants have been interviewed and criteria developed for a program in staff development for the coming school year. A summer workshop was conducted at Newton College of the Sacred Heart as part of the Project funded by New England Program for Teacher Education in which the interns, Home Base staff, Newton College staff, and community resource people participated.
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INTRODUCTION

During the last two years the phrase public alternative schools has been heard in educational circles around the country and has headlined numerous professional conferences and seminars. Scores of school systems have started public alternative schools and still more are courting the idea. The alternative school, with its rationale of providing educational options for a pluralistic society and its promise of fundamental change, has found wide acceptance. Yet the challenge of actually creating and implementing these options has caused many school districts to waver.

The purpose of this volume is to give readers an idea of the broad array of choices that have been developed in recent years and of the ways in which these programs have gone beyond the familiar rhetoric. It should dispel the notion that there is one kind of alternative school or one kind of student that chooses it. The range of possible alternatives is as diverse as the communities that are creating them.

Some of the schools described in this book are the one alternative effort in their district (Mankato, Minnesota) whereas others are part of a program to convert to alternative schools throughout the system (Berkeley, California). The models in this volume show that public alternative schools are not confined to suburban or urban communities or to any age or income level.

There are many more public alternative schools than the fourteen we have included here. However, we are most familiar with this group because we have had close association with them either through providing technical assistance, undergraduate interns, or support group seminars. In many cases we have drawn parts of the narrative from the schools’ brochures and we gratefully acknowledge their cooperation in supplying us with material and photographs.

June, 1973
In one summer parents, students, and staff put in over 1,000 hours of work to prepare a new program and a new site. They were getting ready for the opening of the Pasadena Alternative School which opened its doors to 100 children in September, 1972. The Pasadena Program had its beginnings in a planning school that had started the previous February and was jointly sponsored and staffed by the Pasadena Unified School District and the University of Massachusetts, School of Education. Forty-five students and their parents began to create a curriculum and a program that would be the framework for the alternative school.

Serving children ages 4 to 17, the Pasadena school was probably the first K-12 public alternative school in California. Now Los Angeles, San Jose, Modesto, Fresno, San Francisco, Berkeley, and others all operate multi-age alternative programs. All school-aged residents of Pasadena, Altadena, and Sierra Madre are eligible to apply for the school. Students were randomly selected from over 1,200 applicants, creating a balanced population ethnically and socio-economically reflective of Pasadena. The alternative school is 47% white, 37% black, 12% Mexican-American, and 4% Asian-American.

The Board of Education established the guideline that the alternative school would operate on a per pupil expenditure comparable to other schools in the district. It receives approximately $625 per pupil and has considerable autonomy in deciding how the
money will be spent. About two-thirds is currently spent on personnel. Through its association with the National Alternative Schools Program at the University of Massachusetts, the alternative school also receives added staff, in-service training, and technical assistance in the development of the program.

The staff consists of a director; two certified teachers; three graduate teaching assistants and undergraduate interns from the University of Massachusetts, School of Education; student teachers from local colleges; and a number of parent and community volunteers. District and University consultants help throughout the year in the areas of curriculum and evaluation.

**GOALS**

A basic theme of the Pasadena Alternative School is "learning to learn." The goal is to provide students with a critical awareness of the learning process, a tolerance for ambiguity, a chance to make independent decisions about learning, and an opportunity to develop all aspects of their intellectual, social, and physical make-up so that they will be productive and happy citizens.

The aim of creating a more humane climate for learning has been furthered by the wide student age range and serious attention to teacher attitudes. Two major schooling traditions—authority determined by position power and the lack of consideration of affective development—have been challenged.

To demonstrate the viability of alternative educational environments the Pasadena school has experimented with a variety of student groupings (age, ethnicity, and abilities), staff responsibilities, and methods of instruction.

**PROGRAM**

Classes are of varying lengths, sizes, and structures depending on the subject matter. The curriculum emphasizes student responsibility for learning, a cooperative rather than a competitive environment, and individual attention. A flexible approach is supported through the following elements of the program:

- non-gradedness
- individual pacing
- integrated subject matter
- varied community and school resources
- lower staff-student ratio
- students teaching other students
- optional activities
- student program planning
- flexible scheduling and grouping patterns

Each week is scheduled to include times for skill development and counseling, independent work, town meeting, recreation and lunch, and learning activities in and outside of the building. Special events often intervene. Reading and math instruction is provided in a required two-hour block each morning by a team of teachers working with multi-age groups. After the two-hour block, students have a wide variety of offerings—some traditional, some unique—from which they can choose. Those choices are monitored by the staff member whom the student has chosen as his advisor. This past year inquiry and activities were organized around the themes of human development, tools for change, basic survival skills, our working world, access to cities, aesthetics, political literacy, ethnic studies, towards the third millenium, and worldmindedness and spaceship earth.

After every five weeks of instruction, the staff and students spend one week evaluating and redesigning their programs. The School and its organization are also reviewed at this time. Students must negotiate a learning plan for each five-week learning module and make provisions in that plan for a literacy component and a computational component.

Several dimensions of student progress are evaluated:

- literacy
- computation
- service
- goal-setting
- knowledge
- follow-through
- basic skill
- social relationships
- self-identity
- academic
- attitudinal
- psychomotor
Student and program progress are assessed by parent questionnaires, recorded comments of visitors, standardized achievement tests, parent conferences, consultant observations, and a variety of teacher assessment efforts including informal student discussions and more formal student record-keeping and evaluation forms.

Community involvement continues to grow with the school. In addition to meeting every two weeks, parents participate in school governance, staff selection, curriculum planning, teaching, and resource development. The Alternative School houses a pre-school parent education program and a community recreation program. These programs are conducted in cooperation with community agencies.

The Pasadena School has been developing its model with an eye toward expansion. In September, 1973, its enrollment will increase to 300 students. Another program objective that is being addressed is the creation of a Center for Alternative Programs in Pasadena. The Alternative School has begun a “network” organization of public alternative schools in southern California that will act as a support group and a nucleus of innovation.

CONTACT:
Greta Pruitt
Pasadena Alternative School
1850 Casa Grande
Pasadena, California 91104
213-798-6741
A walk through the corridors of St. Paul Open School is bound to arouse interest and stimulate questions. You might see students of literally different generations actively involved in the art area on a silk-screening, jewelry-making or photography project; around the corner you might see the very intense concern of a ten year old for the six year old he is helping to read. You will be excited by the Open School’s “smorgasbord” of activities just as its 500 students are. They were so excited about the school that they arrived early in droves to help convert its factory-drab decor into a brightly colored four-floor environment.

The St. Paul Open School is a research demonstration project of the St. Paul public school system. It opened in September, 1971, and has 500 students, ages 5 through 18, representative of the city’s geographic areas and its citizens’ socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. The idea that continual research and experimentation are essential to the development of better educational systems is a basic premise of the St. Paul Open School. It hopes that its evolving design for quality education may make it a prototype school for the future.

The staff consists of seventeen certified teacher and sixteen teacher aides for 500 students. A principal directs the school, assisted by a program coordinator and two community resource specialists (local citizens) who coordinate volunteers, resources, information dissemination, and visitors.

GOALS
At the Open School they have not formulated a new theory of learning but they have grounded their design in substantial research and in concepts more recently championed by Dewey and Piaget. The whole environment of the school reflects the theory that learning occurs most naturally during periods of intense involvement, active doing, and as part of living. Learning results from experiencing: for example, reading an appreciated poem, attempting to explain feelings in speech or writing, playing an instrument, drawing, acting, planning, etc. Learning occurs most easily and thoroughly when personal motivation and interest are high. That is precisely why each child’s program in the Open School is based on interest. Again, research and experience suggest that children learn in different ways and at different rates. In the Open School the timetable for learning is within the individual rather than artificially established by age. The school’s task is to provide an environment that encourages a child to learn in new ways, to develop talents and interests, to continue learning, to be excited about new things, to be in awe and wonder of the unknown—in short, to be an enthusiastic lifelong learner.

PROGRAM
The main components of the design illustrate how the rationale and theory behind the Open School are implemented.
ROLE OF THE ADVISOR. Each student selects an advisor from the staff and meets weekly with him to write goals and devise a program. Periodic sessions are held with advisor, student, and parents. The advisor is the student’s advocate, expeditor, and facilitator. The advisor acts as an “educational broker” by helping to arrange learning experiences in and out of the school that achieve the student’s goals.

MAJOR RESOURCE AREAS. Each of the resource areas or “theaters of learning” provides a kaleidoscopic variety of learning experiences and the possibility of hundreds of projects to be pursued independently or with others. The music/drama/dance area provides vocal and instrumental music for individuals, ensembles, or large groups in opera, symphony, and jazz. Drama, formal or extemporaneous, enhances self-discipline, creativity and understanding of self and others. Each resource area contains a small library of books, magazines, and films. The student is encouraged to look things up, explore, delve into a topic, follow “how-to-do-it” materials and conduct research.
The major resource areas provide an incredible array of learning activities: upholstering, mastering trigonometry, organizing a political party, interning on a job or in a community agency, preparing a television script, electronic cooking, writing school publications, experimenting with the effects of light on plants, discussing Shakespeare . . .

INTEGRATED LEARNING. A key to the open environment is that the teachers seek to integrate learning from many areas into projects and activities. One project might involve skills in math, reading, physics, art, and cooperation. Such efforts aid concept development and the student's understanding of relationships.

CURRICULUM CHOICE. Students select courses and activities from the resource areas and then devise their own schedule. There are no required courses. The school's design exploits the child's tendency to concentrate on tasks of interest, tasks he assigns himself.

TEACHING STAFF. The teacher in an open environment or school is familiarly called a facilitator. He arranges learning experiences, suggests possibilities, clears obstacles. He is assisted by making use of resource people—parent volunteers, aides, people with special skills, and the students themselves.

The diversity and flexibility of the Open School's curriculum allow for many of the elements found in other alternative schools—planned learning experiences in the community (fieldtrips, internships), an emphasis on affective development as a way to produce responsible, lifelong learners; cross-age grouping; a policy of shared decision-making.

In striving to create a prototype for the future, the Open School is interested more in the type of people it graduates than in any classroom it might design. In addition to the three R's the St. Paul Open School seeks to instill other qualities important for living in a rapidly changing society: flexibility, openness, initiative, an appetite for lifelong learning, constructive human relationships, responsibility, and continually broadening perspectives.

The St. Paul Open School does not represent surface change or a superficial response to the demands for quality education. It is, instead, a venture that may provide many students and professionals with answers to the fundamental questions of what quality education really is.

CONTACT: Wayne Jennings St. Paul Open School 1885 University Avenue St. Paul, Minnesota 55104 612-646-8891
Prior to July, 1968, ringing bells, report cards, rigid requirements and regulations were the rule at the Wilson Campus School. Now, a granddaddy in alternative and open education, it has just finished its fifth year of operation as a “humane” school, a phrase Wilson Campus has itself made popular. Gaining its original impetus from the imaginative efforts of Donald Glines at Mankato State College, Wilson Campus thought through its role as a laboratory school and decided that it had to assume leadership responsibility in educational innovation. It converted to a completely open school/open campus approach and to programs individually designed for each student.

Wilson Campus is a public alternative school for 580 students pre-K through 12th grade. It is regional in that it enrolls students referred through area social agencies or juvenile courts but primarily its population represents a cross-section of the Mankato School District. Funding is provided by the state college system. Wilson spends approximately $750 per student for staff and educational supplies, a dollar figure very near the average expenditure for the public school in Minnesota.

Students design their own learning experiences in consultation with the adults in the areas they have selected to pursue. The open campus policy applies to all ages. Attendance is optional; there is no dress code.

GOALS

The Wilson student has the flexibility to design his own program of study and experience. Faculty members selected by the student serve as advisors and help to oversee the student’s total program. It is the school’s belief that in order to facilitate the growth of responsible, value choosing, self-directing adults, students need the experience of handling responsibility and freedom.
There are no formal requirements at Wilson Campus but there are areas of strong commitment. In viewing itself as a humane school Wilson offers opportunities important to the growth of the total human being. The creative arts, academic skills, and psycho-motor areas are all seen as interrelated and equally significant in the development of creative, self-fulfilled persons. Opportunities in social service projects enable students to become more responsible and socially concerned. A better understanding on the part of students of the critical issues society faces and a developing social consciousness are also overriding goals of the program. Wilson Campus holds the expectation that each student will take responsibility for defining, building and revising his program of study and that in conjunction with parents and teachers the student will continually review his efforts in fulfilling the goals he initiated. In order to facilitate this process of self-definition and self-criticism there is a strong advising system coupled with education review committees (that consider student progress) at the high school level.

PROGRAM

Students study in various centers of interest. There is an attempt to interrelate disciplines but students may study selectively in many areas or in-depth in a few. Much of the work is completed through one-to-one conferences, open lab, or independent study; some time is spent in small and large groups when desired. Students are off the campus in the community for many programs. There are no elementary, middle, and high school divisions—rather just one continuous educational park. Carpets and brightly painted walls enhance the environment.

A particularly interesting aspect of Wilson’s program organization is its “team” structure. Staff members, diversified and differentiated in their expertise and responsibilities, make up teams that develop and monitor learning experiences in broad curricular areas. Five of these “teams” are described below:

1. The student now goes to the Persons Center where he has a selection of music, drama, speech, or English. And when he has completed the task for the day, he is then free to use his time as he wishes. For example, in the afternoon he may decide to go to the library, or perhaps he has to take care of some responsibilities downtown, or there then might be the decision for an hour or two of study.

EARLY CHILDHOOD TEAM. Team members provide learning experiences geared to the needs and interests of the young child (3 to 8). For example, a large group experience which is team-planned is called HAPPY HOUSE. Happy House meets daily and is an optional offering for 5, 6, and 7 year olds. Also “unit studies” integrate subject areas—Safety Education, World Citizenship, and Halloween. An individualized approach is used for the learning of reading and language arts skills and progress conferences are a regular part of the daily experience.

COMMUNICATIONS TEAM. The Communications Team is composed of teachers from the areas of business, English, math media, and Spanish. Its main charge is to be the “watchdog” of the skills area and to help other teams by setting guidelines in skills that would be useful to them. The business area concentrates on practical skills and work experience. English skills are taught in short interrelated periods. With math it is felt that each student should complete prescribed levels of materials at his own pace. The emphasis in the Spanish program is that of learning culture first, as culture motivates the learning of the language.

CRITICAL ISSUES TEAM. This team organizes two distinct phases of learning. The first phase is composed of mini-courses, independent studies, large and small group instruction, which are experienced at Wilson. Each quarter there are usually more than 100 different traditional and non-traditional studies. The second phase of learning is the Crucial Issues Experience which is held outside the Wilson Campus environment. It is expected that all Wilson students take this course before graduating. Goals of value clarification, improved communication skills, and
social consciousness will be accomplished through student participation in human relations strategies, in simulations, and in community action projects. Students help determine the issues: political elections, drug abuse, the draft, population crisis, problems at Wilson, racism, sexism, for example.

LEISURE TEAM. The primary thrust of the Leisure Team is to prepare students for the creative use of their leisure time. Curriculum is developed by the team for the areas of physical education, music, art, and speech/theater.

SURVIVAL TEAM. Staff members in home economics, science, industrial arts, physical education, and media compose this team. Learning experiences are diverse: nutrition, interior design, consumer buying; animal care to lab research; project development in industrial arts that focuses on the role of technology and industry; and a media center which services the total program.

CONTACT:
Joseph Schulze
Wilson Campus School
Mankato State College
Mankato, Minnesota 56001
507-389-1122
The Everywhere School
Hartford, Connecticut

"With learning comes understanding—
With understanding comes perception of life’s options—
With perception of options comes true freedom—
With true freedom comes true responsibility—
And with acceptance of responsibility comes the full sense of the community."

The Everywhere School is located in the black and Puerto-Rican ghetto of Hartford or the North End. The only option for most of the people that live there has been to repeat the poverty cycle of their parents. Sixty percent of the community is on welfare and fifty percent live in substandard housing.

As the verse above suggests, the lack of options has meant for ghetto residents a lack of freedom to be someone, to fulfill themselves, to enjoy what others enjoy, to create a community they can be proud of. The North End community saw education and learning as one answer to their plight but only if the school could really understand the children and understand their environment. This meant a community-centered school with an open atmosphere that freed the ghetto child, encouraged discovery and exploration, and made learning relevant to his cultural and neighborhood experience.

This was the backdrop for the development of The Everywhere School—a K-6 public alternative elementary school; it is different from the conventional schools in the district because of its program, its population (60% black 40% Puerto-Rican), and because everyone is there by choice.

Plans and facilities for The Everywhere School originated in a concept developed by community residents and proposed to the School Board through the Community Action Agency. The education program was to be organized in large, expansive Multi-Instructional Areas (MIA’s), which would have no contained classrooms. The Everywhere School is located in a warehouse with 4000 square feet of decentralized space. There are two MIA’s, an upper house for grades 4-6 and a lower house for K-3.

The Everywhere School is completely funded by local tax dollars and is a part of the Hartford public school system. A new school is now being built in Hartford along the same model; it will have eight modular MIA’s.
GOALS
The Everywhere philosophy, as the program describes it, embraces "the involvement of the child with his total environment, learning through the Discovery Principle, allowing for an understanding of self and others." It acknowledges its ties to the British Primary model. The staff also affirms that the idea of utilizing the whole neighborhood or city as a learning environment is not new with them but is there because it reflects the Everywhere belief that learning is a lifelong process, that it continues both inside and outside the classroom, that the environment provides the natural bases for the stages of learning to occur.

Specific objectives are to: 1) improve the quality of life in the neighborhood; 2) transfer motivational and instructional responsibilities to the learner; 3) create an atmosphere that makes for more positive learning attitudes; 4) insist on the relevance and utilizational aspects of learning and teaching; and 5) involve the community in the whole of education.

PROGRAM
The major components of the curriculum are implemented in an open classroom environment differentiated with interest areas and are often carried out through activities and trips in the neighborhood and other areas that provide good experience bases for learning. Key areas of the curriculum are:

MATH-SCIENCE—employing the discovery techniques of observing and holding concrete objects to classify, establish relations or patterns, see similarities and differences.

HUMAN RELATIONS—involving the understanding of self and culture, relativity of cultures and values, and rights of self-expression.

LANGUAGE ARTS—emphasizing the use of reading, writing, and speaking to communicate and to develop understanding.

CREATIVE ARTS—stressing creative thinking and behavior as expressed in any manner or medium chosen by the child, dispersed throughout the curriculum.

The Everywhere School structures its learning interactions with the outside community in three different ways: the first is a visiting-in plan, in which organizations, individuals, businesses, or special service groups bring in experiences via lectures, demonstrations, movies, etc. The second is a visiting-out plan, to make use of surrounding parks, museums, historical sites, farms, businesses, and
organizations. The third is an exchange or reciprocal offering idea. Each group gains from something offered by the other. A major environmental extension is Westledge School whose campus offers Everywhere children facilities for outdoor education and nature study and special cultural programs.

The working staff of each MIA consists of a Master Teacher, four certified teachers, five teacher aides from the neighborhood, two program designers (teachers who create special programs) and a host of teaching associates (community professionals, for example). The whole school is under the direction of the Master Coordinator, who is directly responsible to the Superintendent of Schools.

At Everywhere the most important evaluation is that of the student. Continuous evaluation of student progress is done through analysis and feedback from skill sheets in each program area. Teachers and students keep diaries and records and parents also log significant events at home and in the classroom. Developmental patterns for each child are recorded in areas such as self-concept, social, emotional, physical, and perceptual acuity, problem-solving, numerical concepts, concrete and abstract self-expression.

Parents are encouraged to participate in the classroom and are one source of evaluation data. A program review by Hartford is also part of the ongoing evaluation process. Teachers are evaluated on the basis of the use of their expertise in the classroom, their rapport with the students, the human qualities they demonstrate and their ability to work with neighborhood residents.

CONTACT:
Gwen Wilks
The Everywhere School
45 Canton Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06101
203-527-4012
A new principal arrived at the Jefferson Primary School in the fall of 1969 and by the spring she was convinced that the only way to respond to parents' concerns and complaints was to have a school where parents could choose the kind of education they wanted for their children. The result of many discussions and massive meetings was the creation of three models: Multi-cultural, Individual-Personalized (IPL), and Modern Traditional. The first year the three models were operated with a Ford Foundation grant and money from the San Francisco Foundation. Since September, 1971, the school has been funded by the Experimental Schools Program, a large-scale grant from the Office of Education that enabled Berkeley to implement twenty-four alternative schools within its system. The Jefferson Primary School is a K-3 program that serves 600 children.

GOALS

Jefferson’s overall aim is to continually respond to the community’s need for viable diverse options in education. Its objectives are to:

— reflect improved teaching and learning styles
— reflect the cultures and values of the families it serves
— help parents and children feel the school is their community
— help teachers to work cooperatively in planning, implementing, and evaluating the educational needs of the school.

For all three models the mastery of basic skills in reading and math is a significant objective. In addition, each model has specific expectations for its students:

1) The Modern-Traditional Model emphasizes growing competence in areas of academic achievement. This competence will be reflected in classroom behavior: ability to follow directions, complete a task, evaluate work done and prepare for next task.

2) In IPL, students will develop the ability to concentrate on the work at hand and achieve at their own pace in a self-directed manner.

3) The Multi-Cultural Model stresses the Spanish bi-lingual, Chinese bi-lingual, black, or multi-cultural experience through which the students can derive social skills necessary for constructive life experiences in a pluralistic society.

PROGRAM

The major difference of the three models is not so much in the goals or curriculum as in the methods in which materials are presented to the children.

The Modern Tradition Model (five classrooms) retains the traditional mode of instruction, that is, a teacher-directed program with emphasis on the acquisition of skills and subject matter. Instruction relies primarily on the teacher's knowledge of his subject and his ability to present it to children in creative, challenging ways. Children's literature, creative dramatics, music, and the printing of original books are elements in the program.

The Individual-Personalized Model (eight classrooms) provides different types of learning materials (including self-correcting materials) that correspond to the children's varied learning styles. Different learning centers are set up within the classrooms to meet students interests and abilities. Students progress at their own rate and are encouraged to become self-directive.

For the Multi-Cultural Model the task is to develop curriculum and methods which genuinely reflect the Third World cultures the children bring to the classroom. A unique feature is the Chinese and Spanish bi-lingual classes whose goal is not only learning another language but also using it as a vehicle for gaining insight and understanding of
other peoples. The study-of-man theme runs through the whole curriculum.

Specialized centers have been developed to serve children of all three models. These include the math lab, the High Intensity Learning Center for reading, Heritage House, which is a multi-cultural, multimedia reading center, and the Afro-American Studies Center. The media component at Jefferson is well-developed and is used by the entire school. Classroom activities are documented through videotape and still photography. Videotape is also used in micro-teaching and for creating new instructional materials. A video “newsroom” gives daily information about events in the school and the community.

The complete reorientation of the Jefferson School also involved a commitment to the retraining of its teachers. An in-service training model is being developed with the aid of consultants who come to the school at least once a week. An evaluation of the teaching staff is conducted by the Berkeley Unified School District. Parents make input on program and administrative matters through the Parent Advisory Committee and the PTA.

Most importantly, for Jefferson students the educational options do not end at the third grade. They can choose among the many models the Berkeley school system offers, including more traditional, individualized, and multi-cultural alternatives.

CONTACT:
Mary Giorgi
Jefferson Tri-Part Model
1400 Ada Street
Berkeley, California
415-644-6298
Innovation at the junior high school level is often passed over or even consciously avoided. In the eyes of some educators the junior high student seems to be outside the challenge of early learning experimentation and yet appears too dominated by his emerging and often problem-ridden adolescence to be involved in meaningful independent learning.

The efforts of the Satellite Junior High Schools, two public alternative schools in Arlington, Massachusetts, appear in marked contrast to these sentiments. Since 1970, there have been imaginative options for Arlington junior high students that have served over 250 students yearly. Starting with three satellite alternatives, each program was designed with a different approach and in response to the different learning styles and interests of the students. In the fall of 1973, two junior high alternatives will be operating—Spypond East and Central.

Spypond East is located in a wing of the Arlington Boy’s Club. Central is housed in a former industrial arts building and provides its approximately 100 students with a program that focuses on ethnic awareness and sociological concerns. It is also integrated with three fifth and sixth grade open classrooms and in that sense is a middle school. Both Spypond and Central plan extensive outdoor living-learning experiences for their students.

The seven staff members are, of course, all there by choice. They view themselves as teachers of students rather than of a particular discipline and view learning as the development of competencies (emotional, physical, intellectual) rather than the mastery of facts.
GOALS
Although the two schools differ in methods and emphasis, there are a number of major objectives that inform the activities of both schools:

1) Improve the basic learning skills of students.
   As is generally striven for in alternative schools, the curriculum and the methods used in the academic areas stress student mastery of the processes of those disciplines rather than memorization of the “product” of those disciplines. The entire environment fosters on the part of the students expression of their opinions and the making of judgments as well as student responsibility for the consequences of their opinions and judgments.

2) Help students develop an improved self-image.
   The personal attention that can be given students because of the small size of the schools, the flexibility of scheduling, the fact that all the teachers have all the students, combine to facilitate individualized instruction. The student perceives himself growing in knowledge and competencies rather than seeing himself in comparison to others, and his feelings of self-worth are nurtured.

3) Reduce level of interpersonal conflicts.
   On one level this objective is facilitated by the elimination of many petty rules that large, more impersonal schools find it necessary to employ. On the other hand, there is the whole sensitive area of approaching students working through an age of “erupting emotions.” The close student-teacher relationships make this easier; frequent school meetings, flexible schedules and a less competitive atmosphere all help. Conflict is dealt with openly and thoughtfully and at one school was a regular aspect of the social studies curriculum.

4) Develop autonomy and independence.
   Recognizing the junior high students’ desire for responsibility and autonomy rather than repressing it will directly affect our schools’ ability to produce more mature, independent adults.

5) Stimulate creativity.
   Students are encouraged to take informed guesses, make assertions, frame hypotheses and try
new approaches. An open environment enables them to make choices and pursue their creative energies.

Clearly the Satellite Schools strive to give explicit attention to personal growth as well as cognitive growth. To the three R's they say they have added the three humanistic B's—Being, Becoming, Belonging.

**PROGRAM**

The Satellite Schools were created to respond to the special interests and directions of junior high students and staff members are interested in the perspectives coming from thoughtful experimentation and innovation. Some of the approaches to learning they use include:

**BASIC SKILL LABORATORIES**—focus upon fundamental learning skills often through some type of individualized instructional system; for instance, the intercession at Spypond during which specific skills were dealt with directly and the work in both schools in reading under the direction of a reading expert from Harvard.

**SHORT-TERM MINI COURSES**—planned cooperatively by students and teachers dealing with issues of personal and social relevance.

**BIG IDEAS COURSES**—that consider such large questions as “To what should we be loyal?” and “What will life be like in the future?”

**WORK AND SERVICE EXPERIENCES**—offering students significant learning opportunities outside the school. For instance, Satellite students tutor elementary students and operate their own businesses.

**EXPERIENCE AND HAPPENINGS**—which can include such activities as Winter and Summer Olympics in which students from both schools participate, visiting local churches, group activities.

**INFORMAL CLASSES**—frequently stimulated by guest speakers or school visitors.

**COMMUNITY LEARNING EXPERIENCES**—offered by people who have particular skills and knowledge.

Evaluation is a process that links the school and home. There is frequent communication through conferences, telephone calls, teacher visitation to homes and parent visitation to schools. As in most alternative schools, traditional grades are replaced with narrative evaluative reports by the teachers. Increased use is being made of criterion reference testing. These are tests linked to the mastery of particular skills and are used to place students in learning experiences that focus upon skill areas that need practice and development.

**CONTACT:**

Ned Schofield  
Arlington Satellite Junior High Schools  
Arlington Public Schools  
23 Maple Street  
Arlington, Massachusetts 02179  
617-646-1000
Agora
Berkeley, California
Multi-cultural Learning for a Diverse Community

Alternative education in Berkeley may have started small back in 1969 with a school within a school at Berkeley High, but now in full bloom it is one of the most striking examples of a school district diversifying its total system—in ideas, methods, attitudes, commitments, and goals. The Agora School had its beginnings early in this massive overhaul and it has gone through several transitions. It is one of the the system's twenty-four alternative schools funded by the Office of Education under the title of the Experimental Schools Program. Agora serves 100 students from grades 10-12 and is 1/3 white, 1/3 black, 1/3 Chicano.

GOALS

Underlying the entire Experimental Schools Program in Berkeley is the goal of giving young people a chance to find a learning place matching as closely as possible their interests and needs. When Agora first formed as an alternative high school it found itself with a staff and student body that was almost totally white. It then began to actively recruit Third World students and adopted a multi-cultural identity. Agora sees the relations among different ethnic groups essential to progress and sound education not only in Berkeley but in the world as a whole. Ethnic awareness and multi-cultural understanding are the principal objectives of the school, but just as potent a force in the program is the growing role of students in decision-making.

PROGRAM

At Agora history and geography are not the only periods for learning about other cultures. The school's commitment to ethnic awareness and diversity clearly influences the offerings in every area of the curriculum—it is the organizing principle. Physical education, for example, involves African-American Dance, Greek Dance, and Mexican Folk Dance as well as the traditional volleyball and basketball. Creative Cooking exposes students to a wide range of cuisines and Art classes stress expression of one's cultural experience.

Courses this year included such titles as Harlem Renaissance, Chicano studies, math games, What is white?, algebra, communications skills, American folklore, the Black Musician in American Society, human awareness, and creative writing. The approach to the curriculum is interdisciplinary. The Harlem Renaissance course—a study of the period of political and social outpouring of the blacks during the 1920's—provides English and history credit. For the study of black musicians in America, students get credits in the performing arts and history.

Tenth and eleventh graders are expected to take at least twenty units in Agora while twelfth graders need only fifteen units from the Agora roster. Students usually take studies at some of Berkeley's other alternative high schools.

Students let the staff know what kind of curriculum they want in a semester and then evaluate the teachers at the end of it. They determine staffing needs and the extent of parent involvement (which presently is minimal). The students have all-school meetings weekly to discuss problems and plan special events, multi-cultural in nature, of course.

CONTACT:
Ocie Austin, Maria Vargas
Agora
Math Building, High School Campus
Berkeley, California
415-644-6253
entering Agora
Alternate Learning Project
Providence, Rhode Island
First-Hand Study of Urban Questions

The rumble of the pins at a Pine Street bowling alley in Providence, Rhode Island, has been stilled but in its place is the buzz and activity of students coming and going from the Alternate Learning Project (ALP), now housed there. Most of the 120 9-12 grade students actually spend their time in sites in the community. ALP is a public community-based high school alternative that provides an opportunity for students “to forge a new relationship between their education and the city in which they live.” The school is funded by Title III and local dollars and is part of the Providence school system. The student body reflects the ethnic profile of the city of Providence.

GOALS
Central to the Alternate Learning Project’s philosophy is an attempt to blur and finally eradicate the artificial distinction between life and learning. For this reason students learn about juvenile justice at the City Diagnostic Center; others hold voluntary jobs as aides in hospitals and health centers, as teaching assistants in elementary schools, and as apprentice actors in city repertory companies.

ALP considers its major goal is to return to students the right and duty to make the major decisions that affect their learning and their lives. In assuming this responsibility students shape their own programs of study and participate in shaping the program of the school. Staff and students together make decisions of internal governance in representative government meetings. Student government handles violations of one community member against another and students and staff even share responsibility for the upkeep and maintenance of the school.

The project has a deep commitment to exploring the critical social issues of our time through interacting with their various elements in the city environment. Racism is confronted through courses and seminars and in the multi-cultural setting of the school in which all races interact.

PROGRAM
ALP’s curriculum is diverse and exciting. Its conceptual framework links the student to the society he is a part of yet expands his horizons about the questions, the problems, the relationships and hopes fundamental to its progress.

The City Game and the Arts Cluster are the major parts of the curriculum. Within these divisions are several package areas from which to choose. Many alternative high schools have borrowed the “packages” approach to learning that ALP originated.

The CITY GAME includes Health and Welfare, Education, Law and Justice, and Communications. For example, Health and Welfare involves work in medical care, problems of the aged, drugs, mental
health and retardation, welfare and ecology. **Law and Justice:** work in civil rights and liberties, juvenile justice, law enforcement, and state and local government. **Education:** work in early childhood learning and development, problems in city schools, new approaches in education and on “changing the system.” **Communications:** work in journalism, radio and television, the press.

The ARTS CLUSTER consists of instruction and practical experience in one of three major areas: **Performing Arts**—theater, music, and film study; **Visual Arts**—painting, drawing, pottery, ceramics, weaving, photography, and film-making; and **Design and Construction**—architecture and design, carpentry, mechanics and construction.

Work in particular packages can be carried out through field placement or on-site work, such as in a Head Start center or TV station, and through field workshops, seminars, and related courses.

Students also have the option to take a variety of other courses, including traditional college requirements and workshops in art, science, humanities. These can be taken at ALP and at local colleges.

Students regularly record their own estimation of the work they have accomplished and the instruction they have received and teachers prepare detailed evaluations of students’ progress.

**CONTACT:**
Larry Paros
Alternate Learning Project
180-82 Pine Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
401-272-1450
The impetus for an alternative school can come from many different segments of the community. For the Cambridge Pilot School most of the initial stirrings came from a small group of faculty and doctoral students at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. In 1969 they obtained federal money for the Training of Teacher Trainers (TTT) in a proposed sub-school and persuaded the Cambridge School Department to join the effort and set aside space for it in Rindge Technical School.

Implicit in the genesis of the Pilot School was the desire, as in most alternatives, to create a small, informal, culturally diverse school that would contrast with the irrelevance and impersonality of the public school system. Sixty freshman volunteers were chosen by lot to represent a cross-section of the city with respect to race, sex, neighborhood, previous school achievement level and post-high school aspirations. Each year since then a new freshman class has been added so that in June, 1973, the school had its first graduating class. The Pilot School's 200 students occupy one-half of the fourth floor of Rindge Tech.

The full-time Pilot School staff includes eight fully certified Cambridge-paid teachers, two Cambridge guidance counselors, and a TTT paid director. Twenty Harvard M.A.T. interns and ten volunteer "community resource persons," mainly parents, worked part-time in the school this past year as teachers and/or advisors.
GOALS

The Pilot School regards itself as a true community—a community of students, parents and educators closely aligned and mutually accountable for the goals, the program, and the successful operation of the school. Together they formulated the basic principles of the school:

I. Cross-cultural Education. Recognizing that the development of cross-cultural understanding and respect are essential to a genuinely pluralistic American society, the Pilot School is committed to the development of these qualities within its own richly diverse student population.

This diversity represents more than a principle of selection; it is a basic foundation of the school. Classes within the school are heterogeneous and, for the most part, ungraded. A wide variety of cultural studies is available. During the third year a course in Afro-American studies was required for all students. In addition, the school attempts to respond to the problems of diversity by providing a model for the rational settlement of disputes through discussion and by allowing easy access to decision-making processes for all groups in the school.

II. Human Relationships. In the Pilot School community every effort is made to foster human relationships [i.e., teacher-student, student-student, teacher-parent relationships] characterized by informality, relative non-authoritarianism, mutual trust, and an absence of regimentation.

A visitor may identify this with the fact that students call teachers by their first names, but this is only a surface reflection of the principle. More important is the fact that students often participate on an equal basis with teachers in class discussions, conferences and other activities. The notion of human relations moreover, implies a commitment to the group and to the successful functioning of the school.

III. Governance. Decision-making within the Pilot School is based on the premise that people affected by decisions have the right to participate in those decisions.

Students, parents, and staff share decision-making power on program and structure (curriculum planning, selection of courses, definition of space) and staffing (selection of a Director and interviewing of candidates for teaching positions).

IV. Individual Needs and Concerns. The Pilot School program is characterized by a focus on the needs and concerns of the individual.

With a certain balance that seems to characterize the Pilot School, its literature states that “individualism should not flourish at the expense of the community, but that any successful educational community must attend to the needs of its individual members.” Its most direct effort in this regard is its advising system described below. Small classes, individualized instruction, and tutoring, and both non-college and college preparatory curriculum are part of this principle.

PROGRAM

The Pilot School has emphasized humanities on a non-tracked, elective basis, taught in small classes. Electives in social studies have included such topics as Cambridge neighborhood studies, women's liberation, Vietnamese culture, law and student rights, native American history and child development. English electives have ranged from mythology to “Monsters in Literature,” from “Great Books” to media, journalism and creative writing. Skills courses are also offered in grammar, test-taking, composition, and SAT preparation.
Many learning experiences involve leaving the school—to the wilderness for solo camping, to Cape Cod for environmental studies, to a nearby state prison. Pilot School students also have access to the full range of curriculum offerings and extracurricular activities at Cambridge’s other high schools.

The diversity of offerings is dictated by the diversity of the student body. A Pilot student does not have to wait until college to get his first taste of anthropology or philosophy. Students are encouraged to search out and stress the how’s and why’s and challenge different value structures.

A key integrating element of the total program is the advising system. Advising groups composed of 22 students each, work directly with one full-time staff member (advisor), one student counselor, one parent/community person, and one intern. The advising groups meet once a week to discuss school policy and program, personal concerns and group concerns. This meeting is one specific requirement for Pilot School students.

Special components of the curriculum that have provided avenues for challenging group projects and independent research have been the ecology program (for example, constructing working models of rivers and streams, studying erosion and pollution); crafts (emphasis on good craftsmanship and self-discipline); and the wilderness program (to build self-reliance and appreciation of the natural environment).

CONTACT:
Ray Shurtleff
Cambridge Pilot School
1700 Cambridge Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
617-491-4344
The summer of '72 marked the opening of C.I.T.Y. in Cambridge, Massachusetts, but the planning for it had roots the year before in the minds of a group of parents, students, and community persons. This group recognized that public schools could not meet the demands of students who needed to learn about and function within a complex, rapidly changing society. C.I.T.Y. was in response to the cry for a more relevant curriculum and sought to end the isolation of the youth from the community.

From the living and dining rooms of an educator in the community, the program found a new home in November, 1971, in the Community Services Building in Central Square. By January of 1972, the C.I.T.Y. Program was formally accepted as a part of the Cambridge public school system. It receives funding from Title III but is a recognized public alternative and draws 75% of its fifty member student body from Cambridge and 25% from Brookline. At least 15% of the total number of students in the program are physically handicapped. In addition, a real effort has been made to achieve a balance of age, sex, background and level of academic interest and
achievement which is reflective of both the Cambridge and Brookline communities.

C.I.T.Y. focuses on the resources of the community as the principal learning environment but does require students to participate in at least two courses in their local high schools. Academic credit is granted by the student's "home" school. The credit value of C.I.T.Y. courses is cooperatively determined by C.I.T.Y. staff and school department personnel.

GOALS

The "interaction" which C.I.T.Y. embodies in its name represents an attempt to expand and enrich the learning of both the community and its students. Students have the opportunity to test out textbook concepts in real world situations; community businesses, agencies, and institutions can utilize student resources and learn from fresh approaches to established methods.

C.I.T.Y. serves young people of diverse backgrounds and achievement and strives to provide them with

1) real experiences as a basis for learning

Students learn about places, people, and things familiar and important to them. Their classroom is expanded to the community and the region. In-school experiences are based upon planning, researching, and analyzing out-of-school experiences.
opportunities for responsible growth

There is the chance to confront real problems head on, to make mistakes, learn from them and live with them. Students develop loyalty, a commitment to learning, and responsibility for citizenship.

C.I.T.Y. gives teachers opportunities to work with students in new settings and offers parents avenues for participation and “collegueship” with students, teachers, and other parents.

PROGRAM

Courses are taught by unpaid Learning Coordinators, who are established professionals teaching at their “place of business.” Doctors teach biology, chemistry, and child care in laboratories and in hospital wards; lawyers teach consumer education at Boston’s Division of Consumer Protection. The list is as unlimited as the resources of the Metropolitan Boston and Cambridge communities. C.I.T.Y.’s purposes and goals really come alive through the list of courses it offers. For example:

- Astronomy: Microcosm/Macrocosm
- Filmmaking
- Intensive German
- Engineering in Today’s World
- Politics & Government-The City
- Landscaping, Carpentry

Harvard College Observatory
Boston Film Center
Goethe Institute
Draper Laboratories
Cambridge Model Cities
Cosmos Construction

Students’ progress is carefully monitored through weekly evaluation meetings, on-site visits by C.I.T.Y. staff, evaluation reports from community Learning Coordinators and students’ self-evaluation forms.

At C.I.T.Y. the staff members do not instruct the students but guide them. Learning Managers work closely with them in a role similar to guidance counselors while an Instructional Coordinator has responsibility for the overall development of curriculum. A Youth Resource Coordinator supervises the planning and coordination of programs for the students and an Information Supervisor has responsibility for maintaining a smooth flow of communications among the schools, the community, and the program. C.I.T.Y. is supported by an active Community Council which contributes ideas and makes recommendations in areas of policy and program.

CONTACT:
Erna Ballantine
Community Interaction Through Youth
675 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
617-876-0478
"School without walls," "community-based learning," and "utilizing the city’s resources," are now almost catch phrases in alternative education. In many programs they mean attending a Saturday morning lecture at the art museum. In others, such as West Hartford’s Community School, they mean a great deal more than that. This program involves students in educational experiences that relate to particular career interests and sees to it that a student’s relationship to the learning situation and community is a continuing one.

Although the Community School is not an alternative school according to generally accepted criteria in that it is only a one semester program and does not function independently in budgeting and governance, it serves as a good model for how effectively a district can tap the wealth of talent and facilities in its community and organize a total program around them.

West Hartford is a suburban community that has traditionally sent 80% of its students to college. The emphasis on a career education model for an alternative program arose not so much in response to the vocational needs of the 20% but because of the realization that both college and non-college students generally do not have the experiences to prepare them to make realistic choices about career goals. Starting as a pilot project for 50 students in the spring of 1972, the Community School had between 200-300 students participating this past year in the program and it placed them in over 120 community learning centers.

GOALS

The objectives of the career education program are divided into four general categories:

Career Orientation Goals

—To give students the opportunity to test career perceptions against reality in the working world.

—To make available to students resources not usually available in the school, both human and technological.

—To assist students, based on their experiences in the community, in making career choices consistent with their interests and abilities.
Relevance Goals

— To help students find greater meaning in school life through involvement in the community.
— To provide a broader view of career opportunities commensurate with students’ abilities.
— To show the relationship between school work and the specific skills and knowledge needed for jobs.

Generation “Gap” Goals

— To learn about people and jobs through interaction and involvement in the world.
— To give insight into that mechanism called “community” and the interdependence of the individual and the society in which he lives.
— To help students shed suburban isolation through experiences in the greater Hartford area.

Self-Concept Goals

— To provide students with a success experience in an area related to their career interests.
— To give students a clearer idea of their own interests and abilities.
— To promote wholesome attitudes towards all useful work.

A Student’s View

The following article appeared in the July, 1972, issue of “The Bushnell Prompter.” It was written by Maggie Walker, a student at Hall High School who participated in the pilot project last spring and was placed at Bushnell Memorial Hall.

“I came to the Bushnell, under the direction of the Community School, to learn about the theatre. And I learned!

“In four weeks I’ve done a lot—worked on newspaper publicity, handled tickets in the box office, studied the complexities of booking contracts, and worked as a sorter in the direct mail department.

“From both the audience side of the prosenium and from backstage, I’ve watched set-ups and performances (to name a few) of the Connecticut Opera’s Die Fledermaus starring Mary Costa, Roberta Flack in concert, and the musical Carousel, starring John Raitt (and I had a good talk with him about acting).

“These performances gave me a good chance to explore the technical aspects of the stage—lighting, sets (some ‘flown’ overhead, others rolled about on casters), ‘properties’, and everything else that gives the stage its drama and mystery.

“The Community School isn’t a set of buildings at all. It’s a program to provide an alternative to classroom instruction. Sponsored by the West Hartford Department of Education and directed by Mr. Dennen Reilley, it gives students an opportunity to gain now some career experience we might otherwise have to wait until after graduation to get. All of us hoped this program would help us to clarify our career goals.

“Many people (my guidance counselor included) told me I was foolish to enroll in the program. She said I should think of the work I would have to make up. She warned me that I would miss the school’s social atmosphere. But I decided, and my parents agreed, that for me this experience would be worthwhile.

“About 30 of us got excused from classes for a four-week period. Each of us reported, instead, to our assigned ‘community resource center,’ which for me meant Bushnell.

“It turned out to be the most beneficial experience I’ve ever had. It gave me my first contact with the real theatre—a contact I couldn’t get in school. It both strengthened my aspirations toward the theatre, and expanded my horizons. I must admit I’d never considered anything but acting. My experiences here, however, have led me to discover other fascinating fields in the theatre. The work, months ahead of time, that goes into booking and publicizing a show, impressed me and absorbed my interest. I now want to learn more about lighting, stage-set design, and everything that prepares for and insures the success of a show.

“I’ve learned things no drama class could ever teach me. My experience went beyond the ‘dramatic’ in theatre. It explored the heart of the theatre, it expanded my horizons. I’m going back to school in three days, back to Spanish and Algebra and homeroom. I honestly can’t believe that anything I learn there will be as much use to me as these four weeks have been.”

PROGRAM

Students can opt for the program any semester they choose, and mostly juniors and seniors now participate. The “community learning center” is the key element in the West Hartford program. It is a community agency in industry, education, government, business, recreation, communication, service, or fine arts agreeing to involve the high school students in concrete education experiences. Other districts should take notice that the expectations of the agencies and the students are clear from the start.

The community learning center agrees to meet certain obligations:

1. To appoint someone at its organization who will serve as contact person for the students and liaison with the community school.
2. To establish an educational program that will expose students to all aspects of their career interest area.
3. To inform employees of the program and their role in making it a successful experience for the students.
4. To arrange periodic conferences with
students.

5. To maintain attendance and performance records for students assigned to their center.

Students are expected to:

1. Meet obligations of travel, punctuality, and dress on a daily basis.
2. Engage in work under supervision of employees.
3. Observe people closely and interact with them.
4. Keep a journal of activities.
5. Explore thoroughly occupations related to the career area and be informed of its requirements and opportunities.

The Community School puts out a monthly newsletter that lists community learning centers where students can be placed. It might include jobs as prompter in a theater, assistant to an attorney or veterinarian, government aide, work in interior decoration, construction or apprenticeship to a tailor, silversmith or potter. In many fields students have become competent technicians (medicine, theater) and in others such as law, architecture, museum work, they have worked on projects and made contributions they were proud to leave behind them.

CONTACT:
Newton A. Clark, Jr.
The Community School
P.O. Box 47
West Hartford, Connecticut 06107
203-233-8282
Franklin House or the Neighborhood Educational and Counseling Center is a public alternative school in North Philadelphia. It deals with a host of problems that most alternative schools never have to consider. Its students, both junior and senior high level, come from all over the city and have had problems coping in their regular schools. The problems range from learning disabilities to difficulties with gangs and the law. The population of the school is predominantly black with a percentage of Puerto-Ricans.

In 1968 Franklin House started as a school thanks to the planning and dedication of Mrs. Louisa Groce, the director. There are now fifty students and fourteen full and part-time staff members and the program is completely funded by the Philadelphia Board of Education. This storefront school does not operate on a 9 to 3 schedule. Countless hours are spent in the evenings and weekends on trips, dinners, follow-up with parents, shows, and other special activities. As one student expressed it—“Franklin House is a big family rather than a school . . .”

GOALS
Franklin House was initiated to develop a freer and more individualized academic program for the students. Stress is put on emotional growth and group

![Image](image-url)
interaction and this is facilitated through a large, supportive staff. The school lists its specific goals as the following:

— To generate within the individual a feeling of self-worth and a facility for projecting a positive self-image.
— To cultivate individual independence and motivation to become self-sustaining—socially, economically, and politically.
— To develop in each student by relevant, interesting, and diversified instruction the ability to think clearly, communicate effectively, and learn easily.

PROGRAM

The name Neighborhood Education and Counseling Center reflects accurately the equal stress placed in the program on teaching and counseling. All staff members function in both roles and accept the position with the commitment to work after hours and on weekends. Usually the emotional needs of the students require the greatest attention and the staff coordinates intensive counseling and casework between the school and the home.

The center has an open classroom atmosphere. Its educational program is completely personalized because of the varying skills levels of the students. The full gamut of school subjects is taught at the center, although students take some work at the regular schools, such as industrial arts. All students retain enrollment at their parent school and even graduate from that school when they are seniors.

Most instruction is carried out on a one-to-one or small group basis. Teachers at Franklin House try to get at subject matter through different methods and
materials. Photography plays an important role in the curriculum as does field study. Last year students and staff raised money and took a camping trip to California and then wrote a book about it. This year they are planning a boat trip down a river and through it will do work in history, math, science, and English. Writing letters has more meaning when there is a purpose to it, like needing information from Chambers of Commerce or marine organizations.

One way for fostering effective communication has been through the Public Speaking Group. The activity of this group functions outside the school and for the most part involves giving talks about Franklin House. A member must train another student to replace him when he leaves.

Psychological interns work in teams in the center and make evaluations through observation and real interaction, not just testing. Small group discussions are held weekly. Career orientation and job development make up another important component of the program.

CONTACT:
Louisa Groce
Franklin House
Neighborhood Education and Counseling Center
1327 North Franklin Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19120
215-CE5-0228
Although railroad stations are fast being boarded up in some parts of the country, there is one in downtown Hartford that is a center of lively activity. It happens to house a public alternative high school for 100 students—SHANTI, which is Hindi for the "peace that surpasseth all understanding."

SHANTI is unique in that it draws its student population from eight towns in the Greater Hartford area (Bloomfield, East Windsor, Glastonbury, Hartford, Plainville, Rocky Hill, Simsbury and Weathersfield). It is funded on local tax dollars from these districts through the Capitol Regional
Education Council. In the summer of 1970 a group of parents and citizens in Hartford began developing plans for an alternative school and the community response was so great that by the following fall the school opened with fifty students. They were drawn from a lottery of 225 applicants.

A great deal of the learning at SHANTI takes place in the Hartford community—in banks, social agencies, museums and insurance companies—or elsewhere—internships at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, at an Environmental Center in New Hampshire, or on the Navajo reservation in the Southwest. SHANTI’s basic staff numbers only six but in addition to community personnel it has utilized the services of nearly forty college interns in one academic year.

GOALS
At SHANTI ask any student or teacher about the school’s goals and philosophy and they will be equally clear and articulate about them because they developed them together.

Its broad educational goals, developed under the aegis of local school boards, include:
— Providing relevant community-centered education to students of the region.
— Providing regional urban-based program for students from Hartford’s outlying areas.
— Providing wide opportunity for flexibility and individualized programe with a planned framework.
— Establishing means by which the program can be of service to the broader community.
— Establishing a climate of innovation and experimentation in education.

More specifically, however, the ethos of the SHANTI community stems from a commitment to taking advantage of the educational opportunities offered

**SHANTI SCHOOL YEAR CALENDAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYCLE I</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 Planning Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) 11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 16-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 25-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 11-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 16-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) 24-28 (October 23, Veterans Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) 30-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 1-7 Evaluation Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 6-11 (November 7, Election Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 13-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 20-22 (November 23-25, Thanksgiving)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 27 Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 8-16 (December 15, Deadline for submission of January Project plans)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) 18-23 (November 23-25, Thanksgiving)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) 25-1 (Winter vacation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Project Month</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 2-3 Evaluation Days; Final January Project planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 4-31 Intern Project Month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYCLE III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 5-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 13-17 (February 12, Lincoln’s Birthday)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 20-24 (February 19, Washington’s birthday)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 26-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 7-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) 12-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) 19-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) 26-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) 28-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 2-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 9-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 16-21 (Spring vacation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 30-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 21-26 (May 28, Memorial Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 29-30 Evaluation Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 31-8 Final Evaluation Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by a multi-cultural, multi-racial environment; relating studies and actions to the realities of urban living; acquiring skills in cooperation, problem-solving and long-range planning; acquiring the basic academic skills which are essential for taking control of one's own life; providing students with the opportunity to engage in real self-government; involving parents in the educative process as both teachers and learners; engaging in continual self-evaluation.

PROGRAM
The curriculum is organized along original groupings—the Communicating Self; The World Out There: The Physical World; Me, the Creator and Craftsman; Body Wonderful, Soul Complete. Only a sample listing of the overwhelming number of diverse, provocative courses could give a sense of the range of interests individuals can pursue. The courses use varied approaches to learning basic skills, mastering subject content, and developing positive personal characteristics.

THE WORLD OUT THERE
- Black Women
- Demography
- American Anarchist History
- History of China
- Urban Geography

THE PHYSICAL WORLD
- Computer Theory and Operation
- Engineering Laboratory
- Nutrition
- Physiology

BODY WONDERFUL, SOUL COMPLETE
- Hiking
- Yoga

COMMUNICATING SELF
- Creative English
- Mysticism in Literature
- Public Self
- Black Drama

ME, THE CREATOR AND CRAFTSMAN
- Drafting
- Hartford Stage Company
- Photography
- Piano

Purposeful on-going evaluation is basic to SHANTI's philosophy. For internal evaluation students and teachers jointly evaluate themselves and the courses. In the students' “home groups” students evaluate the school through discussions led by a staff member or consultant. These groups consider problems of attendance, behavior, adjustment and short and long-term experiences. Annually a major evaluation of the program has been carried out by an external consultant.

The students and staff of the school, meeting together, determine directions of curriculum and day-to-day operation. The Director is the responsible officer. Decisions within the SHANTI community are made by task forces of students and staff for administration and budget, art, curriculum and resources, internal environment, and on-going evaluation. Final policy within the school rests with the full community meeting, which is held monthly. In addition, five students sit on the SHANTI Governing Board along with five school board members, five parents, and five members of the community.

SHANTI is now offering a Spanish language class for Hartford community professionals, a Spanish culture course for the city's Spanish-speaking residents, and is administering a cooperative arts program among the school districts. It is a school that not only strives to learn from the community but seeks to serve it.

CONTACT:
Eugene Mulcahy
Shanti School
480 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103
203-522-6191
A spirit of cooperation is usually an objective of alternative schools and here is one that started on just that basis. The Worcester Alternative School was begun jointly by the Worcester Public Schools and the National Alternative Schools Program at the University of Massachusetts School of Education. It represented the first truly public alternative school in Massachusetts outside the Greater Boston area and was a way to merge the resources of a state school of education and a large urban neighbor.

The Worcester project started with a concept that has worked well for many alternatives, that of the planning school. In April, 1972, the planning school opened with fifty students (grades 9-12) and four staff members and until the end of June they examined thoroughly various aspects of curriculum, governance, and staffing to determine what would best meet Worcester’s needs.

In the fall the Worcester Alternative School, located on the second floor of an old elementary school, opened its doors to 160 high school students, forty-one of whom had participated in the planning school. It had been decided that the major thrust of the school would be an emphasis on education outside schoolroom walls and that “teachers” would be those best able to guide a specific learning experience, be they staff, students, parents, or local citizens. The regular staff consisted of co-directors, six teachers, two aides, one graduate assistant and many college interns. All staff had responsibilities for guidance and counseling.

GOALS

The Worcester Alternative does not claim to be a prototype for all other schools or students. It offers, rather, an important option within the system, one that sees education in broader terms than the traditional schools and that offers wider opportunities and greater flexibility through which many students can better fulfill their creative, intellectual, and social potential.

The idea of choice is more basic to the school’s philosophy than just being a principle of enrollment. Choice is seen as one of the most important instruments for education and it is utilized in all aspects of the school. Students gain the ability to evaluate data and resources, see available alternatives, understand the kinds of requirements they will meet throughout life, see education in terms of their own goals and learn how to make intelligent decisions. A major part of the process is to be presented with optional routes, learn to make distinctions and not be penalized for making the wrong choices.

To try to implement these educational ideals the Worcester Alternative School has relied heavily on the support group concept and a strong advising system. Composed of students and a staff member, the support groups provide a forum for peer group counseling, brainstorming, and group problem-solving. The advisory system or the relationship between the student and his advisor is the primary basis for evaluation of the student’s overall program of learning experiences. It is the link between the student, his educational experience and the system as a whole.

PROGRAM

The Worcester Alternative School year is divided into five seven-week cycles with one-week planning and evaluation periods at the end of each cycle. This structure, however, does not minimize the fact that at the school students really become planners. A
student's curriculum or learning experiences, as they are called, are pretty much defined by him—what courses, when, in the school or in the community. The range of formats includes:

— mini-courses
— depth courses
— independent study
— internships in the community
— outside experiences
— any course in a regular high school

Learning contracts for coursework or other experiences bring objectives and methods of evaluation into the planning process and the student portfolio provides a clear, comprehensive record of what a student has actually done.

Many alternative schools are unsure about how to structure the school so students have the freedom they are seeking and yet are not overwhelmed by it. At the Worcester Alternative School students are differentiated into two levels of academic freedom and responsibility. All entering students are designed as Phase I students and remain so until they and their advisors agree that sufficient maturity has been achieved to move into Phase II, the more unstructured educational environment. Three things are required of all Phase I students:

  Mandatory support group attendance
  Mandatory school attendance
  Academic diversity

Phase II students must demonstrate activity in the community, diversity in their program, and participation in all aspects of their school lives.

On any day at the Worcester Alternative School you might see students heading to the Boston Stock Exchange or the Museum of Fine Arts or to their internships in radio stations, newspaper offices, department stores, or elementary schools. One student sums up her feeling about the school in—"I wouldn't go to any other."

CONTACT:
William Allard
Worcester Alternative School
Elizabeth Street
Worcester, Massachusetts 01605
617-791-0553
WHAT IS the NATIONAL ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM?

The National Alternative Schools Program is a federally supported project at the University of Massachusetts' School of Education which has as its central purpose the establishment, maintenance and improvement of public alternative schools.

Funded since July 1971 by the U.S. Office of Education as a program of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, NASP provides planning, training, and other technical assistance to school systems undertaking the establishment of alternative schools—with emphasis on alternatives for minority communities. NASP does not make grants to local districts.

THE NATIONAL ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM IS COMMITTED TO:

- Promoting options within the public school systems that allow for voluntary participation by students, staff, parents, and community.
- Encouraging the development of social consciousness and the active consideration of social concerns within alternative schools.
- Creating schools that recognize the validity of special educational environments for students and communities with unique learning needs or goals while avoiding abuses of specialization such as elitist programs and "dumping ground" efforts.
- Developing multi-racial educational programs that encourage respect for cultural and socio-economic diversity.
- Demonstrating the viability of alternative schools, particularly within urban and poor communities.
- Broadening the vision of both educators and laymen to include a wider range of options within public school systems.
- Fostering models of school decision-making that fully recognize the needs and provide for the participation of the people and communities served.

WITH THIS CREDO AS A BASE, THE NATIONAL ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM HAS ESTABLISHED THE FOLLOWING OBJECTIVES:

- To advocate the implementation and development of alternative schools with public districts through workshops, conferences, and other means.
- To research the developmental issues and variables involved in alternative schools and to disseminate the results.
- To provide technical assistance to alternative schools in planning, evaluation, crisis management, curriculum, and human relations.
- To promote collaboration among alternative schools through the creation and support of various school networks.
- To create a coordinated in-service/pre-service program for training alternative school teachers, and to develop leadership training programs for alternative schools.
The National Alternative Schools Program is a federally supported project at the University of Massachusetts' School of Education which has as its central purpose the establishment, maintenance and improvement of public alternative schools.

Funded since July 1971 by the U.S. Office of Education as a program of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, NASP provides planning, training, and other technical assistance to school systems undertaking the establishment of alternative schools—with emphasis on alternatives for minority communities. NASP does not make grants to local districts.

NASP, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01002 (413) 545-0941