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It has been more than a decade since community control of schools was the dominant issue in urban education. The concept that developed was as varied as the cities that tried to apply the idea. In Washington, D.C. where two different experiments were tried, one was the Anacostia Community School Project. This study is an attempt to assess the aspect of the Project which dealt with: (1) providing community boards to insure parent involvement; (2) developing exciting new curriculum; (3) utilizing community members, and through schools providing jobs, raising income levels of families, and developing career training in human services.

In order to develop the proper perspective for the Anacostia experiment, Chapter I is devoted to a history of communities' efforts to control their schools. Beginning with the turn of the century attention is given to the political climate and how it affected schools. Efforts made by "progressives" to remove schools from unsavory political influence is noted, as is the establishment of a bureaucracy that eventually controlled the public schools. Some attention is devoted to immigration
and its effect on schools and to the effect of blacks migrating to urban areas. Discussed, also, is the Supreme Court's decision outlawing segregation and the federal government's attempt to achieve equality through the Antipoverty Programs. Events related in Chapter I were significant in causing blacks, in their quest for improved lifestyles, to turn to community control of schools as a possible solution.

Chapter II focuses on two experiments—the Adams-Morgan single school effort in Washington and the three experimental districts in New York City. These efforts served, more or less, as models that would guide cities bent on trying the concept, hoping that they would profit by earlier mistakes. Problems, successes and failures of these experiments are discussed.

Chapter III is concerned with Phase I of the Anacostia Project which was monitored by the U.S. Office of Education. After examining the structure and organization of the Project, attention is given to problems, successes and failures. There follows an account of the attempt by the Office of Education to close down the Project, and the resulting response from the total community. A discussion of the reaction to and result of this dilemma follows in Chapter IV. There is also a discussion of Phase II of the Project which was reorganized under and monitored by the National Institute of Education. This phase is currently being studied by consultants engaged by the Institute.

Chapter V consists of the most recent research conducted by the writer. Included are surveys and interviews involving the adult participants in the Project, as well as, the perusal of hundreds of materials
and documents on file and in the writer's possession. The attempt is made to analyze the data in order to ascertain what progress has been made in eight years toward achieving what is considered an acceptable lifestyle.

Chapter VI discusses the impact community control of schools has had on the Anacostia area. Insight is provided into two successful programs initiated by the community which have become models for Washington and for the nation. Pointed out, also, is the recognition by the community of its limitations in performing certain functions.

Finally, the ramification concerning the restructuring of the urban school hierarchy involving city-wide school boards is discussed, with a suggestion for change.

It is hoped that this study, made after a period of eight years, will provide information and give hope to those who still have confidence that parent involvement in the school decision-making process makes a difference in the performances of parents and their children.
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CHAPTER I
A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The District of Columbia Board of Education approved the Anacostia Community School Project at its meeting on September 18, 1968. The approval came as a result of President Lyndon B. Johnson's recommendation, included in his message to Congress in 1968, for a major experimental subsystem to be established in the public schools of Washington that would allow parents and children a voice in the operation of the educational system.

When the proposal for the Anacostia Community School Project was being planned and written, in keeping with the Presidential mandate, it was emphasized that the totality of an individual's experience would influence his specific behavior. The Project was perceived as a significant "process" in which citizens of the community were to be involved in the educational enterprise and in the determination of their own destiny. The methods, procedures, and activities participated in were viewed as vital learning and developmental activities, and in the eyes of the planners—and later the participants—the results of the Project would be represented in the relative improvement of the quality of life and the opportunities present in the community.

Sufficient time has now elapsed to allow for a valid evaluation of a project of this nature. It is with this in mind that after a decade this study has been pursued.
In order to place the Anacostia experience in its proper perspective, it is necessary to examine past public school structure and efforts of control during both the distant and the more recent past.

A Historical Sketch of Local Control

Urban boards of education and schools find themselves in the predicament of being unable to perform satisfactorily for all of their clients more by accident than by design. Prior to the growth of large urban areas, local school boards and committees of smaller districts carried out required duties and assumed responsibilities expected of them with reasonable success. During the first half of the 19th century, with little interference from the outside, local authorities received funds, hired staff, and decided what their schools would be like. Usually there existed "two" school systems--one served the poorer students, most of whom would soon leave the schools to go to work on the farm or in the factory; and, a "second" school system existed for the wealthy and privileged who continued their education through college and seminary, then became ministers, professors, and scholars.

During the latter part of the 19th century, industrialization and urbanization took place at a rapid rate. With these phenomena came positive gains for the country and people, but there came, also, many conditions that were undesirable. On the positive side there was general improvement in the standard of living. Transportation and communication were improved; technology made for more conveniences; and although it encompassed a struggle, there was an upgrading of education for the poor, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Negatively, there was the
exploitation of poor workers and consumers by a growing industry. Especially were poor children misused and abused. Corruption could be found in almost every economic and political realm. Businesses were without adequate controls and there existed limited concern for human beings.

By the last quarter of the 19th century, education as we basically know it today had been firmly established in this country. Michael Katz stated that "American education had acquired its fundamental structural characteristics. . . . Public education was universal, tax supported, free, compulsory, bureaucratically arranged, class based and racist."¹

Bowles and Gintis echoed some of the same characteristics in their discussion of the history of public education. They indicated that those who speak for education reform feel that "upbringing in the family was not training for the rising industrial sector." They further stated that the Lowell committee lamented that "children have to receive their first lessons of subordination and obedience in the classrooms."²

Changes were being made, according to Bowles and Gintis, but for reasons that were beneficial to a growing industry.

The need of schools for a change in governance. Schools were plagued with the same problems that permeated the rest of the community during the period. Jobs were obtained, not on the basis of competence or qualification, but rather, on the basis of the candidate's ability and


willingness to pay corrupt politicians. Not until the beginning of the 20th century did most communities become sufficiently aroused by the corruption prevalent in all areas of public life that they began to move toward reform. In order to prevent unsavory political bosses from inflicting their ideas of patronage any further upon the schools, "progressives" sought to divest the schools of unhealthy political influence. School boards became the appointing agencies. They sought to organize and maintain a controlled bureaucracy which would become so engaged in administrative functions that there would be little time or need for them to meddle in politics. School administrators, it was believed, would organize themselves like a business, and they would conduct their affairs independently of elected governments, unencumbered by the restraints of public accountability. With no vested interest in political power, appointed school authorities would make objective decisions, be responsive to public needs and demands, and would operate efficiently and economically. In order to assure that its school boards would be beyond reproach, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania decreed that members should be restricted to "business men and professional people." And in order to further guarantee that these standards would be adhered to, board members were appointed by the Common Pleas Court.

Bowles and Gintis describe the reform of education movement that took place during the early part of the 20th century as an elitist


movement without any grassroots participation. Those who in the end controlled the schools were "the new and rising corporate elite--upper class women's groups, school superintendents, university professors, and college presidents. Almost all were white Anglo-Saxon Protestants." The boards of education, according to Bowles and Gintis, were committed to social control as the overriding objective of schooling, and so-called progressivism was acceptable by the boards insofar as it did not contradict the class system. The high qualification for board membership served to exclude poor and black people.

In discussing what she termed a revisionist perspective of American history, Diane Ravitch concentrated on the history and problems of New York City schools, which she assumed to be the problems of other American cities on a magnified scale. She viewed reform and changes as having followed the political struggles of the city of New York during its history. The controversies and issues of the system were referred to by her as "school wars," which in spite of the desire on the part of some persons to gain social control did not necessarily indicate that they were successful and that the control that they desired existed. She contended, moreover, that "the political systems of the city and state which usually aim to compromise differences and pacify discontent, on each occasion engineered a political solution which satisfied both wanted and fears, terminating the contest."7

5Bowles and Gintis, op. cit., pp. 186-191.
6Ibid.
7Diane Ravitch, op. cit., pp. xi-xiv.
The changed school structure worked well for the middle class for whom the arrangement had been designed. Even though control was delegated to a bureaucracy, "for many years," said Mario Fantini, "city schools represented America's finest."\(^8\) As new immigrants came to America from Europe and settled in the cities, they, too, in spite of the discrimination and hardships, looked to and were able to utilize public education as a means of lifting themselves and their children to positions of economic independence and political influence.

Unrestricted immigration continued in America (except for Orientals) until World War I. Then the fear of labor leaders that they would not be able to hold wage gains made during the war, aided by intellectuals who feared the mongrelization or formation of a hybrid race as a result of the large number of southern Europeans coming into the country, resulted in the passage of the new Johnson Act. The Act, based on the 1890 census, provided that annually "only two percent of each foreign born group not resident in the United States prior to 1890 would be admitted." By 1929, the fixed annual quota was 150,000 of which 132,000 were allotted to northern Europeans and only 20,000 allotted to southern and eastern Europe and Asia. It was the public schools which were called upon to cope with the social, economic, and physical problems of the immigrants whether they were the Italians who were purported to have little aptitude or the Jews who had a strong tradition of education.\(^9\)


The migration of blacks to urban areas. The limitation placed upon immigration caused a shortage in the number of laborers available for industry and domestic servants in the North and West. The problem was somewhat alleviated by the blacks. First, they migrated to the towns and cities of the South, and then to the large urban centers of the North. But the new residents brought with them the scars of many years of dehumanization and degradation caused by slavery and segregation. Blacks who came from the South were especially lacking in schooling for in the rural areas from whence they came, education for them had been at a bare minimum and often scarcely existed at all. Backed by the Plessy v. Ferguson court decision which supported segregation through its separate but equal doctrine, jim crow practices took over the South. Blacks got the worst school buildings, railroad cars, and run-down tenements. Segregation reached its height in Washington, D.C. under President Woodrow Wilson when all government offices, restaurants, and lavatories were segregated. These same practices continued through both the Harding-Coolidge and Hoover administrations. It was a sad sight indeed that at the dedication of the Abraham Lincoln Memorial on Memorial Day in 1922, blacks were separated from whites by a road. Robert R. Moton, president of the Tuskegee Institute, who was one of the speakers at the dedication, was not allowed to sit on the speakers' platform, but he had to sit with the other blacks who were in attendance. Washingtonians, though, had made some gains after World War I--blacks boasted that they had what was reputed to be one of the best high schools (black) in the country, there was a normal school to train black teachers, and there was Howard University. There was also a black fire
station and the opportunity for black citizens of the nation's capital to use the government (U.S.) owned tennis and golf course on Tuesdays. Economically there were actually less blacks employed by the Federal government in Washington (even in menial jobs) than there were in 1910. 10

The educational bureaucracy which had been established by the reformers in the earlier part of the 20th century was not equipped, nor did it try very hard—to serve the migrant clientele. The problem was largely disregarded in the North, and in the South, blacks were expected to do the best that they could with what was doled out to them. The great Depression of the thirties served to subdue any thought of reform or rebellion. The most urgent need of urban blacks during this period was the need to survive. Feeble efforts made by the Communist and Socialist parties during the time to gain the support of the blacks and the poor failed, while social legislation sponsored by the Roosevelt administration aided blacks in numerous ways and gained support for the Democratic Party which persists in most urban areas until this day.

The black struggle for change—the Supreme Court decision. During the Second World War blacks again gained economic independence sufficient to allow protest organizations to begin to make clamors in their quest for equal rights. President Roosevelt (influenced by his wife) returned some rights to blacks that had been taken away by the "black codes" of earlier administrations. Permanent legislation establishing a Fair

Employment Practices Commission was passed. Then, following the liberal tradition set by President Roosevelt, President Truman issued an executive order abolishing segregation in the armed forces.

In the field of education, the United States Supreme Court, urged on by the persistent flow of cases from the NAACP, began rendering decisions outlawing inequality in higher education. The court ruled in the Sweatt case (1949) that even though the state of Texas had a separate law school for blacks, education there was inferior because the black school "lacked those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement, but which make for greatness in a law school." Herman Sweatt became the first black since Reconstruction to enter a white state university. In 1954, Thurgood Marshall, chief counsel for the NAACP, backed by a staff of competent lawyers, argued the case for equal educational opportunities for blacks who were in the public schools before the Court. Although Marshall (now justice Marshall) presented the argument, the legal preparation for the case that led to the decision had begun some years before at Howard University. Here, Charles Houston, Harvard trained dean of the Howard University Law School, organized and taught the first course in Civil Rights law in the United States. Marshall was one of a number of his bright students. It was also at Howard that a team of scholars which included Kenneth Clark, noted writer and psychologist, and James Nabrit (former president of Howard University) joined forces with a group of citizens and organizations which eventually dealt segregation its death blow in the nation's capital. In the forefront were the American Veterans Committee, The American Federation of Teachers, The Washington Urban League, The American
Friends Service Committee, the Jewish Council, and a local group, Consolidated Parents, Inc. This team was interested in attacking all facets of racial discrimination and injustices. The school case *Boiling v. Sharpe* was argued and considered with the other four suits that had been brought before the Supreme Court in Prince Edward County, Virginia; Kansas; Delaware; and South Carolina. The resulting decision (in *Brown v. Board of Education*) outlawed segregation in all public schools.  

A second decision, which required the integration of public schools with all deliberate speed, and designated state and local school districts as the agents responsible for accomplishing this goal, followed in 1955.

In spite of the gains that had been made, blacks realized that changes would be slow and difficult. Continued resistance by whites led to protest movements that extended to every facet of life. The die had now been cast. The war (World War II) was over, and as had been the case after World War I, blacks who had been the last to be hired were the first to be fired. However, as a result of "progress" made during the war, the expectations of blacks had been raised and, then, further bolstered by the Supreme Court decisions. Protests became more numerous and more vigorous. Liberal whites maintained that it was now time that the country bring its practices in line with its premises, and they assisted in the push for equal opportunity.

During the next several years the focal point for equality would be the struggle for equal education.

---

Immediately following the Supreme Court's decision, only a few of the border cities made any effort to desegregate their schools. Washington, D.C.; Baltimore, Maryland; St. Louis, Missouri; and some schools in Louisville, Kentucky opened relatively quietly in 1954 on a limited integrated basis. On the other hand, two thousand school districts, including all of those in the deep South and in Virginia, remained segregated. Instead of the segregated districts planning how they would integrate schools, they devoted their greater efforts to insidious means of keeping the schools segregated. 12

Resistance to desegregation mounts within the system. School systems continued to stall and use decoys as blacks increased their migration to large urban areas in the South and North. Blacks believed that better job opportunities, better housing, a better education for their children, and an improved lifestyle, in general, awaited them in the new regions. They were aware of the opportunities that had been available for other Americans (including the recent immigrants) to move up the economic and social ladders. But, a different dilemma faced the blacks. As was strongly suggested by one writer, the principal problem now was that the issue was centered around race. 13

Immigrants from Europe had been assimilated into most aspects of American life, the dissimilarity being, all of them were white. Diane Ravitch, in seeking to draw a parallel between the assimilation of

12 Ibid., pp. 457-458.

immigrants from Europe and the integration of blacks, admits that the principal impediment to the integration of blacks is **racism**, but, she averred, that "had it been decided at some earlier point in history that poor Italians or Irish or Poles should be transferred out of their slum schools and distributed evenly among other, better schools in order to expose them to middle class children, there would very likely have been a two-sided protest: first, from middle class parents who perceived the children of lower class foreigners as ill-mannered, dirty, and educationally backward; and second, from the parents of the children being dispersed who would have resented the imputation of their group inferiority."\(^{14}\) This statement by Ravitch indicates that she does not really appreciate the dire predicament of the black migrant--a racial group that had been uprooted from their home in Africa and brought to this country against their will. They had existed as slave property (sanctioned by the federal government) for almost two and one-half centuries. Then, after becoming "free," they have been legally and illegally excluded for an additional century from enjoying ordinary rights other citizens take for granted. Being black meant total discrimination and practically exclusion from all facets of American life--economic, political, and social--again sanctioned by the federal government.

Schools continued to function for the white middle class client although the racial group was fast disappearing from urban schools and becoming the minority. Problems for blacks were becoming exacerbated because school systems, even those that recognized the plight of black

\(^{14}\)Ravitch, op. cit., pp. 244-247.
schools as victims and pushed for new programs, ended up in a subtly patronizing position and sought to absolve themselves of their ineffectiveness with blacks by "blaming the victim," and by announcing that blacks were "depraved and deprived," "culturally disadvantaged," or, "poor, ghettoized, and hopeless." These labels gave rise to myths as to why blacks could not achieve the same as whites--class size (classes too large), classroom organization (groups too heterogeneous), incorrect subject matter (too difficult and unsuitable for blacks). There were also the myths that black children were lazy and stupid. In order to protect the originators of these myths, as well as the existent system, ideas of alleged inferiority of blacks were allowed to permeate all levels of the school system. Further, the schools' stance was protected through standardized testing, tracking of students, by disillusioned counselors, and by patterning a curriculum that supported the superiority of the white child.  

Blacks and the supporters of integration were most unhappy with the slow and slovenly efforts on the part of school districts. Demands for integration of the schools were pursued through the courts, and soon decisions emanating from the courts forced school boards to begin to take some action. Reluctant to move on their own, however, boards shifted the burden of making decisions relative to integration to the laps of school administrators. Superintendents and their staffs, finding themselves in a "no win" position, also resorted to dilatory tactics. They made such delusory statements as: "schools must be color-blind,"

---

"no attention must be given to one's race," and, criticisms of schools coming from "lay citizens" who were "unqualified" to make decisions about the education of children.\textsuperscript{16} The administrators realized that even if they had been totally committed to making integration work as the prime value of schools, many of the subordinate personnel were too traditionalistic, too prejudiced or too recalcitrant to make the needed adjustments without great resistance.\textsuperscript{17} School personnel were, for the most part, middle class, and the sheer problems of school size, scale and change, along with middle class values, tended to move the system towards an emphasis on a traditional philosophy of education that stressed the three Rs, the standard neighborhood school, and sound programs. When racial or other social changes were demanded of the schools, leaders were unwilling or unable to articulate an ideology that dealt with integration, broadening goals of welfare, and achievement for all students.\textsuperscript{18}

The apathy, and sometimes deceitfulness, of school officials began to be felt more keenly in urban communities as blacks and other minority students became disillusioned at the dim prospects that the desegregation of schools would serve to support and benefit their aspirations and ideals. Blacks and minorities dropped out (or were pushed out) of school when they did not measure up to expectations, and when theorists began to rationalize and vocalize the student failure among blacks and minorities was due to their genetic inferiority.\textsuperscript{19} Those who were

\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 143.
\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Ibid.}
eliminated from school, either as a result of their own actions or otherwise, found themselves in an economic market which they were unable to cope with--one that either could not or would not absorb them--because they lacked the necessary skills. This rejection resulted in a vicious circle of dehumanization that caused these young victims to engage in "survival" tactics. Public assistance or unemployment, at worst, or menial and debilitating employment, at best, became their lot. Some turned to drugs and crime in an effort to live with and sustain themselves at the lowest level. To help ameliorate these conditions, a stay-in-school campaign was launched with the aim of reclaiming some students and sustaining others who had refused to give up. The high school diploma began to be called the "key to the future" by respected agencies like the U.S. Department of Labor and Manpower, as well as by publications such as: Reader's Digest, Ebony and School Life. Individuals like the president of Harvard University, and groups like the National Urban League also supported the idea. All stressed the importance of staying in school without questioning why many had left school or why black high school graduates had higher unemployment rates than did the white dropouts. 20

Breaking down the resistance. By the 1960s civil rights organizations, realizing that schools did not operate in a vacuum, and that schools were microcosms of their communities, broadened their attack to include the whole system. Through such efforts as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s

non-violent program and the later "black power" movement, new voting strength was attained, so that by bloc voting, blacks were able to exert some control over city councils and elected school boards. Since in many cities school boards had been removed from political ties, they were forced, in many instances, to respond almost immediately. The responses varied. Some conciliatory moves were made as state and federal agencies and the courts entered the picture to keep the situations from getting out of hand. In cities where school boards enjoyed complete autonomy, resistance was continued, although here too, it was weakened to the point that some concessions had to be made.\textsuperscript{21}

The school boards' protection of the professionals continued even as a few token black faces began to appear on large city boards in northern and border states. New York City led the way in 1961 when its Board of Education was empowered to appoint local board members for twenty-five of its school districts. The activation of these local boards was an admittance that an over-centralized system could not respond to local needs. The same pattern, with varying degrees, was followed in Los Angeles, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. These new boards (or advisory councils) were given little or no authority, but rather, acted as a community buffer, holding hearings and discussing local issues without authority to really resolve local problems.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{22}Fantini and Gittell, op. cit., p. 221.
Teachers request a voice in decision-making. About the same time that parents began to raise questions, teachers and principals in urban areas began to become aware that they were now powerless in their dealings with the downtown central office. It was especially disheartening to teachers when they knew that they bore the front-line responsibility—as viewed by parents—for children's success or failure in school. Criticism emanating from parents and others was directed at teachers and principals as being ineffectual and lackadasical in their attitudes toward parents and their children. Teachers, also, wanted to change the image that was being portrayed by current critics like Eleanor Leacock, who after extensive research in New York City schools, described teachers as having attitudes toward poor and black children that were so negative that they precluded successful relationships that resulted in good teaching. Jonathan Kozol, although lacking in experience, called attention to the horrible conditions that existed in the Boston schools that were attended mostly by blacks. Raymond Callahan abhorred the kind of mindless adherence to routine and discipline exhibited by teachers and administrators in most city schools. Said Callahan: "I had expected more professional autonomy, and I was completely unprepared for the degree of capitulation by administrators to whatever demands were made upon them."23

In order to respond to some of the criticisms directed at them, teachers and principals began to press their demands for a share in the

decision-making powers of the school system. Through their bargaining agents, they sought the right to participate in determining what children should be taught as well as how they should be taught. Nor were they any longer satisfied to have discussed and negotiated salary and leave policies, they demanded to be involved in curriculum and instructional policy. Especially did the American Federation of Teachers, a branch of AFL-CIO, insist that teachers be consulted before any policy decisions affecting their teaching or welfare. For Unions, "where leadership is solidly committed to increasing group power, the intention is to convert that power into a full partnership in educational policy-making."^24

During the late 1960s, the local Washington Teachers Union assumed a similar stance. They asked to be consulted prior to administrative or school board decisions in regard to teacher welfare, salary or curriculum. The Washington Board of Education was stunned when the Washington Teachers Union was selected to be the bargaining agent for teachers over the supposedly more popular and "more professional" District of Columbia Education Association, an affiliate of the powerful National Education Association.

Prior to the confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville, community parent groups generally supported teachers in their war against management. But when the union wanted to exclude from classes pupils who were termed by them to be "disruptive" and when parent groups tried to

dismiss or have transferred "ineffectual" school staff, the lines were
drawn. Antagonism between teacher unions and parents increased.25

Decentralization: an effort to change. Another effort to effect change
in the manner in which schools function was attempted in some cities
through more widespread administrative decentralization. Some decisions
that were administrative in nature were moved downward from the central
office in order to bring processes closer to individuals who would be
affected by the decisions. The process of a "development" bureaucracy
was a model for redefining the administrative and organizational struc-
ture of urban schools. It was hoped that the process would overcome
some of the binding day-to-day problems of the system, and that by allo-
cating authority in accordance with functional necessity, schools could
achieve order and system without becoming rigid, hierarchical or iso-
lated from their clientele. If followed to its optimal possibility, de-
centralization might have been an effective means of coordinating the
activities of the school system with the desires and needs of the stu-
dents and the community. But this was not done. What did happen was
that the larger districts were divided into smaller sub-districts, each
administered by a subordinate officer. Rarely, though, did real
decision-making power go beyond the level of the school superintendent.
Power delegated was kept to a minimum. Sub-district administrators were
allowed to make only relatively unimportant housekeeping decisions.26

25 Charles W. Cheng, "Community Representation in Teacher Collective

26 Raymond C. Hummel and John M. Nagle, Urban Education in America:
Federal government attempts toward an educational policy. It was during the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson that the federal government joined the effort to effect real change in education for the poor and blacks. The anti-poverty program, of which compensatory education became a major part, was introduced as a component that would raise the level of achievement of disadvantaged students. The two largest, and perhaps most effective, of the educational programs were Head Start, which began during the summer of 1965, and the Title I Program which was introduced in 1966. Both were designed to focus upon remediation and to help the learners to fit into the existing school mold. Additions to the processes and procedures already being used in the schools were expected to provide for the learners' needs.

The term "Head Start" was coined because it was supposed that if disadvantaged children were going to profit from what schools offered, they needed a "Head Start" to catch up with the middle class children. Moreover, many upper and middle class families sent pre-schoolers to nursery school and this was an attempt to expand like services to the poor. The program, administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity (an antipoverty agency) was designed by experts in pediatrics, public health, nursing, education, child psychiatry, child development, and child psychology. Guidelines for the program reflected the interests of these professions. In addition, the guidelines provided that 90 percent of the enrollment had to come from families that met the standards for the disadvantaged. Parents had to be involved in the program at the

---

policy-making level, services were required of a physician and nurse, a
career development program had to be provided to upgrade adult personnel
who were involved in the program, and transportation had to be provided
for those children who lived beyond an established walking distance.28

The Head Start Program continued for three years amidst mixed
feelings before it was thoroughly evaluated. The most influential
evaluation was conducted in 1969 by Ohio University and the Westinghouse
Learning Corporation. It was concluded by them that the program had been
only "marginally effective," but that many well-planned full-year pro-
grams had improved significantly the academic aptitude of the partici-
pants. Many Head Start children, on measurements for reading readi-
ness, approached the national norm by the time that they reached first
grade. But, according to the evaluation, by the end of grade two, the
Head Start children who had gained during the pre-school years achieved
little differently on the standardized tests than similar children with-
out pre-school experience. A later evaluation of the program by Educa-
tional Testing Service (1971) reported the same gains and fade-outs.29
Later studies, however, refute these notions. The followup studies of
820 children were summarized and evaluated by a research team at Cornell
University. The studies show that the former Head Start students
generally are held back less frequently, are placed in special education
classes less, score better than a control group on math achievement

28 James S. Payne, Head Start: A Tragicomedy, with Epilogue, New

29 Benjamin D. Stickney, "Comparative Education and Pupil Achieve-
ment," Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 1976,
pp. 136-138.
tests, have a higher self-image, and do better on I.Q. tests for at least three years after pre-school. In some cases, according to a research analyst at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, it is five to six years after the pre-school programs.  

The Title I Program differed from the Head Start Program in that it was a within school program. From the beginning, it was monitored by the Office of Education. The overall goal of Title I encompassed overcoming educational deprivation based on race and poverty. Efforts were made to decrease impediments to education by providing services to schools and to the children in the school who met poverty guidelines. Included were: medical and dental services, staff development and training for teachers, lunch and breakfast, diagnostic and testing services for children, and classroom construction that was related to the Title I Program. Aid was given to the state based on applications submitted by its educational agencies. Title I's target population were the poor of preschool, elementary and junior high schools. The program emphasized the basic skills in reading, arithmetic, and language. Classroom aides were provided. They were usually parents who served as tutors, assisted teachers as reinforcers of instruction, and assisted with classroom clerical duties. Teachers with special talents for working with disadvantaged children were recruited, and when necessary they were provided with special training.  

---


32 Ibid.
An evaluation of the program at the end of the second year revealed the following: (1) the reading scores of Title I children improved at an average rate approximating the normal range of one month's advance for one month of instruction (this is a higher rate than is usual for lower income urban schools); (2) arithmetic gains, although not as large as reading, showed significant improvement; (3) the dropout rate in the target area schools decreased five percentage points in two years (a trend not observed in non-target schools). 33

In spite of the fact that these gains had been registered, further evaluation of Title I programs advanced the conclusions that the schools in the program seldom modified their conventional teaching practices sufficiently to result in significant and enduring gains in reading and arithmetic. 34

Later evaluations followed the same trends since it was difficult to discern whether the findings were based solely on reaching achievement and other cognitive gains or whether Title I was important because it was providing educational services which would result in their overall improvement. The question was also raised as to whether Title I services were being used to supplant rather than supplement the regular programs of schools receiving Title I aid. 35

Other federal programs impacting on education. President Johnson's Economic Act of 1964 rededicated the nation to a vigorous attack on the

33 Ibid., pp. 27-29. 34 Ibid. 35 Paul J. Hill, "Title I Under the Microscope," American Education 12(October 1976)31-33.
causes of poverty which he stated "grips one-fifth of our nation, including fifteen million children." The aim of the program was to assist the poor to achieve a better life. The funds appropriated covered three hundred rural and community actions programs, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA, and the Peace Corps. There were also programs for health and healthy facilities (including mental health), and a broadening of the Manpower and Development Act, and increased funds for education.  

Although, through these ambitious programs, gains were made in bringing the poor up to a more reasonable standard of living, several problems occurred to impede the desired progress.

The Model Cities programs which were being counted upon to play a major role in extricating the poor from the throes of despair, were guided by persons who were unfamiliar with power and status. They lacked organizational skills and had to contend with apathy, disunity, and cynicism such as were to be found in communities which had been long associated with repression. This weakened the ability of those in charge to compete effectively with reinforced power from the system and it rendered the community vulnerable to those who would exploit it. Moreover, the community action program challenged the established political policies that discriminated against the poor.


38 Atron Gentry et al., op. cit., p. 99.
An additional obstacle to the success of the Anti-Poverty Program was the Viet Nam War. The widespread disaffection with the war hurt the Johnson administration and caused domestic programs to suffer. Even so, war spending, combined with the need for military personnel, caused tight job markets which did more to equalize job opportunities for the poor and blacks than did the anti-poverty programs. Nevertheless, as a result of the problems encountered, the total program proposed by President Johnson never had a real chance. It dwindled until all that remained were the education and health portions of the program, and those jobs that trained for war-related occupations. Christopher Jencks attributed the failure of the Antipoverty Program efforts to "defining poverty in relative rather than in absolute terms." He argued that the poor could not be eliminated merely by helping children to rise above poverty, nor would acquiring basic skills and reforming education provide the solution. Said he, "There is no evidence that school . . . can substantially reduce the extent of cognitive inequality nor cause economic equality among its graduates."^39

Generally, those who have evaluated and discussed the Anti-poverty Program found that while it had not been a failure, the program was not "cost effective," for the goals of equalizing educational opportunity to improve achievement and of eliminating poverty. The poor were largely still poor; and, so far, they saw little reason to hope that their lot would become better.

There were many reasons for lack of changes and improvements in the areas sought by all who tried for reform. These reasons neither condemn or support the efforts that were made. But, with the problems still present, it was apparent that the methods used to attack the problems deserved careful scrutiny. Compensatory education and the other Antipoverty programs were steps in the right direction. They were a series of efforts that were not totally successful in solving the problems that were attempted, but they converged on them and indicated the need to reform the total systems in urban areas.
CHAPTER II
COMMUNITY CONTROL FOR QUALITY EDUCATION

The Dissatisfaction of the Black Community

When the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions of 1954 and 1955 did not show any probability of quickly solving the problem of black children in inner city schools, when the feeble efforts of the local districts to solve these same problems were not only ineffectual but impertinent, and after the federal compensatory education programs of the early and late sixties left black children with the same deficiencies and frustrations, black parents began to demand more decision-making powers in all of the political arenas, including education.

At a meeting of a Harlem parents committee in 1966, Isaiah Robinson, a black minister, who was later appointed the Manhattan representative to an interim board of education, made in jest the following statement: "Since white children will not be sent to Harlem (to desegregate New York City schools), and black children were not being invited downtown in any meaningful numbers, maybe the blacks had better accept segregation and run their own schools."¹ This was not the beginning of parents requesting a more meaningful role and decision-making powers in the public schools, but it did turn out to be prophetic of what was to be expected in the future.

The Adams-Morgan community move toward control. There were no evidences that parent involvement and decentralization would raise the academic achievement of black children and make them more respected, but there were encouraging signs. In 1967, the Adams-Morgan community of Washington, D.C. began to move in the direction of control of its schools. The idea was developed by a community composed of middle class whites and poor blacks who had previously obtained a grant under the Housing Act of 1954 to improve their community through a two-year demonstration project. Successor organizations sought to go beyond the neighborhood's physical problems and developed other areas that were social in nature. The Adams-Morgan Community School was a response to educational shortcomings and the desire of parents to work with educators to explore the possibilities of such innovative approaches as team teaching, differentiated staffing, and individualized instruction.  

The experiment got off to a rocky start. In May 1967 the District of Columbia Board of Education approved a memorandum prepared by the Superintendent of Schools which provided that Antioch College, with the "advice of a parents' advisory board" would be able to select staff, determine curriculum, and allocate resources within normal budget allotments. A final agreement was to have been worked out at a later meeting.  

The resulting document which allegedly would have spelled out the parity relationships among the parties to the agreement--Antioch College, District of Columbia public schools, and Adams-Morgan community--was

2 Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, op. cit., pp. 82-84.

never ratified. This left unclear the question of who was in charge during the initial phases. Fortunately, the project was able to begin its operation during the summer months under the aegis of the college because the principal during the preceding year had expressed the desire to leave, and she was transferred to another school at the close of the year.

The neighborhood immediately to the west of the Adams and Morgan schools consisted of upper and middle class whites, a number of whom were alumni of Antioch College. They formed the leadership core for the first council of parents and were most responsible for the successful push towards community control for the two schools. Few of their own children would attend either school, but the white members of the council were sure that with the help of Antioch College, they could do a better job of educating children of their adjacent neighborhood than could the school system. Few of the blacks in the community had any leadership role in the actual planning and training phase of the project. The bulk of the work was done by the middle class whites, one or two board members and the Superintendent of the District of Columbia public schools. As a matter of fact, the Superintendent did not even involve his staff. This would later prove to be a handicap, for it resulted in a community divided in its aspirations and goals, and a school staff which felt no stake or responsibility for a program that had been planned and begun without their involvement. The Superintendent's staff actually showed a great amount of resentment to the experiment and shied away from it.\(^4\)

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 239.
The college, nevertheless, moved to institute its ideas of what a community-controlled school should be like. But, their ideas seemed to serve the needs of the college more than the needs of the children of the community. A differentiated teaching staff was immediately proposed. This meant the conversion of eleven full-time teaching and three specialist positions from the regular staff to support eleven Antioch and fourteen community interns. It also provided that each school quarter Antioch undergraduates were to be provided work assignments. As these personnel were organized on paper, it seemed that the arrangement might please those who were involved. But, as it turned out this was not the case because of many unanticipated problems. First, the newly appointed staff were found to be inexperienced at working with elementary school children. The older staff members who were retained were stubborn and resentful of their new roles, especially since there had not been sufficient time to effectively orientate and train them. The professional staff also refused to accept the paraprofessionals who suddenly regarded themselves as "teachers." Moreover, parents wanted to be assured that their children would have a real teacher at all times.\(^5\) Another problem that was encountered was the lack of total commitment and involvement of parents and community residents. This was exacerbated by the absence of a principal for the schools who would perform the day-to-day operations and deal with routine questions concerning the school system.

With an inexperienced and/or indifferent staff, along with a largely uncommitted local school council (especially the poor members)

\(^5\)Ibid.
trying to operate without a principal, the newly appointed project
director from Antioch College was faced with an all but impossible task.
He conducted a three week summer institute. Realizing that this was in-
adequate for the task ahead, he attempted to influence the participants
to postpone the opening of the school year until a later date, but nei-
ther the school council nor the participants would agree. They coun-
tered that any delay would cause people to lose interest and would doom
the program to failure. Shortly after school was opened in September
1967, an election was held for membership on the Morgan Community School
Board. Dissatisfied with the Antioch project director, and disapproving
what they considered Antioch's desire to turn the Adams-Morgan experi-
ment into a training ground for its students and staff, the new local
board fired the director.

Contrary to the implications of "The Short Happy Life of the
Adams-Morgan Community School Project," an article that appeared in
the Harvard Educational Review, this was not the ending, but the begin-
ing of a successful local school project in community control. While
Antioch's ties diminished, community cohesiveness grew. At the Septem-
ber 1968 meeting of the District of Columbia Board of Education that was
packed with interested parents, the new superintendent of schools de-
livered an eloquent message supporting decentralization. At this meet-
ing the school board approved the Morgan and the Anacostia Community
School Projects. The Washington Teachers' Union and the District Educa-
tion Association also backed decentralization and community control in
those areas where it was desired by the schools and their communities.

6Lauter, op. cit.
Soon after this meeting, Morgan's local board hired its first principal. A former social worker, he had served as a school-community liaison worker in an integrated northern suburb. His strongest asset, however, was his ability to win the respect of parents, community residents, and students. He welcomed the Teachers Union (which had recently become the bargaining agent for all District of Columbia teachers), and he sought the help of community agencies and persons who were willing to come to the school to make a contribution. The Morgan experiment came alive! Help was provided by many sources, and the drab physical surroundings in which the children were attempting to learn were forgotten amidst the newly acquired enthusiasm. The local school board viewed itself as the governing body for the Morgan School. "It cannot be merely an advisory or consultative body to an administration which is basically responsible to a larger system over which the community has no control," were the new board's utterances. "The school should take its character from the nature of the people living in the community and from the children utilizing the school, rather than rigidly defining itself as an institution accepting only those people who already fit into a set definition." These were words that the community believed in and were determined to live by with the support of their elected board. The philosophy permeated the Morgan community. The principal, Kenneth Haskins, indicated while addressing a workshop comprised of parents and teachers from the Anacostia Project, that "when a group of children appeared at the school door at 8:00 a.m. (school opened officially at 8:45), the parents

in my community were saying to me 'we need a program for our children that begins at 8:00 a.m.' so I started one." Further evidence of close community ties was the establishment of such neighborhood institutions as a pre-school center, a neighborhood house, a walk-in science center, a dental clinic, an alley library, and a store-front art center. The parents' complete support for the school was demonstrated when the District of Columbia Board of Education asked for "proof" that the school was "succeeding," in order to decide whether the experiment should continue. First, the community insisted that any report to the District of Columbia Board of Education would have to be made at the Morgan building. The District of Columbia Board was invited to hold their next meeting there. This was agreed to. When the meeting was held, the opening speaker from the Morgan Community Board arose and made the following statement: "I want to make it clear at the outset that whether or not the Morgan Community School Board continues its present relationship with the Morgan School is not negotiable." He repeated this statement louder and more emphatically. The tone of the meeting was set, and the balance of the time was spent listening to parents and supporters praise the effectiveness of the Morgan Community School.

The school continued to get help from a variety of resources, ranging from the Urban Service Corps, which provided volunteers, to a Friends group and other private organizations which provided summer camping and field programs.8

The Morgan School was housed in an eighty year old building, but it organized the first "open education" program in the District of

8Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, op. cit., pp. 86-87.
Columbia public schools. It was also responsible for the first "community facilities" school which included community services agencies that provided a one-stop service for the people of the community. The Morgan Community School Board obtained the services of its own architect and presented a plan for a building based upon specific community needs and programs to the school head of Buildings and Grounds and to the District of Columbia architect. The plan defied the traditional building concept and was rejected because it was said to be "too sophisticated" for an elementary school. The community board persisted, allowing that they were not interested in an "elementary" school, but in a "community facilities" school that would provide for the needs of all who wanted to make use of the building. The plan called for tennis courts, a swimming pool, a full size gymnasium, and for underground parking for its staff. Except for some new senior high schools, no such facilities had been requested or built in the District of Columbia. The idea was finally accepted by the Board of Education; however, the first school of this type was built not in the Morgan area but in Anacostia. The plan for the school won an award at the meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, held in Atlantic City, New Jersey in 1974. It was judged to be the most advanced and functional school planned during the year. Since that time (after eight years) a similar school has been built for Morgan.

If there is a single school that has demonstrated the efficacy of local "community control," it has surely been Morgan. Almost since the inception of the idea, the desires of the Morgan community have been uppermost in the attempt to provide for their students. They have
resisted infringement by the system on their right to decide what is best for the children, even at the expense of cognitive gains.

The New York experience. New York City furnished another example of an attempt on the part of local communities to gain decision-making powers over their schools. The issue in New York was not to gain decision-making powers over a single school, but for several school districts. The attempt there was the largest of the earlier efforts and became the most renowned.

The I.S. 201 move towards community control. The first move towards community control in New York City was in 1966 at the new I.S. 201. The original plan was to build a school to promote community solidarity. The school was situated on the boundary between the black and the Puerto Rican communities in East Harlem. The main opposition to the school came from those who wanted to integrate the schools, and it was obvious I.S. 201 would not have any white children in its enrollment. The community faced the mayor and the Superintendent of Schools with the threat of a boycott if the school was not integrated by transferring in white students by September 1966. Either this or parents demanded direct community control with the power to hire and fire teachers and administrators, control of the curriculum, and accountability from the staff. When the Board and the Superintendent indicated to parents that the request that they had made would be in violation of state policy and would not be honored, the parents boycotted the school, and in September the school failed to open. During the next several days, parents and the community demanded that the white principal be replaced with a black
principal. After much strife and confusion, the boycott began to dwindle and by the end of the first month the white principal had been replaced by a black assistant principal.

But, I.S. 201 controversy did not cease. It became the spearhead for official authorization of other experimental groups--Ocean Hill-Brownsville and the Two Bridges Project. The Ford Foundation awarded each of them grants which allowed the members of the community to conduct elections and hire consultants to give advice in the areas of curriculum, community organization, and legal matters.

These experimental groups were sanctioned by the New York City Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools, but they still maintained that the Board had no authority to delegate "substantive decision-making powers to any lay body." They stated further that "the basic functional relationships would remain the same" between the local boards and the central administration.\(^9\) This caused the local community boards to continue an adversary relationship with the New York City Board and the Superintendent of Schools.

The Bundy Plan. It was amid this confusion and indecision that a report entitled "Reconnection for Learning" (better known as the Bundy Plan) appeared. The report dealt with the problems of the New York City school system, and it proposed that the possible solution of problems lay in decentralizing the system and encouraging parents and other members of the community to form a partnership with the professionals in making educational decisions. The report was developed by a special committee that was created in response to a request by the New York

\(^9\)Fantini and Gittell, op. cit., pp. 4-10.
State Legislature. The committee found problems existing between the community and the school board (especially in low income and black areas) that were so severe, and the breakdown of communication so long-standing and advanced, that it called for fundamental changes in the structure of the schools. These recommendations were not made in a vacuum. For several years New York City schools had been decentralized with local school participation by the community and a supposedly responsive centralized administration. But the decentralization had existed merely on paper, and was more apparent than real. The bureaucracy, consisting of the Superintendent of Schools and his subordinates, the Board of Education, and the United Federation of Teachers, inextricably controlled the schools, and parents and other members of the community could not possibly find a place or an opportunity to enter the decision-making process. Moreover, these groups seemed primarily interested in maintaining the status quo and in protecting their own interest.

The mayor of the city was aware of the unsatisfactory arrangements, and it was in support of him that the State Commissioner of Education influenced the Legislature to bypass the New York City Board of Education and present a plan for real decentralization. The mayor complied and appointed a distinguished body of citizens headed by McGeorge Bundy of the Ford Foundation to make recommendations for reforming the system. The basic recommendations of the group were essentially the following:
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1. The New York City schools should be reorganized into a community school system consisting of a federation of largely autonomous school districts and a central education agency

2. The districts should have responsibility and authority for the regular elementary and secondary schools within their boundaries

3. Educational standards should be maintained through state and city agencies

4. School districts should be governed by elected parents and by selected appointed representatives

5. Funds should be allocated in an equitable manner, and utilized by the decentralized units

6. Districts should have broad personnel powers to hire a community superintendent on a contract basis

7. Old teachers should retain tenure, but new teachers should be given tenure at the discretion of the districts

8. Communication by local school boards should be at a maximum with parents, residents, teachers, and supervisory personnel participating

9. Racial integration of schools should be a priority

10. Community school board members should be trained to deal with budgets, curriculum and school functions

These recommendations, in summary, were concerned with five main problems. They were: (a) the nature of community voice in educational policy, (b) the composition and selection of community boards, (c) the relation between the community board and higher authorities, (d) reform of the personnel system, and (e) the integration of schools.\(^{11}\)

The Bundy Plan was opposed from every angle—personnel, principle, cost, teacher and supervisory organizations, and, by the legislators who had authorized the plan because it was felt to be too drastic. On the other hand, others opposed the plan because it did not go far enough.

\(^{11}\) Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-112.
It was true that the plan did not intend to shift all power from the educational bureaucracy. In fact, the plan was conciliatory in its request for the orchestration of powers and reconnection with the community. But, it was also true that the plan threatened the status quo—it would have diminished the power of those in command, and strengthened the powers of the poor and minorities.\textsuperscript{12} The fiercest opposition to the plan came from the educational supervisors. These were the staff members who were immediately above the rank of teachers and who were frightened mostly by the frustration and discomfiture of the possibility that they might be moved from their present positions. These were joined by the United Federation of Teachers, the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education members. The Union, in particular, took advantage of the attacks waged on the plan by those who were considered the architects of the plan, but were labeled "outsiders" new to the struggle. The Union was more opposed to the committee members than to the plan's substance. The plan was attacked as one that would serve to separate and further segregate the city; it would turn the schools over to vigilantes and racists; it would put the schools in the hands of ghetto parents who were incapable of coping with educational issues; the teachers would be weakened; and the plan would really be making the poor responsible for the failure of the schools.\textsuperscript{13} These were the arguments from the opposition.

After much procrastination, and without an equal supportive effort by those who favored the plan, a law was finally adopted that fell considerably short of that proposed by the mayor's committee. In spite of

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., pp. 127-135. \textsuperscript{13}Ibid.
this, there was a meaningful progression towards the goal of more participation in the schools by parents and other members of the community. Higher educational institutions in the city showed their concern by adopting individual schools, and Queens College's Institute for Community Studies continued to provide technical and financial assistance supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

**Ocean Hill-Brownsville: seat of controversy.** Even during the deliberations on the Plan, the experimental districts that had been sanctioned by school authorities were moving forward with their plans for community control and seeking more decision-making powers. Especially in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district was the push in evidence. Basically, the primary interest in this district seemed to have been a determination to change the structure and philosophy of the schools. In a conference sponsored by the Brookings Institution held in 1968 on the subject of Community Schools, Rhody McCoy, District Superintendent of Ocean Hill-Brownsville, presented an essay in which he described the establishment of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district. He began by assessing the poor physical facilities of the district, the lack of experienced teaching staffs and principals, and the failure of the decentralized units to involve parents of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district in any substantive manner. Attention was also given to the low socioeconomic level, absence of health facilities, and general lack of concern for the citizens who lived in the area.¹⁴

Emphasis was placed by McCoy on the necessity for and the extent to which the independent school board went to change the existing attitudes and structure of the schools in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville School District. Acting on the Superintendent of Schools' statement that the proposal from the independent school board was "substantially acceptable" even though certain legalities had to be discussed with the Board of Education, contact was made with the Ford Foundation (through Mario Fantini) and an agreement with the New York City School Board was established. The accord recognized the district as an experimental unit, and it was decided that the administrator of the district was to have the same rights as other district superintendents. The unit administrator was required to have state certification; otherwise, when candidates were interviewed the questioning sought to determine the relationship that the candidate expected would exist between himself and the community school boards. It was clear by the community board's interview questions that changes in the school were to be made, but only with sanctioning by the local school board.  

In selecting the other staff members of the district, the unit administrator had great leeway. Because of the urgent need to make changes, there was concern that persons selected be willing to "buck" the system when necessary without feeling insecure. Titles and number of positions were altered. This was accomplished through money allocation rather than by the allocation of positions. The selection of principals provoked the first hostilities because the recommendations bypassed the regular civil service list and procedures from which officers

---

15 Ibid., pp. 173-175.
had usually been selected. And, although some effort was made to use the lists when needs of the school and community could be met, the City Board of Education--influenced by the Council of Supervisory Associations--blocked several critical appointments.

Procedures had to be developed to facilitate the governing board's functions. After some effort, this was accomplished. The governing board was then able to effectively screen personnel, consider policy decisions in regard to curriculum and organization, and make policy with regard to the allocation of funds. Regular monthly meetings were also scheduled to be opened to the community-at-large. At the meeting, fact sheets were distributed and opinions were elicited from the community. When practicable, the suggestions were translated into policy and plans were implemented.\(^\text{16}\)

The most serious problem at Ocean Hill-Brownsville was with the teaching staff. McCoy classified teachers into two groups. The first group were the young militants (mostly black) who identified with the community. The second group, predominantly white, adhered to the requirements of the Board of Education but lived by the United Federation of Teachers' contract. They felt that their only responsibility was to teach subject matter. They did not attend meetings, did not recognize the governing board, and avoided them whenever they visited the schools. Teacher attitudes were certain to result in a conflict that would have to be resolved. Moreover, the governing board in some of the schools accused some teachers of deliberately attempting to cause the experiment to fail by being excessively absent and late, by not teaching, and by

\(^{16}\)Ibid., p. 183.
other negative and irresponsible acts. In the meantime, word was received from the newly appointed principals (those appointed by the community boards) that the assistant principals placed in the schools by the central administration were inexperienced and were neither obeying orders nor supporting the program.  

During the spring of 1968, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Community Board, realizing that the attempt to transfer a group of unwanted teachers from the district to the central office would be disapproved, ordered that the transfers be made anyway. The United Federation of Teachers opposed the transfers and termed them "dismissals." When the community board refused to relent and take the teachers back, the teachers in the three demonstration units who were union members walked off the job. The Superintendent of New York City closed the three schools, and the governing board closed the other schools in the districts. The issue remained unresolved during the summer recess. The following fall, the union called a strike in all of the city schools on the grounds that its members had been denied the right of due process. The non-union members, especially in the experimental districts, made a valiant effort to keep the schools open. It was conceded, though, that the decision of the governing board to being formal changes before a hearing examiner on the question of due process was a fatal mistake. The ruling was in the union's favor. Really, what the experimental districts failed to realize was that they were on trial and that their judge and jury would be guided by white society's rules and regulations,

---

17 Fantini, Gittell, Magat, op. cit., p. 160.
which were against their interests. Confrontations during and after the strike were many. At one time more than one thousand policemen were being used to restore order and to prevent "harrassment of the union" by "non-union" teachers. The settlement of the strike included placing the schools under a trusteeship which operated directly out of the office of the State Commissioner of Education. The trusteeship lasted for four months. The strike had caused great tension and conflict within the city. The coalition between civil rights groups, labor and liberals was ruptured; and since many of the teachers who were affected by the experimental district's action were Jewish, the cry of antisemitism was raised. Then, of course, teachers, too, took sides, and it was difficult to mend the break after the strike had ended. Those who supported the districts, including the mayor, were accused of forming a grand design to substitute "black" racism for white racism and to sacrifice the employment rights and the personal safety of white teachers. The union was the one that appealed to the State Legislature to step in. They produced the argument that the demonstration districts were examples of what would happen in the city if decentralization, as had been proposed by the committee headed by McGeorge Bundy and by others, was used as the model. The members of the Legislature "ran scared." As a result, the experimental districts not only lost the battle of the strike; they also failed to win over a large enough proportion of the white community to the cause of community control.

Experimental districts abolished. Repercussions were taken against the parents in the form of state legislation which, although
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18 Ibid., pp. 161-162.  
19 Ibid.
allowing decentralization, brushed aside all compromise bills and wiped out the demonstration districts by specifying a minimum population for each of the newly formed districts. The legislature also placed strictures on district board elections and barred parents who worked as para-professionals from serving on the local boards. The effect was that in less than a year, decentralization changed from a theoretical concept to the raw politics of urban reform, combined with the deep current of racial unrest.20

It is difficult to assess blame for the failure of the three experimental units to become viable parts of the New York City school system. Ravitch states that, in retrospect, the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools were equally responsible for not informing the planning groups of the restraints on the experiments. Ford Foundation was also accused for funding the demonstration "precipitously" without concern for the adequacy of plans.21 There were a number of positive attempts to settle the problems that had ensued amicably, but in the final analysis the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Board and its district superintendent were their own worst enemies when they insisted upon complete control and total victory.22 The quest for power became the dominant goal of the governing board and the top staff. Because of the changed emphasis, it became necessary for the state legislators and all of the distinguished citizens who supported the concept of greater participation and involvement of citizens in the operation of their schools

to abandon the hope that the time for such involvement had arrived. Instead, a watered down version of decentralization which was less effective (and less troublesome) was substituted.

But, as has been suggested by Ravitch, critics of the public schools (and of "community control") "should not lose sight of the monumental accomplishments of the public school system of New York City." The same can be said of other large urban school systems which face daily the severe problems inherent in urban education, and yet persevere in spite of their vulnerability to the attacks of the public. If America's confidence in the ability of lay people to control public education is to be maintained, then, responding to the demands of citizens becomes a necessity.

The New York experience became an anathema for those who might have supported the concept of community control. Unfortunately for the process, it was considered to be synonymous with "black control" and/or "control by the militants." It would take considerable time to live down the unpleasantness associated with the process. And it would be very difficult to implement a similar experience which would prove a valid test as to its efficacy in helping to respond to the needs of both the educational establishment and the community.

\[23\] Ibid.
**CHAPTER III**

THE ANACOSTIA COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROJECT

Federal Support for Community Control

Phase I--Project monitored by Office of Education. President Lyndon B. Johnson was presenting to Congress his recommendation for the District of Columbia School System, which included a major experimental sub-system, at the same time that the city of New York was struggling with the problems of decentralization and community control. The President stated in his message that "with additional resources we can become a beacon to the school systems in other cities of the nation." He continued:

Washington's 150,000 school children and their parents . . . must also be able to exercise their most fundamental rights. They must have a voice which can be heard in the operation of their school system.

To support this program, I have included $10 million in my 1969 budget . . . to supplement the funds providing regular support for the D.C. schools . . . With these additional resources we can launch an exciting new venture in education as we seek new levels of quality in the schools of the nation's capital.¹

The U.S. Office of Education assembled an ad hoc committee to respond to the presidential mandate. The committee was comprised of representatives from the District of Columbia schools, the mayor's office, Federal City College, Washington Technical Institute, and the total community action agency. The first duty of the committee was to suggest criteria for selection of a demonstration site. A later

¹Excerpts from President Johnson's Message to Congress, with reference to the Anacostia Project, March 1968.
committee designated by the Community Council (a group representing seventy-five organizations established to implement the recent report on District of Columbia public schools made by Dr. Harry A. Passow) recommended the Frederick Douglass Junior High and its feeder elementary schools become the demonstration area. The District of Columbia School Board approved the project site and appointed a temporary director and a chief consultant to assist with the planning of the Project.²

Some of the criteria that were used to select the Anacostia area fitted other Washington communities as well, but the Anacostia region qualified because it exhibited a more pronounced need than did the others. Educationally, inner city decay was reflected in a high dropout rate, severe overcrowding in the schools with unwanted busing to other sections of the city, low reading achievement scores, shortages of school supplies, low morale that resulted in high teacher turnover in all of the schools, and graduates without marketable skills. Economically, the area was depressed. Separated from the rest of the District by the Anacostia River, the locality was like a different city. Residents viewed their community as a "dumping ground" for persons and things that had been rejected by the rest of the city. Seven large public housing projects were located within its boundaries, as were Saint Elizabeth Hospital for the mentally ill, junior village (home for deserted children), District of Columbia Village (home for the indigent old), a warehouse for condemned city furniture, the District of Columbia waste disposal plant, and schools that could not retain their staffs.

beyond their probationary period. Moreover, rather than dismissing un-
satisfactory teachers from the other sections of the city, the system "banished" them to Anacostia schools via transfers. These horrid condi-
tions created the potential for socially unacceptable behavior which periodically expressed itself in acts of violence against persons and property. The circumstances existing in Anacostia made it the logical site in which an experiment in community control could be tried.

After the determination was made that Anacostia would be the area for the experiment, the planning of the project began. A day-long in-
formation conference was held at which the suggested scope for the project was presented to the community, and an open forum was provided for the participants to discuss the educational needs of Anacostia. The conference also provided the opportunity for the selection of persons who would become members of the Anacostia Community Planning Coun-
cil. The primary purpose of the Council would be to assure a continuum of community input. The Council was later expanded to forty-six members so that it would be broadly representative of the total community.

The all-day conference was followed by a summer workshop which was held to plan programs and strategies. A total of 282 persons partici-
pated. Included were parents, young adults, youths--both in and out of school--teachers, school officers, and other residents and representa-
tives from organizations of Anacostia. The participants, assisted by special resource persons and nationally known consultants, were divided into task forces and sub-groups in order to consider the needs of the community and to formulate and promulgate plans for programs that would begin to meet the requirements suggested by the citizenry. During the
workshop, the Community Planning Council was formalized and became one of the task forces. Its deliberations resulted in the component, "Project Organization and Community Participation."

Twenty-five programs were proposed and planned by the workshop. Of these, "Project Organization and Community Participation" emerged as priority one. The programs that were to be recommended were included in a formal proposal which was later approved by the District of Columbia Board of Education and the Office of Education. After the workshop ended, there were no funds, but the Anacostia Community Planning Council continued to meet. During the next three months the Council sought to do the following:

1. Define roles and responsibilities of the community in the development and implementation of the Project
2. Outline a set of structures and procedures designed to effectuate community participation
3. Establish policies and procedures that would govern relationships between the community and other entities related to the program

The project becomes a reality. In October 1968 the President signed the Appropriations Bill for the District of Columbia (PL 9473) which included one million dollars for the Anacostia Project. This amount was only one-tenth of what the President had asked for and one-fifteenth of what the members of the workshop felt was necessary to begin to do an effective job in the community. Nevertheless, the proposal was sent to four national field representatives who returned it with high praise and recommendations.

\[^3\text{Ibid.}\]
After the proposal had been approved and funded, it was sent to members of an interagency group within the Office of Education. The purpose was to seek program commitments for the Project that would possibly result in additional funds. Responses offering some aid were received from the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund the planning phase of the early childhood unit and from the National Science Foundation to fund an experiment in developing curriculum in data processing for inner high school youths. These two programs that received early support in terms of money resources ultimately proved to be the most successful and long-lasting in contributing to the community's welfare. Today, both are still popular with parents and are as effective with students as they were when the program began. The impact that these programs have had upon the community will be discussed later.

The Project was now prepared to move forward in the effort to achieve its objectives, realizing that they were always subject to change. Nevertheless, the main thrusts were stated to be as follows:

1. To demonstrate effective de facto local community control of the ten schools involved in the Project in the areas of policy-making, administration, staffing, and curriculum development to the degree possible within the regulations of the Government of the District of Columbia, and the policies of the District of Columbia Board of Education

2. To demonstrate efficient administrative decentralization of the ten-school sub-system which extends from pre-school through the twelfth grade and to adult education

3. To develop extended day community schools which would offer a comprehensive program providing self-improvement opportunities to all segments of the community on a schedule that is virtually around-the-clock, and around the year

4. To demonstrate that the schools are accountable to the community for the educational tasks which they undertake in terms of the quality of performance of the students and the competencies of the staff in carrying out these tasks
5. To make the schools the focus of a broad and evolving community problem-solving effort to upgrade the health, social, economic, and educational status of the community residents

6. To work out dynamic, efficient, and viable processes between the community and the District of Columbia public school system in order to arrive at goals, policies, and operation of the Project and to insure productive mechanisms for changes in the future

7. To demonstrate and document a model of excellence in urban education possibly to either be replicated elsewhere or used to provide guidelines for other projects over an extended time period

From these objectives came the educational requirements of the community which were expressed as improved and more relevant curriculum, expanded community involvement in schools, greater and improved relationship of teaching staff with the community, expanded psychological and counselling services, better job opportunities and placement, and more class space. As a follow-up of these requirements, and in view of the stated goals of the Project, the Council worked toward achieving the following purposes:

1. Providing for a community education policy board to insure real involvement and participation

2. Developing exciting and relevant curriculum which would include on-the-job training, vocational guidance, black history, and cultural enrichment

3. Initiating an early childhood unit to reach children when they are very young, and aiding their families in raising them

4. Organizing pre-service and in-service training for teachers to assist them in responding more adequately to the community's educational needs and goals

5. Finding ways for the schools and community to work together so as to help those residents with personal and health problems through the establishment of a child guidance and health clinic

6. Working for improved equipment and adequate facilities in order to reduce overcrowding and to help prevent dropouts and juvenile delinquency
7. Utilizing as many of the members of the community as possible in order to provide jobs, raise income levels of families, and to develop career training in human service roles and employment programs rotating around the school.

With objectives and purposes in place, and with funding now approved, the urgency for implementation was apparent. Almost immediately a problem arose in the area of policy. The question: what would be the relationship of the Community Planning Council to the District of Columbia government and to the District of Columbia Board of Education? It was acknowledged by the Council that the purposes as stated would have to be achieved within the context of existing legal relationships between these two arms of government. The District of Columbia Corporation Counsel (legal arm of the District Government) had already indicated in an opinion in January 1968 that "public officials may not without statutory authorization delegate their government powers." This meant that the District of Columbia Board of Education was not free to delegate to the Council the powers that it sought whether it wanted to or not. In the same opinion, however, the Corporation Counsel stated that "there is nothing in the statutes which would prevent the Board of Education from seeking and acting upon the views, advice, and recommendations of citizens groups of an advisory nature so long as the ultimate authority over educational matters in the public school system remained with the Board of Education." With this ruling as a basis, an understanding was developed with the District of Columbia public schools which agreed to de facto powers for the Planning Council with de jure powers remaining with the District of Columbia Board of Education. ⁴

⁴Ibid.
The direction that the Anacostia Project would take became unmistakably clear. Almost with a single stroke it implemented a program that benefitted both students and parents. Although first priority had been accorded the Project Organization and Community Participation component, the initial grant was for the improvement of reading. The "Updated Reading" proposal was approved by the Office of Education in February 1969. The program provided additional personnel to assist in improving reading instruction. A master teacher was approved for each of the Project's eight elementary schools, along with the paraprofessional positions for community residents in the form of a community reading assistant for each classroom teacher. The assistants were given two weeks of pre-training prior to entering the classrooms with the understanding that training would continue and that responsibilities of the assistants would be increased as they became better trained. The reading assistants were mostly parents and relatives of children who attended the schools. They were screened and selected by a committee of parents and community residents who often waived educational requirements in favor of "proper" attitudes towards children and the community.

Community reading assistants enter classrooms. A group of ninety community reading assistants entered the classrooms after completing their pre-training. Because their training period had been short, questions arose relative to their preparedness to function. A meeting was held with teachers and assistants in an effort to explain to both teachers and assistants the procedures that would be followed, but a group of teachers who were disenchanted with the idea took issue with how the
program was being implemented. They indicated their discontent by leaving the meeting. Those teachers and assistants who remained aired their difficulties with the program, raised questions, and in many cases offered positive suggestions. After the meeting, the Washington Teachers' Union agreed to the selection of two teachers who would meet with the other teachers at the Project schools to allay unfounded fears by listening to questions that might arise. Problems and questions were to be referred to the project administration and, when necessary, to the Area Planning Council to be resolved. Local press coverage of the incident made much of the "conflict" between teachers and paraprofessionals, but the problems were gradually solved and relationships improved between the two groups. By working together to gain an understanding of the program, parents and school personnel were brought together in respect to other school problems and the overall relationships between home and school improved.\(^5\)

Permanent officers selected, project moves forward. By May 1969, a project director, a program developer, and a deputy director for management had been appointed. Then, in August 1969, the Project Organization and Community Participation component was funded and partially staffed. During the intervening period, the Council had been active developing position descriptions, screening personnel, and recommending to the District of Columbia Board of Education those persons who were to be hired. The Council had also, through its task forces, revised and added to the curriculum via its Updated Reading program. It

\(^5\)Ibid.
had become an incorporated body so that it could enter into separate contracts and receive funds, and the Planning Council had signed a "Memorandum of Understanding" with the Washington Teachers' Union and the District of Columbia Board of Education which enabled it to transfer to other parts of the school system dissatisfied personnel who wanted to leave Anacostia. By the end of calendar year 1969 the Council had supervised the election of the first Anacostia School Board, and the elected board had received two weeks of training in policy and procedures. Participation in the election process by members of the community was less than had been expected, but if the fact that citizens of Washington, D.C. had been disenfranchised for such a long period is considered, then any response to the elective process, especially from a community comprised of mostly low-income people, is remarkable.

There were those skeptics who doubted the feasibility of community people fulfilling a prominent role in the operation of schools. The community residents actually helped antagonize many members of the school system by proclaiming that they could do a better job of educating their children than the teachers (were doing). Certainly (they were told) they could do no worse. This feeling on the part of the community resulted more from the frustration that was prevalent because schools were failing in their mission to help inner city children than from any unusual confidence in their own abilities. The high expectations and the esteem that low income residents had held for schools had eroded to the extent that they believed that their only hope would be to take over and attempt to reform the schools themselves.
Fortunately, within the system there were those who were willing to involve the community in the attempt to make the schools more responsive, and they were resolute in insisting that there should be a real chance for the experiment in community control to succeed. Included in this group of persons was Dr. William Manning, Superintendent of District of Columbia schools, who became a national spokesman for the movement. Most of the District of Columbia School Board of Education members were also in favor of more community input at this time. Advocacy on the part of the presidents of District of Columbia Teachers College, Federal City College, and Washington Technical Institute, and by portions of the faculty of Howard University proved to be an additional asset. On the other hand, some members of the superintendent’s staff chose either to attempt to stall the effort or completely ignored it. The assistant superintendent in charge of personnel, the associate superintendent in charge of budget and finance, and the assistant superintendent in charge of procurement and business operations left the system rather than support the concept. One remarked that he did not want to be a part of a system where one unit was "managed by exception" rather than being subjected to the same (bureaucratic) requirements as everyone else. Of the staff that remained, many often closed their doors to the "people from the community" or made themselves "unavailable" by referring community representatives to subordinates who could not make decisions. In order to help overcome some of the resistance, the Superintendent of Schools set up a Special Projects Division. The division was placed on the same level with the other major departments and the head reported directly to the Superintendent.
In addition to the opposition to the Project that came from the administrative bureaucracy of the system, perhaps even a greater challenge—especially during the first year—was that emanating from within the Project. The most penetrating resistance was shown by teachers who gave lip-service to the idea and then showed their complete disdain by rejecting the in-service training that was being conducted by universities and consultants. The unhappy teachers refused to attend meetings of the local and area boards and then complained that they were not being kept informed. They showed their rejection of the community reading assistants either by not letting them help in ways that they could or by turning the entire lesson over to them in order to prove them incompetent. Parents became upset when teachers informed them that in-service activities required teachers to spend an inordinate amount of time away from the children even though community reading assistants replaced them and used the time for reinforcement of learning skills supposedly in accord with the teacher's direction. Teachers also influenced some parents to object to the new approaches to learning that were being instituted by Project instructional personnel.

**Project moves towards realization of first year's goals.** In spite of the many obstacles, the Project proceeded toward the realization of the goals and objectives that had been described in the Scope of Work approved for the first year by the Office of Education. In addition, during the first year the Project staff also wrote proposals and planned for a data processing program at the Ballou High School and for the early childhood program (Head Start). In each case, the most difficult problem
was trying to locate suitable and competent leadership for the programs. The incredible time lapse between the funding of programs and filling even the top positions covered as much as a year or more. This, along with the fact that the funding for the Project was temporary and was assured only from one fiscal year to the next, made it extremely unlikely that services of the best and most experienced workers could always be obtained. Consequently, many top positions were filled by local persons who were not far enough removed from the local scene to be expected to make the substantive changes that were often needed. Some critical positions were never filled because persons deemed qualified by the Planning Council--and later the area board--were not available. Attempts to remedy the leadership problem were made by resorting to in-service sensitivity workshops and by using consultants who were experienced in utilizing the community in an effort to bring about change. Quite unexpectedly, though, parents were more responsive to the innovative ideas in regard to the participation of students in the decision-making process than were some teachers and administrators who resented students having any say in the operation of the schools.

Anacostia preschool and Ballou data processing added. By the close of the first year, the Project had two components in place, they were the Updated Reading Program and Project Organization and Community Participation. The Anacostia Preschool (Head Start) and the Ballou Data Processing programs were added midway the second year. The Preschool proved to be exceedingly popular from the start. The number of applicants for the available spaces in the program were double the number
that had been funded. Excellent leadership was provided this program by a director who was ready and willing to do everything possible to develop a first-rate program. As a result, the Anacostia Preschool became a model for the city and for the nation. All services required by Head Start guidelines were provided and were adequately performed by professional and paraprofessional staffs. Parent groups (required in each of the twenty classrooms) were active as volunteers and served to hold the "family teams" together. They were persistent in their utilization of the career ladders that were provided at local colleges and universities as scholarships were granted to those parents and workers who aspired to improve themselves.

The first Ballou data processing proposal was written by Dr. Reuben Pierce, present assistant superintendent of Region I, District of Columbia public schools. The proposal stressed the need for an opportunity for inner city youths to learn data processing and to be trained in the operation of computers. A curriculum was recommended that was intended to result in job placement at the entry level for average and above average students, and the program was designed to attract students of a sufficient interest level that they would be directed into some of the more academic subjects that made use of computer programming—mathematics, science, business.8

Like the preschool program, the number requesting the courses in data processing far exceeded the number of places that were available. The National Science Foundation had approved funds that were to be used

only in an experiment to develop curriculum for inner city high school students. The guidelines provided that the total students involved should not exceed forty, and the total number of classes involved should not be in excess of four. When 150 students (many of whom were seniors who wanted to make computers their careers) signed up for the program, a dilemma was created. The hope was that additional funds to be provided by the Office of Education would allow the 110 extra students to be enrolled. The National Science Foundation reluctantly agreed to the arrangement, but funds to provide for the additional students were not made available until the following year. The National Science Foundation threatened to withdraw its funding unless the number for their part of the experiment was limited as was intended. Because the program had experienced other difficulties during the first year, it was decided that beginning with the second year, the proposal would be restricted to the number that had been approved by the National Science Foundation, and that the program would use the consultants furnished by the foundation. A new director was appointed, also.

Because the National Science Foundation was interested in the effort being replicated within the District as well as national, the District of Columbia Public Schools Division of Instruction was called upon to closely monitor the program. With the beginning of the second year, however, the Division decided that the Ballou design was a "needless repetition" of what was already being taught in District high schools. It was further determined that the program had not proved to be "cost effective" and, therefore, it would not be supported. Realizing the potential of computer training for inner city youth, the newly appointed
school superintendent rescued the program. Then, utilizing the data processing courses as the basis for her action, the next step was the organization of a special math/science minischool at Ballou. The emphasis on entry level skills for employment was maintained, and equal emphasis was placed upon computer training for those who would be entering college. Teachers of mathematics, science, social studies, and other disciplines were encouraged to employ the computer in the teaching of their courses. The new emphasis caused computer training and the math/science program to become nationally known for its contributions to the field of computer education at the high school level.

The efficacy of the in-service education component. There were other short-term programs initiated by the Project that were effective. The In-Service Education component, which provided intensive and extensive training of the staff, was necessary because competent personnel in many fields were not available through regular school channels. The deficit meant that if the Project wanted an improved staff, it would have to provide the resources for accomplishing the necessary training. Moreover, since the Project was a pioneer in the large-scale employment of paraprofessionals, it was also incumbent upon it to develop a career ladder by which these personnel could advance.

As a result of the in-service efforts, a large number of teachers who had not been qualified obtained certification and a number of the professional staff received advanced degrees. Paraprofessionals who had not completed high school received the General Education Development certification, and some continued to study for the associate and
bachelor degrees. It was reported that during the school year 1970-71 there were seventy-five professional employees studying for the master of arts degree in Education and Guidance and that there were more than one hundred paraprofessionals and clerical workers who were taking courses at the college level in an effort to improve their skills and general intelligence. The in-service education program was in keeping with one of the stated purposes of the Project which was to offer comprehensive programs providing self-improvement opportunities to all segments of the community and to make available in-service education for teachers so that they might respond more adequately and intelligently to the community's needs and goals.9

Project organization and community participation shows promise. Foremost among the accomplishments of the Anacostia Project were the benefits that accrued to those who participated in the Project Organization and Community Participation component. Included were the paid parents and volunteers who prior to the advent of the Project were largely unskilled, had been unemployed or underemployed, and who were indifferent or dilatory toward the public schools. The question that was usually posed by them was, what's the pay-off for me? Participants, though, soon began to realize that there was a reward for them of freedom and satisfaction that they had not heretofore experienced. So that, although their original motive may have been personal or job-seeking, ultimately their interests changed to those that expressed the goals and purposes of the Project. As the participants came to understand some of the complexities

of schools and education, they moderated some of the earlier pronounce-
ments by which they condemned the schools.

By the close of the second full year of operation, the Project had
been audited and had been subjected to two reviews by outside groups.
Both commendations and recommendations were received and indications
were that progress toward the goals and objectives was being made. The
dissidents and doubters had either left the scene or had been converted,
or, they were patiently awaiting the chance for a renewed attack. The
newly elected area boards were proud of the new programs that had been
started as a result of their initiative. They were imbued by the
realization that a better trained staff was now in place and directed by
officers whom they had chosen; they were ecstatic over the fact that
fourteen new buildings or major additions would soon relieve the
criminally overcrowded conditions that existed in the schools prior to
their intervention; and they were satisfied now that they had a con-
tractual relationship with the District of Columbia Board of Education
that outlined specific "powers" that had been delegated to the Anacostia
Area Board. Certain procedures and practices that originated in Ana-
costia had already been adopted by the system—the joint selection of
school principals by the community and the administration, and the hold-
ing of open board meetings which permitted the community to report their
concerns. On the horizon for the city, also, was the practice of allow-
ing members of the community to participate in and make comments at bud-
get hearings as was being done in Anacostia. All of these indicators
served to confirm the value of community input.
Members of the community were gratified, too, that test scores indicated that there had been some improvement in the cognitive areas. The reading test scores of children in elementary schools were significantly higher than the scores of children in similar inner city neighborhoods, although the scores for the age groups tested failed to reach the national norms.¹⁰

Project put to extreme test. With the coming of the Nixon administration, the positive gains cited above were not sufficient to satisfy the new staff at the Office of Education. The Project was without a project officer from the Office of Education for more than a year. Largely ignored, it was left to drift from one department to the next. Not only was President Nixon listening to Patrick Moynihan who advocated a period of "benign neglect" in respect to federal funding for social legislation, but he also was not overly enamored of the District of Columbia since its citizens failed to support him during the recent election. The new Commissioner of Education stated that he was more concerned with career development and accountability than with community control. "How," he queried, "could educators expect that non-educators could succeed where the professional educators had failed?" Added to this predicament was the selection of a new Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia who stated unequivocally that the "last thing that I need is a group of local boards running around expecting me to respond to them." Although he made no immediate moves against the existing boards, his early attitude toward them was passive and little comfort was accorded to those who were advocates of community control.

With these conditions prevailing, it was not difficult for the new Director of Experimental Schools of the agency within the Office of Education, who was made responsible for the Project, to begin immediately an effort to disband the Project. His first attack was on the Project's financial support. Requiring a new proposal revision each quarter, he also demanded before his approval of a grant extension that there be documentation that showed specific progress toward each of the stated behavioral objectives. Even when such documentation was available, he still insisted upon written verification by "an outside expert" in each component field prior to the approval of funds. The delays caused by the restraints made it almost impossible to maintain programs, much less implement any new parts of programs simply because no commitments could be made for personnel, equipment, supplies or whatever might have been needed to implement the program.

On the first of June 1971, an intern who had just completed the Office of Education management program for new recruits, was appointed the new project officer to serve as liaison person between the Office of Education and the Anacostia Project. At about the same time, the Director of Experimental Schools commissioned an outside evaluator to conduct what was purported to be the "final" look at the Project. The evaluation, which was begun in June, was conducted under the direction of the new Office of Education project officer during the summer vacation period when only a few of the programs were in session and while schools, except for the summer program, were closed. The report was completed and distributed in September 1971. The chief evaluator apologized for his limitations, but he offered recommendations which he
felt would make the Project more effective, and while he suggested a more structured and higher level formative evaluation for the Project, he, nevertheless, had this to say:

The crucial question which is being raised in this study is not the importance of a need for high achievement in the academic areas of reading, communication, and mathematics. The question is in which educational context will it be accomplished. The findings of this study support the position that the Anacostia Project deals with the realities of man's existence and plans organizational structures which relate to these human aspirations, motivations and needs. ... Urban education must provide experiences which include the improvement of intellectual abilities, but support the total needs of man socially, culturally, physically, and vocationally.

In spite of the favorable reviews, and in complete disregard of the recommendation from the latest commissioned evaluation that the Anacostia Project be not only strengthened but that it receive a larger commitment and more support from the Office of Education and the District of Columbia public schools, the Director of Experimental Schools decided differently. On October 13, 1971 before either the Director of the Project or the Superintendent of Schools had seen the evaluation, a letter was sent to the Director of the Project by Robert Binswanger, Director of Experimental Schools, which stated that the Project was to be phased out within the next school year. Among the reasons given was that the "Anacostia Project has been unable to successfully document that it has made a significant progress toward the fulfillment of its original objectives." The letter was disquieting, to say the least. The initial response from the Anacostia community was stunned disbelief. Other areas of the city exhibited mixed reactions. Those who supported

---

the efforts were disappointed, while those who were against community control were elated that the experiment had been labeled a failure and said, "I told you so."

What followed this traumatic experience is symbolic of what happens in a community which has experienced, only for a short while, the joys and rewards of participating with their peers in an effort to control their own destinies. That progress had been made toward the goals set by the community was evident from the statements that came from the officials of the Office of Education, themselves, and by their hired evaluators. But, the Director of Experimental Schools failed to see and understand the larger purposes of education as had been viewed and adduced by Project participants. It was not important to him that a community had spoken, and although they, too, were interested in achievement for their children, they realized that only when the experiences were total for them and their children were the process and products of education effective and real for them. Here was a classic example of government interference, even though well intentioned, which was working to the detriment of those it purported to serve.

The following chapter discusses a second phase of the Project which was continued as the "Response to Educational Needs Project." After a short time under the Office of Education, it was transferred to the National Institute of Education, a new agency which required some philosophical and personnel changes, but which was amenable to the new perspective which encouraged the wide participation of parent and community in the education process.
CHAPTER IV
THE ANACOSTIA COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIVISION
PHASE II

The Community Mobilizes for Action

If officials of the Office of Education expected the Anacostia community in response to its letter of termination to "fold its wings and silently slip away," it was in for a rude awakening. Members of the area board and community leaders were swift in rising to the need and in assuaging the effects of the initial shock.

First indications were that movement would be against the Project. At the same time that Binswanger addressed his letter to the director of the Project announcing his decision, he dispatched a news release to the daily press. The release was received by the paper and used immediately. The director of the Project first received the information when a reporter telephoned to inquire "why the Project had failed?" The question was an indication that the newspaper had already accepted the Binswanger version. The news article was followed with a quick editorial which stated that the Anacostia Project was dead.¹ Then appeared another article which accused Project officials of misspending funds and of gross mismanagement.²

As word spread through the community about the fate of the Project, community residents learned that a delegation of twenty local board members and project staff would be going to the office of the Commissioner of Education to discuss the matter. Community leaders, who were not necessarily a part of the organized Project itself, perceived the issue as being larger than the Project. It was rather viewed as having community-wide concern and the total community felt that it should be represented in the delegation. Accordingly, the conference was set with the Commissioner, but instead of twenty persons as had been expected, 250 people descended upon the usually staid headquarters of the Office of Education. The press stated that the crowd was made up principally of those who had a personal or vested interest in the Project continuing which were the employees of the Project and Antipoverty workers. This, of course, was not the case. There were representatives in the protesting group from professional societies, church groups, the Washington Teachers' Union, the Congressional Black Caucus, labor unions, social service agencies, the mayor's office and from the D.C. Board of Education. Formal protests were sent to the Commissioner from the Superintendent of Schools, individual D.C. Board of Education members, and from the Anacostia Area Board.

The Commissioner and his staff were overwhelmed by the response and demonstration. The Director of Experimental Schools, who had issued the letter, alleged that he had been misled and "had no sufficient time to prepare for such a large group." After about three hours of protesting in a noisy confrontation with Binswanger, a meeting was held in the
auditorium of Health, Education and Welfare. The aim was to placate the crowd through speeches. The people were not mollified, so a subsequent meeting was held in a conference room where the people could engage in a dialogue with the Commissioner's staff and raise pertinent questions. The citizens, vowing that they would not leave the building until the questions that they raised had been answered to their satisfaction, finally agreed that a smaller delegation representing the Project and the community would meet with the director later that day. Meanwhile, representatives from the Project and the community met and outlined strategies which included a demand for detailed explanation including cogent reasons for the precipitate action that had been taken. The delegation was also instructed to demand that the Project be given a chance to appeal the verdict of the Director of Experimental Schools with the appeal to answer only the charges that would come out of the scheduled meeting. These demands were acceded to, and it was further agreed that the final decision as to the fate of the Project would come from the Commissioner of Education and not his subordinate.

D. C. Board of Education Authorizes New Division

What followed the meeting at the Office of Education were rallies and a display of cohesiveness not heretofore witnessed in the Washington, D.C. area. The primary impetus for the enthusiasm came from members of the community who met almost every night and organized themselves into task forces to work on specific sections of the appeal. It was made clear that the D.C. Board of Education was the legal entity and that
its support was mandatory for a successful waging of the fight to save the Project. Nor was the District of Columbia Board irresolute in extending its full backing. It began by informing the Superintendent of Schools that the Project schools would remain as a unit regardless of the decision coming from the Commissioner's office. The Superintendent was then directed to reorganize the school system and to establish immediately the Anacostia Division. The new unit would be on a par with the other three divisions of the school system and would have the same basic administrative structure.\(^3\)

There were already some programs in the new division. In addition to the regular school offerings, the Anacostia Board had been able to have instituted other programs that were not dependent on the Office of Education grant funds that had been responsible for the Project. They included: a special education unit, the Head Start program, Follow Through, Ballou Data Processing program and Title I, ESEA. To strengthen further the new division, eight schools--two junior high and six elementary--were added; plus two schools were being constructed to relieve the overcrowding and would be ready the following year. The increase brought the total number of schools in the Division to twenty-one with a combined enrollment of more than 21,000.

The Project staff's determination to continue and to increase the effort toward a successful appeal was enhanced by the support they received. The Superintendent of Schools, taking a cue from the Board of Education, made positive moves to rescue the program. He appointed

\(^3\)Minutes of the District of Columbia Board of Education, November 1971.
full-time consultants to assist with documentation and a consultant firm to aid in the preparation of the grant proposal for the next year.

**Unexpected Assistance Received from Law Firm**

The Project was elated when it received unexpected assistance from Covington and Burling, one of the largest and most prestigious law firms in the country. Besides desiring to render a public service, members of the firm recognized that an important legal question was at stake: "How much power should be wielded by a subordinate government agency?" When the Project officers were asked how the attorneys might be helpful, they replied that technical assistance would be needed in documentation and writing. This the attorneys agreed to do, but with the understanding that their appeal document would be independently prepared since they wanted to deal with the principle involving the abuse of bureaucratic power. With these considerations, a document entitled "A Memorandum of Law in Support of the Appeal of the Anacostia Community School Project" was prepared by them.* The memorandum was divided into two parts: Part I held that the Office of Education had failed to justify a decision to terminate the Project under standards to which it was bound, and that it had failed to explain the inconsistency of its decisions with other Office of Education evaluations; Part II of the memorandum asserted that the decision made by the Director of Experimental Schools was derived in violation of the Project's due

---

*This document was submitted to the U.S. Commissioner of Education on December 6, 1971.
process rights to a notice and hearing, and that any initial decision by the director was in violation of the separation of functions requirement of the Administrative Procedures Act. The twenty-eight page document covered each point of the Director of Experimental School's contention that the Project had failed, and offered evidence and proof that the claims were either unfounded, unreasonable or simply not true. Part I cited one court case after another in which the same principles had been violated. The memorandum stated that "None of Director Binswanger's five specific findings . . . which the director indicated to be dispositive points in the analysis that led to the decision indicates even a consideration of the standard of susceptibility." The significance of this was that the focus of Binswanger's findings was on past performances rather than on future capabilities. Since, according to the memorandum, the findings were not dispositive "or even relevant" to the standard to be applied, legally the Project did not need to respond to them. Nevertheless, a response was given. Part II indicated that under the Separation of Powers Act, any officer who took part in the staff investigation of the Project was precluded from participation in the decision-making process. Therefore, stated the memorandum, Binswanger acted illegally when he informed the director of the Project that the program was being phased out, only the Commissioner of Education could do that after proper investigation, report, and extension of due process.


5 Ibid., p. 12.

6 Ibid., p. 27.
The conclusions advanced by the memorandum were as follows: that the decision to terminate the Project's grant was arbitrary, capricious, and was an abuse of discretion. Furthermore, it violated the Project's due process procedural rights to notice and opportunity to be heard.\(^7\) In order to remedy the statutory defects of the proceedings thus far, it was stated that the commissioner should appoint an impartial panel of hearing examiners, independent of the Experimental School's Division, to conduct a thorough investigation and hearing of the case and to take into account any appropriate evidence offered by either the Project or the Office of Education staff prior to making the final decision.\(^8\)

**The Project's Appeal to the Commissioner**

Along with the memorandum from the law firm of Covington and Burling, there was the official appeal from the Board of Education and the Superintendent of D.C. Schools. The appeal had been largely prepared by the community and by the Project staff. Stressed were the positive evaluations that had been received by the Project, including the one that had been recently commissioned by Binswanger. It also pointed out that the change of the objectives and the primary interests of the Project with the introduction of new Office of Education personnel were *ex post facto*, and that the Project should have been evaluated only on the basis of already established and agreed upon objectives that were in existence prior to the advent of new personnel. Any subsequent

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 27.

\(^8\)Ibid.,
objectives should have been developed by both. The appeal also cited evidence of accomplishments by the Project based on stated objectives. It was further recommended that funding be continued, and increased, with the proviso that the three parties to the agreement--the Office of Education, the D.C. Public Schools, and the Anacostia community--sit down and decide on the role that each should play to guarantee the Project's future success. The appeal from school authorities fully utilized the resources of the community. School principals, who formerly had been less than enthusiastic about the community, now proclaimed the worth of the Project. Said one principal, "I don't care what anyone says, we were always two years behind (in achievement scores) and now we are on grade level." The principal also stated that his school, whose children came mostly from a nearby public housing project, was now serving as "an entire social agency." Other principals and teachers spoke of how well community and schools were now working together, and about the new relationships that had been welded with the home. The television media (especially the local talk shows) sought to have a discussion of the issues on their channels. They found the community willing, but the Commissioner's office refused to appear. The community had a further supporter in Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman of the Sub-committee on Health, Labor, Education, and Welfare, who had championed the legislation that originally approved the Project. He sent staff members to visit the site. They were impressed by both the need and the attempted solutions of the problems by the community.

---

As a matter of fact, upon seeing the conditions that existed, the chief of the delegation from the senator's office conveyed to Senator Magnuson the need for additional funding. Anticipating the support that could be expected from the Senator, a group, led by the president of the D.C. Board of Education, called upon him and informed him of the crisis. The results were that the Commissioner's office was called upon by the Senator to explain what was happening to a project which had previously been reported in the Congressional Record as "doing well."

The Commissioner of Education found himself in an embarrassing dilemma. Facing what could be an undesirable legal suit being brought by another government agency (the D.C. Schools), and with questions being raised so vehemently by the community and by the Senator through whose committee legislation and funding for the Office of Education must flow, the Commissioner realized that any decision rendered by him had to be beyond question as to its fairness and profundity. He, therefore, called together his senior staff, including Blacks, and he decided to forego the oral appeal from both the Project and from the legal firm.

After meeting with his staff, the Commissioner summoned the Superintendent of Schools, the president of the D.C. Board of Education, the chairman of the Anacostia Area Board, and Project staff to a meeting in his office. The following decision was rendered: 1) The Anacostia Project as it was conceived at that time would be terminated, 2) the Project would be replaced by another effort which focused on the same geographic area but under considerably more supervision by the Office of Education, 3) the amount of funding would be essentially the same,
4) the plan for the "new proposal" would include the two original components of the Anacostia Project—reading and Project Organization and Community Participation—with an additional emphasis on mathematics, and 5) the school system, rather than the community would be administratively responsible to the Office of Education, and in turn would receive advice and counsel from them.

There were some members of the Anacostia Area Board and the D.C. Board of Education who felt that complete vindication was the only acceptable decision, and they sought to continue the fight. However, after considerable discussion among Area and D.C. Board of Education members, and upon the advice of the Superintendent of Schools and the director of the Anacostia Project, it was decided to accept the verdict of the Commissioner. The law firm of Covington and Burling left the decision up to the community since it was clear that in order for them to proceed with a suit it would require the full sanction and support of the D.C. Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools. The agreement to accept the decision was based on the following: 1) the area would retain the funds, 2) even though all of the original terms of the grant could not now be carried out, the two oldest and most stable components, plus one additional program would be included in the new proposal, 3) the new project would become a segment of the new Anacostia Division rather than being the total program, 4) a strong community involvement component would be included, and 5) the program was scheduled to become a part of the new National Institute of Education.
There would have to be a transition period during the time that the new proposal was being developed. As was to be expected, this would necessitate a lull in the Anacostia Project programs, some of which were to be completely phased out. Many of the participants took advantage of the delay and accepted positions that they were now qualified for because of the experience that they had gained while employed with the Anacostia Project. Eighty-three paraprofessionals were absorbed into the Title I program of the school system. Some joined other agencies of the District and federal governments. Still others, who had been supervisors and officers in the Project, decided that they would return to teaching.

The greater part of the next school year was spent in developing a proposal that would be acceptable to the National Institute of Education. The Superintendent of Schools, seeking to comply with the dictates of the Office of Education, appointed a task force to develop the new proposal. The first efforts of the group resulted in a plan which was opposite in concept to that of the community component under the Anacostia Project. The emphasis was stated to be on "cultural identity, environment and experiences, with concentration solely on the learner and the cognitive." The "community" was mentioned in the beginning, then scarcely at all afterwards. It was also noted that the relationship between the D.C. School Board and the Area and local boards "is primarily indirect."^10

---

When the plan was presented to the Anacostia community, the reaction was violent, primarily because the community had not been consulted by the task force in the development of the document. The vice-chairman of the Area Board was so incensed that he literally tore the proposal to shreds. At the meeting at which the proposal was presented, the Anacostia Project Director (now assistant superintendent of the Anacostia Division), recognizing that an impasse existed, suggested that the proposal be revised and that there be no substantive decisions made regarding the proposal unless community members of the task force were present. The suggestion was accepted and the proposal entitled the "Response to Educational Needs Project" was developed.

**Project Placed under the National Institute of Education**

The implementation of the new project was further delayed when it was placed under the National Institute of Education. The agency had some difficulty trying to adjust the program as it had been designed into a research based proposal. It was asserted that the Institute did not support "service delivery projects," although it would welcome "studies of new approaches." Questions that arose during the deliberations on the proposal were: should grass roots organizations be publicly supported as a substitute for the bureaucracy? should they be considered a supplement to the traditional enforcement mechanisms? or, would public support of grass roots organizations co-opt the vitality of the have-nots fighting for their rights.

In spite of these and many other questions that were raised, the National Institute of Education approved the proposal and became the
grant agency for the new project. Several revisions and rewrites were necessary to assure that the Response to Educational Needs Project fitted the philosophy of the agency and at the same time provided for the needs of the children and the community. Public school officials and members of the Institute staff, plus consultants, worked together to develop a proposal that was satisfactory to all.

It was agreed that the primary purpose of the new proposal would be to raise the achievement levels of young people in the Anacostia schools, and it was hypothesized that attainment of this goal would enhance the future progress of the Anacostia community. To accomplish the goals, it was decided that the Response to Educational Needs Project would focus on two major areas of activity: 1) staff development for teachers of reading and mathematics, and 2) supportive parent/community organization and education. While the programs as designed furnished some "services" to the schools and community, the interest of the funding agency was in the process by which services were delivered. The experiment would provide the opportunity to study the efficacy of several methodologies for assessing parental outcomes and student outcomes, teacher outcomes and student outcomes, and their relationship to each other.

The designs for the new program are presented. A discussion of the program and procedures of the Response to Educational Needs Project is being adequately covered in a series of studies being prepared by Gibbony Associates, a consultant firm engaged by the National Institute of Education. Appearing in February 1979 was a detailed
evaluation and analysis of data concerning the Project. While the document gives some attention to the community's role, the primary interest of the study is in the cognitive areas. Numerous tables, charts, and much analysis are provided to portray the achievement of students who were participants in the Response to Educational Needs program.

In order to gain knowledge and perspective of the "process" employed by the Response to Educational Needs Project, five designs are being included in this study. There are designs for reading, mathematics, parent/community involvement, formative evaluation, and management. The designs were accompanied by a time chart and strategies that indicated responsibility for the input to accomplish an operation, what the process would be, and what output was expected.

These designs describe the main program activities of the Project. The activities were organized by program areas and by strategies within each of the program areas. They constitute an operationalized statement of the program that was described in the original proposal. Further details and planning and analysis were required for the implementation of the program activities, but that was the task of the day-to-day staff.

The designs were implemented and the programs were monitored by the National Institute of Education staff. Modifications were permitted when needed, and when they were approved by, and in accordance with

the recommendations of the Response to Educational Needs formative evaluation unit.¹²

The program continued from 1973 to 1977, after which federal funds were no longer available. Phase II of the Project differed from Phase I in its organizational structure. The difference was due to a change in direction which focused on staff development of teachers instead of working directly with students. With heavy emphasis being placed upon research and training, there were large numbers of professional workers. Included were the director of the Project, two associate directors—one for reading and one for mathematics—sixteen assistant directors of reading, six assistant directors of mathematics, and fifteen teacher trainers of aides. Besides these professionals who were directly engaged in the training of teachers in the classrooms, there were six educational research and planning associates, a public information officer, a community educational trainer, and a program assistant. These forty-nine professionals worked only with the teachers and aides in the schools; they bore no responsibility for the students.

In addition to these workers were more than eighty instructional aides who assisted in classrooms by reinforcing teaching techniques used by teachers, and the twenty-seven community organizers whose responsibility it was to keep parents and the community alert as to what was happening in the schools. They were in some measure responsible for the welfare of children and they delivered social type services to them.

An additional change that occurred during Phase II was evident in the make-up of the area board. The leadership had become more middle-class. They tended to perceive their mission more like that of the D.C. Board of Education with stress being placed on college preparatory subjects, standardized and achievement test scores, and with less attention and confidence being exhibited in guidance counselors and special subject teachers, especially in the elementary grades. They were still convinced, however, of the need for an active role for parents and the community.

**Phase II Comes to a Close**

Although it is too early to adequately assess the effectiveness of Phase II of the Project, certain aspects were apparent during the process. First, the teachers of elementary school children were much more receptive to the staff development with its focus on reading and mathematics than were the secondary school teachers. This was not unusual since secondary teachers consider themselves "specialists" in their subject fields, and they take a dim view of being called upon to teach basic skills. Comments from secondary teachers suggested that the funds could have been better spent on books and supplies. They failed to take into account the fact that books are completely useless if they are not read and understood by students. This suggests that perhaps reading and mathematics skills should be a functional teaching competency required for the certification of all teachers.

Some results from the summative evaluation of Phase II are now available, and although sufficient time has not elapsed to determine
whether teachers have benefitted by the new approaches that were offered to them, the product that has been reported by evaluators, thus far, ranged from good to inconclusive. Test scores of the control groups of children in reading and mathematics, who were not taught by teachers exposed to the program, have sometimes exceeded those of children in the experimental group. Gibbony attributes this anamoly to the fact that the Response to Educational Needs Project was not a "model program" with specific "guidelines." The emphases in the various schools of the Project were often entirely different from each other because the task forces, consisting of parents and faculty of each school, determined the particular needs of their school. Also it was assumed that the parent involvement would enhance pupil achievement but the relationship between community input and the achievement scores of children is still unclear. Gibbony did suggest, however, that parent involvement is, in and of itself, an important outcome, and it serves as a mechanism for allowing the communities to participate in the policies and the direction of the school.

The accomplishments and effectiveness of Phase II of the Anacostia experience involving both paid and volunteer parents and the community for a five-year period was summarized by the Anacostia Community Area Board in a report submitted to the D.C. Board of Education in March 1978. Beginning with the year 1973, the document outlined the Project's

14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
original mission, and then listed the following as achievements of the program:

1. Organization and creation of local boards for individual schools within the area which provided grass roots participation of members of the community in identifying problems and suggesting improvements through the local principal and regional superintendent to the central administration.

2. Provision of training to teach local board members about budgeting procedure, personnel matters, curriculum planning, and other topics important to their effective functioning.

3. Monitoring and overseeing the National Institute of Education funded Response to Educational Needs Project, making sure that the mandate was carried out, and aiding in the selection and evaluation of key personnel.

4. Assisting in the formulation of goals and objectives for the school district which reflected the particular concerns of the school community.

5. Promulgation of a policy for the region of preferential hiring of reading and mathematics teachers who would focus on many of the basic skills needed to survive and prosper in present day society.

6. Assistance in planning the design of and equipment of school buildings, and in the establishment of school boundaries that were fair and acceptable to all.

7. Participation in planning and developing budgets for personnel in new schools.

8. Promotion of special programs—notably the nationally recognized computer science program and the special science/math mini school at Ballou High School.

9. Surveying physical conditions in existing buildings for the purpose of correcting deficiencies and improving facilities as needed.

10. Screening of all prospective candidates for officer positions prior to recommendation for filling by the District of Columbia Board of Education.

11. Monitoring allocations and expenditures of federal funds to determine the proper pupil-to-staff and pupil-to-expenditure ratio.

In addition, the community board was mindful of the important contributions that were being made by parents who were paid workers. Board
members were concerned that parents not be subjected to a double standard in regard to decisions by the administration which affected personnel status, performance, pay and evaluation.\textsuperscript{16}

Finally, the Anacostia Community Area Board requested that the District of Columbia Board of Education continue the policy agreement that had insured effective parental involvement during the past decade. They pointed out that many of the practices begun in Anacostia had been replicated in other parts of the school system.\textsuperscript{17}

It is not surprising that the members of the Anacostia Community School Board would view their participation in the educational process of their community as positive and beneficial to the schools. This, then, serves as an indicator of the worth and effectiveness of "community control" under conditions perceived by the Anacostia Board. To determine whether others in the Anacostia community who were affected by the program of involvement felt that they had derived equal benefits to the extent that it changed their behavior and altered their lifestyles is the principal purpose of this study.

We will now examine the data that have been collected to see what extent other indicators are provided which suggest that the reforms and changes instituted by the parents and the community have favorably affected them and their children.


\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., pp. 3-12.
Traditionally, schools have not been willing to attempt the solution of broad social problems; nor can they be blamed for seeking to avoid areas for which they have not been trained and in which they lack expertise. And so, when the Anacostia community identified the school as the public agency best suited to serve as an anchoring facility and the principal instrument for achieving neighborhood stability and planning for upward mobility, there were outcries of opposition emanating from the schools. The community, however, persevered, and added to the school's responsibility of providing the basic skills necessary to participate in the current society, was that of helping the older members of the community to solve their socio-economic problems and achieve better and happier lives. The extent to which these ideals have been realized during the past eight years will be examined now.

The Anacostia Community School Project began its operation in an area that had been wracked by riots that followed the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. There were certain social indicators that were used to describe the quality of life as it existed in Anacostia at that time. Included were: (1) health conditions, (2) housing, and (3) socio-economic conditions. The overall picture, as described by the National Capital Planning Commission, was that "Problems within Anacostia are many and varied. There are pockets of physical deterioration ... haphazard development; inadequacies in schools and play space;
lack of appropriate physical and functional links to the rest of the city; and a tendency toward over-concentration of low-rent public housing in several sections.\textsuperscript{1}

In developing the attributes for the instruments used in the present study, the same indicators used by the National Capital Planning Commission were employed. Also, these were some of the same indicators used as a measure of progress in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 1976; in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women (1978) and in Dorothy K. Newman, et al., Protest, Politics and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions 1940-1975 (1978).

The surveys that were distributed to the select populations--board members (volunteer parent groups), paraprofessionals (paid parents), and the professionals (principals and teachers)--were all designed to gather data in categories suggested by the indicators. Where possible, a comparison has been made between conditions as they existed in 1969 with what exists today, concentrating primarily on what happened in the way of change in the schools and to the parents and citizens of Anacostia. An analysis of the data should reveal the extent to which there have been changes that demonstrate improvement in the socioeconomic levela and in the total lifestyle of the Anacostia citizens.

Using the census tracts for 1970, Table 1 shows "Composite Social Indicators for 1969" in project schools. It is significant to note the

TABLE 1
Composite of Social Indicators for Anacostia Tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract No.</th>
<th>Schools in Tract</th>
<th>Health Condition</th>
<th>Housing Condition</th>
<th>Socio-economic Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>Ballou Congress Heights</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>Savoy Birney</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>Douglass Moten</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>Johnson Turner</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>Green McGogney</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B = Best  
M = Medium  
W = Worst

Qualitative references for these tracts: M=medium, W=worst, and B=best. Comparison is made with 116 other census tracts in the District of Columbia.

None of the census tracts was rated "best" in any of the categories listed. On the other hand, in housing 70 percent were rated "worst" and in socio-economic conditions, 50 percent were rated "worst." This does not indicate an absence of leadership potential in the area, for there were ministers, social agency heads, parent teacher officials,

\(^2\)Office of Planning and Management, op. cit., pp. 39-41.
antipoverty workers, and other community residents of the total Anacostia area who were eligible for and interested in participation in the Project. Also some quality leadership emerged from the census tracts that were rated from medium to worst.

Even though the individuals covered by the surveys had not been interviewed to determine their categories prior to becoming a part of the Anacostia experience, it is not unreasonable to suspect that the majority of those who were hired to be trained for non-professional positions in the Project fitted into the categories as indicated by the percentages. They lived in the area; they sent their children to schools in the area; and they were seeking work in the Project at wages that were lower than the minimum wage for the Anacostia area; or, they were unemployed.

The tables that follow will provide further data which will help to determine the extent to which the community reached its goal of improving the lifestyle of its citizens. Perceptions of the unpaid workers (board members), the paraprofessionals (paid parents and community), and the professional workers: (principals and teachers), all of whom were participants in the Project, will be examined.

**Socio-Economic Status of Paid Parents Improves**

The data received from the non-professional employees of the Project revealed information relative to their present socio-economic status. Knowledge about their present employment status was necessary in order to ascertain whether they were now employed, and if they were, whether their present income and status were commensurate with the pay and training that they had received as employees of the Anacostia
Project. Table 2, "Employment of Anacostia Non-Professional Personnel in D.C. Schools and/or Other Government Agencies at the End of Federal Funding," revealed that 71 percent of the non-professionals employed by the Project during Phase I and 95 percent of those employed by the Project during Phase II were still with the District of Columbia public schools. This is an average of 83 percent for both phases combined. Some of the remaining respondents indicated that they were now working for the federal government; others had elected private employment, and a small number were no longer interested in working.

The status of these same workers (1973-1978) as measured by the amount of salary increases is shown in Table 3, "Progress of Non-Professional Employees as Measured by Increases in Average Salary." It is revealed that while the average salary for the non-professional at the end of Phase I (1972) was $5,822.00, and the workers were temporary; as of September 1979, the average salary of these same workers was $11,975.00, and their status is permanent. A further perusal of their General Service status indicated that a number of the former non-professional and unskilled workers had moved into the technical ranks. At the earlier date, the salary range was GS 3 to GS 6 (salary—$5,524.00 to $9,275.00). The present range is GS 3 to GS 11 (salary $8,366.00 to $22,656.00). The increases in salary were attained through promotions, regular and merit step increments, and cost-of-living raises. The average increase for the non-professional workers, after adjustment for inflation, was 39 percent.
### TABLE 2

**Employment and Retention of Anacostia Project (RENP) Non-Professional Personnel in D.C. Public Schools and/or Other Government Agencies at the End of Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Professional Personnel in ASCP end of Phase I (1971)</th>
<th>Total Employed</th>
<th>Transferred to Permanent Status D.C.</th>
<th>Transferred to Temporary Status D.C.</th>
<th>Total Employed 1978</th>
<th>% Employed End of Phase I</th>
<th>% Employed End of Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional Personnel in RENP end of Phase II (excluding transferees) (1977)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Professional Personnel from Phase I &amp; II employed in other D.C. and U.S. government agencies</td>
<td>Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83 percent are working for District of Columbia public schools and/or other District of Columbia and Federal Government agencies. The remaining are working in private industry, self-employed or are housewives who refused other employment. Three have died. None was reported unemployed.
TABLE 3

Progress of Non-Professional Personnel of Anacostia as Indicated by Increases in Average Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average salary of non-professional employees, 1978-79</td>
<td>$11,975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average salary of non-professional employees at the end of Phase I</td>
<td>5,822.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$6,153.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average percentage increase 39% (adjusted for inflation)*

GS level range 1972--GS 3 to GS 6 (salary $55.24 to $9,275.00)
GS level range 1978--GS 3 to GS 11 (salary $8,366.00 to $22,657)

*Increases attained through promotions, regular and merit step increments, and cost-of-living increases. Cost-of-living increases have averaged an aggregate total of 60% since 1972.

In order to ascertain whether the apparent improvements in socio-economic conditions as manifested by salary increases were being reflected by a comcomitant change usually associated with an acceptable lifestyle, Table 4, "Responses to Part C--Questionnaire for Non-Professionals," was prepared. The questions asked were of a personal nature and so it was necessary to state that answering these questions would be according to the discretion of the respondents. All, however, elected to answer the questions.

Included in the responses were data that revealed that 30 percent of the employees were now buying their homes or already owned them. (At the time that the Project began, only 11 percent of Anacostia residents owned or were buying their own homes.) Another 34 percent indicated that they were saving to buy a new home. A second positive indicator was that 93 percent of the employees now had some form of savings
TABLE 4
Responses to Part C--Questionnaire for Non-Professionals

The following are responses to Part C--Questionnaire for Non-Professional employees— which was designed to provide indicators generally associated with an acceptable lifestyle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Responding &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I own or I am buying my home</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own an automobile</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I subscribe to a newspaper and/or magazine</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I and my children possess a library card</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of a church or religious group</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in after-school activities</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a registered voter</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I voted in the last city-wide election</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I voted in the last school board election</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family visited the dentist within the year</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family visited the doctor within the year</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a savings account</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am saving for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a new home</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my children's education</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new furniture</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a vacation</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergencies</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

account, with 55 percent of the respondents stating that they were saving for their children's education. Also, casting a positive image was the fact that 63 percent owned an automobile; 79 percent subscribed to a newspaper or magazine; 79 percent were members of the public library (as are their children); and 75 percent stated that they had voted in the
last general and/or school board elections. Finally, 82-86 percent had visited their family dentist and/or physician during the past year.

To further strengthen the indication of an improvement in the socio-economic status and lifestyle, data was sought that would reveal the importance that non-professional employees attached to formal higher education. Table 5, "Former Non-Professional Employees of Anacostia Project Who Have Improved Their Education by Attending a College or University for Credit" provides the following information: Of a total of 166 non-professional employees of Phase I of the Project, 112 or 67 percent had attended college to improve their skills. Tuition had been paid by the Project or by themselves. Of those reporting, eight had completed their college work and had taken some graduate courses. This takes on an added significance when it is compared with the original data which showed that of the ten tracts in which the Project schools were located, only in two had more than 50 percent of the population graduates from high school (Tract 74=52% and Tract 75.2=57.5%), and in Tract 74.4 only 29.3 percent had completed high school.³

Also indicant of a change in lifestyle for participants were the number who were registered to vote and who stated that they had voted in both the school boards and the general elections. In the first local elections for the Anacostia school boards held in 1969, only 8 percent of the eligible electorate cast votes. While this was in keeping with the total number of all Anacostians voting in the general election, it was still the lowest percentage among the eight wards of the

TABLE 5
Former Non-Professional Employees of Anacostia/RENP Who Have Improved Their Education by Attending College or University for Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total non-professionals (non-college graduates)</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-professionals attending college or university during time of employment with Anacostia Community School Project (tuition paid by Project)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total attending college for credit on own</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total attending</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of non-professionals improving their education while employed by the Anacostia Project</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-professionals completing college</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

city. Now, with 75 to 79 percent of non-professionals participating in the Project active as voters, this signifies an important change in the lifestyle of these residents of Anacostia.

The improvement in voting patterns is shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Comparison of Percentage of Anacostia Voters in Election of 1961 with the Non-Professional Employees in 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Anacostia voters in election, 1961</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of non-professional employees of the Anacostia Project voting in 1978 elections</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The community's concern for health might not have appeared to have been urgent in the original proposal since it was placed last among the list of twenty-five priorities. The primary need that had been discussed in the 1968 workshop had been to establish a clinic which would serve the needs of the total family--adults as well as children. It was decided, however, that the Department of Health could best handle this problem. The need for improved health facilities was very keenly felt. There were few physicians, and citizens in need of health services had to go across the Anacostia River to overcrowded District of Columbia General Hospital. Although for those who had transportation the distance was not great, it was inaccessible for citizens of Anacostia. A circuitous route that required at least three bus transfers and about two hours travel time was necessary for patients to reach health facilities. Two small hospitals were located in the extreme southern part of the area for those who could afford to pay. Among Anacostians, these were few, especially those who would be the beneficiaries of the Project.

Health clinics were later provided in both the southern and northern ends of the community. A pharmacy and a dental clinic were also made available in the new Washington Highland Community Facilities School. For those needing mental health services the Area D Mental Health Clinic was established at the St. Elizabeth's Hospital, a large federal institution that provided care for those with mental health problems. Collaboration with the Project schools provided for excellent mental health services.
The health care program was apparently effective as evidenced by the response in Table 4 which indicated that 86 percent of the non-professionals stated that they and their families had visited their physician within the past year, and 82 percent had visited their dentist.

**Professional Workers Assess the Anacostia Project**

One population group that could assuredly be used in the attempt to obtain an objective assessment of the Anacostia Project would be those in the community who did not expect to benefit either socially or economically from the program. Such were the teachers and officers who were employees in the Project. Few of them lived in the area of Anacostia that was included as a part of the experiment. At least, during the earlier years, the professionals, as a group, did not take too kindly to the Project. Especially did they view the paraprofessionals with disdain—suspecting that they were parent spies or threats to their well-being, and considering them to be hopelessly unprepared to assist them professionally. A close look at the data that were received revealed that of the total number, most of the secondary school teachers were less willing to accept parent paraprofessionals and were much more vehement in their attitudes toward them than were the elementary teachers. The junior high school teachers were most critical. They were opposed to the teaching of reading and/or mathematics in the content areas. It is possible that their training and indoctrination had been so oriented to subject matter that they were unacquainted with the teaching of skills in the basic areas. Secondary teachers also objected to sharing their institutional
chores with others who they felt were not on a par with them intellectually.

Table 7 "Effectiveness of Non-Professionals as Perceived by the Professional Staff of Anacostia Project Schools," requested the professional staff to indicate "yes," "no," or "no response" to the items listed on the instrument. The data revealed that 64 percent of the professional staff felt that the non-professionals aided the students in the area of academic achievement. The aid was concentrated primarily in reading and mathematics. There were 24 percent who gave the answer "no response" and 12 percent who indicated that no help was given. Both of these groups could have included teachers who felt no responsibility for teaching these skill subjects since they were outside of their specialization. Sixty-three percent agreed that the non-professionals were helpful in classroom management, 19 percent did not respond, and 18 percent of the staff recognized no contribution in this area. Sixty percent indicated that there was help from the non-professional staff in improving the school image. Twenty-one percent felt that there was no help in this regard and 19 percent made no response. One-half (50 percent) of the teachers and other professionals said that they were assisted by non-professionals in helping them to improve students' attendance and punctuality, while 40 percent gave "no response." This can be interpreted as teachers' lack of knowledge of the role played by non-professionals in providing services in this area.

On the lower end of the scale were the teachers' perception of the role non-professionals played in providing for the physical needs of students. Only 40 percent answered "yes" to non-professionals
TABLE 7
Effectiveness of Non-Professionals as Perceived by the Professional Staff of the Anacostia Project Schools

Professional staff indicated that non-professionals were useful as indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>% No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiding students in academic achievement</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to provide for the physical needs of children</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting with attendance and punctuality</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting with classroom management</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to improve the school image</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping students to improve in the affective domain</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contributing to lessening the needs of their students, with 25 percent giving "no response"; again possibly indicating a lack of knowledge. On the other hand, the 25 percent indicating "no" might have made an effort to obtain help for students but to no avail, or they may have noticed that the physical needs of students were not being met. Finally, the item "Helping students to improve in the affective domain," might have indicated that professionals had no recognizable evidence that such a contribution had or was being made. This seems obvious with 50 percent indicating "no response" to the inquiry.

While the professionals were not overwhelming in proclaiming the effectiveness of the non-professionals, when weighed against the opposition exhibited by some at the beginning of the Project, the professionals now show a relatively positive feeling and support.
A somewhat different and more positive image is portrayed in regard to the professional respondents' attitude toward the local and the area boards. Over 96 percent of those reporting stated that they supported the concept of parent participation as a consequence of their experience with local and area boards, and, 63 percent reported that their support of the objectives of urban education had been enhanced as a result of the training that they had received.

The overall assessment of the performance of local and area boards as perceived by the professionals is given in Table 8.

**TABLE 8**

Performance of Local and Area Boards as Perceived by the Professional Employees in Anacostia Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boards were effective in:</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining new facilities</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining additional textbooks and supplies</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effecting curriculum changes</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining additional staff</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving parent/student/teacher relationships</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising the interest levels of parents</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiding in school discipline</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting in classrooms</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising funds</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to improve the school image</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of school's goals and objectives</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professional employees include principals, assistant principals, teachers, supervisors, assistant supervisors, directors, school psychologists and counselors
Boards were rated highest in improving parent/student/teacher relationships (87 percent), raising the level of parent interest (87 percent), and in the formulation of goals and objectives (82 percent). They were rated lowest in aiding school discipline (31 percent), and in assisting in the classroom (31 percent). Only a few more than one-half thought that boards were effective in helping to develop curriculum.

The responses by schools actually showed great variations in several of the items, ranging from "not at all" to "to a large extent" for the same item in different schools. Some individual respondents felt the urge to make comments. One school officer, who has since transferred to another section of the city, volunteered the following statement: "Without community involvement, the public educational system cannot be successful and cannot survive." Another former officer who elected to return to the classroom in another section of the city said: "I believe that the Anacostia Community School Project gave hope to many who had no hope. ... The Project gave citizens of the area excellent opportunities to change the indifference with which the (local) government had treated the multifaceted problems of the community. The community became educated in the politics of change and accountability of government. They also became activists in pursuing their goals and objectives."

There were also professionals who expressed "no confidence" in the concept of parent participation via elected school boards. Some attributed their posture to a lack of their own participation, and they, therefore, had little knowledge about the Project and what it was doing. Especially was this true of teachers and officers who had only recently joined the division or region. Only one principal and one assistant
director indicated that they supported parent participation "not at all." It was interesting to note the attitude of the principal since the person who had preceded him as principal had given an unqualified endorsement of the concept, and the local board of the school was one of the most active and effective of all of the Project schools.

Professional personnel were enthusiastic in their praise of the opportunities available to participate in the staff development and the in-service training which were provided by the Project. A large number of the professional staff stated that they had taken college and university courses for credit. As a result, some were able to become fully certified for their positions; others were awarded an advanced degree; still others received an increase in pay; and some few accomplished all of these.

Although advancement of professional personnel into the areas of administration and supervision was not a stated goal, the professional growth that many of the personnel experienced resulted in their receiving promotions and citations for excellence. Some were advanced while working in Anacostia; others were promoted later. Table 9 shows administrative and supervisory positions to which professional employees of the Project have been promoted.

The three senior high school principals listed in the table are in schools outside of the Anacostia Project area. The same is true of two of the junior high school principals, three of the elementary school principals, the two assistants to the Superintendent of Schools, the system-wide reading supervisor, and seven of the assistant
TABLE 9

Administrative and Supervisory Positions to Which the Professional Employees of the Project Have Been Promoted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent of Region</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High School Principals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School Principals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Principals</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Director of Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Reading (Region)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Mathematics (Region)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principals (all levels)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the Superintendent of Fairfax County</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the Regional Superintendent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Chief, U.S. Office of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Staffing Specialists (Central Office)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Special Programs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

principals. All of these persons hold permanent positions wherever they are employed.

Local and Area Boards Give Views of Impact

The final population group that was a part of the sample population consisted of the elected local and area boards. These were the unpaid participants. The data provided by them were objective to the degree that they sometimes needlessly downgraded their own performances.

Table 10, "Board Members' Perception of Their Impact Upon the Schools," reveals how those who served felt they impacted upon the schools. Indications are that they were much more comfortable in
TABLE 10

Board Members' Perception of Their Impact Upon the Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percent Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisted in improving school plant and facilities</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted in getting more suitable textbooks</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided in obtaining more and better supplies</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in the selection of school staff</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted in formulating school's goals and objectives</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted in making curriculum changes</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in the evaluation of school program</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in preparation of annual budget</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped to improve parent/student/teacher relationship</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped in providing funds for jobs and training</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes in Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percent Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helped to improve response of schools to students' needs</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved the school's acceptance of its responsibility for achieving goals and objectives</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped students understand and better master skills needed as adults</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped students feel good about themselves and become confident that they could control their own destiny</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped students improve in art of communicating with all races and levels</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped in providing a better learning environment for students</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

claiming contributions in areas of change, except in relationship to improving communication with other races. This could have been due to the fact that there were few white students in most of the Project schools, and little opportunity was afforded them to observe this aspect. Board members were less likely to claim credit for "assisting in formulation of goals and objectives," "assisting in making curriculum changes," and "participating in the evaluation of the school program."
Even though local and area board members spent a great deal of time serving on the boards and their committees, there was no provision made for compensating them. Actually, there was a need to subsidize them so that they could take care of such expenses as transportation, baby sitting, and being able to be absent from their jobs without leave and/or pay. There was also the need to insure their participation would not be sacrificed because they could not afford the extra expenses. Subsidies to cover these costs would not be unlike those paid by large corporations and to superordinate staffs in public and governmental agencies. Under Phase I of the Project such a stipend was given to those requesting it, but this practice was eliminated in Phase II. The failure to continue to provide subsidies for those who could not afford to pay the extra expenses resulted in a decrease in the number of board members present at the meetings, a noticeable change in emphasis and purpose, and a lessening of interest on the part of some of the participants.

Parents were also asked to rank the future needs of schools, based upon their experience as board members. The results are shown in Table 11.

Parents (board members) cited more and better trained teachers (90 percent of the respondents) as the number one need. This suggests a renewal of the confidence in teachers that appeared to have waned at the beginning of the Project. The feeling of the importance of parents being involved in the educational process is in evidence by the high rank that was accorded "participation of local boards" (tied for number 2); and the rank given to "more attention to basics" demonstrates that
parents feel that this is an ongoing function of the school. The relative low rank that was given to "more attention to the development of character traits" would signify that this to parents is less a function of the school than perhaps some other agency like the home or church; while the lack of confidence in innovative teaching (number 10) illustrates a disappointment with such new techniques as "open schools," "non-graded classes," and "differentiated staffing," all of which they had had some acquaintance with in Project Schools. Finally, the last ranked "more attention to other than regular classroom subjects," again gives sustenance to the awareness of the ever-present need to stress basics, even at the sacrifice of the more specialized subjects.
On the whole, the responding board members were convinced of the importance of the existing school program. That they gained more confidence as their experience increased, and they were able to see the results of their efforts, is apparent. The professionals, too, as a group, had begun to realize that parents should be allowed a formal and collegial relationship with the schools, at least "to some extent." A comparison of how professional staff perceived performance of area and local boards with how the boards perceived themselves is shown in Table 12.

**TABLE 12**

A Comparison: The Performance of Local and Area Boards as Perceived by Professional Employees and by the Members of the Boards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boards were effective in:</th>
<th>Professional Employees</th>
<th>Board Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining new facilities</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining additional textbooks</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making curriculum changes</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving parent/student/teacher relationships</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening and selecting staff</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising interest levels of parents</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiding school discipline</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in workshops and conferences</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing additional funds</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting in formulating school goals and objectives</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping students improve in academic skills</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to improve the school's image</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 12, both populations were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to the statement. A number of professional employees made no response to items 7 and 9 largely because they did not feel that they had enough information to provide a correct answer. Under these circumstances, agreement (although in varying degrees) on all of the items except two, indicates that the two populations were essentially aware of the role and contributions of the local and area boards.

Finally, the extent to which parents were satisfied with the schools and program in the Anacostia Project is shown in Table 13. Included are parents who were board members as well as those parents who were employed by the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 13</th>
<th>Extent of Satisfaction of Parents Who Participated in the Anacostia Community School Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents whose children attend or have attended Anacostia schools</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of satisfaction of parents with the Anacostia program:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents who were very satisfied with the schools and school programs were generally those whose children had completed school and were now either furthering their education or who were reasonably successful in their chosen field. The "somewhat satisfied" were for the most part, parents whose children were still in school. Some of them, although
liking the school, expressed dissatisfaction with teachers and school administrators. The "dissatisfied" parents were those who had lost faith in both the school and the school program. As one parent expressed it, "I was dissatisfied and that is why I put him in private school." Of those who were satisfied, the following comment generally sums up how they felt: "As a result of my association with the Project, I have a better understanding of what I need in dealing with my own children. I have personally improved; I have a better respect for the school administrators and the community. . . . Through the gained understanding of teachers and children, I can better help my children, and I can communicate the facts of the District of Columbia school system to those who need to know about it."

Utilizing the above data and other data that are now available, the final chapter will examine the extent to which the stated hypotheses have been tested; and, will cite the implications and the ramifications of the results.
CHAPTER VI

THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY CONTROL ON THE ANACOSTIA COMMUNITY: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Testing the Hypotheses

The data that were derived from the surveys and interviews have furnished indicators that give credence to the general statement of the hypothesis: "Since urban school boards and their hired staffs have proved to be ineffective in instituting needed changes . . . local control by the community becomes a replacement strategy that is desirable and necessary to bring about changes in the lifestyle of community residents." The statement continues, asserting that "reforms and changes of substance can best be realized when operations are closely scrutinized and controlled by those who utilize and support the services."

Proceeding from these concepts, the Anacostia Community School Project embarked upon a mission that is still not popular with school staff nor with regular community leaders. It is one which requires educators to accept responsibilities not usually associated with the schools. The extra burden, in and of itself, could have been sufficient to induce failure, but the community remained resolute, faced obstacles as they occurred, overcame them, and was able to attain many of its goals and objectives. Outstanding among their accomplishments has been the success realized through "Project Organization and Community Participation." It was this component that was in the forefront and was utilized to institute the type of changes that were necessary to raise the levels of the participants and the community to the extent that they
gained in the attributes that are associated with an acceptable lifestyle. Because the component was made up of a group of in-house parents and community residents who were independent of the schools, it was able to accomplish some things which neither of the groups could have done alone.

Social Indicators Reveal the Extent of Progress

Social indicators, as used in this study, are defined as a quantitative measure of the quality of life. They reveal the status of a population in relation to a perceived social objective. These indicators have provided the basis for concluding that the Project progressed toward its objectives in significant areas. Socio-economic conditions was one of the indicators. This indicator was further broken down into "jobs and employment," "promotions and salaries," and "tenure." Indications were that there was upward mobility in regard to all of these by the parent participants in the Project who, previous to their joining the Project, had no skills and required extensive on the job training. This upward movement fulfilled one of the purposes set forth in the original workshop. But, it did more than that, for there were unforeseen and unanticipated benefits that accrued to the community during the process. An example was the fine relationship that was forged between parents and professionals when it became necessary to oppose the federal bureaucracy. While the community and committed parents were attempting to reach their objectives, they also learned to persevere, even when there were "unhappy" teachers, "distraught" parents, and "indifferent" school officers.
That parents who were formerly unnoticed and disregarded were now respected and were gaining an awareness of the possibility that they might have some control over their own destinies, was revealed by their new and varied interests. Large numbers were now buying homes, reading books and newspapers, and an exceptionally large group were voting in school and city elections. They further demonstrated social development by participating in after school and church activities, and they showed their growing stability by evolving habits of frugality so that they could pay for their homes and their children's education. Not only was future schooling for their children deemed important, but educational improvement for themselves gained in import to the extent that 67 percent had enhanced their education by attending college and/or university. This is a significant gain, for, in spite of the recent and present attacks upon education, it is evident that schooling maintains a high value in American thought and culture. It is, moreover, the path that leads to upward occupational as well as upward social mobility. Educational attainment is directly related to subsequent levels of earnings, as they are to types of occupations in which people are engaged.

The local and area board members (most of whom were non-working parent participants) were important factors in the overall changes that took place as they labored to develop new goals and objectives, improve curriculum, evaluate programs, and participate in the day-to-day activities of the school. Unlike some school-related groups, they chose not to sit on the sidelines and wait for involvement through bureaucratic favors, but, rather, demanded to be directly involved in the education of their children and to have a collegial and parity relationship with
those associated with the learning process. Nor did they seek an adversary posture with school professionals, but they were not averse to taking stands on issues when their views differed from those held by the school bureaucracy. Parents learned to expect accountability from teachers and school administrators as well as from District of Columbia and federal officials. Local school board members were not extravagant in their desires and demands. The objectives which they sought did not vary substantially from those that were demanded by the more affluent population groups--adequate facilities, sufficient books and supplies, well-prepared teachers and other personnel, and perhaps most important to them, a prominent role in any decision-making process which involved their children, the community and themselves. Being on the scene daily made them more aware of needs and problems and it provided them with first-hand information with which to make practical and timely recommendations for solutions.

The professional staffs began to realize more that parents and the community were needed resources and they were able to make contributions in the recondite areas of instruction and curriculum, just as they were able to provide better facilities, materials for teaching, and moral support. In situations where parents and community were fully utilized, there were improvements in all aspects of the learning process. Parents became partners in education along with teachers and students. This led to a better understanding of the roles each needed to play if progress in total learning was to be the result.

And so, in terms of these indicators, implications are that schools in an urban setting should realize that parents are not only
important but they are essential if schools are to be successful in pursuing their goals and objectives. This means that schools must include parents in their day-to-day activities and programs, and they must also be included when the budgets are being developed. No longer can urban areas expect to have volunteer parent groups perform the additional duties that urban schools require. These are human services that must be paid for and the investment of funds in "human capital" will result in a return that far exceeds the amount invested. The salaries of the non-professionals alone of the Anacostia workers contribute a sum to the Gross National Product that is greater than the total amount that was expended on their training, and this investment is continuing to yield returns, not to mention the changes in their socio-economic levels and lifestyles which hardly anyone doubts will eventually result in the uplift and upgrading of the achievement levels of their children. The decision to spend in order to improve the school and the clients of the schools should pose no problems. There are enough success models to demonstrate the worth, and, as was observed by B. F. Skinner, surely the priority for improving education in our cities and public schools is not less than sending men to outer space and to the moon.¹

To illustrate the feasibility of, and to substantiate the second portion of the hypotheses which states that "children of participating parents will benefit from the freedom of having been a part of the decision-making process, and that their children will experience new behavior patterns that will favorably affect the response to school

programs which they and their parents have had a role in planning and implementing," two of the school programs that originated with the Project were examined.

Anacostia Pre-School: A Model Program

During a structured interview with the director of the Anacostia Pre-School program, the question was raised as to whether or not the original goals and objectives of the program had been attained, and if they had, to what extent they had been realized. Information was provided that showed that the program had not only reached its original stated goals, but had exceeded them in many respects. The number of children and staff in the program had doubled, and the program had been replicated in all schools within the Anacostia area. Additional funding had been supplied by the District of Columbia public schools. Parents, said the director, were continuing their involvement which was required for Head Start, into the elementary school grades. This meant that they were continuing to learn along with their children. As further indication that the program was succeeding, information was supplied about a local experiment called "Developmental Continuity." This special model applied the Head Start concept to twenty-five children in the Anacostia program in an effort to ascertain what the results would be if they were maintained in the program from age 4 to age 8. The only basis for selection of the children was parent involvement, the theory being that solid parent backing would make the difference in the performance of the children. Parents also received training each month. The same social services, the same nutritional services, and the same health services were
provided for parents and children as needed. Nothing else was done differently. The assigned teacher had excellent rapport in working with both the children and their parents developing skills in the cognitive areas. After a period of four years, the results are in. Every child tested at, or above, grade level in reading and in mathematics, and all were socially prepared to transfer to a regular elementary school. There were five children who made outstanding gains in achievement test scores in reading and mathematics at the sixth grade level and above. Inasmuch as parent involvement was the only requirement for children to be selected for this program, it was concluded that the primary reason for the progress shown by these children was that they had followed the Anacostia model that insured that solid parent backing and involvement would make the difference.2

The Ballou Data Processing Program: A Success Story

The second program that was examined through the interview method was the Ballou Data Processing program. This program was sought out, planned for, and monitored by the Anacostia Project. It has not only exceeded its expectations in terms of its objectives, but it has been judged a "model program" by a national survey of programs for computer training that ranged from the elementary school through the university. Out of the six thousand that were evaluated, only thirty-one schools were selected as models. Of the six categories used to judge the program, the Ballou effort was exemplary in four. Only three were needed

to be classified as a model school. The program has provided assistance to its students in the instructional subjects, including mathematics, science, social studies, and business subjects. Teachers at Ballou High School, and at other schools and colleges throughout the Washington, D.C. area, have received training in the use of the computer for which they have been awarded college credit. Presently, according to the director, over eighty teachers at Ballou, plus teachers at ten other high schools of the city, use the facilities either directly or via terminals that are located in their schools. The director was especially proud that students were servicing small black colleges that do not have computers. It was also noted that graduates from Ballou had been hired at all levels of computer programming in six languages. System-wide, the program has greatly expanded the guidance function for high school students by making it possible to retrieve in a few seconds information that students may want to know about any major college or university in the country. The program continues to expand in capability each year, and its possible impact on students in the future, in the words of the director, "is almost incomprehensible." "Already," he said, "80 percent of students at Ballou High School have the opportunity to make use of data processing and computer programming before they graduate." The paramount success of the program has been the organization of the Ballou Math/Science Mini School, a magnet program built around computer science for students of Anacostia and other students outside of the area who are interested in a rigorous treatment of mathematics and science.

These two programs, which were developed as a result of parents' persistence and intervention, indicate changes of substance, and support the second portion of the hypotheses which deals with services to children. The results would suggest that both of these programs should be continued, expanded, and replicated in other urban areas. The dollar cost should not be a deciding factor for these are the types of programs that are needed to raise the hope factor for urban citizens. This investment in "human capital" must be viewed in light of the expected return. The experiences of Anacostia make untenable any argument or discussion that school systems "cannot afford" the programs. In the long run, those traditional programs that are no longer productive and yield little return, are the more costly.

The third and final portion of the hypothesis states that "after an extended period of participation, the results of community control and parent participation in the schools can be measured substantively and statistically." The substantive aspect has already been dealt with in part. To further substantiate the premise, and to show statistically that the changes in socio-economic status, and subsequently in lifestyle, can be measured quantitatively, an analysis of variance, comparing the average income of non-professionals in 1972 with the average income in 1979 was accomplished. The ANOVA Summary Table 14 below indicates the results. It can be observed that there was significant increase at the .05 level as was predicted by the hypotheses. Also, the significance is apparent at the .01 level.
TABLE 14
ANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>90173131.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90173131.78</td>
<td>39.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1718295.63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22609153.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypotheses for the ANOVA are as follows:

\[ H_0: M_a = M_b \text{ (null)} \]
\[ H_1: M_a > M_b \text{ (alternative)} \]

where \( M_a \) represents the average non-professional income in 1972 and \( M_b \) represents the average non-professional income in 1979. \( H_0 \) will be rejected at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) in favor of \( H_1 \) if the computed "F" statistic in the ANOVA is greater than 3.98 (critical F).

For those who require objective measurement in order to accept confirmation of this portion of the hypotheses, the results, even without extrapolation, should be convincing. It is not intended to suggest by the validation of the results that there is indicated a final or even a satisfactory solution to the problem of improving lifestyles in the urban community, but it does point to a process that is moving in a positive direction. It also shows that without resorting to drastic changes politically as some have recommended, distribution of income can be accomplished in such a manner that there will be changes in lifestyle of those who are at the bottom of the economic and social ladders. Moreover, there will subsequently be a change in educational achievement (as newly defined) of the subject population.
While these indicators of social and economic progress have by no means been exhausted in this study, those that have been mentioned are sufficient to arrive at implications and ramifications for the Anacostia Project that make it an important adventure and experience in the study of community participation and/or control of education.

Some Further Implications of the Anacostia Experience

What then, are some other implications of the Anacostia experience? First, "community control," "parent involvement," "parent participation" or by whatever name we choose to call it, indicates that it is necessary for the community and the parents to become a part of the decision-making process in the operation of the school system. It establishes a "hope factor" for all inner city residents, and, it provides the opportunity for them to enjoy real freedom and to develop the feeling of joy that comes when one knows that he is controlling his own destiny. The study supports the exegesis of Urban Education: The Hope Factor when it holds that there must be new careers in the human services which provide for placement of the unskilled and the uneducated populations into permanent jobs with the opportunity for the more talented to advance into positions that are highly favored, and which also permit them to contribute to the well-being of society.4

A second implication is that there should be a willingness on the part of the larger community to invest in human capital, a phenomenon

advocated by Dr. Byrd L. Jones. His assumptions are that learning is an investment in human capital. "It enhances," he states, "productivity and it provides the opportunity for individuals to invest in their own competencies and to enjoy a fair reward. . . . Further, if human talents and preferences are fairly equally developed, and opportunities opened to all, then personal rewards and social benefits would seem reasonably connected to both efforts and contributions to society." Jones also speaks to the necessity for urban community development to involve a trained population with stable employment providing a high standard of living and effective public service. Since schools only start a lifelong process of acquiring valuable information, continued on-the-job training is deemed a must for the peripheral work, for it is indicated that "careful estimates have generally credited more than half of a worker's earnings to skills acquired on the job rather than through formal training programs or in schools."

A good example of investment in human capital was the federal Career Opportunities Programs that were funded under the Education Professional Development Act of 1968. The programs resulted in ten thousand educational aides working in schools and being enrolled in participating colleges and universities. The participants received credit for experiences that they had had while working in the classroom as aides as well as for the courses that they took. While the Anacostia
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program was not a part of the Career Opportunities Program, many of the objectives and activities were the same. The Anacostia program was a part of a larger design which envisioned the entire community as benefiting from the contribution and training that were being given to the aides. Moreover, the expectations were that the benefits derived would be extended to the children of the aides and that there would be a multiplier effect. Usually, plans sponsored by the colleges and universities were much more sophisticated and elaborate in planning and scope. It is supposed that a current evaluation of these programs would reveal gains as extensive or even more than were those achieved in Anacostia. What is needed is for this same concept, with the same guidelines, to be extended to other areas of human services such as health, welfare, police work, etc. Private industry should also be encouraged to invest in these workers.

That there will be adequate employment opportunities in urban areas in the services occupations is attested to by Bennett Harrison who states that the "suburbanization of jobs and skills has been overplayed." He maintains further that "the most rapidly growing sector of the American economy--public service employment--already displays a strong propensity to locate in the core city, and in the future the location of such jobs will be (or can be made to be) to some extent directly subject to government control as an instrument of employment policy." Harrison also stated that a major cause of unemployment in

---

the cities is due to suburbanites commuting to the core where they continue to work. 

Further indication of the problem existing in Washington, D.C. came from the mayor, who in an address to a citizen's group in October 1979 stated that only 26 percent of those engaged in apprenticeship training in the building trades--carpentry, electrical wiring, bricklaying, concrete finishing, painting, etc.--in the District of Columbia, were residents of the city, rather they were commuting from the surrounding suburbs to learn the most highly paying skill trades.

These pronouncements from authorities in the field support the Anacostia idea in which the investment in human capital, with much of the funding having been originally provided by the federal government, has paid off in terms of social advancement, political astuteness, and economic security for those involved. The community, families, and their children have all benefited. Schools, too, have been helped in performing their usual rituals for children as parents have begun to earn a better livelihood and have become more knowledgeable and sophisticated in dealing with some of the complex issues of education.

But, some authorities and citizens are still confused as to the role they should play. The mayor of a large urban area has suggested that the school problem could be solved if schools would cease trying to provide social services to children and their families and stick to education. This would at the same time permit him to reduce the school budget and close down some of the educational facilities. The mayor has the backing of a part of the press which asserted, editorially, that

\[9\] Ibid.
this would make it possible for the city government to cut taxes and save money.

Although this would be a sad solution to the problem of educating urban children, sadder still is to hear a black member of the city-wide board of education exclaim that after ten years he is opposed to community control and community involvement because a legal opinion has been "expressed" that community control may have been illegal.

Brighter reactions and responses have been given by some. Carmon St. John Hunter and David Harman in their late report to the Ford Foundation, suggested that a major shift in national educational policy is necessary to serve the needs of disadvantaged adults. They recommend the establishment of new pluralistic community-based initiatives whose specific objectives will be to serve the most disadvantaged hard core poor. They also indicate the need for proper funding.¹⁰

Another positive response comes from a headmaster at a leading eastern prep school who averred that although changing education in a private school is different, his school was committed to family education, not just child education. He called for decisive national action to "jar our educational system out of its inch by inch mentality." "We," he continued, "need to redefine our American values and insist that our schools express them." He also advocated that there be a moratorium on existing standards such as test scores, course requirements, and teacher training. "Bring the parents into the school," he said, "and the school into the family. Make the school take an active role in the

community and give the community new teaching responsibilities in the school." He recognized that there might be attendant problems, but he felt that the creative capabilities of the American people would result in their solution.\footnote{John W. Gaul, "How to Educate Our Children to Feel Equal," The Washington Post, OEP, May 29, 1979.}

Some governments--state and local--have realized that the school bureaucracy, including the city-wide boards of education, do not have the answer as how best to educate children, and they, therefore, need help from parents and community. The state of California requires elected bodies in their school organization in order to receive certain state funds. The cities of Detroit, New York, Salt Lake City, Washington, Minneapolis, Boston, and many others, are at various stages of community participation in decision-making. The National Teacher Corps, after ten years of operation with volunteer parent participation, has now made it mandatory that school systems that participate in its programs accept parents and community on a parity basis in all phases of its program--planning, operation and evaluation.

A final implication that perhaps needs some discussion is that the Anacostia experience suggests some limitation on the extent of "control" granted to communities in urban areas. While the limitation could be relative to circumstances, including size and intellectual climate, experience in the Anacostia Project posits the following as better handled--both as to policy and procedure--through a centralized office.
Staff certification and eligibility. It is desirable that the certification and eligibility requirements for the staff be uniform in order to insure that all schools receive personnel which possess at least the minimum requirements. This is not to suggest that there will be less opportunity for ideas such as the use of differentiated staffing and a curriculum that is in keeping with the wishes of the community, but is an attempt to guarantee that all children will receive basic personnel and basic learnings that have been accepted by the system as a whole.

Provisions for pay and salary adjustments. A central office can better provide services that are needed to keep up with pay and perform the accounting that affects one's pay. Leave, promotions and retirements can best be handled by the central office and board. Also, the difficulty of finding competent personnel in the fields of finance and accounting adds to the desirability of centralizing the operation. Again, this does not preclude or restrict innovative use of staff. There should be arrangements that will permit employing per diem workers for short term assignments and for altering salaries--up or down--in order to attract personnel for services needed.

Procuring equipment, books and supplies. Efforts to purchase items that are utilized daily and in large quantities in the classroom, proved to be a momentous task. Especially was this the case when there was the need to obtain bids, and to buy from firms that were outside of the geographical area. Contracting posed another real problem as interpretation by companies differed from firm to firm and from city to city. In large urban communities, where more than one school is involved,
purchasing can be more effectively accomplished by a central office. What is needed is a group that is representative of all who will be using what is to be purchased and who will keep current on products that are available, and then work to insure that the needs of all children and staff are met.

Employer and employee relations. Because a great deal of expertise is needed to deal with the problems of teacher unions and other professional associations, policies and procedures in this regard, can best be handled centrally. The several communities, taken separately, would be no match for the astute legal aid furnished by the AFL-CIO and the National Education Association. The results would be confusion and frustration for the schools. The entire field of labor relations in schools needs further study. The question of whether or not parents should be a party in the negotiation process is still unsettled, and there is much to be said for both points of view.

Food services for children. In order to take full advantage of the many opportunities provided by the Department of Agriculture to improve the health and nutrition of children nationally, at nominal cost, it is mandatory that policies and procedures for this school activity be centralized. The federal government would not likely find it feasible to negotiate services with individual schools, nor would it be economical to do so. And, with the large number of needy children in urban centers, it would be unwise to attempt to provide quality food for the low prices that are available through the Department of Agriculture.
Depending on the locale, there may be other management type activities that require that policy and procedural decisions be made centrally. The communities, however, should be given an opportunity to make decisions whenever it is practicable. The role that the community plays should be based on reality factors. Budget alone, e.g., must not be the deciding factor.

In terms of governance, there is a caution that the members of the community should be aware of, it is that those who benefit by a change in lifestyle as a result of participation and involvement, may tend to either take on some of the less desirable characteristics of the system that they have sought to change or they may let themselves be replaced by those who do. It, therefore, is incumbent upon those in the community who wish to bring about desirable changes in urban communities, and maintain them, that they do not forget that the real purpose of education is to enable all persons of the community to realize their true worth, and that they must not be misled by the slogans and myths that permeate the schools such as: "back to basics," "improved standardized test scores," or other epitaphs.

In summary, the study accepts the alternative hypothesis and rejects the null hypothesis, i.e., the data reveals a statistically significant difference in the attributes that are used to indicate an improved lifestyle. After a period of eight years a majority of that portion of the community who were employed by the Project indicate that they are still gainfully employed in a permanent position, and that their salary is much improved over what it had been before they became involved with the Project. They also acknowledged that they are voters
in the school and city-wide elections, and that they have improved their formal education. In the area of health, facilities in the community have been improved and they and their families take advantage of the opportunity to provide for their health needs.

The participants also indicate that they have a renewed interest in schools, including both their successes and problems, and that they are at least "somewhat satisfied" with what the schools are accomplishing. Moreover, they are aware of their own contributions that are being made in an effort to insure the success of the schools.

The gains that have been made by the participants are attested to by school professionals and by community residents who have also been working with the employed people of the community to improve both schools and the Anacostia community. These community residents have been largely responsible for the vast improvement in buildings, facilities, equipment, and books and supplies, and for improvement in the attitudes and performances of teachers and staffs. They have also worked to clarify goals and objectives and to improve offerings and curriculum of the schools. Whether there has been an overall improvement in achievement test scores in reading and mathematics has not yet been established, but participants are confident that, at least for those homes where there has been a change in lifestyles because of improved socio-economic, health, and education status, the children will be affected.

Further gains are evidenced by two highly successful programs--the Anacostia Pre-School and the Ballou Data Processing--that were started
by the community and have been nurtured until they are now acclaimed nation-wide for the contribution they are making.

Indicant also of the success of the Project is the fact that much of it has continued in Anacostia, and also many facets have been precursors of what is happening in other areas of the city and beyond.

The City-Wide School Board: Is It Needed?

Perhaps the main ramification of the Anacostia experience for the schools is that the city-wide school boards--whether elective or appointive--as presently organized and perceived have become archaic and obsolete, especially in large urban areas. They have served a purpose, but they no longer appear viable and functional in terms of the needs of the inner city because they have become too far removed from the local school. Since they no longer seem capable of rendering real help in making policy decisions, they often resort to engaging in administrative chores and seeking to manage the schools, a task for which they are hardly prepared. Most school board members in urban areas have become highly politicized, a fact that they do not deny. They, therefore, end up exerting pressures on some; while they find themselves yielding to pressures from others.

Perhaps school systems need to rethink their organization and hire a school executive (Superintendent of Schools) who would have as his advisors and monitors an independent body that would meet possibly quarterly. Selection of this body would be on the basis of members' knowledge and expertise in dealing with such broad subjects as educational philosophy, finance, health, law, business, and other policy type
issues. Their primary responsibility would still be the selection of the Superintendent of Schools. Other policy matters would be dealt with either on a regional basis where schools are decentralized, or on a school-by-school basis where the schools are not decentralized. The effect would be that the policies of the schools would be set at the local level by those who have an immediate knowledge and concern for problems and needs at the level where the response would be most urgent. In all matters of interest at the level where all schools are affected in the same manner, the decision would be by the monitoring body and/or the Superintendent. Indications are that there would be few decisions that could not be made at the lower jurisdictions, but if there were occasions when agreement became a problem, provisions could be made for hearings and referees as is presently the case.

Finally, there is thorough disagreement by the writer with the thesis of Jencks in *Inequality* which states that one can expect little social and occupational mobility between children and their parents. This may be the case when there is not a sincere and positive effort to improve the status of parents and their children. Nor is there tolerance with the principle of gradualism, but also ineffectual is dependency upon a panacea that promises delivery of functional educational competencies within a specified time. What must be remembered is that education is basically a process as well as a product.

Although there has been important improvement in Anacostia in public education, in housing, in health, and in job opportunities for the poor and black, there still exists there too many "Winston Streets"
(Ulf Hannerz's *Soulside*) and too many residents who resort to "Tally's Corner" (Elliot Liebow) because either they have not had the opportunity or they are denied the chance to seek and make a better life for themselves and their families.

The reality of the situation is that there must be a commitment on the part of all of the members of the community to face up to the institutionalized problems of white racism, black apathy, unsuitable welfare and poor reform efforts, and unequal opportunities which permeate all facets of society. It is understood that, just as complete and adequate training cannot be provided to all at the same rate, so it is unreasonable to expect that advancement would be at the same level and time for everyone. But, the bottom line is that there should be a constant and steady movement toward the elimination of the racism and all of the unequal conditions that exist with all haste so that every person can see himself as being able to move in the direction in which he would like to go.
During my year in residence at the University of Massachusetts, I spent considerable time compiling an annotated bibliography for the Center for Urban Education of the School of Education. Needless to say, as I read and perused hundreds of books, monographs and articles, I gained substantial information on and was impressed by the great concern for urban education, in general, and for community control of schools or parent participation in school decision-making, in particular. While I have not made specific notation of all of these works in the text of this study, it is a fact that all of them were utilized and they influenced my overall concepts about my study. It is therefore felt that they must be included as a part of my bibliography.

In addition to the published materials, use was made of the hundreds of reports, newsletters, speeches, reviews, evaluations, and other documents that were available to me as a result of my having served as director of the Anacostia Project for four years, and then having the director who succeeded me, serve under my supervision for an additional four years. Much of the information used is on file in my personal library. Other information and data (much of it raw) are located in the office of the assistant superintendent, Region I, District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C., and at the Ballou High School of the same city.

I have by no means exhausted all of the information found in the materials at these two locations; as a matter of fact, it is my
intention to continue to research and to report what happened during my association with this valuable project.

There are some popular works (which are to an extent outdated) that were not included in the compiled bibliography, and I am including them for they do express a point of view of the nation's capital. They are:


There are also a number of newspapers and periodicals that were consulted and frequently used. They were:

The New York Times
The Washington Post
The Washington Star
The Boston Globe
The Baltimore Sun
Newsweek
Time
Ebony
Black Enterprises
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Downs, Anthony. "Competition and Community Schools" in Levin's Community Control of Schools. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970, pp. 219-249. The pressure of competition is the crucial ingredient needed to force big-city school systems to adopt their outputs to what consumers want and need.
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