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Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to provide a descriptive analysis of the procedures and processes utilized by the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee in the development of a system-wide school-community involvement plan. As a means of accomplishing the aforementioned purpose, the writer acted as a participant-observer and monitored all of the activities of the above mentioned Committee.

Methodology

The descriptive-analysis was the research methodology used in conducting this study. The writer acted as a participant-observer and utilized the techniques of observation, informal interviews and/or conversations, recorder of minutes and attendance, researcher, and writer of the final draft of the proposed plan.

Conclusions

Taking into consideration the writer's observations, analyses, and conversations with all of the individuals involved in this project, the following conclusions and implications are deemed appropriate:

1. Given adequate time, staff support, and directions, individuals with diverse experiential backgrounds can work on a project of this nature and scope with an acceptable degree of success.
2. Given similar responsibilities, group composition and conditions, the professional members of the group would tend to disagree among themselves more often than any of the other categories comprising the total group.

3. Under circumstances similar to the ones described in this study, the students would provide the least amount of input with regard to the development of the end product.

4. The level of individual and group participation in a project similar to the one described herein is influenced greatly by the following factors:
   a. The amount of time the individual can contribute to the project.
   b. The individual's assessment or view of the importance of the tasks being carried out by the total group.
   c. The individual's perceived importance of the activities conducted by the group with respect to his immediate situation. In brief, people tend to take more interest in and support those projects that they feel are related to their personal and/or professional situations.

5. Individuals in groups similar to the one discussed herein, who do not become personally attached to a given plan (idea), tend to serve more effectively as mediators than those persons who do.

Recommendations

The findings, conclusions, and implications of this study warrant the enumeration of the following recommendations:

1. School-community planning of this scope and magnitude should consider carefully the following factors:
   a. The most appropriate time during the school year to develop such a project.
   b. The school system's commitment to the area in which the school-community group has been asked to work. In brief, the school system should be in a position to assure those persons working on plans for the system that what they have been asked to develop is needed and will be implemented in part or in toto.
   c. The amount of time needed to complete the project.
   d. The number and varied experiential backgrounds of the persons selected to serve on the school-community planning group. Careful attention should be given to ensuring balanced representation in all categories comprising the group. In brief, if the group has five
parents, it should have five students, five teachers, five administrators, five community representatives, etc. This measure would reduce the possibility of one faction within the group overwhelming the others. Also, since student attendance was lower than the other groups comprising the Committee, student representation could possibly be increased as a means of ensuring more student participation.

e. The amount of staff support needed to assist the group in completing its tasks.

2. If the school-community planning group is designing a program that is system-wide in scope, the superintendent should present the formal charge to the membership. This formal charge from the superintendent should outline in definitive terms what the group is being asked to do, why they are being asked, and what will become of their recommendations. Additionally, the time frame for completing the project should be presented.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Traditionally, educational institutions, especially the public schools, have given only perfunctory attention to the development of meaningful community involvement programs. In fact, if one were to look closely at what public schools did in the area of community participation prior to the decades of the 60's and early 70's, the most salient phenomenon would be the fact that school administrators operated their schools with little or no meaningful community input. Usually, community involvement with the schools was peripheral in nature and limited to such activities as booster clubs, PTA fund raising activities, grade mother, etc. Fortunately, this situation no longer exists in many school districts. Such factors as (1) increased support for public education by the Federal Government, (2) higher educational training of parents, (3) court ordered school desegregation, (4) teacher accountability, (5) growing demands of teacher organizations, and (6) community pressures have influenced many public school administrators to develop more effective ways of enhancing school-community involvement.

Regardless of what phenomena are enumerated to explain why many public school administrators and districts have begun to place more emphasis on community participation in the educational process, the unavoidable truth of the matter is that communities throughout these United States are demanding and
rightfully receiving a greater voice in determining how their schools are to be operated. Realizing that the demand for meaningful school-community involvement is an inevitable phenomenon, the school district and administrator should play a major role in developing mechanisms whereby the public can express their concerns and have them acted upon in a prompt and judicious manner. Admittedly, this is a very new and uncomfortable position for some school systems, but the benefits realized from addressing this problem are invaluable to the schools and community members.

Mindful of the aforementioned observations, the writer has selected as his final project in his doctoral program, the description and analysis of the procedures and/or processes utilized by the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee in developing a system-wide community involvement plan.

Background of Project

The writer's interest in this issue developed during the 1974-75 school term when he was assigned to the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Affairs Division. It was during this period that he realized that rhetoric alone would not facilitate meaningful school-community involvement. Additionally, as a result of being assigned to the aforementioned Division as a Community Relations Coordinator, the writer realized the weaknesses inherent in planning for the community as opposed to planning with them. Therefore, the writer and other members of the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Affairs Division conceptualized, planned, implemented, coordinated, and evaluated a series of School-Community Conferences which were designed to effectuate more meaningful school-community involvement. One of the most prevalent concerns expressed during each of these
sessions was the need to develop a mechanism whereby community members could provide meaningful input as to how schools could better serve their respective communities.

Realizing the importance of the above mentioned mandate, the writer, under the guidance of the Assistant Superintendent for Community Affairs, Ms. Barbara I. Whitaker, requested and received recommendations from all levels of the school and community, the names of persons who could serve effectively on a Community Education Planning Committee. The names of twenty-three persons were submitted and official letters from the Superintendent, Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, were sent out asking those persons recommended to serve on the Committee. (See Appendix A.) Nearly all of the persons who were sent letters agreed, in writing or verbally, that they would serve on the Superintendent's Community Education Planning Committee. Some invitees, however, explained that due to the fact that they had other obligations, full attention could not be given to the project at this time. Also, some Committee members questioned the feasibility of developing the "Plan" during the summer months.

Looking briefly at the selection process for committee members, it should be noted that the twenty-three persons who were sent letters by Dr. Crim were selected from a large list of names submitted by school personnel and certain school-community organizations. The final decision as to whom the Superintendent would send letters was made by the Assistant Superintendent for Community Affairs, Ms. Barbara I. Whitaker. The primary factors influencing the selection process were age, race, sex, and status. A conscientious effort was made to reflect the above factors in the final composition of the Committee. Consequently, of the twenty-three persons invited to serve on the Committee, the following categories were established:
Black (Males)
7 (Dawson, Dixon, Eberhart, Jackson, Lincoln, Moody, and Young).

Black (Females)
7 (Byrd, Crowder, Hall, Howard, C. Johnson, G. Johnson, and Smith).

White (Males)
4 (Bottomly, Miller, Ramsaur, and Richards).

White (Females)
5 (Cantor, Lefever, Mumford, Watkins, and Young).

(Note: Refer to Appendix A for further details concerning the composition of the group.)

It is hoped that through describing, monitoring, and analyzing the procedures and/or processes involved in developing the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Involvement Plan, future endeavors of this nature by the System and other school districts will be ameliorated. The writer-philosopher, Walter Lippman, addressed this point when he wrote: "A rational man acting in the real world ... is one who decides where he will strike a balance between what he desires and what can be done."1 It is the writer's contention that reports or projects of this nature will be immensely more meaningful to educational planners since the primary focus will be on process, not product alone. This approach will go far in assisting educators in making those crucial decisions concerning what they actually can do as opposed to what they would like to have done in the areas of school-community relations.

---

Significance of Study

March and Simon wrote: "Rational behavior involves substituting for the complex reality a model of reality that is sufficiently simple to be handled by problem solving processes." The writer agrees with the preceding statement and believes that a project of this scope will enhance considerably the school-community planner's knowledge of the day-to-day activities involved in developing a system-wide community involvement program. The unique aspect of this study stems from the fact that the primary focus will be on those "nuts and bolts" activities and strategies which are required to formulate a plan of this magnitude.

In brief, the writer shall report and analyze his findings in such a way that more meaningful insight can be made with regard to what is really involved in using a broad cross-section of the school-community to develop a school-community relations program. This, to the writer, is in keeping with the contention of March and Simon that effective problem solving results when complex situations are factorized into simpler more understandable units. It is from this frame of reference that the writer feels that a project of this nature will contribute significantly to the area of community relations in the public schools throughout this nation.

Statement of the Problem

This study is designed to provide a descriptive analysis of the processes utilized by the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee.

---

in the development of a system-wide community involvement program with emphasis on the period from July-September, 1975. The purpose will be to identify strategies and/or problems that will assist other educators in planning more effectively when they embark upon a similar endeavor.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were posited by the writer as a means of providing specific frames of reference during the period that this study was conducted:

1. Can individuals with diverse personal and educational backgrounds develop a practical and reality-based school-community involvement plan?
2. Who will assume the major leadership role in the development and thrust of the school-community involvement plan?
3. Who will attend the greatest number of meetings?
4. Where will the greatest disagreement concerning the nature and thrust of the "plan" occur: Among the professionals? Among the laymen? Between the laymen and the professionals?
5. Who will serve most often as mediators in resolving differences between Committee members?
6. Who will provide the least amount of input into the development of the school-community involvement "plan"?
7. What will be some of the problems and solutions generated from this approach?
8. How effective will Committee members feel that they were in assisting in the development of the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Involvement Plan?
9. What suggestions will Committee members provide to improve the process that they participated in to complete the "plan"?
10. Will Committee members view the time frame for the completion of the "plan" as being realistic?
11. Will Committee members indicate a clear understanding of the responsibility (charge) given them by the Assistant Superintendent of the Community Affairs Division?

12. Will the level of the Community Affairs Division staff support, facilitate or hinder the development of the aforementioned "plan"?

**Research Procedures**

Due to the unique nature and scope of this study, the writer utilized the anthropological approach of participant/observer. Therefore, most of the information contained herein was obtained by employing the following techniques:

1. **Observations** — During each of the eight meetings of the Committee, the writer noted how Committee members interacted on certain issues and recorded his findings during and immediately following each meeting session.

2. **Informal Interviews (Conversations with Committee Members)** — Careful notes were maintained by the writer on the informal discussions and comments made by Committee members concerning their perceptions of other Committee members as well as Committee activities.

3. **Record Minutes and Attendance of Each Meeting** — The minutes and attendance of the eight meetings were recorded by the writer as a means of gathering and maintaining first-hand information on the progress and support provided by each Committee member.

4. **Secure Pertinent Information for Committee** — The writer served as a resource person for the Committee and secured pertinent data for Committee members upon request.

5. **Provide Assistance to the Committee in Writing the Final Draft of the Plan** — The writer assisted in the revision of the final draft of the "plan" and wrote the final report which was submitted to the Assistant Superintendent for the Community Affairs Division on October 2, 1975.

**Definitions**

The following definitions were developed by the writer as a means of further delineating and clarifying the terms utilized in this study:
1. **Professional** — Any person whose occupational status in the areas of education and community relations influenced their being selected to serve on the Committee. Some examples are teachers, principals, area superintendents, community relations officers, etc.

2. **Laymen** — Any individual whose occupational status in the areas of education and community relations did not influence their selection to the Committee. Some examples are students, parents, secretaries, custodians, etc.

3. **Committee (CEPC)** — The members of the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee (July September, 1975).

4. **Plan** — The community-involvement plan developed by the Committee.

**Time Schedule**

The writer, as a result of having given serious consideration to the time constraints involved in conducting a study of this magnitude, established the following milestones and/or time frames:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepare and submit research project proposal to Committee for approval.</td>
<td>July, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meet with members of the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee and collect the necessary data to complete the project.</td>
<td>July-September, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review related literature in the areas of school-community involvement and group decision making. (Chapter II of project report.)</td>
<td>September-October, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Submit Chapters I and II to Committee for review and approval.</td>
<td>November-December, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Present final draft of synthesized and analyzed data that were collected during Committee meetings to Committee for review and approval. (Chapter III.)</td>
<td>December, 1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity | Time Frame
--- | ---
6. Write and submit conclusions and recommendations from research project to Committee for approval. (Chapter IV.) | January, 1976
7. Provide oral defense of research project. | January-February, 1976
8. Submit final report of research project to the Dean's Office. | March, 1976

Organization of Chapters

Chapter I was designed primarily to provide the reader with a clear understanding of the rationale, background, significance and procedures that were used in conducting this study. Additionally, a problem statement, research questions, definitions, and a time schedule were provided to further delineate the focus, thrust, and parameters within which this project was conducted. Chapter II provides the reader with a review of the related literature in school-community relations. Chapter III describes the procedures utilized by the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee in developing the System's Community Involvement Plan. Chapter IV reports on the findings and provides the reader with some implications, recommendations, and conclusions stemming from this study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

One of the most interesting discoveries made by the writer during his review of the related literature in school-community involvement is the fact that although many contemporary educators support the concept of community involvement, very few agree in practice or in principle as to what this relationship should really involve. Many of the authors and administrators espoused a very liberal attitude concerning school-community involvement and suggested that the public's will should prevail regardless of whether school staff members view their (the public's) wishes as being desirable and plausible. Still others, whom the writer shall refer to as "moderates," assumed the position that some kind of balance between the wishes of the community and the professional educator's knowledge of school related problems be established so that the school system could benefit from the input of all parties. Finally, there were those writers and educators who felt that education should be left solely to the professional educators. The writers who assumed this posture were categorized by the writer as being "conservative." It should be noted here that the preceding categories of "liberal," "moderate," and "conservative" are not designed to assign any relative value to one position over against the other. It is the writer's belief that using the aforementioned labels would provide a more systematic way to present the literature reviewed in this area.
Before moving to the specific information concerning the divergent views contemporary writers and educators have concerning school-community involvement, the writer believes that it is equally as important to review what the social psychologists have written about group behavior, especially in the areas of group planning and problem solving. Therefore, emphasis will not only be placed on the different ways that educators view school-community involvement, but also on how effective groups are in addressing and solving school-community problems.

Keeping the above observations in mind, the first phase of this review of related literature shall examine the views of those writers and educators who have been categorized by the writer as being liberal in their approach to school-community involvement. Two of the most ardent contemporary proponents of the "liberal" philosophy of school-community involvement are Ostrander and Dethy. These men left no doubt in the reader's mind as to their convictions when they wrote:

In a free society, government should be the servant of the people. Public schools are units of government and as such they should serve the people as the people decree. Not always will the voters of a local school district make the kind of decisions in respect to educational policy which the administrator believes represents the best interest of either the pupils or of the total society. If, however, he accepts the assumption that the public schools belong to the public, he must abide by its decisions until he can lead the community into more acceptable policies.1

Although the above statement provides the reader with an unequivocal understanding of their position on school-community involvement, they reiterate their contentions by noting: "We are saying that the school administrator should administer the schools in accordance with policy formulated on the basis of the value system of the public."2 Daniel Selakovich agrees with Ostrander and Dethy,

---


2Ibid., p. 209.
but goes a step further in his discussion of the topic by making the following observations:

In spite of the increasing influence of the national and state governments on matters of educational policy, the community remains the most important level of decision making in the operation of the school. Although it is impossible to generalize about American communities, there seems to be a tendency for community influences on schooling to be on the traditional or conservative side. Leaders in positions of power, regardless of class or other affiliation, tend to be conservative on many issues.

Thus, one can see from Selakovich's statement that although he believes in community involvement in public education, he has some serious doubts about the public's ability to effectuate meaningful changes in the operations of schools.

Ralph B. Kimbrough, a noted educator and researcher in school-community relations, made a similar observation prior to Selakovich's book, when he wrote:

An hypothesis that might be supported in many communities is that the power wielding group and/or individual in any given community tends to be on the traditional end of a traditional-emergent value continuum.

In spite of the serious concerns expressed by Selakovich and Kimbrough about the conservative nature of people who are selected or elected to represent the community, Olsen reaffirms the need for school-community participation by writing:

Thus, we have been driven to recognize the inescapable truth, that the education of the whole child in his total environment is, and must remain, a community function despite the existence and development of the school. Education cannot be identified solely with schooling, nor learning with formal instruction. That is why "education in a democracy" cannot be much more than a delusive verbalism unless it is everywhere grounded in appropriate community-wide, and community guided actions.

---


As a means of providing additional information to support his convictions about the need for more effective school-community involvement, Olsen provided some valuable historical data on the development of citizen participation in public agencies:

The first true coordinating council, ——, was formally organized in Berkeley, California, in 1919. It was developed by the superintendent of schools and the chief of police in order to secure community-wide participation in more effectively meeting the problems of youth in that city. By 1940, over three hundred local coordinating councils had been organized in 26 states. Today, they number several thousand, listed under a variety of names — "Community Council," "Neighborhood Council," "Human Relations Council," and the like.

The preceding statement by Olsen puts community involvement with public agencies into its proper historical perspective, but the following statement by Sidney H. Estes addresses the specific concerns of many urban administrators:

Effective inner-city education cannot be isolated from parents, the immediate community, or the community-at-large. Community control is one thing, but community accountability is another. The education of children is a two-way street. Communities should be accountable to the schools, and the schools must be accountable to the communities.

In the above statement, Dr. Estes, who is presently the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction in the Atlanta Public School System, speaks with authority and strong personal commitment for the improvement in school-community involvement. Dr. Estes reiterates his convictions concerning the need for improved relations between the public schools and the community by making the following observation:

Large urban school systems are predominantly "minority" populated. This knowledge means that these systems should be revamped and restructured to adjust to the reality that maintaining the "status quo" is no longer appropriate.

---

6 Ibid., p. 448.


8 Ibid., p. 384.
The General Superintendent of the Dallas Independent School District, Nolan Estes, gives additional support and credence to the observations made by Sidney Estes (no relation) when he wrote the following:

The day is past when we can open our doors to citizens only during American Education Week and close our minds to what they are saying about how their money is being spent and what we are doing with their children. I feel that it is imperative for us to find ways to reconnect the schools and the community.

In addition to Nolan Estes' belief in providing a mechanism for ensuring meaningful community participation in the schools, he points out one of the major advantages of fostering school-community partnerships. According to Nolan Estes: "People, even in large urban systems, such as the Dallas Independent School District, support the decisions that they have helped to make. This model gives much promise." In the same article, Nolan Estes provided another plausible explanation for involving the community in solving school problems by noting: "... The way to change many of our severest critics into our staunchest supporters is by giving them a piece of the action and by getting actively involved in seeking solutions and meeting the challenge."

As one continues to examine the different approaches that educators use to improve community participation in the schools, it is not surprising to find the name of Marcus A. Foster, former Superintendent of the Oakland Public Schools, among those educators favoring strongly the concept of meaningful school-community involvement. Marcus Foster, before his assassination, was an unswerving supporter of community power in assisting schools to better meet the

---


10 Ibid., p. 365.

11 Ibid., p. 365.
needs of students. In his discussion of this topic, Foster noted: "I am a great believer in the power of the total school community — staff, students, parents and interested citizens."

In the same book, Foster stated that, "In any kind of school setting, if the community believes that nothing is happening, then in fact, for them nothing is happening." Thus, one can readily see that Foster, Sidney Estes, and Nolan Estes believed that it was incumbent upon school districts, especially those districts in urban areas, to establish mechanisms not only to inform the community but to ensure a two-way communications system between the schools and community. Foster summarized his position concerning this area when he wrote:

A school isolated from its community never was a good idea. Nowadays, it is impossible. The people must have meaningful roles in making decisions in order for them to have legitimate means of expressing their power.

In spite of the strong stand Marcus Foster took on the need for meaningful school-community involvement, he did identify some constraints that many public school administrators should remember. According to Foster, those constraints are as follows:

Schools are state institutions. We are bound by state statutes; many of our powers simply cannot be given to the communities. But we can share, in increasingly effective ways, our decision-making prerogatives.

The discussion up to this point has not dealt with those persons who, according to the writer, would be placed on the extreme left end of the continuum of liberal thinkers in school-community involvement. Ivan Illich would be one of those

---


13 Ibid., p. 103.

14 Ibid., p. 158.

15 Ibid., p. 158.
Illich expressed his views concerning the rights of citizens in public education in the following statement:

*We need a guarantee of the right of each citizen to an equal share of tax derived educational resources, the right to verify this share, and the right to sue for it, if denied. It is one form of a guarantee against repressive taxation.*

Thus, the reader can clearly see that Illich isn't talking simply about schools sharing their "decision-making prerogatives" with the community or calling the community in to assist the schools on controversial issues. Illich is talking about the need for citizens to have a guaranteed right to ascertain how tax dollars are spent, influence the allocation of educational resources and the right to sue the state if it fails to perform its responsibilities effectively. This position is quite different from the views discussed up to this juncture.

Illich points out still another foible in present school-community relations by noting: "Educational reformers promise each new generation the latest and the best, and the public is schooled into demanding what they offer." This, according to Illich, is one of the fallacies of the present relationship between the schools and the community. Reverend C. Herbert Oliver, in his discussion of the Ocean Hill-Brownville situation in Brooklyn, New York, expressed views similar to those of Illich when he wrote:

Community control is that phase of human government in which a community of persons takes an active part in the government of their affairs. In its broadest sense, it extends to the total life of the

---


17 Ibid., pp. 42-43.
community (political, economical, social, religious) and embraces the most basic needs of a well-ordered society. In brief, according to Reverend Oliver: "The concept of community control is of the very essence of Western democracy. It is nothing more or less than local self-government."19

Before reviewing those writers and educators who have been categorized as "moderates" in the area of school-community involvement, the profound and apocalyptic words of Philip Meranto appear appropriate as he wrote: "...The future of education in our large cities will hinge upon the outcome of several political struggles. At the local level, conflict will center on who controls the school system."20 The writer, from an a priori viewpoint, agrees with Meranto's assessment of the situation in our urban school districts.

Looking now at those educators whom the writer has categorized as being "moderate" in their views, it should be noted that (1) an inordinate number of educators and writers could be placed in this category, (2) no attempt was made to provide an extensive review of literature in this category since each writer/educator was taking similar positions, and (3) the line of demarcation between liberals and moderates is not that distinct and should not be construed as being such. Keeping the preceding observations in mind, Fantini, Gittell, and Magot appear to represent adequately the "moderate" viewpoint as they wrote the following:


19Ibid., p.113.

Both the schools and the parents and community participants themselves benefit from their active involvement in the education process. Their very act of meaningful participation—a sense of greater control over a decisive institution that influences the fate of their children—contributes to parent's sense of potency and self-worth.

In the preceding statement the authors view community participation in the schools as being mutually beneficial to all parties (schools, parents, and community participants). It appears that this position is being taken, not so much that it will help students, but because of the fact that it gives the community "a sense of greater control" over educational institutions. One gets the feeling, after having read a statement similar to the one above, that educators should use school-community involvement programs to delude parents into believing that they have more power than they actually possess. Fantini, Gittell, and Magot reaffirmed the writer's contentions when they wrote the following statement:

Participatory democracy in education should also instill in parents and the community, a new respect for the complexity of the professional problems in urban education. Responsibility comes with the power of effective voice and, in its train, should follow judgment, stability, and dedication to constructive purposes.22

It should be noted here that after careful examination many educators viewed community involvement as just another strategy to co-opt community members and parents so that they would accept and support the professional educators' way of thinking. Bernays stressed this point when he wrote the following concerning the importance of public relations:

Public relations is a vital tool of adjustment, interpretation, and integration between individuals, groups, and society. Public understanding


22 Ibid., p. 96.
and support are basic to existence in our competitive system. To know how to get along with the public is important for everyone.23

The preceding statement describes how many "moderate" educators view school-community involvement. In brief, public school administrators and their community relations staff members are viewed as social planners whose primary functions are to discuss issues with the public and foster greater public support and understanding of the system's programs. Floyd Hunter provides some additional insight into this posture as he explained his definition of social planning:

Social planning means that groups and individuals who are concerned with issues, projects, and community problems may organize into effective bodies to discuss issues, coordinate opinions, help lay out policy to cover any specific problem, and lay out alternative ways of action to meet a given social need."24

Although Hunter emphasized the role that social planning played in formulating policies and developing alternative ways of addressing social needs, he also identified some critical factors that school public relations staffers would do well to remember. According to Hunter, the following observations would assist many educators in avoiding the traditional pitfalls that they all too often encounter:

The task of social reconstruction may never be finished once and for all. It is a recurring task confronting each generation, which somehow manages to find courage to meet social issues as they arise. In spite of the limitations that confront the individual in relation to community participation on the level of policy decision, there is still room for him in this area.25


25Ibid., p. 260.
Carl L. Marburger, a nationally known educator who is an outspoken and adamant supporter of community involvement in public education, concurs with the observations made by Hunter. In fact, Marburger's most profound comments on the problems of urban public schools are outlined in the following statement:

What, then, is wrong with the "urban school structure"? All too frequently, such school systems are not responsive to the demands of the parents and the children that they serve. Their leaders too often treat their public trust, not as public property, but as a fief earned by some "divine right," or as a token of fealty to city hall. All too many of the teachers and administrators in these systems are locked in a fervent struggle for status, and display loyalty first to their profession and only secondly to their charges.

The preceding statement by Marburger is a serious indictment of urban public school systems. One cannot avoid concluding that there is still much to be done in our urban schools to improve the status, viability, and credibility of urban administrators and systems. According to Marburger: "There is only one overriding way in which we (public school administrators) can win back this trust — and that is by vastly improving the quality of education."27 Anita F. Allen, former president of the Washington, D.C. Board of Education from January, 1970-November, 1971, expressed concerns similar to the contentions of Marburger as she wrote:

Personally, I tend to hold the paid professionals and the lay board of education primarily responsible for the caliber of our public schools, because society and parents and students have placed their confidence in them. It is the professionals who in the first instance must try to accomplish what needs to be accomplished to improve public education.28

---


27 Ibid., p. 145.

Again, one is reminded of the tremendous responsibilities that urban schools have in providing the leadership required to enhance student learning and effectuate more meaningful school-community relations. In this same article, Allen discussed what she felt the role of schools in the 70's should play:

The schools, in short, have a new role to play in the 1970's: They must become the advocates for children vis-a-vis the society as a whole. This means that the failures of public education cannot be excused by pointing to the shortcomings of the world around us. On the contrary, schools must now be judged on the basis of their effectiveness in performing the traditional task — that of freeing the mind — while at the same time acting as public spokesman for children and their parents.²⁹

In spite of this incisive and prophetic statement concerning public education in the 70's, Allen identified a perennial problem facing many school systems when she wrote: "The educational bureaucracy is truly self-perpetuating, omniscient, and omnipotent. It counts on being able to outlast any superintendent and any board member, and it generally can."³⁰ The preceding statement has greater credibility today (1975) than it did when it was written in the early 70's. This is especially true in light of what happened to Washington, D. C.'s first Black woman Superintendent of Schools, Barbara Sizemore, who was fired ostensibly for her strong stand for the students and community and her refusal to acquiesce to the D. C. Board and the educational bureaucracy under her supervision. It should be noted here that this situation is not unique to the Washington, D. C. school system and can be observed in many school districts throughout the nation. Some examples of other urban public school districts experiencing problems similar to what Sizemore faced in D. C. are such places as New York City, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Baltimore, Oakland, and Chicago. All of the previously

²⁹Ibid., p. 60.

³⁰Ibid., p. 69.
mentioned cities, along with many other school systems have one thing in common and that is an all encompassing anachronistic bureaucracy that continues to thwart any attempts to make it more responsive to the needs and concerns of the community.

Litwak and Meyer expressed their concern about the reluctance on the part of public school bureaucracies to change when they made the following observation:

We have been made particularly aware in recent years that our public school systems, or the individual schools that compose them, are not necessarily in tune with the needs and demands of the people they presume to serve.

Gittell and Havesi were even more critical than Litwak and Meyer as they denounced, in scathing terms, those unresponsive educational bureaucracies that have stultified the development and effectiveness of public educational institutions:

Those who now control the schools have been unable to produce results; they have excluded the public from its rightful role in the policy making process; the structure, therefore, must be adjusted to give the community a measure of control over educational institutions. Participation in itself provides an involvement with the system that can not only diminish attitudes of alienation but also serve to stimulate educational change. This new role for the community is not conceived as an abandonment of professionalism but, rather, as an effort to achieve proper balance between professionalism and public involvement in the policy process. The definition of community includes parents of school children, as well as those segments of the public that have been excluded from a role in public education.

---


Thus, one can see that although Gittell and Hevesi's denunciation of public education was intense, they did provide some suggestions and explanations that many public schools could utilize to improve their respective districts. Barth, in his discussion of the changing role of inner-city schools in the area of school-community involvement, provided some practical advice that all public school administrators would do well to heed:

Although school administrators are inclined to view greater parent involvement in the educational process as a threat, there is evidence that such involvement can provide strong support, pedagogically as well as politically, for programs intended to help inner-city children. \(^{33}\)

Also, according to Barth: "In the inner-city there is no longer a question of whether the school system wants to or will allow parents to participate in educational decisions affecting their children. Parents are participating."\(^{34}\)

Unfortunately, this reality has not been accepted and acknowledged by many public school officials. The failure on behalf of school administrators to espouse this philosophy could be adduced as a plausible explanation for some of the problems school administrators face when they seek additional financial support for the schools and are rejected by the public. If nothing else, past experience should teach educators that the public tends to support those institutions that they feel are productive and serving their specific need.

While many contemporary writers and educators continue to give much lip service to this "new" concept of community involvement in public education,


\(^{34}\)Ibid., p. 194.
Foshay provided the writer with some additional historical data when he wrote: One of the rare new ideas in education is that the community should participate fully in the schools. As an idea, this has a relatively brief history, though its historical context goes back to the Greeks.\textsuperscript{35} The preceding statement by Foshay is especially significant in light of the fact that historically various communities have been provided opportunities to participate in deciding how schools should be operated. The major difference, however, between the past and today is that community involvement in education was left primarily to chance or the specific interests of its patrons. Today, school-community participation, on the mere basis of the proliferation of public education, cannot afford to leave this phenomenon to chance. Foshay addressed this point as he explained his definition of community participation:

By 'community participation,' we mean that everyone in the community considers children and the young as learners and themselves as teachers. Education would not be delegated to a specialized set of people but would involve everyone in an educational role... Rarely since the Renaissance has the community been the educator.

In essence, Foshay is calling upon contemporary educators to use more effectively a valuable resource available to them — the community. Pressey and his colleagues support Foshay's contention by noting: "... As school, home, and community work more closely together and understand their common problems better, many difficulties with which the school now wrestles, and others that


\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 50.
Again, one is inclined to believe that if educators were wise, they would seize the opportunity to co-opt or convince the community that their assistance is needed. In fact, most of the writers in the moderate category suggested that this approach was the most tenable. Martin Carnoy, however, took a more radical stand in criticizing all schools by making the following observations:

We contend that the schools function to reinforce the social relations in production, and that no school reform can be separated from the effect it will have on the hierarchal relations in society. ... The success of educational reforms, in turn, depend on the relation of those reforms to change in the economic and social structures.

Carnoy has expressed some serious doubts about the ability of public schools to institute meaningful change. His major contention is that it is useless to talk about reforming the schools if one fails to effectuate changes in the economic and social structures that impact upon public education. Unfortunately, many contemporary educators who may not agree wholly with Carnoy are expressing similar concerns. One such educator and supporter of more school-community involvement is Carl Marburger who wrote:

I have great concern for the future of the public schools. Primary among my concerns is the apparent decrease in citizen participation in the decision-making and operation of the schools. In our democracy which is steeped in tradition of public participation in public education, there are dangerous signs of extreme erosion.

The public interest is, or should be, in the provision of the best quality of education for all children in the most efficient way. That interest must be translated through a strong citizen base. The public's interest is not

---


necessarily always served by those who profit from it, whether they be employees of school systems, politicians seeking office or to keep it, or manufacturers of books, school supplies or equipment.

Upon closer examination one can see that Marburger and Carnoy are saying essentially the same thing. In essence, both men accept the fact that the public's interest is not necessarily served by persons who profit from their involvement with public education or its products, the students. Kenneth Clark expressed similar concerns as he urged the public to adopt a multi-faceted approach to addressing and resolving its problems. Clark was very emphatic in his admonitions to the public as he discouraged the use of one-dimensional problem solving techniques. His (Clark's) most profound observation related to the public's tendency to give too much credence to the research and/or proposed solutions of social scientists. According to Clark: "The public must be alerted to the vulnerabilities — the human frailties — of social scientists. There must be continued reliance upon the political, the legislative, and the judicial apparatuses — in spite of their imperfections — for determinations on matters of equity and justice." In brief, all three writers agree with the premise that effective decision-making must be broadly based and diverse.

Realizing that there is an inordinate number of writers and educators who could be categorized as moderates in the area of school-community relations, the writer shall turn his attention to those persons whose views are more conservative. One of the major proponents of a conservative philosophy in school-community relations is Carl Weinberg who made the following observations:


Education, ..., cannot do its work by following the mandates of political expediency or even community response. But the major changes in educational structures need to flow from an internal rather than an external set of demands. The community and for the most part well meaning political figures only vaguely understand the dynamics of process; they do respond with spirit to a conception of profit.

The preceding statement is typical of how many conservative educators view political and community input. Blau and Scott responded to this kind of conservative thinking as they wrote:

It is ironic, ..., that the motto, 'the customer is always right' originated in those organizations which may legitimately consider its owners and managers as prime beneficiaries, whereas the service organizations — whose prime beneficiary is the client in contact — do not, in general allow their 'customer' either to diagnose or to prescribe. The service organizations typically, are manned by professionals who are presumed to know the clients' true needs better than he.

In essence, Blau and Scott are questioning the right of professionals, particularly those in service organizations such as the public schools, social service agencies, etc., to reject input from the people whom they are serving. Schiller presents a plausible explanation for those professionals who are reluctant to seek and utilize advice from their clients by pointing out: "The flow of information in a complex society is a source of unparalleled power. It is unrealistic to imagine that control of this power will be relinquished readily." What Schiller is implying is

---


that many "professionals" are elitist and view political and community input as an attack upon their hard earned and well deserved power. Williams points out that regardless of whether a system is liberal, moderate, or conservative in its approach to school-community involvement, the following advice should be considered:

Before involving the community in any change endeavor, the persons initiating such action should clearly understand the change concepts they advocate and be able to articulate those concepts.  

The foregoing advice is particularly helpful in light of the fact that many educators whose views are conservative in the area of school-community relations assume this posture because they do not feel comfortable and/or competent enough to take their ideas to the public for review and approval. It is the writer's belief that the general reluctance of many public officials to provide for political and community input stems from the observations made in the preceding sentence.

One of the interesting observations made by the writer as he reviewed the literature in school-community relations is that many of the writers agreed with the argument of the conservatives. One such example is the discussion presented by Johns, Morphet and Reller on the issue — "Is There Danger That Public Opinion Will Be Too Large A Determiner of Educational Practice?" Although these writers stated emphatically that they believed in meaningful school-community involvement, these observations were made during their discussion of the foregoing question:

There is danger that uninformed public opinion or perhaps a small but highly vocal group will have too large an influence on educational

---

practice. ... The individual or group with the greatest pressure potential does not necessarily have the sound answer. 45

Here, one can see that even those educators who are staunch supporters of school-community relations have their doubts about putting too much power into the hands of the public. Johns, Morphet, and Reller expanded on their convictions by noting: "The development of sound educational practices demands that there be recognition of the limitations of the expert. ... It also requires that the contribution of the expert be recognized and capitalized upon." 46 Again, what is being suggested by the aforementioned writers is that in spite of the problems inherent in adopting an effective school-community involvement process, respect and reason should prevail in both camps, i.e., among the professional educators and laymen (community).

Mindful of the fact that some degree of conservatism can be found in the writings of many of the educators reviewed in this study, the writer shall devote the balance of this chapter to the consideration of those factors that influence individuals and groups as they pursue goals similar to the ones described in this study. One such example of the constraints impacting upon group planning and problem solving was presented by Johns, Morphet, and Reller:

There are limits to involvement in terms of available time, in terms of the contribution of those involved, and in terms of the abilities of the various parties to work together in a satisfactory manner.

Development of plans for and working with large numbers of laymen is time consuming for the educator. ...
Limitations may also exist in terms of the competency of various people to contribute to the specific issue under consideration. . . .

Limitations to involvement are also found in the competency of people to work together. If they have had little experience in group processes and are emotionally attached to certain proposed solutions, little good is likely to result from their consideration of the problem.

The preceding concerns are discussed by many other writers who have studied the effectiveness of groups in planning and problem solving. Katz and Kahn cited research conducted by Maier and Hoffman concerning the quality of group problem solving:

The determinants of the quality of group problem-solving have been systematically studied by Maier and Hoffman. These investigations found that homogeneous groups (composed of members similar with respect to personality characteristics) produced fewer high quality solutions than did heterogeneous groups (Hoffman and Maier, 1961; Hoffman, 1959). Presumably, diversity of approach among group members facilitates problem solving.

The social-psychologist George Meade provided some additional insight into how individuals behave in groups as he wrote:

. . . Those social situations in which the individual finds it most difficult to integrate his own behavior with the behavior of others are those in which he and they are acting as members, respectively, of two or more different socially functional groups: groups whose respective social purposes are antagonistic or conflicting or widely separated.

If one were to compare the statements by Maier and Hoffman with that of Meade, it would be obvious that there is some disagreement among the aforementioned writers. Hoffman and Maier are saying that heterogeneous

---

47 Ibid., pp. 143-144.


grouping facilitates group problem solving and Meade has presented the antithesis of this position. In spite of the disagreement between the foregoing authors, the statement by Johns, Morphet, and Reller is appropriate as they wrote:

A committee, in order to be effective, must become a group rather than an aggregation of individuals in a struggle for survival. Therefore, the administrator in order to use committees effectively, must be aware of the characteristics of effective groups.  

The above statement gets to the very core of effective group planning and problem solving by placing the responsibility on the administrator to assemble persons with diverse opinions and assist them in employing different viewpoints in such a way that they will be able to accomplish the task confronting them. Admittedly, this is a mammoth job, but this is the responsibility that public administrators will have to assume if they wish to achieve maximum community input. Litwak and Meyer expressed similar views when they noted: "Our analysis suggests that experts in the school and nonexperts in the community should be in communication with one another." Lightfoot and Li, although expressing support for effective community involvement with public agencies, pointed out: "Today, in many kinds of group activities, sophisticated adults often feel that they are being manipulated." Unfortunately, many community members feel this way when they are asked by public agencies to assist them in their planning and/or problem solving. This lack of trust by community members has been caused primarily because many public organizations only involve the public after the problem has

---
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gotten out of control. Therefore, it is not surprising to find many laymen who question the sincerity of "professionals" who seek their advice only during crisis situations.

Katz and Kahn provided the most profound statement concerning group decision making when they wrote:

Immediate pressures often seem so overwhelming to executives that they will accept some hasty solution and bypass a thorough analysis of the problem and a careful weighing of the likely major consequences of their action.

In essence, group problem solving could eliminate the possibility of public officials making hasty and irrational decisions. This particular point was further explicated by the above writers in a different section of the same work, as they wrote:

Decision-making in organizations with respect to substantive goals is sooner or later confronted with two types of critical questions: (1) clarity and consistency of objectives versus the pressures of expediency, and (2) broadening of goals versus the narrow self-interest of the organizations.

According to Katz and Kahn, the clarity and consistency of objectives and the broadening of goals would be more desirable than the two alternatives listed above.

Looking briefly at the theories of other writers in the areas of group planning and problem solving, Deutsch and Krauss have posited some assumptions which are noteworthy:

Pressures toward uniformity among members of a group may arise because such uniformity is desirable or necessary in order for the group to move toward some goal. Greater uniformity within a group can be achieved in either of the following ways: (1) by actions (communications) that are directed at changing one's own views or (2) by actions to make others incomparable in the sense that they are no longer effective as a

---
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comparison for one's opinion (rejecting or excluding people with deviating opinions from the group).

Although Deutsch and Krauss do not advocate or espouse any of the strategies outlined above, they do provide the writer with some helpful research data on these approaches:

While there has, as yet, been little research to indicate the conditions that will lead the pressure toward uniformity to manifest itself in a rejection of deviates rather than in an attempt to influence them to change, experiments by Gerard (1953) and by Festinger and Thibaut (1951) suggest that, as the heterogeneity of a group increases, rejection of deviates also increases.

Therefore, based on what has been stated in the preceding paragraph, individuals who work in heterogeneous groups are less likely to respond to group pressures in the same manner as those persons who work in homogeneous group settings. A study conducted by Back, Festinger, and Schachter entitled, Social Pressures in Informal Groups, provides data which substantiate the foregoing assumptions concerning individual behavior in varying group situations. Deutsch, Morton, and Krauss explained this phenomenon in succinct terms, as they wrote:

Isolated persons may perhaps change their attitudes because of their experiences, but the person who is deeply enmeshed in the social life of his community is unlikely to be able to resist the pressures to conform on matters of community importance if he wishes to continue in good standing.


56 Ibid., p. 58.


If one wished to apply the above statement to a broader spectrum of society, one could begin to understand more clearly how small pressure groups within a community can raise the ire of the entire community and influence them (community members) to react irrationally on such issues as busing, prayer in the public schools, contemporary textbooks, etc. Unfortunately, many of the people who get caught in these issues do so because of peer group and community pressures.

The above phenomenon and the other factors discussed in this chapter served as a frame of reference for the writer in his description of the process utilized by the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee in the development of a system-wide community involvement program.
CHAPTER III

AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
AND A REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE CEPC

Introduction

It has been said that the most practical way to understand why certain events occur is to examine those factors that influenced the final product. This chapter is designed ostensibly to accomplish the aforementioned goal. Therefore, the primary purposes of this chapter will be to provide the reader with a brief description of the Atlanta Public School System and a comprehensive account of all of the activities that were involved in the development of the Atlanta Public Schools' "School-Community Involvement Plan." Additionally, the writer has included his personal observations that will, hopefully, shed some light on the group and interpersonal relations of the individuals who participated in the development of this "plan."

Looking first at the historical development of the Atlanta Public Schools, the following descriptive data are appropriate:¹

1. The history of the Atlanta Public Schools dates back to 1869, when the City Council established the Atlanta School Board.

2. The first public schools for whites were opened in 1870 and two years later (1872), the Board assumed responsibility for the two black schools started by the Freedmen's Bureau.

3. From 1872 to 1961, Atlanta operated a dual school system.

4. In 1955 black parents, having been encouraged by the landmark, Brown v. Board of Education Decision (1954), petitioned the Atlanta Board of Education to eliminate segregation of the public schools.

5. In January 1958, a group of black parents, with the assistance of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), filed a civil action suit against the Atlanta Public School System. The initial suit was filed under the name of Calhoun v. Cook et. al., Civil Action No. 6298.

6. On January 18, 1960, the U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, approved a "Freedom of Choice Plan" submitted by the Atlanta Board. The "Plan" called for the desegregation of the schools to begin during the 1960-61 school term, beginning with the twelfth grade and adding one grade each subsequent year. During this period, the total school enrollment was 98,894 students. Fifty-five per cent of the students were white and forty-five per cent were black. There were 135 schools — 91 white and 44 black.

7. In September 1961, grades 11 and 12 were desegregated on a very limited basis. Nine black students enrolled in four different previously all white high schools.

8. In April 1965, the U. S. District Court ordered the System to speed up its desegregation process and have all grades completed by 1968.

9. In May 1967, the U. S. Supreme Court decision of Green v. New Kent County, Virginia nullified "freedom of choice" as a viable way to effectuate school desegregation and brought the Calhoun v. Cook, et. al. case back before the court.

10. In January 1970, the Atlanta School Board presented a new plan to the Court. The new plan (1) abolished the freedom of choice plan, (2) instituted a "majority to minority" transfer policy, (3) proposed new zoning to bring about more integration, and (4) proposed that faculty transfers be made on the basis of the system-wide black-white ratios. The transfers were made on a lottery basis and resulted in a total of 1,600 of the approximately 5,000 school staff being transferred.

11. The above measures, especially the faculty transfers, increased significantly the out-migration of whites from the Atlanta Public Schools. The student population had grown at a steady rate from 1960-1968. In 1960, the enrollment was 96,961. In 1968, the enrollment was 113,470. Since 1968, the student enrollment has declined at a steady rate.

12. The above situation was further accelerated in April, 1973 when Judge Henderson accepted a "Compromise Plan" which provided for
(1) desegregation of administration, (2) staff desegregation, (3) majority to minority transfer plan, and (4) student assignment plan.

13. In July 1973, the System's first black superintendent, Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, was appointed by the Board. One of Dr. Crim's major thrusts was to be in the area of enhancing school-community involvement.

14. On May 1, 1974, Judge Henderson issued his decree on the effectiveness of the System's Compromise Plan. In this decree, Judge Henderson concluded that 'the Atlanta School District is unitary and has purged itself of all vestiges of the formerly state imposed dual system.'

15. Presently, the Atlanta School System has approximately 85,000 students. Approximately 85 per cent of the students are black and 15 per cent are white. The School Board has nine members. Five of the Board members are black including the Board president, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, and four Board members are white.

The preceding data provide the kind of historical perspective which is needed to fully understand many of the observations and comments made throughout the development of the "plan."

As a means of providing the reader with a logical and comprehensible account of what transpired during each of the eight regularly scheduled meetings discussed herein, the writer has also described and analyzed those events which occurred between each meeting. This additional information will make it easier for the reader to follow the evolutionary process involved in the development of the "plan." The reader will also have a greater insight into those underlying factors that influenced each Committee member's behavior during the regular meeting sessions.

Finally, the last section of this chapter will be devoted to the writer's overall analysis of the events which are discussed and analyzed herein. It is believed that by utilizing this approach, the reader would gain an even greater insight into the advantages and/or disadvantages of this process in developing a system-wide school-community involvement plan.
The first meeting of the Community Education Planning Committee was held on Thursday, July 8, 1975. The meeting began at 2:00 p.m. in the conference room of the Community Affairs Division and adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The most interesting observations made by the writer were: (1) the surprise some of the persons in attendance expressed concerning their being asked to serve on the Committee, (2) the enthusiasm and interest expressed by the group concerning the need for such a project, and (3) the level of interchange that occurred during the discussion phase of the meeting. The latter observation was quite surprising in view of the diverse experiential and educational backgrounds of the persons present. In fact, before continuing to discuss what transpired during the first meeting, the writer feels that it would be appropriate to enumerate the names and positions of those persons who were in attendance: (See Appendix A for more complete details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ms. Veverly Byrd</td>
<td>Student, Turner High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ms. Betty Cantor</td>
<td>Director of Anti-Defamation League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mr. Alvin Dawson</td>
<td>Area IV Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mr. Horace Eberhart</td>
<td>Teacher, George High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mrs. Allene Hall</td>
<td>Secretary, Atlanta Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ms. Goldie Johnson</td>
<td>Parent and President of the Atlanta Council for Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mr. Milt Lincoln</td>
<td>Associate Director of Community Affairs Atlanta Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mr. Harold B. Miller</td>
<td>Principal, Grady High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mr. Victor Moody</td>
<td>Student, Washington High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ms. Carole Mumford</td>
<td>Education Specialist, Atlanta Urban League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mr. Stephen D. Ramsaur</td>
<td>Regional Custodial Staff Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mr. Pete Richards</td>
<td>Parent, Co-President of Morningside Elementary School PTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ms. Joann D. Smith</td>
<td>Teacher, E. A. Ware Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mr. Dan P. Young</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Political Science at Atlanta University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ms. Jacquelyn Young</td>
<td>President of City-Wide PTA Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ms. Barbara I. Whitaker</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for the Division of Community Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Mr. Norman Thomas</td>
<td>Convener/Recorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first order of business was conducted by the writer who had been delegated the responsibility of presiding during this initial meeting. He (the writer) thanked the participants for agreeing to serve on the Community Education Planning Committee (CEPC) and asked that they introduce themselves to the rest of the group. As mentioned in Chapter I, the persons who were invited to serve on the Committee by the Superintendent, Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, were selected from a list of names submitted by school staff and certain school-community organizations.

When the introductions had been completed, Ms. Whitaker expressed her appreciation to the Committee members and delivered the formal "charge" to the Committee. The major aspects of Ms. Whitaker's "charge" to the Committee are outlined below: (See Appendix B).

1. The Superintendent, Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, is committed to the idea of school-community involvement and believes that the best way to ensure that schools and their communities work together is that they begin planning together.
2. The convening of the Community Education Planning Committee is a concrete example of the Superintendent and Community Affairs Division's belief in joint planning and cooperation with all levels of the school-community.

3. The primary purpose of the Committee will be to develop a system-wide community involvement plan for the Atlanta Public Schools and recommend said plan to the Superintendent for action.

4. The specific objectives of the Committee will be to (1) develop a definitive school-community involvement plan, (2) establish minimum standards of community involvement for all units in the Atlanta Public Schools, (3) design a mechanism to accomplish this goal, and (4) recommend the plan developed by the Committee to the Superintendent for his approval.

5. The organization chart for the Committee was presented and explained.

6. The time frame for the Committee to complete its work was also presented.

When Ms. Whitaker had completed her "charge" to the Committee, an interesting question and answer period followed. Milt Lincoln of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce noted that the time frame appeared too short for the job that the Committee was being asked to perform. Other members of the group agreed and inquired as to why such a short time frame had been given. Ms. Whitaker stated that the short time frame stemmed from the Superintendent's desire to have the plan prepared for presentation to the Board at the beginning of the 1975-76 school year. Betty Cantor asked candidly whether this was just another exercise in futility or would the Superintendent and Board really utilize the plan recommended by the Committee. Ms. Whitaker noted that she could not speak for the Board, but she was positive that the Superintendent would favor and support their plan. "Otherwise," stated Ms. Whitaker, "the Superintendent would not have asked all you busy and important people to serve on this Committee." Ms. Jackie Young inquired about how this new mechanism would affect existing local PTA's. Ms. Whitaker stated that she didn't feel that the plan developed by the Committee
would have an adverse effect on local PTA's. "In fact," Ms. Whitaker stated, "the plan might strengthen the local PTA's."

The balance of the discussion during the meeting revolved around the aforementioned concerns. Around 3:15 p.m., the writer suggested that the Committee members review the information given to them in their folders concerning what other school systems are doing in the area of school-community involvement and come prepared at the next meeting to establish task forces, elect a chairman, and begin working on the stated objectives. Ms. Whitaker and the writer thanked the participants again for agreeing to serve and asked when there would be a convenient time to have the next meeting. The group agreed to meet at 2:00 p.m. on July 22, 1975. On this final note, the meeting was adjourned.

**Significant Events Between the July 8 and July 22, 1975 Meetings**

A project of this nature would not be complete if it were limited to those observations that were made during each meeting session. Therefore, following each set of Committee meeting minutes, the writer shall describe the pertinent events that occurred between the regularly scheduled meetings:

1. Immediately following the first meeting, the writer was approached by Pete Richards of the Committee who asked whether he could be given a block of time during the upcoming meeting to discuss a community involvement plan he had developed and presented to the Superintendent for review and approval. The writer responded by pointing out that it was not the purpose of the Committee to take an existing plan and adopt it in toto, but to examine plans from many different school districts. Therefore, the writer continued, the Committee members are the ones who would decide what would be discussed during subsequent meetings. Mr. Richards agreed with the writer's comments and stated that he would bring the request up during the next regularly scheduled meeting.

2. According to Ms. Whitaker, a few days after Mr. Richards had discussed his desire to explain the plan he had developed to the full Committee, he (Mr. Richards) called Dr. Crim and expressed some concern about the writer not encouraging the presentation of his plan.
3. On July 18, 1975, Mr. Richards called the writer and again discussed the need to have his plan presented to the Committee members. The writer repeated his earlier position and suggested that he present this request during the July 22, 1975 meeting. Mr. Richards agreed with this suggestion.

4. On the date (July 22, 1975) of the second meeting, Mr. Richards called the writer from Birmingham, Alabama where he was on a business trip and expressed regrets that he would not be able to attend the meeting. However, Mr. Richards requested that the writer provide the Committee members with the following information: (1) the school-community involvement plan should be simple, inexpensive, and interface with existing school-community organizations, (2) the plan should provide for maximum input from businessmen and influential public officials, and (3) the expressed school-community involvement structure should be broad enough to encompass all segments of Atlanta's community.

Second Meeting — July 22, 1975
Notes and Observations

The first order of business for this meeting was the introduction of the Committee members who were absent during the first meeting. The new persons present were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forbes Bottomly</td>
<td>Chairman, Department of Educational Administration, Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Crowder</td>
<td>Parent and Member of the Atlanta Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Dixon</td>
<td>Principal, King Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Johnson</td>
<td>Social Studies Teacher, George High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Lefever</td>
<td>Founder/Director of the &quot;Patch&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Watkins</td>
<td>Student, Turner High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the new introductions had been completed, the writer reviewed briefly what had transpired during the initial meeting and answered questions that some members raised. The question of whether the projected completion date
(August 1975) was realistic came up again and the writer responded by noting that if the Committee members felt that strongly about the proposed deadline for completing the project, more time could be secured. Once this question had been resolved, the writer reminded the group that one of the major purposes for this meeting was to elect someone to serve as Committee Chairman. Horace Eberhart, a high school social studies teacher, nominated Milt Lincoln from the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. Harold Miller, a high school principal, introduced a motion to close the nomination on the one name. Esther Lefever, founder and director of The Patch, seconded the motion and it was carried as read. Thus, Milt Lincoln assumed his responsibilities as Chairman and conducted the business during the balance of the meeting. Immediately after Milt assumed his role as Committee Chairman, it became apparent to the writer that there were some clear-cut philosophical differences among the professional members of the group. The specific incident which brought these differences to the forefront was when the writer informed the group of the suggestions called in by Pete Richards from Birmingham, Alabama. As stated earlier, Pete wanted the group to consider a simple plan that was broadly based, yet well represented with businessmen and public officials who would be expected to assume the leadership role in fostering better school-community involvement. Milt indicated that he thought Pete's plan had some merits but he would not endorse a plan that would give businessmen and other public officials a greater influence than the "lay" community. Dan Young, a political science instructor from Atlanta University, agreed with Milt and pointed out that Pete's plan wasn't anything but a subtle way of letting the same old white businessmen continue to dictate to the Atlanta Public School System as to how it should function when most of the business people don't even live in the city. "Furthermore," Dan stated, "those white businessmen and public officials who live in
Atlanta don't send their children to the Atlanta Public Schools." Milt, who is Black and employed by the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, became very indignant and retorted by pointing out to Dan that regardless of whether White businessmen lived outside of the city, these men headed up institutions that helped pay the taxes which provided revenue to support the System. Esther Lefever, Betty Cantor, Goldie Johnson, and Horace Eberhart agreed with Dan on this issue. Forbes Bottomly, Alvin Dawson, and Harold Miller expressed lukewarm support for Milt's position. The other members present, Veverly Byrd, Carolyn Crowder, Robert Dixon, Allene Hall, Catherine Johnson, Victor Moody, Stephen Ramsaur, Joann Smith, and Dee Watkins remained silent and observed the dialogue between the two aforementioned opposing factions.

The balance of the meeting was spent discussing the advantages and disadvantages of having the businessmen and public officials provide the leadership role in facilitating effective school-community involvement. As the meeting progressed, the discussion between Milt and Dan became so heated that the writer intervened by pointing out to the group that it was too soon to become bogged down in a long drawn out philosophical discussion concerning the specific aspects of the plan. The writer then suggested that it might be more appropriate to review what other school systems are doing in school-community relations and come prepared during the next meeting to discuss what mechanism they felt would be more appropriate for the Atlanta School System. The Committee members accepted the preceding suggestion and requested the writer to secure some additional copies of school-community involvement plans from other school systems. The writer indicated that this information was already in his files and he would duplicate copies of these plans and send them to each member before the next Committee meeting. Milt then asked whether the group wanted to meet on the same day
(Tuesday) of the next week. The majority of the group said yes. The next meeting date was set for July 29, 1975. A motion for adjournment was introduced and carried. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

PERSONS PRESENT: (See Appendix for Complete List)

1. Forbes Bottomly
2. Veverly Byrd
3. Betty Cantor
4. Carolyn Crowder
5. Alvin Dawson
6. Robert L. Dixon
7. Horace L. Eberhart
8. Allene Hall
9. Catherine Johnson
10. Goldie Johnson
11. Esther Lefever
12. Milt Lincoln
13. Harold B. Miller
14. Victor Moody
15. Stephen D. Ramsaur
16. Joann D. Smith
17. Dee Watkins
18. Dan Young
19. Norman Thomas — Convener/Recorder

Significant Events Between the July 22, 1975 and July 29, 1975 Meetings

1. Immediately after the July 22, 1975 meeting was adjourned, Dan Young called the writer aside and expressed concern about the directions the Committee's activities were taking. Dan reiterated his orginal statement during the meeting and stated quite bluntly that, "the Atlanta School System is 85 per cent Black and we (Blacks) can't afford to sit back and let White businessmen who don't live in the city influence the education of our children."

2. During the time that Dan and I were talking, Milt had walked back to Ms. Whitaker's office and expressed some concern about the radical position Dan had taken during the meeting. According to Ms. Whitaker, Milt was so incensed by Dan's remarks that he exclaimed — "Who does he (Dan) think he is? I will make it so rough that he won't be able to turn in this city. After all, he still has to depend on support from private industry to support some of his programs." This conversation lasted about thirty minutes after the meeting had been adjourned.
3. Based upon the observations during and immediately after the July 22, 1975 meeting, the writer concluded that the following measures would have to be taken to ensure that accurate and comprehensive descriptions of the activities during the meeting sessions were provided:

(a) Develop a standardized form to record minutes and observations during each meeting session. (See Appendix C.)

(b) Write up minutes from each meeting and forward information to Committee members so that they could remain apprised of what happened during the meeting sessions.

(c) Reiterate to Committee members the importance of this project to the System and express the need for each Committee member's continued, full, and unrelenting support.

The above measures were designed to improve the reporting process and encourage greater and sustained participation from those Committee members who were reticent during previous meetings.

Third Meeting — July 29, 1975

Notes and Observations

Armed with a uniform format for recording meeting activities and a greater feel for how Committee members related to each other, the writer approached the third official meeting of the Community Education Planning Committee with renewed enthusiasm. The meeting began at 2:00 p.m. Milt Lincoln, the Committee Chairman, opened the meeting by having the writer read the minutes from the last meeting. Corrections and/or clarifications were asked for after the reading of the minutes. There were none. The minutes were approved as read.

Milt turned to the writer and inquired about the school-community involvement plans that were scheduled to be given to members of the Committee for their review. The writer proceeded to give each member copies of the school-community involvement plans from the Dallas, Detroit, Oakland, and Seattle public
school systems. Goldie Johnson, a parent, expressed some concern that after two years of existence, Atlanta's Community Affairs Division did not even have tentative plans for enhancing school-community relations. The writer addressed Goldie's concern and stated that a school-community involvement plan had been written by the writer as early as June 1974, but due to the fact that the School Board had rejected a similar plan which was introduced by Carolyn Crowder of the Board, the proposed plan was placed in the files. Additionally, the writer noted that the Atlanta System did not have any kind of policy relative to school-community involvement and in the absence of Board policy, the Community Affairs Division could not proceed with the proposed plan. Ms. Crowder spoke to this point also, and expressed some hope that her colleagues on the Board would reverse their original decision to reject any definitive plan or policy on school-community involvement. Goldie stated that she understood the constraints that the Board had placed on the Community Affairs Division, but she also wanted to see the school-community involvement plan developed by this Division. Goldie's request was honored and each Committee member was given a copy of the plan developed by the writer. (See Appendix D.)

At this juncture, Milt indicated that he had given a great deal of thought to the type of school-community involvement plan the System should have and conceded that it was very similar to the plan proposed by the writer in June 1974. The plan presented by Milt was outlined in the following manner:

On the Local Level, each school would have a school-community advisory committee comprised of all levels within the school. The Area-Wide Level, according to Milt, would draw its membership from the local school-community organizations. The membership on this level wasn't spelled out clearly by Milt and he suggested that the entire Committee assist him in solving this problem.
However, on the City-Wide Level, Milt made it clear that this was where he felt the business community could provide the greatest assistance to the System. In fact, Milt stated categorically that the business community would have the foresight and wherewithal to provide the kind of leadership that the predominantly lay Board had failed to provide. Dan Young, who had been relatively silent up to this point, became incensed. Dan responded by pointing out to Milt that this Committee did not need him to come before the group with a "bill of goods" from the Downtown Atlanta Business Establishment. Milt, according to Dan, was advocating that traditional Chamber of Commerce approach to influencing the public schools that was wholly inappropriate for a System that is 85 per cent Black. Milt, who had also become angry, pointed out to Dan that he obviously had a problem accepting the fact that regardless of whether we (Blacks) like it or not, White businessmen play a major role in supporting the Atlanta Public schools. "This fact," Milt stated, "cannot be ignored and cast aside as if it did not exist." During this heated discussion between Dan and Milt, some of the other Committee members became involved. Esther Lefever, Horace Eberhart, Carole Mumford, and Betty Cantor expressed support for Dan's viewpoint and indicated that "lay" representation on all levels should be greater than that of the professionals. Harold Miller and Pete Richards leaned more toward the position taken by Milt. The other persons present, Joann Smith, Victor Moody, and Jacquelyn Young did not comment one way or the other.

Before the meeting became too unmanageable, Victor Moody, a student, expressed concern about the petty bickering among some of the Committee members and suggested that the group simply review Milt's plan and make suggestions. Victor's comments put the group back on task and the following recommendations were made by Committee members:
1. Betty, Harold, and Carole—All categories (students, parents, teachers, administrators, community, etc.) should be represented on each of the three levels (local, area, and city-wide).

2. Esther, Horace, and Betty—Agreed with the above statement, but reiterated their belief in having more "lay" than "professionals" comprising each level of the proposed school-community organizations.

3. Dan—Remained adamant in his opposition to Milt's plan and suggested that the Committee utilize the "Cluster Concept" in designing a school-community involvement plan for the System.

4. Milt—Continued to disagree with Dan, but agreed that Dan's plan should be written up and presented to the Committee in the same manner that he had done. Dan agreed to have his plan written up and ready for discussion during the next regularly scheduled meeting.

It was on the above note that Milt asked the group when it would like to meet again. Dan pointed out that due to the fact that he needed some time to think through and write his "Cluster Concept Plan," the Committee should meet two weeks from the July 29, 1975 date, which was August 12, 1975. The Committee membership agreed with Dan's suggestion and the meeting was adjourned.

**Persons Present**

1. Betty Cantor
2. Horace Eberhart
3. Esther Lefever
4. Milt Lincoln
5. Harold B. Miller
6. Victor Moody
7. Carole Mumford
8. Pete Richards
9. Joann Smith
10. Dan Young
11. Jacquelyn Young
12. Norman Thomas — Convener/Recorder
Significant Events Between the July 29, 1975 and August 12, 1975 Meetings

1. The day after the July 29, 1975 meeting, Milt called the writer and again expressed concern about some of the comments made by Dan during the above mentioned meeting. Milt stated that he felt Dan's ideas were too impractical and would not be acceptable to the Board. He (Milt) was particularly concerned about how some of the other Committee members felt about Dan's approach. According to Milt, at least two members of the group had expressed some dissatisfaction with the way Dan "imposed" his viewpoints on other Committee members. The writer listened patiently and noted that this was just Dan's way and would call this concern to his (Dan's) attention.

2. Dan called the writer later during the same week, August 1, 1975, and requested a time that the two of us could sit down with a map showing the locations of all the Atlanta Public Schools and work on his plan to cluster the schools for the purpose of facilitating effective school-community involvement. The meeting was set for Tuesday, August 5, 1975.

3. Immediately after talking with Dan, the writer explained to Ms. Whitaker the problem that seemed to be developing between Dan and Milt. Ms. Whitaker informed the writer that she was aware of this problem and suggested that the writer prepare a memo and send it to all Committee members outlining the constraints and parameters under which they were to operate. (See Appendix E for a copy of this memo.)

4. On Tuesday, August 5, 1975, Dan and the writer met in the conference room of the Community Affairs Division and identified the schools within each of the four school areas that could be clustered. When this task was completed, Dan informed the writer that he needed to write the narrative for his "Cluster Concept" plan and as soon as this was completed, he would bring it by the office for the writer's secretary to type, duplicate, and prepare for distribution to Committee members during the August 12, 1975 meeting.

5. On August 7, 1975, Dan brought his proposed plan by the writer's office so that it could be typed and duplicated for members of the Committee during the August 12, 1975 meeting.

6. On August 12, 1975, just before the Committee meeting, Dan came by and received copies of his plan.
The meeting began at its usual time of 2:00 p.m. in the conference room of the Community Affairs Division. The chairman, Milt Lincoln, called the meeting to order and noted that very few Committee members were present. The writer was asked by Milt whether he had sent out the notices of this meeting as he had done in the past. In response, the writer noted that he not only sent out the memo announcing the meeting, but had asked his secretary to call each member on the morning of the meeting to remind him to attend. It was further noted by the writer that most of the persons called were either out of the office, on vacation, or simply unavailable. Goldie reminded the writer and the other Committee members, as she had done previously, that poor attendance should not be surprising since most people took their vacations during this time of the year. Milt agreed with Goldie and noted that since attendance was so low, the members should review what was done during the last regularly scheduled meeting.

Before Milt could finish explaining what transpired during the last Committee meeting, Dan reminded the group that he had developed the "Cluster Concept" plan discussed during the last meeting and was prepared to make his presentation. Milt thanked Dan for reminding him of the plan he(Dan) had been asked to develop and asked whether he wanted to make his presentation at this juncture during the meeting. Dan indicated that he did and proceeded to present his plan. (See Appendix F for complete details.) The following is a summary of Dan's plan.

1. Each of the four areas would be divided into seven or eight clusters. (Elementary School Council Districts.)
2. Three to four elementary schools would constitute one cluster.

3. Persons serving on the elementary school councils would have to have a child enrolled in one of the elementary schools comprising the cluster, be a registered voter, and live in the area district for a period of six months before filing for office.

4. Each member of the cluster would be elected by parents from the cluster schools and serve for a period of two years.

5. School elections would be held to coincide with elections for the Georgia General Assembly.

6. Each cluster would have nine elected members and the chairman of each cluster would automatically sit as a full voting member of the Area-Wide Advisory Councils.

7. Members of the Area-wide Councils would have the chairman and the two other members as their representatives to the twelve-member System-Wide Citizens Advisory Panel.

8. The geographical boundaries would be determined by the established zones of the four existing areas.

Immediately after Dan had finished explaining the above plan, Goldie asked Dan what input the middle and high schools would have and where the money would come from to pay for the proposed elections. Dan responded to the latter question by pointing out that if the elections were held in conjunction with those of the Georgia General Assembly, the cost would be minimal. Responding to the former question, Dan noted that high and middle school students would be reserved two at-large seats on the Area-Wide Advisory Council. Goldie expressed her concern to Dan about the impracticality of the plan he devised. Milt, Carole, and Allene agreed with Goldie and reminded Dan of the fact that the Board had a history of being conservative in the area of school-community involvement and his plan was too radical for the Board to approve. Forbes stated that he felt that Dan was on the right track, but the Committee should start with a mechanism that is less complicated and expensive. Dan noted that the System spent money on less important projects with no objections and raised the question as to why everyone is
so money conscious now. Milt and the other members present explained to Dan
that their concern was not only money, but the desire to formulate a plan that
would at least stand a chance of being approved by the Superintendent and Board.

The discussion proceeded along this line for approximately thirty minutes until
the writer reminded the group that they did not have a quorum and although their
suggestions were very helpful, no decision could be reached on any plan until a
quorum was present. It was on this note that Milt suggested that a less
cumbersome plan be developed by the Committee. The persons present, over Dan's
objections, agreed to refine the plan developed and presented to the Committee by
Milt at an earlier meeting. (See minutes of July 29, 1975 meeting.) The
Committee scheduled the next meeting for August 21, 1975. The meeting was
adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

 Persons Present

1. Forbes Bottomly 6. Milt Lincoln
2. Carolyn Crowder 7. Carole Mumford
3. Horace Eberhart 8. Dan Young
5. Goldie Johnson

Significant Events Between the August 12, 1975
and August 21, 1975 Meeting

1. On Wednesday, August 13, 1975, the writer called all of the persons who
were not present to update them on what had transpired during the
August 12, 1975 meeting. Many of the persons called were out of town or
unavailable.
2. Minutes were typed from the August 12 meeting and sent to each Committee member. The accompanying memo also apprised the group of the time, place, and thrust of the August 21, 1975 meeting. Additionally, each member was asked to please try and attend the upcoming meeting.

3. The writer had a conference with his immediate supervisor, Barbara Whitaker, to express concern about the poor attendance during the August 12, 1975 meeting. Barbara suggested that the writer monitor more closely the process being followed in calling each Committee member and have the secretary record this information, especially for those persons who said they had not been called or forwarded the minutes from prior meetings.

4. Dan and Milt called on different occasions to express their concern about the level of disagreement that existed between the two parties (Dan and Milt). Additionally, each person expressed concern about the poor attendance during the last regular meeting. The writer was tempted to point out to both parties that one possible factor contributing to the waning interest on behalf of the other Committee members could be ascribed to the constant bickering that they had engaged in during each of the earlier meetings. Realizing that this was an inappropriate time to make such an observation, the writer refrained from commenting.

5. Betty Cantor called the writer and requested the minutes from the July 29, and August 12, 1975 meetings. The writer informed her that they had already been sent to her. It was at this point that Betty made the same recommendations to the writer that Barbara had made earlier, i.e., the process for disseminating information and informing Committee members of meeting dates should be monitored more closely.

6. Acting on the suggestions made by Barbara and Betty, the writer requested and received from his secretary detailed reports on when information was sent to Committee members and when or what responses she received when a Committee member was called to be reminded of an upcoming meeting.

Fifth Meeting — August 21, 1975

Notes and Observations

The meeting began at its usual time of 2:00 p.m. in the conference room of the Community Affairs Division. Milt, the chairman, opened the meeting by noting that attendance appeared to be getting worse with each subsequent meeting. The writer agreed with Milt and pointed out that many of the Committee members
were on vacation or away on business trips. Carole pointed out that the poor attendance could also stem from the fact that the Committee was established during the summer months which might have suggested to many of the members that this responsibility was not an important one. "Otherwise," stated Carole, "such an important task would have been addressed during the regular school term."
The writer agreed with Carole and indicated that her observation would be a major consideration in establishing future committees of this nature. Barbara agreed with Carole also, but pointed out to the group that it is not unusual for the ranks to thin out when the group gets down to really pulling the specifics of a project of this magnitude together. "In fact," stated Barbara, "sometimes it is better to have a small group of dedicated workers than a large group that isn't productive."

Milt seemingly sensed that the group was about to go off on a tangent and put everyone back on target by introducing the "three-tiered" school-community involvement plan that he introduced initially at the July 29, 1975 Committee meeting. The first question raised was posited by Forbes who wanted to know, "How would people be elected to serve on the local school community organizations?" Before Milt could respond Barbara mentioned that whatever procedure was used should be as simple and nonthreatening as possible. Carolyn Crowder supported Barbara's statement and stated emphatically that the Atlanta Board of Education would not ratify any plan based on elections. The previous statements by Barbara and Carolyn were perceived by the writer as an attempt to discourage Dan from pursuing his plan which was based on clustering and system-wide elections. Before Dan could respond, Carolyn asked whether the local school-community councils suggested by Milt in his plan would serve as an umbrella for other local school-community organizations such as the PTA, PTSA, advisory committees to Federal programs, etc. Milt answered in the affirmative and stated,
"The local school-community councils would have representatives who would articulate that particular group's interests and/or concerns." Forbes expressed concern about the safeguards that would protect other local school-community groups from being overshadowed. Forbes went on to cite some specific examples where this situation did occur. One school system that was specifically mentioned was the Seattle, Washington Public Schools where Forbes had served as Superintendent. Dan, who had lived, worked, and served on one of the neighborhood school boards when Forbes was Superintendent of the Seattle, Washington system, agreed with Forbes and stated that Milt's plan was wholly inadequate and would not work. Dan's major contention was that Milt's plan would not ensure adequate representation for poorer communities. "Additionally," stated Dan, "by clustering middle class or affluent schools with lower class or poorer schools, the poorer schools would be able to benefit from the political sophistication of the parents from the middle class communities." Barbara and Milt disagreed with Dan and pointed out that his (Dan's) assumption was "fallacious," for in many instances the poorer communities were more sophisticated out of necessity in handling school-community problems than many middle class communities. Dan retorted by pointing out to the group that he understood why they were reluctant to accept his plan but he had worked in enough school systems to know that Milt's plan would fail and not provide the kind of meaningful school-community involvement that the Committee was seeking to obtain.

Sensing that the discussion was about to go awry, the writer intervened by reminding the members that Milt's plan was not the final mechanism for enhancing school-community involvement and the group should remember this fact as they listened to the balance of his report. Having eliminated the protracted dialogue between Dan and Milt, Milt proceeded to present his plan to the rest of the group.
Milt pointed out that his plan would ensure greater participation by all organizations on the local level by bringing them together to speak in one unified voice. Additionally, Barbara and Milt felt that it might be advantageous to have a paid staff member on the local level to serve as a liaison between the divergent local school-community organizations, the local school administrator, and the System. Dan disagreed with this suggestion and stated that the only plausible strategies to use to ensure maximum community input would be to accept his original recommendations of electing all representatives to the local and area councils and cluster them to provide for better representation. Barbara, Carolyn, and Milt took issue with Dan and noted that having a local school-community council at each school would best address the concerns that he (Dan) had articulated. Barbara went on to say, "The System is not at the point, in the area of school community relations, where clustering would be successful." Forbes, Carole, Carolyn, and Milt agreed with Barbara and stated that Dan's suggestion might be more appropriate after the initial plan has been implemented. Dan conceded on this point and indicated his desire to develop an alternative mechanism that could be used by schools that had reached the point where they could work effectively with other schools to solve common problems. The writer agreed with Dan's contention and stated that this could be done by focusing on the area-wide level where each local school sent a representative to share their particular concerns with other schools in the area. "This," stated the writer, "would be the most logical time to have schools come together to solve common problems." The Committee agreed. It was on this note that Milt asked whether they had any other questions concerning his plan. There were none. The Committee agreed to incorporate the suggestions by Dan and others into Milt's plan and meet again on August 28, 1975. The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m.
Persons Present

1. Forbes Bottomly
2. Carolyn Crowder
3. Milt Lincoln
4. Carole Mumford
5. Dan Young
6. Norman Thomas — Convener/Recorder
7. Barbara Whitaker — Assistant Superintendent for the Community Affairs Division

Significant Events Between the August 21, 1975 and August 28, 1975 Meetings

1. Immediately following the meeting, the writer met with his immediate supervisor, Barbara Whitaker, to explain the progress, or lack of same, of the Committee up to this juncture. During the meeting the writer was reminded by Barbara that the deadline for completing the plan was the end of August. Barbara asked whether this deadline could be kept. The writer said, "No," and cited the following reasons:
   
   (a) The Committee felt that the initial time frame was too short.
   
   (b) Due to the time of year that the Committee was established, interest and attendance were low. These factors inhibited the effective functioning of the group.
   
   (c) The intensity of disagreement between certain members on the Committee, namely, Dan and Milt, inhibited the group's ability to complete the task at hand.

   Barbara suggested that since I knew Dan well and had taken some courses from him at Atlanta University, that I talk with him about his conduct during meetings. The writer agreed to perform this assignment.

2. On Friday, August 22, 1975, the writer called Dan and set up an appointment to meet with him on Tuesday, August 27, 1975, of the following week.
3. Dan and the writer met on August 27 as planned and discussed the concerns cited by Barbara. Dan stated that he knew where the other Committee members were coming from and if they did not want to consider seriously the plan he had developed, he would not hassle over it any longer. Additionally, Dan pointed out that his schedule was too full to continue spending his time and energy working on a project that everyone else involved took lightly. In brief, Dan promised the writer that he would keep "cool" during subsequent meetings and see what developed.

4. The writer met with Barbara and shared with her the results of his discussion with Dan.

5. On Monday and Wednesday of the week of the August 28, 1975 meeting, the writer’s secretary called each Committee member and reminded them of the upcoming meeting.

Sixth Meeting — August 28, 1975
Notes and Observations

The August 28, 1975 meeting was held in its usual location in the conference room of the Community Affairs Division. Milt opened the meeting by having the minutes from the previous meeting read. When this had been done by the writer, Milt asked if there were any questions or corrections. There were none. Milt then asked the persons present if they had reviewed the plan he had developed and discussed in previous meetings. Everyone present said, "Yes," and Milt asked whether there were any questions. Allene Hall who had been absent during two earlier meetings apologized for her absences and asked, "Who would comprise the central-level school-community organizations?" Allene went on to note that the specific people had been designated who would be serving on the local and area-wide levels, and wanted to know why this was not done for the central level. Milt responded by pointing out that the specifics of the central level were omitted because he wasn't sure who should serve on this level. Esther, Goldie, Jackie Young, and Victor expressed their desire to have similar representation on all three levels. Milt responded by noting that the central level would be an excellent point
to involve the broader community, especially businessmen, in the public schools. Harold agreed with Milt and noted that many businessmen don't have any idea of what the public schools are doing to educate Atlanta's youths. Dan stated that he had problems with Milt and Harold's suggestion because he believed that only those persons who live in Atlanta and send their children to the Atlanta Public Schools should decide how those schools should be operated. Milt and Harold countered by noting that this issue had come up before, but one cannot ignore the fact that tax dollars paid by local businessmen also support public schools. Therefore, contended Milt and Harold, it would be unrealistic to deny a person representation simply because they do not live in the City. Victor Moody, the student representative, suggested that the Committee agree to some representation from the business community on the central level, but not in the same proportion as students and parents. The Committee agreed with Victor's suggestion and recommended that the Superintendent be given the power to appoint six (6) of the forty (40) persons suggested to serve on the city-wide or central level.

The next question that was raised dealt with where the finances would come from to implement the proposed plan. Harold raised this question, and noted that even as a principal who supposedly had some influence over the writing of his budget, this opportunity was not provided him. The writer pointed out that the System's funds were very tight and Barbara had mentioned the possibility of the System receiving funds from the Rockefeller Foundation to implement its school-community involvement plan. Esther stated that if, after all of this time and energy, the proposed plan were not implemented, the Committee should reassemble to devise additional strategies. Milt agreed with Esther's suggestion and requested that it be presented in the form of a motion. Esther put the above suggestion in the form of a motion. Goldie seconded the motion and it was carried
as stated. Milt then asked the group if there were no more questions whether they wanted to take a formal vote on his plan. Dan objected, stating that the Committee should consider the alternate plan that he had developed during the past week. Milt agreed reluctantly to have Dan present his revised plan. (See Appendix F for details.)

Realizing that the hour was late, Milt asked the group to vote on his and Dan's plans. Surprisingly, the vote was 5 to 4 in favor of Dan's plan. Those persons who voted in favor of Dan's plan were Allene, Goldie, Esther, Victor, and Dan. Those supporting Milt's plan were, Horace, Harold, Jacquelyn, and Milt. When the voting was completed, Milt asked for volunteers to serve on the "Re-Write" Committee. Esther, Goldie, Dan, Milt, and the writer agreed to serve. The meeting for the "Re-Write" Committee was left open and Milt agreed to inform the "Re-Write" Committee of the time and date of the meeting. The meeting was adjourned.

### Persons Present

1. Horace Eberhart
2. Allene Hall
3. Goldie Johnson
4. Esther Lefever
5. Milt Lincoln
6. Harold Miller
7. Victor Moody
8. Dan Young
9. Jacquelyn Young
10. Norman Thomas — Convener/Recorder

### Significant Events Between the August 28, 1975 and September 11, 1975 Meetings

1. Immediately after the August 28, 1975 meeting, Milt accosted the writer in the corridors and expressed disgust with the unmitigated gall of Dan in pursuing a plan that was impractical and too radical for the present Board to approve. He (Milt) stated that he would determine when the "Re-Write" Committee would meet and contact each member personally.
"This way," Milt stated, "we can conveniently forget to inform Dan as to when and where the 'Re-Write' Committee will be meeting." The writer indicated to Milt that as Chairman he reserved the right to make such a decision, but personally and professionally employing such tactics might create more problems than they solved. Milt suggested that the writer leave the situation up to him. The writer agreed, but did not hesitate to point out that if Dan inquired as to why he was not informed, he (the writer) would feel obligated to explain what had transpired.

2. On September 3, 1975, Milt called the writer and informed him that he had called all of the members of the 'Re-Write' Committee with the exception of Dan and informed them that the next meeting would be on September 11, 1975, at 9:00 a.m. in the conference room of the Community Affairs Division. The writer reminded Milt of his (the writer's) initial reactions, and again, expressed reservations about not apprising Dan of the meeting. Milt said not to worry about it and he would play the entire situation by ear.

3. On the morning of the meeting (September 11, 1975), the writer received a call from Dan around 8:30 a.m. inquiring about where and when the "Re-Write" Committee would be meeting. The writer told Dan that the Committee was scheduled to meet at 9:00 a.m. and his presence was expected. Dan stated that he had to teach his class from 9:00-10:30 a.m. but he would come as soon as he dismissed his class.

4. As soon as the writer finished talking with Dan, Milt came in expressing his eagerness to get on with the meeting. The writer informed Milt as to what had just transpired and he (Milt) stated that Dan's presence would not be a problem since he had already talked with the other members of the "Re-Write" Committee and they agreed with him and his original plan.

Seventh Meeting (Re-Write Committee)  
September 11, 1975

Due to the tardiness of the other members of the "Re-Write" Committee, the meeting did not start until 9:35 a.m. As planned, Milt discussed the plan he had developed and asked for ways that it could be improved. The following suggestions were made by Esther and Goldie:

1. A glossary of terms should accompany the final draft of the plan to explain those terms that may not be very clear to persons who are unfamiliar with the project.
2. **Guidelines** should be developed that would spell out, in definitive terms, the parameters the proposed school-community advisory councils would work within. This strategy would eliminate any confusion as to what would be within the purview of the various advisory councils.

3. The wording of the proposed plan should be simple enough for the "average" layman to understand.

4. The composition of the city-wide advisory committee should be as follows:
   
   (a) One student from each area — (4)
   
   (b) Two parents (community representatives) from each area — (8)
   
   (c) Representatives from city-wide organizations — (12)

As the persons present were about to reach some closure on the above suggestions, Dan walked in and apologized for not getting to the meeting until 10:30 a.m. Dan asked Milt for an update on what had been done prior to his arrival. Milt complied with Dan's request and before Milt could finish, Dan pointed out to Milt and the others present that they were pursuing a plan that was inconsistent with the one voted on and approved during the August 28, 1975 meeting. Dan then suggested that the group look at the plan approved during the plenary session of the Committee and begin making the necessary modifications. Milt stated that he had some misgivings about Dan's plan because the "Cluster Concept" did not have a natural administrative unit to facilitate the activities at the cluster level. Dan pointed out that it would be just as easy to identify someone on the cluster level to coordinate the activities of the advisory councils as it would be on the local, area, and central levels. Goldie, Esther, and Milt disagreed vehemently with Dan over the practicality of the cluster concept. When the meeting appeared to be getting out of control, the writer agreed to get the minutes from the August 28, 1975 meeting and clarify the instructions (vote) of the Committee. The writer referred to his August 28, 1975 minutes and read the section where the Committee had voted to utilize the cluster concept proffered by Dan.
Realizing that Dan was correct in his initial statement, Esther introduced a motion that in the narrative of Milt's plan it would be mentioned that the School System would work toward educating parents and community people to become involved with "cross-city" educational needs. Dan took issue with Esther and accused the other members of the "Re-Write" Committee of trying to change the thrusts of the proposed plan to meet their special preferences. The writer suggested that since both factions could not agree, why not develop two plans and submit them to the plenary committee meeting session for their approval. Everyone agreed, although Dan remained visibly upset over the way the other members of the "Re-Write" Committee had ignored the full Committee's instructions. It was after 12:00 noon and Milt indicated that he had a luncheon meeting at the Chamber of Commerce. A motion for adjournment was made and carried. The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. (See Appendix G for details on the plan developed at the September 11, 1975 meeting.)

Significant Events Between the September 11, 1975 And September 30, 1975 Meetings

1. Immediately following the September 11, 1975 meeting, the writer was visited by Dan who expressed shock and anger about the way Milt, Esther, and Goldie had ignored the vote of the full Committee. Dan pointed out that it was this kind of irresponsibility that disturbed him most in his working relationship with Milt and some of the other Committee members. As Dan left the writer's office, he reiterated that he knew he was right and would have the details of the plan voted on by the Committee ready for the September 30, 1975 meeting.

2. The next day, September 12, 1975, the writer was called by Milt to find out whether it would be necessary for the "Re-Write" Committee to meet again before September 30, 1975, to finalize the plan that they (Milt, Goldie, and Esther) would be submitting to the full Committee for approval. The writer said no and indicated that he had all of the information needed to prepare the draft of their proposed plan.
3. On September 18, 1975, the writer called Dan and informed him that the plan proposed by Milt, Esther, and Goldie had been completed and asked whether the plan he was writing was ready so that both copies of the plan could be sent to members of the Committee prior to the September 30, 1975 meeting. Dan stated that he had not gotten around to working on his plan and stated that he would bring his proposal to the September 30, 1975 meeting.

4. On September 22, 1975, the writer drafted a memo (See Appendix G) and sent it to each member of the Committee. The memo provided a capsulized report on what happened during the September 11, 1975 meeting, a copy of the plan developed by Milt, Goldie, and Esther and announced when and where the next regularly scheduled meeting would be held.

Eighth Meeting — September 30, 1975
Notes and Observations

The eighth and final meeting of the Community Education Planning Committee began at 2:00 p.m. in the conference room of the Community Affairs Division. Milt thanked everyone for coming and noted that the attendance was better at this meeting than it had been in two or three earlier ones. Betty, Forbes, Harold, Esther, and Jackie stated that their schedules were so busy that they simply couldn't make many of the meetings that they had planned to attend. Some of the other members nodded their heads in agreement. The writer took the occasion to thank everyone present for their continued support and cooperation throughout the project. Additionally, the writer intimated to those present that if the School System did not learn anything else from this endeavor, it has a better feel for determining the best time to engage in a task of this magnitude. Betty and Goldie reiterated an observation that they had made at an earlier meeting by pointing out that summer months were not conducive to this kind of planning and suggested that the staff of the Community Affairs Division keep this in mind when planning similar projects. The writer agreed with Betty and Goldie.
Before the discussion deviated too far from the business at hand, Milt asked whether everyone on the Committee had read and reviewed the proposed plan developed by the "Re-Write" Committee. Everyone answered in the affirmative. Milt then asked for questions or comments. Forbes stated that based on the memo written by the writer on September 22, 1975, there was some disagreement as to what the "Re-Write" Committee was instructed to do. Milt responded that the "Re-Write" Committee had worked out a solution, i.e., to prepare two plans to present to the rest of the Committee for their approval. Forbes then asked where was the second plan. The writer stated that Dan had not arrived yet and when he did, he would share the plan he had developed with the Committee. Just as the writer was completing his statement, Dan walked into the conference room and sat down. The writer asked Dan if he had his plan. Dan simply said, "No," and that he would go along with the plan developed by Milt, Goldie, and Esther. Everyone in the room appeared surprised and relieved. Milt asked again for comments and/or questions on the plan they had before them. Betty stated that the proposed plan appeared to be in fairly good shape but she would like to have the following statements placed under the "Minimum Standards" section:

1. The designated administrator on each of the three levels (principals, area superintendent, and superintendent) shall identify persons to staff their respective organizations.

2. Staff Development shall provide the necessary training to ensure the success of the "plan."

3. Funding should be obtained from the Board, public, or private foundations to support this endeavor.

4. Specific mechanisms should be developed to keep the public apprised as to what various school-community organizations are doing.

5. Specific funds should be allocated to each level to ensure the success of the "plan."
Milt thanked Betty for the above suggestions and asked whether anyone else had additional questions or suggestions. Betty was asked by Milt to put her suggestions in the form of a motion. Betty's motion was seconded by Forbes and carried as read. Milt instructed the writer to include Betty's suggestions in the final copy which would be forwarded to the Superintendent for his review and/or approval. Goldie asked, "Now that the 'plan' has been completed, where will it go from here?" The writer stated that the completed "plan" would be forwarded to the Superintendent by way of Ms. Whitaker and the Superintendent would discuss the plan with his Cabinet for additional input before it is recommended to the Board for approval. Esther asked whether the Committee would be kept abreast of the progress of their plan. The writer gave an emphatic "yes." Milt and the other members of the Committee thanked the writer for facilitating their work throughout the duration (3 months) of this endeavor and expressed appreciation for the cooperation and support provided by the entire staff of the Community Affairs Division. The writer thanked everyone for their kind remarks and promised them that he would inform Barbara and the staff of their gracious praise. On this very pleasant note, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Persons Present

1. Forbes Bottomly
2. Betty Cantor
3. Horace Eberhart
4. Allene Hall
5. Goldie Johnson
6. Esther Lefever
7. Milton Lincoln
8. Harold Miller
9. Victor Moody
10. Carole Mumford
11. Joann Smith
12. Dan Young
13. Jacquelyn Young
14. Norman Thomas — Convener/Recorder
Significant Events After the September 30, 1975 Meeting

1. Immediately after the meeting, the writer asked Dan why he had not prepared the plan as he had promised. Dan intimated to the writer that he was tired of fighting a losing battle, and rather than create more confusion, he decided to let Milt and the others have it their way.

2. The writer met with his immediate supervisor and informed her that the Committee had agreed on a final "School-Community Involvement Plan" and it would be ready for the Superintendent and his Cabinet by the first week in October. Barbara thanked the writer for completing the job and stated that she would prepare the "plan" for submission to the Superintendent and Cabinet.

3. On November 5, 1975, the Superintendent sent copies of the proposed "plan" to all of his administrative staff for additional review and input. (See Appendix I.)

Overall Analysis

In this section, the writer will elaborate more fully on his observations concerning the entire process that resulted in the development of the Atlanta Public Schools Community Involvement Plan.

1. As expressed by many members of the Committee, the summer months were not the best time to convene a group of this nature.

2. Although the Assistant Superintendent for Community Affairs did an excellent job of delivering the "charge" to the Committee, the group possibly would have viewed their job as being more important if the Superintendent had given the "charge" and displayed a more active interest in the Committee's activities.

3. Due to the foregoing observations, many of the Committee members did not view their roles as being important and this contention manifested itself in the low or nonattendance of some of the members.

4. Although it was the primary purpose of the Atlanta School System to have members on the Committee from all levels of the school-community, many of the "lay" (students, parents, custodians) members were inhibited by the presence of the professionals who tended to dominate the discussion sessions.
5. Many of the "lay" members on the Committee stopped coming to meetings and failed to make contributions when they were present because of the constant disagreement among the "professional" members.

6. The failure on behalf of the Superintendent and his representative, the Assistant Superintendent for Community Affairs to assume a more active role and interest in the Committee's activities, contributed to the lack of importance some members ascribed to their task.

Finally, it is the writer's belief that, given the fact that the Committee members contributed their time, energy, and knowledge without any cost to the System, some kind of incentive (tangible or intangible) should have been provided to the participants. This obvious oversight should be avoided in future endeavors of this nature.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Before discussing the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations stemming from this study, the words of Paul Lauter are both profound and apocalyptic as he wrote the following about a similar report on the Adams-Morgan Community School Project in Washington, D. C.:

... People are forever producing fine-sounding plans and programs for others that, remarkably enough, correspond to their own visions and desires.

... The issues of community participation, teachers' attitudes and preparation, classroom organization and curriculum, and the roles of outside agencies all must be worked out together or the educational fabric will unravel almost as quickly as it is stitched.

The writer, as a result of having had a first-hand view of the activities and procedures utilized by Atlanta's Community Education Planning Committee, can fully understand and appreciate the importance of Lauter's observations. In fact, as the writer reflects on his experiences during the period that this study was conducted, one of the most challenging responsibilities was that of convincing some of the Committee members that the final plan should be practical, simple, and reality-based. Hopefully, the plan produced by this Committee will not be viewed as just another "fine sounding plan" that simply reflects the selfish visions and

---

desires of the people who assisted in the development of the final document. In any event, as the participant/observer/reporter, a conscientious attempt by the writer shall be made to report what actually happened as opposed to what he hoped would occur. Therefore, the balance of this chapter shall be devoted to answering the twelve "Research Questions" posited by the writer in Chapter I and discussing the conclusions and recommendations emanating from the overall study.

Findings

1. Can individuals with diverse personal and educational backgrounds develop a practical and reality-based school-community involvement plan?

Based upon the writer's observations during the period in which the Committee worked on the "plan" and the end product (See Appendix G), the answer to the above question is an emphatic "yes." Contrary to what was anticipated by the writer, the greatest hindrance to the Committee's effectiveness was caused by disagreements among the professional membership rather than between the laymen. Additionally, as shall be discussed more completely later in this chapter, the diverse personal and educational backgrounds of the Committee members provided the kind of balance necessary to facilitate the development of a plan that was not too idealistic, complicated, or impractical.

General Description of Plan. The final plan, which was approved by the CEPC, called for the establishment of local school-community councils in all of the Atlanta Public Schools. The membership on the Local School Community Council would be drawn from existing school-community groups functioning in that particular building. Representatives from the local councils would be selected by their peers to serve on the four Area School-Community Councils. Representatives on the Area Level would select persons from their group to represent them on the
Central Level Advisory Council and make recommendations to the Superintendent who would share these concerns with his administrative staff and/or the Board.

2. Who will assume the major leadership role in the development and thrust of the school-community involvement plan?

Using committee meeting attendance and participation during each of the eight regularly scheduled meetings as criteria, the writer can state unequivocally that the major leadership role in the development and thrust of the plan was assumed by the "Professionals." It is the writer's belief that one possible factor which contributed to the "Professionals" assuming the major role in developing the "plan" was due to the early afternoon meeting time. Many of the parents, students, and community members who were on the Committee were either working, just getting off from work or too busy with other home and business responsibilities to attend many of the meetings. This was not the case for many of the "Professional" members. In fact, many of the "Professionals" attended the meetings as a part of their regular work day and responsibilities.

3. Who will attend the greatest number of meetings?

The group that attended the greatest number of meetings, on a percentage and mean bases, was the "Professional Community Relations Officers." As mentioned in Chapter I, the twenty-three members of the Committee were categorized as follows: (See Appendix H for specific details on individual attendance during each meeting session. Percentage of attendance during each meeting is also depicted.)
## Meetings Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mrs. Carolyn Crowder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mrs. Allene Hall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mrs. Goldie Johnson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mr. Stephen Ramsaur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mr. Pete Richards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mrs. Jacquelyn Young</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mrs. Esther Lefever</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ms. Veverly Byrd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mr. Victor Moody</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ms. Dee Watkins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mr. Horace Eberhart</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ms. Catherine Johnson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ms. Joann D. Smith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Educators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dr. Forbes Bottomly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mr. Alvin Dawson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mr. Robert Dixon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mrs. Gwen Howard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mr. Harold Miller</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mr. Dan Young</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Community Relations Officers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ms. Betty Cantor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mr. Dwight Jackson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mr. Milt Lincoln</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ms. Carole Mumford</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the fact that each category did not have the same number of members, the writer concluded that the percentage and mean would be more reliable measures than simply the number of meetings attended by each of the five categories. Therefore, the Professional Community Relations Officers not only had the highest percentage (50%) but the highest mean (4.0) as well. Note that the Professional Community Relations Officers had the highest percentage and mean in spite of the fact that one among its ranks failed to attend a single meeting. However, as a means of being objective in reporting the attendance figures, the writer included everyone regardless of whether they were actively involved in the project.

Looking now at the other categories listed, it can be noted that the "Parents" had the second highest percentage of attendance and mean, which were 46% and 3.7 respectively. The third highest group resulted in a tie between the "Teachers" and "Professional Educators" with each having attendance percentages and means of 42% and 3.3 respectively. The "Students" attained the lowest percentage and mean which were 33% and 2.6 respectively.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the five categories that Committee members were placed in were not "hard and fast" or distinct. In brief, many of the persons who served on the Committee could have been placed in at least one other category. However, for the purpose of this study, Committee members were categorized on the basis of the affiliations which influenced their being recommended to serve on this project. As a case in point, Goldie Johnson has worked as a community relations officer for a federal project in school-community relations at Atlanta University and is presently serving as president of the organization that developed from the above project. But for the purpose of this project, Goldie was selected as a parent. Therefore, she (Goldie) was so categorized.
4. Where will the greatest disagreement concerning the nature and thrust of the "plan" occur: Among the professionals? Among the laymen? Between the laymen and professionals?

Based on the writer's observations during and between regularly scheduled meetings, the greatest disagreement occurred among the professional Committee members. The writer believes that this can be ascribed to the fact that the "Professionals" brought to the project some preconceived notions about how effective school-community relations could be fostered. Therefore, when a "Professional" member had his idea or plan questioned and/or rejected, the personal involvement was too great in many cases for the differing parties to be objective. This observation was particularly true in the cases of two members on the Committee.

5. Who will serve most often as mediators in resolving differences between Committee members?

As can be seen from reading Chapter III of this project, the laymen (parents and students) served most often as mediators in resolving differences among the professionals. Surprisingly, the opposing factions among the professionals were more receptive to suggestions and ideas presented by the laymen than they were to those adduced by their peers. This phenomenon, to the writer, was unanticipated and anomalous.

6. Who will provide the least amount of input into the development of the "plan"?

Using attendance and participation during the eight meeting sessions as criteria, the students would easily be the group that qualifies as having provided the least amount of input into the development of the "plan." It is the writer's contention that the students did not see the relationship between what the Committee was discussing and their immediate situations. Consequently, they (the students) did not become seriously involved in what was being discussed.
Additionally, due to the fact that the meetings were held during the summer months when most students are out of school and only three students were on the Committee compared to twenty adults, the need for their support and input was probably minimized in their eyesights. The writer surmises that this problem could have been avoided if the meetings had been held during the regular school year and more students selected to serve on the Committee.

7. What will be some of the problems and solutions generated from this approach?

As a means of answering this question, the writer has outlined below those problems and solutions encountered by him as he coordinated this project:

Problems

a. Remaining neutral during Committee discussions.

b. Providing a milieu that was conducive to the providing of input by all Committee members.

c. Retaining the interest of members whose ideas were rejected by the Committee.

d. Selecting a meeting time that would accommodate the varied schedules of Committee members.

e. Keeping school staffers from dominating the meetings.

f. Recording minutes and observing how members of the Committee interacted.

g. Keeping the "Re-write Committee" from altering the plan agreed upon by the full Committee.

h. Convincing Committee members that the Superintendent was sincere in his request for assistance and that what they suggested would be utilized.

Solutions

a. In organizing a group of this nature, more attention should be given to the equitable distribution of persons selected to serve under the various categories constituting the group. For example, if six parents are selected, then six students, teachers, community members, etc., should be selected.
b. The participant/observer should have someone else to record minutes during meetings so that he can devote more time to observing and analyzing how members of the group interact during each session. Additionally, the participant/observer would be able to compare notes after each meeting to ascertain how well he is assessing and recording the events during the meetings. This suggestion and others will be further explicated in the recommendations section of this work.

c. When conducting a study of this nature, one should initially establish a uniform method for recording the data that will be used in completing his project (see Appendix C).

8. How effective will Committee members feel that they were in assisting in the development of the "plan"?

Based upon informal conversations and comments made during and after each meeting, most of the "active" Committee members felt that they were effective in assisting in the development of the "plan." On the other hand, the writer believes very strongly that those persons who did not become actively involved in the project failed to do so as a result of factors other than their perceived ineffectiveness on the Committee. This observation is particularly pertinent in light of the fact that many Committee members expressed concern and disappointment about the timing (summer) of the project and their inability to participate fully in the Committee's activities due to other personal and professional responsibilities.

9. What suggestions will Committee members provide to improve the process that they participated in to complete the "plan"?

Although many of the suggestions made by Committee members have already been listed or alluded to, the writer shall restate those that were particularly pertinent and noteworthy:

a. Do not convene a group of this type during the summer months.

b. Identify people who have the time and desire to work on a project of this nature.

c. Allocate more time for the Committee to complete its tasks.
d. Secure funds to compensate Committee members as an added incentive for those persons who have agreed to serve on a project of this magnitude and scope.

e. Ask the Superintendent to present the formal "charge" to the Committee so that the members will view their jobs as being important.

f. Upon completion of a project of this type, the Committee should be given an audience with the Superintendent to present formally the end product to him for further action.

g. The Committee should have been larger and represented a wider cross-section of the school-community.

10. Will Committee members view the time frame for the completion of the "plan" as being realistic?

An informal poll of the Committee members indicated that the initial time frame (July-August) was unrealistic. The minutes of the first two regular meeting sessions support this conclusion.

11. Will Committee members indicate a clear understanding of the responsibility (charge) given them by the Assistant Superintendent of the Community Affairs Division?

Based on feedback from Committee members and personal observations, the writer found that all of the persons who were present when the "charge" was presented, clearly understood what was expected of them.

12. Did the level of the Community Affairs Division staff support, facilitate or hinder the development of the "plan"?

Using statements made during and between each Committee meeting session, the writer found that most of the project participants believed that the Community Affairs Division's staff had facilitated their (Committee's) efforts in completing the "plan."
Conclusions

Taking into consideration the writer's observations, analyses, and conversations with all of the individuals involved in this project, the following conclusions are deemed appropriate:

1. Given adequate time, staff support, and directions, individuals with diverse experiential backgrounds can work on a project of this nature and scope with an acceptable degree of success.

2. Due to the greater amount of time that the professional members of the Committee contributed to the project, they (professionals) assumed the major leadership role in the development of the "plan."

3. The "Professional Community Relations Officers" attended the largest number of meetings due to the fact that, of all the groups represented, they tended to view their involvement with the project as being an integral part of their job responsibilities.

4. Given similar responsibilities, group composition, and conditions, the "professional" members of the group would tend to disagree among themselves more often than any of the other categories comprising the total group.

5. Given similar responsibilities group composition, and conditions, the "lay" members of the group would serve more often as mediators concerning group and individual differences than the "professionals."

6. Under circumstances similar to the ones described in this study, the students would provide the least amount of input with regard to the development of the end product.

7. In spite of the problems resulting from this approach, one could state unequivocally that school-community planning of this nature can be conducted successfully.

8. Given similar responsibilities, group composition, and conditions, most group members would view the initial time frame (two months) for completing their work as being unrealistic.

9. Based upon the writer's observations of the Committee's activities and the comments made by participants throughout the duration of this project, most of the Committee members understood what was expected of them.
Implications

The findings and conclusions of this study warrant that the following implications be drawn:

1. Groups consisting of individuals with diverse experiential backgrounds can work successfully on projects similar to the one described herein, provided they are given adequate time, directions, and staff support.

2. The level of individual and group participation in a project similar to the one described herein is influenced greatly by the following factors:
   a. The amount of time the individual can contribute to the project.
   b. The individual's assessment or view of the importance of the tasks being carried out by the total group.
   c. The individual's perceived importance of the activities conducted by the group with respect to his immediate situation. In brief, people tend to take more interest in and support those projects that they feel are related to their personal and/or professional situations.

3. When members of a group, similar to the one discussed in this study, become personally attached to a given plan (idea) and it is rejected by their peers in the same group, the possibility of reaching an acceptable compromise between the opposing parties is reduced. In brief, "professional" group members tended to find it harder to accept criticism and rejection from other professionals in the group than they did from the "lay" group members.

4. Individuals in groups similar to the one discussed herein, who do not become personally attached to a given plan (idea), tend to serve more effectively as mediators than those persons who do.

Recommendations

The findings, conclusions, and implications of this study warrant the enumeration of the following recommendations:

1. School-community planning of this scope and magnitude should consider carefully the following factors:
   a. The most appropriate time during the school year to develop such a project.
b. The school system's commitment to the area in which the school-community group has been asked to work. In brief, the school system should be in a position to assure those persons working on plans for the system that what they have been asked to develop is needed and will be implemented in part or in toto.

c. The amount of time needed to complete the project.

d. The number and varied experiential backgrounds of the persons selected to serve on the school-community planning group. Careful attention should be given to ensuring balanced representation in all categories comprising the group. In brief, if the group has five parents, it should have five students, five teachers, five administrators, five community representatives, etc. This measure would reduce the possibility of one faction within the group overwhelming the others.

e. The amount of staff support needed to assist the group in completing its tasks.

2. If the school-community planning group is designing a program that is system-wide in scope, the superintendent should present the formal "charge" to the membership. This formal "charge" from the superintendent should outline in definitive terms what the group is being asked to do, why, and what will become of their recommendations. Additionally, the time frame for completing the project should be presented.

3. When one has elected to provide a descriptive analysis of the activities involved in this kind of project, he should take the following steps to ensure uniformity, consistency, and accuracy in his reporting:

   a. Avoid serving as chairman and recorder for the group so that more time can be devoted to observing how various members of the group relate to each other.

   b. Determine what he is interested in observing as he prepares to provide a descriptive analysis of the group's activities.

   c. Based upon factors (variables) identified in "b" above, devise a standardized form for recording observations during meeting sessions and use this form for each and every meeting.

   d. If time permits, one should write his impressions or account of what happened during a meeting immediately after it (meeting) is adjourned.

   e. Maintain a daily log of those pertinent events occurring between regularly scheduled meetings. This information tends to be invaluable in writing up one's final report.
4. The participant/observer should be careful not to impose his personal beliefs on the group and try to be as objective as possible in reporting what transpired throughout the duration of the project.

5. Establish a meeting schedule that is varied and flexible enough to provide for maximum input and participation from all members of the group. In brief, the group's meeting schedule should not be so rigid that it prohibits and/or discourages group members from serving.

Summary of Observations

Throughout this study, the writer has endeavored to describe in an objective and judicious manner all of the activities which were involved in the development of the Atlanta Public Schools' "School-Community Involvement Plan." The specific focus for this study was on the twelve research questions posited in Chapter I and answered in Chapter IV of this document. However, after reviewing what has been presented and discussed up to this juncture, it is believed that some additional observations could be made that would enhance considerably the usefulness of this study for school administrators contemplating similar projects. Therefore, the writer shall devote the balance of this document to a discussion of the nuances and questions that evolved during the period in which this study was being conducted.

One question that should be asked in conducting a study of this nature and scope is, "Can the participant/observer remain completely objective while working on a project such as the one described herein?" Based upon the writer's experiences in working with the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee, the answer to the above question would be a qualified "No." Briefly stated, complete objectivity in a project of this type would be an unrealistic expectation. However, it is believed that if the participant/observer is conscientious and sensitive to the way in which he relates to the group, a certain degree of objectivity can be realized. A specific example of the difficulty that the
writer encountered in remaining completely objective can be seen in the August 8, 1975 memorandum which outlined the constraints and parameters affecting the Committee's activities. In this memo (Appendix E), the writer was forced to abandon his objective role and interject some data that influenced significantly the future activities of the Committee. It is the writer's belief that situations of this nature will arise invariably throughout the period that the group is working. The important factor to remember is that the school staff and/or participant/observer should make a conscientious effort to refrain from exerting undue pressure on the Committee members to adopt their particular way of thinking.

Another question that a school district should raise before embarking upon a project of this magnitude is, "How much information, if any, should the school district make available to committee members who are desirous of reviewing what other school systems and local districts have developed in the area in which they (committee members) have been asked to work?" The writer's experiences indicate that it would be advantageous for the school district and/or participant/observer to provide all of the information requested by the committee and any other pertinent materials in the specific area being considered. It should be kept in mind that many of the committee members would be working in an area that is completely new to them. Therefore, the more information that the district makes available to the committee, the more effective the group can be in performing its responsibilities. However, it should be noted that there are some inherent risks involved in assuming this position. One such risk is the possibility of the committee opting to adopt an existing plan. A specific case in point can be seen in the similarity between the school-community involvement plan developed by the writer in June, 1974, and the plan adopted by the Committee in September, 1975. A cursory review of the aforementioned plans could lead an individual to conclude
that each plan is so similar that it was futile to empanel the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee. However, after closer examination, there are some significant differences between the two plans. It is the writer's belief that the most important difference between the above mentioned plans is that the June, 1974 School-Community Involvement Plan was developed unilaterally by the writer. The Committee's plan, regardless of how similar it is to the writer's, was a group effort. This factor alone is important when one begins to assign some relative value to one plan as opposed to the other. Additionally, the writer's plan gave the school staff more influence over the Committee's activities, whereas the Community Education Planning Committee placed more power in the hands of the community. Another difference between the two plans can be seen in the proposed manner in which each was to be implemented. The writer's plan called for the establishment of school-community advisory councils that would be separate and distinct from existing school-community organizations. The Committee's plan called for the local school councils to serve as an umbrella for all existing school-community groups. The point that is being made here is clear: "If school districts provided more opportunities for the community to provide meaningful input, much of what the system has planned can be enhanced and implemented."

A third question that a school district should consider is, "To what extent does the selection process influence the effectiveness of the group?" It is the writer's contention that the selection process is crucial to the effective functioning of the group. Careful attention should be given to the race, sex, status, and interests of the persons selected to serve on a group similar to the one discussed herein. In fact, even though great pain was taken in ensuring that the Committee was balanced in the above categories, some problems still occurred. The biggest problem, as mentioned previously, was the fact that the "Professional" Committee
members dominated the activities of the group. This problem could be minimized by selecting "Lay" people who are outspoken and would not allow the professional members to dictate the group's major thrust. In fact, as the writer reflects on what transpired during the period that the Atlanta Public Schools' Community Education Planning Committee worked, the most salient problem revolved around the presence of two intelligent and articulate black men who were adamant in their contentions on how schools should relate to the community. The exchange which occurred between these two men set the tone for the Committee's activities. Therefore, in retrospect, the writer would suggest very strongly that careful consideration be given to devising strategies to preclude one or two members from taking control of the entire planning process.

The foregoing observations are especially significant for school staff members who have as their major responsibility the establishment and monitoring of school-community planning groups. The writer found it quite interesting and enlightening that two individuals who were not affiliated closely with the School System could have such a profound effect on the degree of input provided by parents, principals, an area superintendent, teachers, and students. One would think that the previously mentioned individuals would, by their close affiliation with the schools, exercise more influence over the group's activities. However, this was not the case. Consequently, the two prime movers in developing the System's School-Community Involvement Plan were from the Atlanta University Center and the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. Neither institution, at this point, could be viewed as being involved intimately with the Atlanta Public Schools.

The foregoing observations lead the writer to the next question that school districts should ask prior to embarking upon a project of this nature and scope: What role should committee members who are school employees play in this kind
of school-community project?" It is the writer's belief that committee members who are school employees should not use their employment in the System as an excuse for not participating actively in the deliberations of the group. Initially, school employees were very outspoken in the regular meeting sessions, but during the latter phase of the project, school staff members were conspicuously reticent. The writer surmises that this low-key approach assumed by school employees was by design. Speaking frankly, had it not been for the students and parents, very few Committee members affiliated closely with the schools would have provided any important input. As stated earlier, the students served most often as mediators during committee meetings and only one person (the writer) employed by the System volunteered to work on the very important "Re-Write" Committee. Therefore, it is recommended that school districts involved in similar activities impress upon its representatives the importance of active group participation.

Finally, the writer would employ the following strategies if he had to go through this process again:

1. Review more closely the selection process for identifying committee members and include aggressiveness and articulateness as additional criteria for group selection.

2. Devise a system that would maximize input from all members of the group.

3. Refrain from being the recorder and devote more time to observing how group members interacted during meeting sessions.

4. Encourage the Superintendent to present the formal "charge" to the membership and ask that he accept personally the final plan developed by the group.

5. Conduct the group's activities during the regular school year and allocate more time to design the plan.

6. Secure funds to provide members of the group with a small honorarium for their services.
In addition to the foregoing suggestions, the writer believes that further study should be conducted in the area that this study encompasses. Special consideration should be given to such factors as: (1) the size of the school district, (2) socioeconomic status of the community, (3) commitment of the school board to school-community relations, (4) the "hidden" authority that influences activities similar to those described herein, and (5) the impact that an "open door" policy would have on the effectiveness of the group as opposed to the "structured" approach utilized in this study.
APPENDIX A

Dr. Crim's Letter of Invitation to Potential CEPC Members and
Names and Titles of Persons Who agreed to Serve
June 26, 1975

Mr. Milt Lincoln
Director, Community Affairs
Atlanta Chamber of Commerce
1300 Commerce Bldg.
P. O. Box 1740
Atlanta, Georgia 30301

Dear Mr. Lincoln:

During the 1974-75 school term, the Community Affairs Division held conferences with PTA and related school-community organizations to discuss and outline strategies for effective school-community relations. One of the primary concerns expressed during these sessions was the need to have a definitive school-community involvement plan. In order for the System to develop such a plan, I am officially asking you to assist us in this effort. The first meeting will be held on July 8, 1975, at 2:00 p.m. in the conference room of the Community Affairs Division at 224 Central Avenue, S.W.

Additionally, I would be most appreciative if you forwarded your reply to Norman H. Thomas at the above address by June 30, 1975. The System-Wide Community Education Planning Committee will remain in existence for approximately sixty days, June-August 30, 1975.

If you have any additional comments or concerns, please call Mr. Thomas at 659-2058.

I shall eagerly await your reply.

Sincerely,

Alonzo A. Crim
Superintendent

AAC:NHT:peh

☐ I will serve on the System-Wide Community Education Planning Committee.
☐ I will not be able to serve on the System-Wide Community Education Planning Committee.

JUL 1, 1975 (Signature)
## COMMUNITY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dr. Forbes Bottomly</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ms. Veverly Byrd</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ms. Betty Cantor</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ms. Carolyn Crowder</td>
<td>Member of the Atlanta Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mr. Alvin Dawson</td>
<td>Superintendent, Area IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mr. Robert L. Dixon</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mr. L. Horace Eberhart</td>
<td>Social Studies Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walter George High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mrs. Allene M. Hall</td>
<td>Secretary to an Assistant Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ms. Gwendolyn Howard</td>
<td>Principal of an elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mr. Dwight Jackson</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Relations Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ms. Catherine Johnson</td>
<td>Social Studies Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ms. Goldie Johnson</td>
<td>Parent and Community Activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ms. Esther Lefever</td>
<td>Founder and Director of the &quot;Patch&quot; in Cabbage Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mr. Milt Lincoln</td>
<td>Associate Director of Community Affairs, Atlanta Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mr. Harold B. Miller</td>
<td>Principal&lt;br&gt;Grady High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mr. Victor Moody</td>
<td>Student, Washington High School&lt;br&gt;(formerly SGA president at&lt;br&gt;Kennedy Middle School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ms. Carole Mumford</td>
<td>Education Specialist&lt;br&gt;Atlanta Urban League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Mr. Stephen D. Ramsaur</td>
<td>Regional Supervisor for Custodial Staff, Atlanta Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mr. Pete Richards</td>
<td>Engineer, parent, and PTA Co-President of an elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ms. Joann D. Smith</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher on the elementary level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Ms. Dee Watkins</td>
<td>Student, Turner High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mr. Dan Young</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Political Science, Atlanta University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Ms. Jacquelyn Young</td>
<td>President of City-Wide PTA Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARENTS

1. Mrs. Carolyn Crowder
2. Mrs. Allene Hall
3. Mrs. Goldie Johnson
4. Mr. Stephen Ramsaur
5. Mr. Pete Richards
6. Mrs. Jacquelyn Young
7. Mrs. Esther Lefever

STUDENTS

1. Ms. Veverly Bryd
2. Mr. Victor Moody
3. Ms. Dee Watkins

TEACHERS

1. Mr. Horace Eberhart
2. Ms. Catherine Johnson
3. Ms. Joann D. Smith

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS

1. Dr. Forbes Bottomly
2. Mr. Alvin Dawson
3. Mr. Robert Dixon
4. Mrs. Gwen Howard
5. Mr. Harold Miller
6. Mr. Dan Young

PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS OFFICERS

1. Ms. Betty Cantor
2. Mr. Dwight Jackson
3. Mr. Milt Lincoln
4. Ms. Carole Mumford
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Agenda of Initial Meeting (Tuesday, July 8, 1975)
ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Community Education Planning Committee
Conference Room
Community Affairs Division
Tuesday, July 8, 1975
2:00 P.M.

AGENDA

Presiding ................................................. Norman H. Thomas
Community Relations Coordinator

Introductions ............................................ Committee Members
and Community Affairs Division Staff

Stage-Setting ............................................ Ms. Barbara I. Whitaker
Assistant Superintendent
Community Affairs Division

Discussion .................................................. Committee Members

Establish Task Forces and Select Chairmen ....... Committee Members

Adjournment
COMMUNITY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMITTEE

I. PURPOSE: To develop a system-wide community-involvement plan for the Atlanta Public Schools and recommend said plan to the Superintendent for action.

II. OBJECTIVES: The Community Education Planning Committee is specifically charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Develop a definitive school-community involvement plan for the Atlanta Public Schools.

2. Establish minimum community involvement standards for all units in the Atlanta Public Schools.

3. Design a mechanism that will facilitate the accomplishment of the above objectives.

4. Recommend to the Superintendent the community-involvement plan developed by the Committee.

III. PLANNING COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION:

- Assistant Superintendent
  Community Affairs Division

- Community Relations Coordinator

- Task Force I
  Mechanism and Delivery

- Task Force II
  Minimum Standards for Community Involvement
APPENDIX C

Meeting Report Form Devised by the Writer
MEETING REPORT FORM

I. Meeting Date and Time:

II. Persons Present:

1. 13.
2. 14.
3. 15.
4. 16.
5. 17.
6. 18.
7. 19.
8. 20.
9. 21.
10. 22.
11. 23.
12. 24.

III. Meeting Notes (Minutes):

IV. Summary of Major Discussion Items:

V. Decisions Made During Meeting:

VI. Writer's Personal Observations During the Meeting:
APPENDIX D

Plan Developed, June 1974, by the Writer
Plan for Improving Community Involvement

In the Atlanta Public School System

Introduction

The Community Affairs Division, since its inception in September, 1973, has established as its primary goal, the development of a viable program that would join the Atlanta Public School System and relevant publics in dynamic interaction that facilitates mutual understanding and support for relevant learning. Realizing the fact that it has been approximately one year since this division was established through a court ordered decree, the Community Affairs Division has identified the following goals for the upcoming 1974-75 school term:

1. To assist principals in effectuating more and improved community involvement at the site level by conducting school-community surveys to assess the present degree and effectiveness of community involvement.

2. To provide principals and other staff members at the site level with in-service training based on the school-community involvement profile derived from the aforementioned survey.

3. To provide area superintendents and other support personnel with in-service training that would assist them in facilitating the efforts of school-community groups on the site level.

4. To assist area superintendents, their staff members, principals, teachers, students and parents in implementing an effective community involvement program for their respective schools by providing whatever technical assistance the staff and resources of the Community Affairs Division can make available.

5. To monitor, on a continuous basis, the community involvement program of all of the Atlanta Public Schools and provide data to the parties involved so that ongoing program improvements can become an integral part of the schools' community-involvement activities.

6. To design a mechanism whereby designated representatives from local school sites will be able to exchange ideas with similar groups and present to the Superintendent via the Assistant Superintendent for
Community Affairs recommendations that they believe would improve the existing school system.

7. To foster a better working relationship between all employees of the Atlanta Public School System and its community by encouraging the development of pleasant, cooperative, courteous and congenial personality traits that would improve the image of the system in the eyes of the Atlanta school-community (In-service workshops and other mechanism will be used to effectuate these desired changes.)

The aforementioned goals have been enumerated as a means of providing some guidance in designing the proposed plan outlined on the following pages.

**Organization Chart and Job Descriptions**
(Department of Community Relations)

**Introduction**

It is envisioned that the successful implementation of the goals enumerated in "Section I" of this paper would require an organizational design similar to the one outlined below:

```
  Superintendent
     /       \
 System-Wide Community Advisory Committee
   /     \
Area I & CAC  Area II & CAC  Area III & CAC  Area IV & CAC
   |     |           |     |           |     |           |
  |     |           |     |           |     |           |
 School Site Community Advisory Committee
```
It is believed that the previously outlined organizational chart would serve as the most expedient vehicle for enhancing community-involvement within the school system. As a means of further delineating the specific functions and composition of each of the categories constituting the previous chart, the following information is appropriate:

**Superintendent**

The Superintendent's major functions would consist of the following:

1. Appoint community members to serve on the System-Wide Community Advisory Committee.

2. Receive from principals and area superintendents recommendations for the System-Wide Advisory Committee.

3. Receive from the Assistant Superintendent for Community Affairs, via the System-Wide Community Advisory Committee, recommendations for improvements within the system.

4. Present to the Board recommendations developed by the System-Wide Community Advisory Committee and reviewed by the Assistant Superintendent for Community Affairs.

**Assistant Superintendent for Community Affairs**

The Assistant Superintendent for Community Affairs, or a designee from this division, would work with the System-Wide Community Advisory Committee and serve as a liaison between this committee and the Superintendent.

**System-Wide Community Advisory Committee**

The System-Wide Community Advisory Committee would consist of one Board member, three students from each area representing the high, middle and elementary school levels, three parents from each area representing the high, middle and elementary school levels, one community member from each area and one chairman appointed by the Superintendent.

Additionally, other persons may be added, on an ad hoc basis, to this committee. Committee membership shall be staggered to provide continuity and experienced leadership. Maximum committee membership shall be thirty.
Area Community Advisory Committee

The Area Community Advisory Committee would consist of elected and/or appointed representatives from the School-Site Community Advisory Committee. There should be a maximum of fifty-five and a minimum of thirty representatives serving on an Area Community Advisory Committee. Each high school and its feeder schools shall have one at-large representative appointed by area superintendents. Additionally, one parent, student, teacher and administrator for the elementary, middle, high and community school levels would be elected to this committee by their constituents on the school-site levels. (Example: Elementary parents on site level would elect parents from their neighborhood to represent them on the Area Community Advisory Committee, etc.)

School-Site Community Advisory Committee

Membership on this level shall consist of at least two elected students, parents, and teachers. Additionally, the principal, or another member of the administrative staff, shall comprise this committee. The principal shall appoint two persons from the community at-large and assume the responsibility for convening this committee so that a chairman can be elected.

School-Site Principals

The School-Site Principals' major duties would be as follows:

1. Appoint members from the school-community to serve on the committee representing his/her school.

2. Work in conjunction with other school administrators in his/her school-community to ensure effective articulation between all of the schools located in a specific neighborhood.

3. Coordinate the activities of the committee of his/her school to ensure adequate representation for all concerned parties.
APPENDIX E

Memo to Committee Members Outlining the Parameters and Constraints Affecting their Activities
MEMORANDUM

August 8, 1975

TO: Community Education Planning Committee

FROM: Norman H. Thomas

SUBJECT: Factors to be Considered by Community Education Planning Committee in Developing School-Community Involvement Plan

As a result of the discussion during the last meeting on July 29, 1975, concerning the boundaries the Committee should work within in developing its plan, I have outlined the following factors:

1. The grouping (clustering) of schools should not violate area lines. Ex: A school in Area I cannot be grouped with a school in any other area.

2. The mechanism established to foster school-community relations should be designed to report to the Superintendent and not the Board.

3. The Community Education Planning Committee is not expected to write policy, only suggest what policy should be written.

4. The plan developed by the Community Education Planning Committee should be reality-based and devoid of any activities that require the expenditure of additional school funds.

5. The plan should be viable and reflect the ideas of the majority of the Community Education Planning Committee membership.

If the above factors are kept in mind, the Committee's effectiveness would be greatly enhanced.

NAT:ajs
APPENDIX F

Proposal Developed by Dan Young to Establish

System-Wide Citizen Advisory Councils
RECOMMENDED STRUCTURES FOR CITIZEN ADVISORY COUNCILS FOR ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

AREA I

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT A
Adamsville
Miles
Fain
West Manor
TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 2,624

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT B
Townes
Harwell
Collier Heights
TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,998

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT C
Anderson
White
Grove Park
TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,739

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT D
Peyton Forest
Wright

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,219

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT E
Stanton, F. L.
Clement
Herndon
Carter
TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,527
ELEMNETARY SCHOOL COUNCIL-DISTRICT F
Oglethorpe
Ware
Bethune
Craddock
English Ave. Primary
English Ave. Elem.
TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 2,260

ELEMNETARY SCHOOL COUNCIL-DISTRICT G
Hartnett
Peeples
Connally
Harris
TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,837

AREA II

ELEMNETARY SCHOOL COUNCIL-DISTRICT A
West Atlanta
Ben Hill
Ben Hill Annex
Fickett
Continental Colony
TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 2,203

ELEMNETARY SCHOOL COUNCIL-DISTRICT B
Kimberly
Cascade
Venetian Hills
Arkwright
TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 2,343

ELEMNETARY SCHOOL COUNCIL-DISTRICT C
Ragsdale
Gideons
Pryor
TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,190
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT D
Capitol View
Slater
Jessie M. Jones
Campbell
Gilbert

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 2,101

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT E
Lakewood
Dobbs
Thomasville

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,756

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT F
Waters
Cleveland
Hutchinson

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,652

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT G
Humphries
Howell
Blair Village
Harper

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,266

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT H
Sylvan Hills
Perkerson
Brewer

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,094

AREA III

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT A
Carey
Williams
Center Hill
Woodson

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 2,271
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT B
Mays
Blalock
Scott
Chattahoochee

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,741

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT C
Pitts
Finch
Boyd
Robinson

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,922

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT D
Bolton
Mitchell
Brandon
Jackson

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,070

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT E
S. R. Smith
Garden Hills
Rivers

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 990

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT F
P. P. Howell
Spring
Home Park
Fowler

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 954

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT G
Morningside
Inman
Hill
Forrest
John Hope

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,351
AREA IV

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT A
M. A. Jones
Rusk
Dunbar

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,682

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT B
Butler
Grant Park Primary
Grant Park Elem.
Cook

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,038

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT C
Slaton
McGill
West

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,108

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT D
Reynolds
Hubert
Gordon
Burgess
Peterson

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 2,085

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT E
Lin
Moreland
Wesley

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,307

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT F
Kirkwood
Whitefoord
Toomer

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,170
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNCIL—DISTRICT G
Drew
East Lake
Fountain

TOTAL ENROLLMENT: 1,800
PROCEDURES

Eligibility - The following criteria will be used to determine eligibility for election to the elementary school council and the area-wide school council:

1. Prospective members must have a child enrolled in one of the elementary schools comprising the particular elementary council district,

2. All prospective members must be registered to vote,

3. Parents who live in one elementary school council district, but whose children are bussed to other schools in the school system, must run as an at-large member on the area-wide school council, i.e. Area I or II,

4. Prospective members must be residents of the Area District for a period of six months prior to filing for office.

Terms of Office - All persons elected to the elementary school councils and area-wide councils will serve two-year terms in office. Elections should be coordinated with elections for the Georgia General Assembly to reduce costs and maintain voter interest and participation. It is possible to have elections for the 1975-76 school year but new elections would have to be held in 1976 to coincide with elections for the General Assembly.

Students - Two of the at-large positions on each Area-Wide Advisory Council should be reserved for students. Students in middle and high schools would be eligible to seek office.

Representation - Each elementary advisory school council will have nine elected members. The presidents or chairmen of the elementary school councils will automatically sit as full voting members on the Area-Wide Advisory Councils.
Members of the Area-Wide Advisory Councils will choose the president or chairman and two other members as their representatives to the twelve-member Citizen Advisory Panel.

The geographical boundaries for each Area-Wide Advisory Council will be the respective boundaries of Areas I, II, III, and IV. The geographical boundaries of the elementary school councils will be the existing attendance boundary guidelines.
SUPERINTENDENT

3 MEMBERS FROM EACH AREA-WIDE COUNCIL WILL FORM A 12-MEMBER ADVISORY PANEL

AREA-WIDE COUNCIL FOR AREA I

AREA-WIDE COUNCIL FOR AREA II

AREA-WIDE COUNCIL FOR AREA III

AREA-WIDE COUNCIL FOR AREA IV

AREA I - 8 ELEM.
SCHOOL COUNCIL DISTRICTS WITH 9 ELECTED MEMBERS ON EACH

AREA II - 8 ELEM.
SCHOOL COUNCIL DISTRICTS WITH 9 ELECTED MEMBERS ON EACH

AREA III - 8 ELEM.
SCHOOL COUNCIL DISTRICTS WITH 9 ELECTED MEMBERS ON EACH

AREA IV - 8 ELEM.
SCHOOL COUNCIL DISTRICTS WITH 9 ELECTED MEMBERS ON EACH
APPENDIX G

First Draft of Plan Developed by
the CEPC's Re-Write Committee
MEMORANDUM

TO: Community Education Planning Committee Members

FROM: Norman H. Thomas

SUBJECT: First Draft of Plan Developed by Re-Write Committee Members

The Re-Write Committee met at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, September 11, 1975, in the Conference Room of the Community Affairs Division. Milt Lincoln served as chairman and the following persons were present during the meeting:

1. Ms. Goldie Johnson
2. Ms. Esther Lefever
3. Mr. Dan P. Young

During the meeting, a lengthy discussion ensued concerning the practicality of developing a school-community involvement plan that employed the cluster concept. Dan Young reminded the Re-Write Committee members that this was the concept agreed upon by the full Committee during the August 28, 1975 meeting. Milt Lincoln, Goldie Johnson, and Esther Lefever disagreed with Dan Young and stated that the best way to resolve the issue would be to submit two plans to the full Committee membership for their consideration. Therefore, enclosed is a copy of the plan that was developed by Milt, Esther, and Goldie. Dan Young's proposal will be forwarded to you as soon as it is received.

Finally, our next full Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, September 30, 1975, at 2:00 p.m. in the Conference Room of the Community Affairs Division. Please review the enclosed plan and come prepared to present your comments during this meeting.

See you on September 30, 1975, at 2:00 p.m.!!

NHT:ajs

Enclosure
THREE TIER PLAN

Submitted by

Milt Lincoln
Ms. Goldie Johnson
Ms. Esther Lefever

Introduction

One of the primary objectives for establishing a mechanism for enhancing school-community involvement is to ensure maximum participation on all levels of the community. As a means of accomplishing this objective, the following plan has been developed for your consideration.

Local Level

It is believed that the most effective way to ensure maximum participation at the local level is to establish a system whereby all schools would have a federation of school-community organizations. This organization would have a maximum of four representatives from existing organizations such as the PTA, Title I Advisory Committee, ESAA Advisory Committee, etc., comprising its membership. Additionally, parents, community representatives (non-parents, business religious organizations, etc.), school staff members, students and the principal (ex-officio) will serve on this level. The number of persons constituting this group would range from 15-20 persons. A suggested number of representatives from each category is outlined below:
1. Parents 4
2. Community People 2
3. Staff 2
4. Students 4
5. Representatives of existing school organization 4
6. Principal (appointed representative) 1

17 TOTAL

(The number will vary from school to school, but parents and students should always have the largest representation.)

Area Level

Each of the four areas shall have an area-wide school-community organization. Membership on this level would consist of the following persons and/or categories:

1. Chairman of each local community organization,
2. One student from each high and middle school,
3. Organization(s) with broad area interest,
4. Area superintendent or appointed staff member (ex-officio).

Central Level

The central level community organization shall have the following representation:

1. One student from each area, (4)
2. Two community representatives from each area, (8)
3. Representative from city-wide organizations, (12)+
   (AAE, AFT, AFSCME, C of C, Mayor's Office, NAACP, Urban League, CAP, B'nai B'rith, SCLC, League of Women Voters, etc.)

The preceding plan could be depicted schematically in the following manner:
Minimum Standards

1. Each school shall have a functioning school-community organization with accompanying elected officers, regular meeting dates, formal reports to constituents and by-laws.

2. Parent and student representation shall exist on all levels.

3. Principal and area superintendents shall serve as ex-officio members at their respective levels.

4. School-community organizations shall serve in advisory capacity and should not, in any way, assume responsibility for operating the schools.

5. Additional guidelines and/or standards shall be developed in cooperation with the superintendents' staff and school-community organization members.
APPENDIX H

Attendance Data on Each Meeting Session
COMMUNITY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMITTEE

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>7/18</th>
<th>7/29</th>
<th>8/12</th>
<th>8/21</th>
<th>8/28</th>
<th>9/11*</th>
<th>9/30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bottomly, Forbes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Byrd, Veverly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cantor, Betty</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Crowder, Carolyn</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson, Alvin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Robert L.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eberhart, Horace L.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hall, Allene</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Howard, Gwendolyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Dwight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Johnson, Catherine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Johnson, Goldie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lefever, Esther</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, Milt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Harold B.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody, Victor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mumford, Carole</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsaur, Stephen D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards, Pete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Smith, Joann</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Watkins, Dee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Dan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Young, Jacquelyn</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages</strong></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Re-Write Committee Meeting — 4 members only.
APPENDIX I

Dr. Crim's Cover Letter and Copy of Plan Forwarded to the

Administrative Staff of the Atlanta Public Schools
MEMORANDUM

TO: Administrative Staff

FROM: Alonzo A. Crim, Superintendent

SUBJ: School-Community Participation Program

The products of our schools, the students, should be the most dramatic testimony to our efforts. In an urban community which is constantly changing, our students inevitably reflect the consequences of that change. Low attendance, uneven achievement, indifference on the part of teachers and students alike, criticism and pressure from the community, are symptoms which impact on our students and with which classroom personnel alone cannot cope.

We should be about the business of creating opportunities for productive interaction between Atlanta Public Schools and the community which we serve. The day is long past when we can open the doors of the schools to citizens on our terms and close our minds to what they are saying about how their money is being spent and what we are doing with their children. It is imperative for us to find ways to strengthen the connection between the schools and the community.

A planning committee with 23 members was commissioned in June, 1975, representing community members, parents, students, administrators, and other school staff to develop a comprehensive program for meaningful community participation. This committee accomplished its initial assignment, development of a recommended structure for citizen involvement and minimum standards, from July - September, 1975. This presentation summarizes the committee's report plus adds some recommended functions for the three-tiered advisory structure.

We would appreciate your thoughtful review and comments on this proposal. These comments should be forwarded to your Cabinet representative by Monday, December 15, 1975.

AAC:B1W:lds
Local School-Community Advisory Council

It is believed that the most effective way to ensure maximum participation at the local level is to establish a system whereby all schools would have a federation of school-community organizations. This organization would have a maximum of four representatives from existing organizations such as the PTA, Title I Advisory Committee, ESAA Advisory Committee, etc., comprising its membership. Additionally, parents, community representatives (non-parents, business, religious organizations, etc.), school staff members, students and the principal (ex officio) will serve on this level. The number of persons constituting this group would range from 15-20 persons. A suggested number of representatives from each category is outlined below:

1) parents 4
2) community people 2
3) staff 2
120 4) students 4
5) representatives of existing school organization 4
6) principal (appointed representative)

total 17

*Staff will be elected from all levels of the school.

Functions

Functions of the local school-community advisory council will be to:

1. Serve in accordance with school Board policy in an advisory capacity only, without pay.

2. Review and evaluate problems and programs with the local school administration and recommend solutions to the problems and modifications to programs or recommend new programs when it appears to be necessary.

3. Recommend to the local building administration educational goals and objectives, and priorities to be met by the school and play a significant role in the implementation of existing and future goals of the system.
4. Make recommendations regarding the criteria and process for evaluation of the educational program relative to its achieving the stated educational goals and objectives of the area.

5. Act as the principal formal contact and communication link between the community and the school administration.

6. Encourage participation in Council affairs of people of the community and families through membership in subcommittees and attendance at public meetings.

7. Review long-range plans with the school administrator and/or the regional assistant superintendent.

8. Hold regularly scheduled meetings. With the assistance of the appropriate school staff, at least two of these meetings will be directed toward implementation of educational goals and objectives and other items of concern to the Council or school officials. All such meetings will be publicly announced to the community at least a week preceding the meeting and will be open to the public.

9. Make available minutes of all meetings to citizens, school staffs, students, and school staff organizations upon request.

10. Make regular reports through its representatives to local school PTSA meetings and forward the concerns of each local school PTSA to the Council.

Area School-Community Advisory Council

Each of the four areas shall have an area-wide school-community organization. Membership on this level would consist of the following persons and/or categories:

1) chairman of each local community organization
2) one student from each high and middle school
3) organization(s) with broad area interest
4) area superintendent will select one teacher from existing local organization on the elementary, middle and high school levels
5) area superintendent or appointed staff member (ex officio)

Functions

Functions of the area school-community advisory council will be to:

1. Consult and advise the area superintendent on all matters emanating from the area school councils which affect the total region.
2. Recommend to the area superintendent educational goals and objectives to be met by the schools in the region.

3. Make recommendations to the area superintendent regarding the criteria and process for the evaluation of the educational program relative to its achieving the stated educational goals and objectives of the region.

System-Wide School-Community Advisory Council

The system-wide level community organization shall have the following representation:

1) five parents from each of the four areas 20
2) two students (high and middle) from each area 8
3) six representatives from the area-wide committee (the four area-wide chairmen and two school level employees) 6
4) six members selected by the Superintendent 6

total 40

Functions

The functions of the system-wide advisory council will be to:

1. Consult and advise the Superintendent on all matters emanating from the school councils which affect the school district.

2. Recommend to the Superintendent district-wide educational goals and objectives to be met by the Atlanta Public Schools.

3. Assist the Superintendent in his selection of criteria for the evaluation of the district-wide educational program relative to its achieving the stated educational goals and objectives of the Atlanta Public Schools.
SYSTEM-WIDE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT COUNCIL PLAN

SUPERINTENDENT

CENTRAL LEVEL
SCHOOL-COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

AREA-WIDE SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

AREA I

AREA II

AREA III

AREA IV

LOCAL SCHOOL-COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL
## COMPOSITION OF LOCAL-LEVEL

**SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community People</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Representatives of existing school organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Principal (appointed representative)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 17**
COMPOSITION OF AREA LEVEL
SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

1. **Chairman of each local community organization**

2. **One student from each high and middle school**

3. **Organizations with broad area interest**

4. **Area superintendent will select one teacher from existing local organizations on the elementary, middle, and high school levels**

5. **Area superintendent or appointed staff member (ex-officio)**
COMPOSITION OF SYSTEM-WIDE LEVEL
SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

1. Five parents from each of the four areas .......... 20
2. Two students (high and middle) from each area ...... 8
3. Six representatives from the area-wide committee (the
   four area-wide chairmen and two school level employees) .... 6
4. Six members selected by the Superintendent ............ 6

Total 40
MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL-COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

1. Each school shall have a functioning school-community advisory council with accompanying elected officers, regular meeting dates, formal reports to constituents and bylaws.

2. Parent and student representation shall exist on all levels.

3. Principal and area superintendents shall serve as ex-officio members at their respective levels.

4. School-community advisory councils shall serve in an advisory capacity and should not, in any way, assume responsibility for operating the schools.

5. The designated administrator of each of the three levels (principal, area superintendent, and superintendent) shall identify persons to staff their respective organizations.

6. Staff Development shall provide the necessary training to ensure the success of the "Plan."

7. Funding should be obtained from the Board, public or private foundations to support this endeavor.

8. Specific mechanisms should be developed to keep the public apprised as to what the various school-community organizations are doing.

9. Specific funds should be allocated to each level to ensure the success of the "Plan."

10. Additional guidelines and/or standards shall be developed in cooperation with the superintendent's staff and school-community organization members.
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Name: Norman Thomas
1895 Joseph Court
Decatur, Georgia 30032

Personal: Born — July 27, 1943, Waycross, Georgia
Married to Inez D. Thomas
One daughter — Angela Celene
One son — Norman, Jr.

Education: Center High School
Waycross, Georgia
Bachelor of Arts Degree
History
Morehouse College
Atlanta, Georgia

1961

1965

1968

1968

Experience: Teacher of Social Studies
L. J. Price High School
Atlanta, Georgia

Teacher of Social Studies
Walter F. George High school
Atlanta, Georgia

Curriculum Coordinator
Comprehensive Career Education Model (K-12)
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

August 1966 — August 1970

September 1970 — March 1971

March 1971 — August 31, 1973
Experience (Cont.): Community Relations Coordinator
Community Affairs Division
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

Organizations:
NCSS (National Council for the Social Studies)
NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People)
PUSH (People United to Serve Humanity)
YMCA (Young Men's Christian Association)
Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc.

Awards:
Scholar of the Year
Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. 1965

Academic Scholarship
Atlanta University 1966

Young Man of the Year in Education
International Y's Men Club 1972

Ford Foundation Fellowship
Administration and Supervision
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia  September 1973-1976