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ABSTRACT OF PROJECT

THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE COMMISSION ON
THE STUDY OF DISCIPLINE FOR THE ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

By Harold M. Treadwell
Directed By: Dr. Barbara L. Jackson

This project, The Organization and Administration of The Commission on The Study of Discipline for the Atlanta Public Schools, involved the establishment of a fifty member commission to survey the Atlanta community concerning their recommendations for policy changes to the Board of Education on discipline in the Atlanta schools. The project was conceived by the superintendent of schools, Dr. Alonzo A. Crim as a result of input from a series of "town hall" meetings sponsored by the superintendent's office in the Fall of 1973.

The goal of the commission was to provide the Atlanta schools with a discipline policy flexible enough to be utilized by all schools in the system, yet consistent enough to assure a uniform discipline policy for the total system. The goal of the project recognized a broad based community concern regarding disciplinary procedures as they existed in Atlanta, and the need for persons affected by the policies, students, teachers, parents and community, to be involved in making recommendations on policy to the Board of Education.

The project focus was on the organization and the administration of the commission and the role the writer played as the executive secretary to the project during the first phase, and the role that the writer...
played as an observer-analyst during the second phase of the project. The project did not focus on the research techniques of the study, but upon administrative and organizational skills fundamental to this type of study. As the executive secretary, the writer was responsible to a commission chairman appointed by the superintendent of schools.

Organizational decisions included: the development of a planning document for the project, staffing the commission, developing goals and objectives for the commission, pre-service and in-service training for the commission staff, and keeping the superintendent advised of organizational progress.

The administration of the project involved decision making, planning, alternatives, the gathering of survey data, and the implementation of the approved planning document. Both responsibilities, organization and administration, were viewed from the perspective of the executive secretary of the project, and as a student of educational administration.

The project was divided into two phases. The organizational phase was successful, while the administrative phase was not successful. The project should define for the reader some organizational procedures: the development of a planning document, the development of a broad-based commission team, the use of pre-service and in-service training in this type of project, and define project areas that can cause administrative problems. The primary cause of the lack of success in the administrative phase of the project was in the field of communication with the Board of Education and the superintendent.

There were several issues of organization and administration that were not answered in the project. The role of the superintendent in
this project was never clearly defined, and led to some insurmountable administrative problems. Another important issue was the use of public funds to pay teachers and community people for service on this type of commission. Finally, no strategy was developed to deal with the power of the Board of Education to function outside of a public meeting.

The project illustrated the difficulty of implementing innovative programs without first getting the support of the Board of Education. Also, it demonstrated that community involvement, a complex issue in any setting, had not reached a functional level, for this type of study, in the city of Atlanta, Georgia.

In summary, the study provides the reader with some criteria for pursuing a project in the field of educational administration.
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PREFACE

The project originally approved by the writer's doctoral committee, was the organization and the administration of the Atlanta Public School's Commission on Discipline. In March of 1974, when the staff was discharged by Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, the superintendent, the focus of the project was changed, and after the March date, the writer related to the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline as an analytical observer.

As a result of the above situation, this final report is divided into two parts. Part One will consist of two distinct phases: phase one will deal with the period of time that the writer served as an administrator in the project, and phase two will deal with the time that the writer served as an analytical observer in the project. Part Two will be an analysis of the project which will deal with the questions that are raised throughout the paper. Specific recommendations and/or suggestions for future students of educational administration at Atlanta University who may consider the terminal project as a means of satisfying the degree requirements will complete Part Two.
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PART I: PHASE I

REPORT I

January 14, 1974 — January 30, 1974

INTRODUCTION

In the original proposal for this doctoral study, it was agreed that regular journals of his activities as the executive director of the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline, would be submitted for consideration and for evaluation. The journals would be subject to review by all committee members: Dr. Barbara L. Jackson, primary reader and advisor, Dr. Huey Charlton, Dr. Clark Carnal, and Dr. Ronald Kilpatrick.

Each report was written to cover a period of approximately fifteen days. The reports were to be discussed with the advisor for content, adherence to the goals of the original proposal, implications for the student of educational administration, and to consider at all times the writer in his role as executive secretary of the commission.

The first report concerned itself with the planning for the study, the organization of the commission, and the organization of the staff, who would assist in the project. Accompanying the first report (Appendix A) is the planning document that served as the basis for phase one of this project. Also included in the Appendix (B), are the agendas that were used during the staff training sessions.
Finally, these reports served as a vehicle for raising questions that are considered in part two of this report. Due to the objectivity of journal material, it is important that the subject matter be held in the strictest confidence.

**Annotated Log**

This was the period of time from the date of initial contact by the Chairman of the Commission on Discipline, Mr. Oscar Boozer, with the writer and the submittal of a planning proposal for the consideration of Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, Superintendent of Schools. This period began on January 14th and ended on January 30th, 1974.

1/14/74  
Mr. Oscar Boozer, Chairman of Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline, contacted the writer by telephone; briefly discussed the formation of the Commission and requested the writer to serve as the Executive Secretary. A meeting was arranged for 11:00 a.m., January 18th, 1974 on the subject.

1/16/74  
The writer prepared a series of questions for the January 18th meeting re: the length of the study, the responsibilities of the Executive Secretary, and the type of pre-planning which had been done. Some suggestions were made about the above items, and about the location of the Commission office.

1/18/74  
A meeting was held with Mr. Boozer and Dr. Hosford, who was to act as liaison between Mr. Boozer's office and the office of the commission. The questions
raised by the writer were discussed, and Mr. Boozer
authorized the writer to conduct preliminary planning
around: goals, objectives, duties of the staff, duties
of the community committees, and the budget.

1/21/74
Met with Mr. Oscar Boozer regarding criteria for com-
mission staff members. The following were considered:
parents, former students, former Atlanta public school
staff members, community people, students, males and
females, writing and organizational ability, and non-
local representation.

1/22/74
Met with Dr. Barbara Jackson to discuss the commission
as a possible terminal project.

1/23/74
Met with Mrs. Farrell Thomas, Chairman of the Guardians
organization to solicit some suggestions for the com-
munity people to serve on the commission staff.

1/24/74
Interviewed Norman Thomas and Brenda Belton re:
employment as commission staff members.

1/25/74
Interviewed Aljosie B. Yabura and Dr. Mack Jones re:
employment as commission staff members. Both indicated
interest, and that they would have to give the matter
consideration for a few days.

1/28/74
Meeting with Arthur Barham about employment as a com-
mision staff member; he accepted. Ms. Yabura indicated
her acceptance on this date and Dr. Jones suggested a
c-co-chairman to work with him. Dr. Carl Spight agreed
to work with Dr. Jones. Met with Dr. Jackson to
1/29/74

Planning document presented to Mr. Oscar Boozer for his consideration prior to a meeting on the document on the following day.

1/30/74

Met with Mr. Boozer to discuss the planning document. The document was approved for dissemination to Dr. Crim, Dr. Estes, and Mr. Minor for their consideration. Mr. Boozer set up a meeting with Dr. Crim to discuss the planning document on February 7, 1974. The first pre-service meeting of the staff was held, and it included sharing the planning document and requesting the reactions of the staff by the next meeting on February 6, 1974.

Pre-Service Issues

The period termed "pre-service", January 14th to January 30th, raised several critical issues. Not the least among the issues raised was the degree of commitment the Atlanta Public Schools had to the project. Other issues that are covered in this period are: the staffing of the administrative team, the planning document and its implications, and the role of the executive secretary. Since the issue of commitment cannot be resolved in any one report, the writer will discuss it in the final section of this report.

Staffing the Administrative Team

Some of the organizational structure of the commission had been set
up prior to the writer's involvement in the project. It had been determined that a staff person would chair the commission and Mr. Oscar Boozer, Director of Services for Exceptional Children, was chosen for the role. It seemed like an appointment by default. Mr. Boozer, when questioned on the appointment, indicated that he did not know why he had been chosen for the role, and that he had heard about the appointment through the press. Did not the more logical people on the staff have time for the assignment? Were the more logical people inclined to skirt the issue? The writer, in his role as a student of educational administration, saw some inconsistency in the Director of Special Services being assigned as the chairman of a commission on discipline. It would seem so much more appropriate to assign this responsibility to the Assistant Superintendent for Community Relations, Ms. Barbara Whittaker, or to an administrative assistant to either the superintendent or to Ms. Whittaker. Since the commission was to have community input, Ms. Whittaker's involvement seemed reasonable, but if she was not available, someone from her office or from the superintendent's office would give the commission the necessary prestige it would need to do the job.

From another perspective (of the executive secretary of the commission), the writer recognized the wisdom of assigning Mr. Boozer; he is an experienced administrator in the system, Mrs. Whittaker is not, and Mr. Boozer's responsibilities are probably less time consuming than some of the other personnel. Finally, the white community had to be represented in the study, hence, Mr. Boozer.

It is appropriate, at this point, to take a look at Mr. Boozer's selection of a black man to serve as the executive secretary of the
commission. It seemed like an excellent administrative move. Why should a white man handle this difficult assignment alone? Why not find some one who had the time that the study would dictate? Why not build an "out-side" buffer between the community and the administration? Boozer's selection, in the opinion of the writer, was not by chance. It should be noted that Mr. Boozer had met the writer while they were negotiating the use of an Atlanta Public School retreat site that might be used by a community organization. As a result of this initial contact, Mr. Boozer mentioned the writer's name to Dr. Sidney H. Estes, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, who knew the writer when Dr. Estes was the Director of the Atlanta University Doctoral Program in Educational Administration. Dr. Estes supported the writer's qualifications to do the job as the executive secretary to the commission.

Also, not by chance was the writer's selection of his administrative team. Time did not permit the extensive training of a staff; the writer had a limited time to produce, and competent staff was mandatory. As a student of educational administration, the writer could have chosen a racially integrated staff; he could have chosen a staff that was representative of the five (5) geographic areas of the system. He could have chosen a staff that represented a broad base of opinion on discipline. He could have built in failure to prove some administrative or humanistic theory, but he did not. As the executive secretary, he chose a team that was functional. A team that represented the community that was most affected by disciplinary policy (the black community), a team that consisted, among other things of parents, educators, community leaders, males and females, ex-students or ex-educators from the Atlanta system,
and a team that had the potential to work together. It was important to the writer, as a black man, to see that budget allocations were spent on black expertise. Scientifically, expertise can be documented by the vitas of the personnel selected: Ms. Brenda L. Belton, Ms. Aljosie Yabura, Mr. Arthur Barham, Dr. Mack Jones, Mr. Norman Thomas, and Dr. Carl Spight.

The Planning Document

With the mention of the budget, the planning document (Appendix A) should be given consideration. Here much of the philosophical and theoretical imagination of the writer came into play. Time did not permit the luxury of total involvement in the budget process, as generally recommended. Personnel affected by the budget were not even consulted in some instances, such as teachers on active assignment, students currently enrolled in the Atlanta schools, and a broad base of the community. However, time, not the ignorance of the process is the excuse offered.

The document was a monster of guess work. Would the community buy honoraria for non-professionals? Would the Board of Education support housing a commission in a non-school facility? Would the superintendent support the changing of the name of the commission? What about the theory of equal pay for equal work between the professional and non-professional? Would the superintendent accept phasing the study over one year's time as opposed to his original thoughts of four months?

Some of the ideas proposed were the romantic notions of the student executive operating in a non-political situation. Let us then examine
Compensation was proposed for both professionals and non-professionals for their work on the commission. It was to be in the form of an honorarium of $100.00 for each participant. The rationale for this budget item was as follows: no study has any validity without input from staff and community, and if their input was so important, then they should be given some financial consideration. This is not to say that commission members were being paid, since $100.00 could not pay for the time that would be spent in this type of study. It was, however, an attempt to say that their time and community responsibility was recognized by the Board of Education in the form of a modest honorarium. The writer will stop at this juncture to indicate that in another situation, very similar to this, community people did receive compensation for training to serve in the public schools, and approval for this compensation had come from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for a Teacher Corps proposal. The proposal had been submitted by the writer for a Teacher Corps program in Berkeley, California in November of 1973.

The second idea that was to be tested was that of housing a commission on the subject of discipline in the community. The rationale here was as follows: disassociate the commission office from the school system's central office, make it convenient for the general public to drop in and to talk. Another consideration built into this part of the proposal was that the proposed location was convenient for the writer in satisfying another responsibility he had to the Institute of The Black World which was located at the proposed site.

Were the ideas valid and supportive of the work of the commission or did they build failure into the efforts of the commission? These
questions will be answered in the concluding part of this paper.

There was an element built into the planning document that included a public responsibility. Regular and systematic sharing of commission progress with the public, the superintendent, and the Board of Education was included. The document was to become public information; there was no element that could not be shared. Plans were made to distribute a copy to each member of the commission, and a discussion was planned around the document at the first meeting of the area committees.

Finally, since the writer's doctoral committee requested that he stress process in his reports, the process for review of the document was as follows: review by the chairman of the commission, review by the staff of the commission, review by the superintendent's staff, review by the superintendent with the chairman and executive secretary of the commission, and review by the total commission who represented staff, community, students and parents. Was the process of review complete? As was seen, the writer did not include the Board of Education and this had grave consequences.

The discussion of the planning document could constitute a term paper in itself. The student of educational administration, cognizant of the emphasis that Federal legislation has placed on post-1965 grants-in-aid, which demanded a great deal of community involvement, hopefully had transferred this concept into a reality. Will the community support what has been done? Will they recognize an attempt to involve them in planning, implementation, and evaluation? Does the document have value?
The Role of the Executive Secretary

Under the direction of the chairman of the commission, he is to carry out the charge of the commission. It would be his responsibility to plan, implement, and to evaluate. Surely, it would be his responsibility to assist in decision making at the highest level. A position that would be representative of the superintendent, and although a consultant, hardly functioning in the capacity of one who gives advice without assuming the responsibility for that advice.

The writer, as the student of educational administration, saw this role as supportive of the chairman. Certainly, a line position with skills in administration that include: public relations, organizational skills, leadership ability, conceptual skills, and with a degree of administrative experience.

As the executive secretary, the writer clearly understood that his role would be the de facto chairman of the commission. He would be called upon to interpret to the media, the superintendent and to the Board of Education. The role was clearly defined by the chairman, Oscar Boozer, since he did not have the time to do the job. We will see how this role develops as this project develops.

Commitment

Many questions have been raised that will be answered in future reports to the doctoral committee. The degree of commitment that students, parents, staff and community people have to an indepth study on discipline may be the first question answered. How much time will be committed? What unforeseen roadblocks will affect commitment.
What political forces will affect the commission? As the reader shall see, these are important questions.

It will be interesting to study the forces that will affect the planning that has been done. It will be interesting to see what reaction experienced administrators have to some of the ideas that have been advanced. It will be interesting to follow the rationale which affects the changes that will be made in the document. It will be interesting to watch the ebb and the flow of commitment.

While the student of educational administration can sit back and watch things develop, the executive secretary must play a real role in seeing that commitment does not ebb; that the politics of the project are constantly understood. The superintendent plays a key role. How will his commitment affect the total project?
REPORT II
February 4, 1974 — February 17, 1974

INTRODUCTION

This report period saw the completion of the pre-service training of the commission staff, and the beginning of in-service thinking. The staff completed their study of the planning document and approved its content with a few minor changes.

It was during this period that formal acceptance of the planning document was affected and the superintendent gave his charge of responsibility to the commission; a charge that will be discussed in some detail on the following pages.

Activity increased during this report period with the study spreading into the community, and the involvement of the area committees becoming quite evident. The commission staff, having completed their training, were active in the community and the focus of the study was swinging away for the commission office.

It was becoming clear that the staff would need the help of someone who had the time to conduct supportive research and this person was chosen.

Report two will focus on some of the decisions made by the superintendent and the affect that they had upon the work of the commission.
Annotated Log

This period of time includes: pre-service training of the commission staff which began during the first report period, the acceptance of the planning proposal by the superintendent with some of the organizational work connected with that, the beginning of research to support the work of the commission, and the development of the roster of commission members.

2/5/74  Pre-service training of the commission staff.  
        (Appendix B).

2/6/74  Meeting with Oscar Boozer to plan the meeting with 
        Dr. Crim and his staff. A tentative calendar of commis-
        sion events (Appendix C) was prepared.

2/7/74  Meeting with Dr. Crim, Dr. Estes, Dr. Hosford, Mr. 
        Boozer, Dr. Boyles and the writer regarding the plan-
        ning proposal. The proposal was approved by Dr. Crim 
        and a date was set for the superintendent to charge 
        the commission.

2/8/74  Meeting with Oscar Boozer to plan the meeting at 
        which Dr. Crim would deliver the charge.

2/11/74  A consultant hired to research previous studies of 
        this type, and to recommend three to five surveys 
        for the commission's consideration.

2/12/74  Final pre-service training session for the commission 
        staff. (Appendix B).

2/13/74  Completed the roster of commission members (Appendix 
        E).
Pre-Service Meetings

On January 30th, 1974, the staff had been given a copy of the planning document for their study and recommendations. The second pre-service meeting of the staff considered, among other things, this document. It was the unanimous opinion of the staff that the document, with a few minor revisions, presented planning which they could support. One of the objectives—"parity to the input from professional and non-professional sources," was discussed. There was no disagreement with the value of the concept, but from the point of view that it could have a divisive affect upon the commission members. It was the opinion of some that the idea could be affected without it being in writing. Budget questions included the number of payments non-staff people would receive for their service, and it was concluded that the honoraria would be paid at one time in a lump sum. The question arose as to how the figures for the salaries had been reached. The thinking was based upon the policy of the Atlanta schools, which paid local consultants at the rate of fifty dollars a day plus expenses. The question arose as to the number of hours per week each staff member would complete. This was guess work, and it was decided that if additional compensation was in order, it would be documented by staff members, and some adjustment would be made in their salaries through the avenue of the contingency fund (see page nine of the planning proposal). It was interesting that the staff felt that the executive secretary's salary,
based upon the same rationale as the salaries for staff people, did not, in their opinion reflect the responsibility factor of the position. The feeling seemed to be that the person responsible for the total project should be compensated at a higher rate. This argument is often the crux of some of the disagreements between teachers and administrators as they negotiate salaries.

A further factor in this discussion on the planning document was the reaction of the superintendent and his staff to two elements: phasing of the study and compensation of commission members. Since the superintendent had published an indication that he wanted recommendations by June 1st on policies, it was questionable that he would accept the phasing approach in the document; also, compensation for school staff and community persons for this type of service presented a departure from the usual procedure.

Another item considered in the second pre-service meeting was the current Board of Education policy on discipline. This rather short document, approved in 1964 and not revised since, was presented to the staff, and was discussed. It seemed a rather sketchy policy document limited in scope, and with little or no consideration of the superintendent's wishes to develop a policy based upon input from students, parents, community and staff. Copies of the document were made available for the staff to use in their individual committee meetings in the areas. It became clear that research and survey would be an important part of any recommendations made to the Board of Education. Who then would do the research? Time was a factor in this decision, and expertise was a major factor. It was agreed that the current staff did not
have the time, and a consultant should be assigned this task. This aspect of this report will be discussed under a separate title.

Pre-service meetings dealt with many of the concerns of the staff, not the least of which was the formulation of plans for the first area meetings. It was important to understand that the staff was not to be viewed by the area committees as administrative personnel. It was important that staff assume the role of the participant-observer. It was important that the first meeting depict organization and efficiency. What were some of the essential elements of this first meeting? Consideration was given to the following: introductions of committee members, deciding on the place, time and dates of subsequent meetings, the definition of the roles of the committee members, a study of the planning document, etc., etc., etc. Each staff member was asked to begin to develop plans around some of the above items, and to bring these plans to the next meeting to share with his fellow staff members and with the executive secretary.

Strategies were discussed and developed to deal with meeting organization, and Norman Thomas presented a short evaluation sheet for the use of area committees. It proved a useful item, and was offered for use to the other members of the staff.

As a result of this pre-planning, area meetings would be well organized, the role of the staff would be clearly defined, and hopefully, future project reports would reflect this training. As we move into future phases of this project, the in-service training of staff members will receive further consideration.

Let us reflect upon the use of pre-service training as a vehicle
in staff training. The student of educational administration recognizes this as a fundamental element in the efficiency and the morale of the staff. Certainly it has implications for in-service training, and the writer recognizes these two elements, pre-service and in-service training, as an essential instructional tool, and a responsibility that an administrator has to his staff.

On the other hand, the writer as the executive secretary recognizes some of the problems inherent in finding the time for pre-service and in-service training. The time factor seems to have resolved itself around noontime meetings in this situation. Certainly the writer, both as a student and as an executive secretary, recognizes this training as an opportunity to afford regular personal contact between staff and superintendent. It might be that once a week staff luncheon meetings are a good idea when they are built around professional training. This might prove a rather "shaky" format for a school principal with his concerns with noontime supervision, but for the superintendent, it has some definite possibilities.

Acceptance of the Planning Proposal

It is important that the chronology of this proposal be understood. On January 18th, 1974 the writer received authority to plan for the project; on January 29th the document in rough draft form was presented to the Commission chairman for his consideration, and on January 30th a discussion on the proposal was held with the chairman and the document received approval for dissemination to the superintendent and his staff. One week later, February 7th, a meeting was scheduled with the superintendent and his staff to discuss the document in detail, so that,
"... a more comprehensive document could become a part of the public record." (Introduction to the planning document).

On February 7th, in a meeting with Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, Dr. Sidney H. Estes, Dr. Marion Boyle, Dr. Hosford, Mr. Boozer, and the writer, the superintendent gave authorization to proceed with the plans. The writer, at this meeting, requested authorization in writing for the meeting did not deal with the specifics of the planning document, but in a generalized discussion of the philosophy of discipline. The writer made specific references to the document at the meeting and requested input from the superintendent of specifics. The superintendent stated that we had administrative authority to conduct the study and were to proceed with the plans.

The writer's reaction to this meeting both as a student of educational administration, and as the executive secretary of the commission was synonymous. The meeting did not deal with the issues! Who, if anyone had read the document? What procedures had the superintendent devised to deal with issues or proposals? What was the role of staff to the superintendent? The writer, as a student, clearly sees that the document should have been read. The writer, as the executive secretary, recognizes that a superintendent can not read everything, therefore, some one else should have been instructed to read the document, and to bring a report to the superintendent. The report should have included recommendations for the superintendent's consideration.

Where did the responsibility rest for this obvious "faux-pas"? With the superintendent? With the superintendent's staff? With the commission chairman? With the writer as the executive secretary of the
commission? Was the writer's statement to the superintendent, that he had come to deal with the issues of the proposal, sufficient to absolve him of any further responsibility in the matter? Should the writer, in his position as the executive secretary, have been more insistent?

**Research Consultant**

As was indicated in the previous discussion of pre-service training, the issue came up as to what other cities had done with the problems of discipline; what was the research in this area; what types of surveys were used to gather data? It was concluded that this type of information was important as a base of information for the Atlanta study, and that since a uniform survey instrument was to be used by five commission areas, instruments must be evaluated and recommended for our consideration. A research consultant was hired to make a study of the literature, and to make recommendations to the commission on three to five possible surveys that we could consider. Also, the consultant was instructed to prepare abstracts of the literature for the use of the commission. In view of this charge, Ms. Janet G. Davis proposed the following (Appendix D): the utilization of three periodicals as references for the research; exploration of at least ten recent documents, and the recommendation of three to five surveys to the commission. Each survey was to be evaluated according to a list of thirteen questions. The questions included the purpose of the study, who conducted the study, racial composition of the school system, methodology of the survey, population of the study, etc. The complete list is included in Appendix D. Ms. Davis, in addition to making recommendations to the commission concerning surveys, was to give the rationale for these recommendations.
The executive secretary recognized two major factors which contributed to the selection of a research consultant to do this study: the limited amount of time available to the staff to complete the study, and the lack of expertise on the part of the executive secretary in this field.

This lack of expertise has some definite implications for the student of educational administration; develop the expertise or make sure someone on your staff has this expertise. While the writer has some knowledge of the vocabulary and the goals of educational research, and of course an appreciation of its use in educational administration, he has no desire to develop an expertise in this area of his profession. It is the writer's contention that an administrator cannot be expected to know everything, and must know when to bring in others to support his goals.

Miscellaneous Activities During the Period

Plans were made to call all fifty members of the commission together to receive the charge by the superintendent. It was felt that the meeting should be rather simple and the agenda should be limited. The purpose was to formally charge the commission members and staff, afford area committees an opportunity to meet one another, and to introduce the staff members to the total commission. The meeting was planned for a maximum of one hour with light refreshments served to facilitate the social aspect of the meeting. Care was taken that aspects of the first formal meeting in each area were not covered in this meeting. It was the opinion of the writer that the area convener and the area staff members could make arrangements at this meeting for their first area
meeting, and that the less said about their roles and duties by the executive secretary would help to establish the desired rapport between the area staff personnel and the area committees. A complete roster, attached to Appendix E, was prepared for the meeting. It included the addresses of the commission members and their telephone numbers. It was felt that this would improve intra-committee communication, and inter-committee communication for the total commission.

Somehow the student of educational administration feels that the responsibilities of the charge were not clear in the mind of the superintendent, Dr. Crim. The report on the charge, to be included in the next report, may bear out this feeling.

As the executive secretary, the process which was to be constantly in the mind of the writer during the project seemed to be sound. It seemed reasonable that prior to formal meetings on the purpose of the commission, the superintendent should make it quite clear what he expected to come from the commission, and that he should spell out some rather clear guidelines for the commission members.

One slight administrative change became necessary in the planning for the meeting. The 15th of February, the date originally selected by the superintendent, conflicted with Valentine Day activities planned throughout the system, therefore the date was changed to the 18th of February.

Conclusion

This marked the end of the planning at the central office level. It covered a period from January 14th, 1974 to February 17th, 1974. It culminated in the acceptance of the planning proposal by the superin-
tendent, the organization of the staff and the area committees, the
development of plans for supportive research, and what seemed like to
the writer, a solid base from which the commission could begin its
work in the community. Solid support had been received from the super-
intendent for the proposal, and even more important to the writer, a
fine supportive staff had been recruited: Ms. Brenda Belton, a doctoral
student in educational administration; Ms. Linda Somers, a secretary
with strong educational credentials; Ms. Aljosie Yabura, a researcher,
director of a local alternative school in pre-school education, and a
parent; Mr. Arthur Barham, a former Atlanta public school graduate,
strongly related to the community, and a lecturer in Black studies;
Dr. Mac Jones, a noted political scientist and parent; Dr. Carl Spight,
a Morehouse professor in Physics, a parent, and an active member of
the Atlanta community; Mr. Norman Thomas, a doctoral student in
educational administration, a parent, and a teacher on leave from the
Atlanta public school system; and Ms. Janet Davis, a former teacher
in the Philadelphia school system, a recent graduate of Atlanta Uni-
versity, and an active community worker.

It seemed to the writer that we had a good beginning.
REPORT III
February 18, 1974 — March 1, 1974

INTRODUCTION

This was a rather difficult administrative period of time for several reasons. The charge by the Superintendent of Schools left a lot to be desired, and will be discussed in greater detail in the body of the report. Money for the project, which previously had been 'no problem', began to present some problems. The racial composition of the commission staff had been questioned.

As agreed by the doctoral committee, the writer will again be making continued reference to the process involved in decision making, and discussing issues from the perspective of the student in educational administration, and as the executive secretary of the commission. It would be fair to say at this point in the study, that the roles become mixed at times. This may be evident to the reader by some of the comments made by the writer.

This period marked the beginning of some rather positive work with the area committees. Goals, objectives, duties, and responsibilities were tested and questioned; the planning that had gone into the project began to have its real test in the field.

Annotated Log

2/18/74 The superintendent of schools delivered the charge to the total commission.
2/19/74 Final pre-service training session (Appendix B).
A preliminary report from the research consultant (Appendix D).
Introduction of Mr. Oscar Boozer, Chairman of the Commission of Accountability and Rights in Discipline, to the staff.
Planning for future in-service meetings.

2/20/74 Meeting with Ms. Barbara Whittaker, Director of Community Relations.

2/21/74 Meeting with Mr. Oscar Boozer in reference to the charge by the superintendent and the budget.

2/26/74 A formal charge prepared for Dr. Crim's signature (Appendix F).

2/28/74 Plans were made for the entire staff to hold an evening meeting with Ms. Janet Davis at which she would discuss the results of her research.

Issues of Report III

The Charge By The Superintendent to The Commission

The planning that had gone into this meeting directed, "The Superintendent to prepare a charge to the commission to be delivered at the first general meeting" (see page eleven of the planning document). It should be emphasized that the planning document was forwarded to the superintendent on January 30th, and that this meeting was held on February 18th, 1974. The process seemed to allow for ample time to prepare a charge, and included sufficient data to give direction as to
the content of the charge.

Clearly, in the opinion of the writer, his staff, and some of the commission members interviewed, the charge given by the superintendent should have been prepared in writing. The charge lacked depth and gave few definite guidelines to the commission members. It appeared to be a repetition of the experience in the superintendent's office on February 7th, when we met to discuss the planning document. The superintendent had neither done his homework, nor had anyone else done it for him. Here the student of educational administration needs to interject some thinking on the elements that should be included in a charge to a task force of this type. One, the superintendent prepares a written statement that leaves little need for a complete interpretation of his intent. Two, the statement defines the limits of the task force, provides guidelines for the operation of the task force, suggests a calendar or a date when reports are expected, and defines a liaison between the superintendent's office and the task force. Finally, task forces have definite time limitations and the charge includes the fact that the task force will be dissolved on or about a particular date. This is an acceptable process; a process that received little consideration in this instance. As the executive secretary, the writer felt compelled to prepare the charge in writing for the superintendent's consideration. This would prevent confusion and future debate on the charge, and would give each area committee a written statement of the superintendent's intent. Support for this position came from the staff members who shared the writer's need for written direction, and who during the social hour following the meeting sensed the need for a written charge.
The writer surely recognizes the restrictions on the time of a superintendent. However, it is felt that the superintendent should have had the charge written by an administrative assistant or other staff. In discussing this matter with my advisor, who attended the meeting, it was agreed that the informality of the superintendent's charge was in order, but that some written charge should have been presented to those present. Also, it should be mentioned that no board members were present.

This meeting would have been an excellent time for the superintendent "to prepare a public announcement...identifying the task force, its goals and objectives", (see page twelve of the planning document). It would have satisfied the intent of the planning document, "to keep the public, superintendent and Board advised of commission progress." (page four of planning document). Did the politics of the commission direct other than complete honesty with the public and the Board of Education, and if so, why?

Final Pre-Service Meeting for Staff

The final meeting on February 19th, after the previous night's meeting charging the commission presented an opportunity for staff input, and led to a formal written charge being prepared with copies prepared for each commission member.

Oscar Boozer, commission chairman, was presented to the staff group at the final pre-service meeting. While the general meeting presented no deviations from the agenda, the after meeting was very interesting. A former black employee of Mr. Boozer's staff "walked in on the final portion of the meeting", and after the meeting ended, asked the writer
some pointed questions in reference to the racial composition of the staff. The writer was questioned as to whether he realized that his staff was all black. The writer responded that he did realize that his staff was all black, and that he was prepared to defend, if necessary, his selection of staff. The employee made it clear that she was only trying to help the commission, and did not want the writer to be unaware of Atlanta's attitude of having committee and task forces representative of the racial composition of the schools. The writer answered the questions calmly and left the meeting when there were no more questions. Later that same evening, the writer thought about the session. One question seemed to bother the writer. Did Oscar Boozer put this former employee up to asking the questions?

The following day, the writer in his role as executive secretary, called for a meeting with Mr. Boozer to discuss the question. The conference established that the employee had not been asked to attend the meeting and that the questions were her own. Based upon previous work with Boozer, the writer agreed that the questions were not initiated by him.

It was at this meeting that Ms. Davis forwarded a preliminary report on her research (Appendix C). She named three references for her research; spelled out certain of the requirements for the research, and indicated questions to be answered by the research. A request was made that the report and its implications be shared in an evening meeting with the staff. One of the most critical elements of the report dealt with the limited number of actual surveys that were available for scrutiny, and the need for the commission to consider other sources of
information. It was at this point that the writer suggested that the services of the Council of The Great City Schools be utilized to assist in gathering survey data. A telephone call and an official letter were sent immediately to the Council requesting their assistance.

The final major consideration on the agenda was the plans for the series of three in-service meetings that were to be held. Three dates were selected beginning on Wednesday, March 6th, and scheduled for succeeding Wednesdays. As a student, the writer recognizes the importance of building continued training into staff education. This provides for opportunities for the staff to keep abreast of current trends, and on the administrative level, provides for the important element of staff coordination.

**Budget**

From a position on January 14th, that money was no object in the study, to a position approximately six weeks later that the original budget of $16,000 had been cut to $13,000 was one of the major, however not insurmountable problems of this report period. The original problem in this study had not been money, but time. Early negotiations had indicated that the source of funds for the project would come from a $16,000 salary which would not be used during the school year because the employee had received a study grant, and would not be with the district for the year. Indications from the comptroller, that the fund had been depleted by $3,000 due to summer work by the employee, was received during this report period.

The issue seemed to be rather clearly spelled out to the writer. It
was the writer's responsibility, as the executive secretary, to find additional money or to take a critical look at the current budget of the commission. There seemed to be several ways of dealing with this problem: use the contingency fund to absorb part of the loss was one thought. Reduce the honoraria and salaries of the staff was another consideration, or reduce the salary of the executive secretary. The logical answer, from the writer's viewpoint, was to reduce the salary of one person, the executive secretary. This move would have little effect upon the morale of the total commission. Morale was important to the writer, and it was agreed that this method of reducing the budget would be employed. It should be noted that the commission chairman resisted this move to reduce the budget, but the other move of finding additional funds did not seem very logical at this point. To the student of educational administration, it would seem that the budget allocation should have been confirmed before the budget was approved. Certainly, the process used in defining the budget for this project left a great deal to be desired.

Budget presented another problem during this period. The original suggestion of the executive secretary to pay staff as consultants seemed to have the approval of the commission chairman. However, the mechanics of payment seemed to present a problem. The problem had to do with the odd hours of the staff's work. This was resolved when it was agreed that staff members, for payroll purposes, might record their days worked (at $50 per day) rather than to record all the odd hours of their employ. Since the commission did not have the time to go through the normal process of being employed through the personnel office, the method of
paying them as consultants served two purposes: the jobs did not have to be advertised, but it did provide a legal means of setting up the commission staff.

Meeting with Barbara Whittaker, Community Relations

The background for this meeting presented the writer with the resolution of a problem that the superintendent had created in answering a request from a local union for school representation at a series of seminars that were being conducted on the subject of crime. The superintendent, without consulting the commission, assigned some members of the commission to attend the meetings. Ms. Whittaker forwarded a letter to Mr. Boozer requesting that he name the members of the commission who were assigned, and Mr. Boozer and the writer questioned the assignment. It was agreed that a letter would be drafted to Ms. Whittaker indicating that we did not recognize this type of meeting as consistent with the role of the commission, and that perhaps social workers could be assigned this responsibility. Since Ms. Whittaker had the responsibility for community relations for the district, it was felt that the commission should sit with her and define the goals and objectives of the commission. This meeting was held between Mr. Boozer, Ms. Whittaker and the writer, and resulted in an agreement that the writer was to keep her office advised on all the meetings of the commission and the progress of the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline.
REPORT IV
March 2, 1974 — March 13, 1974

INTRODUCTION

This was a period of real beginning, and of the end. A period when area committees began to function, research data were being compiled that would lead to a survey instrument for the commission's use and a period when the work of the paid staff was discontinued as a result of two telephone conversations—one between Oscar Boozer and the superintendent, and the other between the writer and Oscar Boozer.

The events leading up to the dismissal of the writer's staff shall be covered in this report with the resulting negotiations, communications and outcomes to be covered in Report V.

Annotated Log

The focus of this report period is on the work of the area committees and the program facilitators as they began the process of research and survey. Key to their work has been the input from the consultant in research, Janet G. Davis.

3/5/74 A meeting was held with Mr. Oscar Boozer to discuss the payroll for the commission staff, the Board of Education meeting on March 11th, and the relocation of the commission office.
In-service meeting of the commission staff around the payroll, Dr. Crim's charge to the commission, report forms for area meetings, research reports from Janet G. Davis. Also, public information to be disseminated through the press and radio.

Reports to the community through press interviews with *The Voice* and *The Atlanta Constitution*. A study session on the implications of research conducted by Janet G. Davis on discipline studies.

Atlanta Board of Education meeting. Dr. Crim alerts Mr. Boozer and the writer to be prepared to respond to any questions on the commission. No honoraria for the area committees, but staff compensation is approved.

In-service meeting of commission staff. Report on Board of Education meeting; discussion of relocation of staff office; a discussion of the calendar for completion of phase one of the study, and a discussion of the honoraria decision by the Board of Education. An interview with *Newsweek* magazine, and an inspection of the proposed new staff office. Area reports for the period March 4th - March 11th.

**Issues of Report IV**

With the charge by the superintendent and the subsequent distribution of the planning document, interviews with the press and radio,
some of the real issues of the commission began to take shape. Nothing of any great consequence in the beginning of the month—a possible relocation of the staff office being the one exception. However, as the report shall substantiate, issues arose that led to the dissolution of the paid staff and to the temporary halting of the work of the commission.

On Tuesday, March 5th, the writer met with Mr. Oscar Boozer around some administrative issues dealing with the method of paying the commission staff, the relocation of the staff office, and an indication by the superintendent that we should be prepared to discuss the commission at the next Board of Education meeting on March 11, 1974.

As was previously indicated in the planning document, the writer had suggested that staff personnel be paid as consultants to the commission. The main issue that came up in this discussion was the justification of $6.00 per day for the staff and the hours that they were to work. Mr. Boozer accepted the rationale that consultants receive $50.00 per day and that this broke down to approximately $6.00 an hour for an eight hour day. Boozer was careful to indicate that staff people, who were at this time to receive an honorarium, would have to do their work after school or on a week-end. Since the writer, as executive secretary, had previously indicated that the scheduling of area meetings would be up to each area, this presented a problem. It also brought up again the problem that Boozer was having with someone on justifying the budget for the project.

The opportunity to present a progress report to the Board of Education was greeted with enthusiasm by both Mr. Boozer and the writer.
It was agreed that the writer would be introduced by Mr. Boozer, make the progress report, and both the writer and Mr. Boozer would answer any questions that the Board of Education might have. It was further agreed that staff members and area committee members would be encouraged to attend the meeting. The question of when the report was to be given was not settled at this date. Mr. Boozer was to determine the time and communicate this information to the writer, so that he could alert the commission members. It is important to note here that the time for the report was never defined by the superintendent, therefore plans were made to attend both meetings. As the executive secretary, the writer feels that not advising the staff of the meeting time was an error by the superintendent. As a student of educational administration, a clear definition of meeting times, dates, and the agenda is a fundamental responsibility of the superintendent in the conduct of his office. As it turned out, the time and information on the meeting was not forthcoming because of some rather clear desires on Dr. Crim's part. The political motives in this issue outweighed the principles of educational administration.

The final item, the relocation of the commission office, seemed to be another indication of the real issues as the commission was beginning to take shape. Mr. Boozer indicated that board members were concerned that office space was being purchased while there was excess office space in the district office. Speculation indicated that prior relations between The Institute of The Black World might have been the reason for the concern about the location of the office. This was no major problem, and the writer indicated that he would discuss the matter
at the next staff meeting, and with Mr. Howard Dodson, Director of The Institute of The Black World.

Two issues were beginning to surface: the justification of salaries, quite contrary to the "money is no object" position previously taken by Mr. Boozer, and the location of the commission office in the community. Both issues were clearly presented in the planning document, and certainly could have been resolved then with little difficulty or inconvenience to the staff.

**In-Service Meetings**

Two meetings were held during this period, and the central issues were: the format for reporting the area meetings, the research reports by Janet G. Davis, publicity for the commission, discussion of honoraria for the area committees, the meeting with the Board of Education, and the development of a calendar for phase one of the study. It is important to note that both pre-service and in-service meetings were well attended, and both formal and informal communication was excellent.

At the direction of the staff, the writer developed a report form that would establish a consistent format for reporting area meetings. It included attendance, information, identified the area and the facilitator, date of report, minutes, and provided space for directions and/or suggestions to the executive secretary.

Janet G. Davis, the research consultant hired for the study, scheduled an evening meeting to discuss the results of her research and the implications for its use in area meetings. It could be used as information, and as a guide to gathering data needed for the formal survey
form which she was to develop. Ms. Davis, as a result of the meeting was requested to prepare abstracts of her research for the area committee members and to develop guidelines (see Appendix G) for gathering information regarding the survey instrument. Discussion was held around the content of the report by Ms. Davis, who in addition to a formal written report, had developed visual aids in the form of charts to assist the staff in following the presentation.

A decision was made at this meeting to continue Ms. Davis' relationship with the project. It was felt by the staff that her support was fundamental to their success in dealing with the area committees.

The staff felt that publicity should be generated by the executive secretary as to the progress of the commission. This was one of the clear objectives of the planning document. As a result, media contacts made by Ms. Brenda Belton and Ms. Aljosie Yabura and also Mr. Arthur Barham gave the commission interviews with WAOK and WIGO, local radio stations for airing on March 7th. Articles were written by Mr. Bill Cutler for the Atlanta Voice and Mr. Peter Scott of the Atlanta Constitution. Valid issues regarding payment of staff, payment of school personnel, and payment of the community people on the commission were raised by Mr. Scott and Mr. Cutler (see Appendix J). The writer, as the executive secretary realized the value of good relationships with the press and media, however, the contacts of staff members: Belton, Yabura and Barham, were far more sophisticated than those of the writer, and were an important contribution to the work of the commission. As a student of educational administration, this is an area that the writer feels he must develop in the future.
The issue of not paying an honorarium to community and staff people received considerable attention by the total commission staff. It concerned all staff members that we had made a promise that we could not keep; a promise made in good faith, and based upon the acceptance of the planning document. It was the opinion of the writer that compensation for community people should be affected even if it meant that the executive secretary's salary should be adjusted. It was the writer's opinion that we had made a commitment, and that commitment had important policy implications for an administrator.

Compensation was discussed as a result of the March 11th meeting of the Board of Education. It was discussed in some depth by the staff on March 13th, and on March the 14th the paid members of the commission were dismissed. During the period of time from March 11th to March 14th, several important decisions affecting the commission were reached: on March 11th it was decided that community people would not be compensated for their service on the commission, but the members of the commission staff would be compensated. On March 14th, it was decided that the paid commission staff would be dissolved. What happened between March 11th and March 14th? What happened during this time, since the superintendent left town on the night of the 11th to attend an A.S.C.D. meeting in Anaheim, California and did not return until the 14th of March? Who had made the decision? When had the decision been made? Questions that shall be discussed in the conclusion of this paper.

The meeting with the Board of Education, which will be discussed under a separate heading, was shared as information with the staff at the March 6th meeting. They were enthusiastic about the opportunity to advise the Board of Education on our progress, and felt that this would
be a good time to publicize the work of the commission. Although the
time of the presentation was still not known by Mr. Boozer, the staff
made plans to advise their area committees of the meeting. Some staff
members indicated their availability to attend the meeting. It was felt
that a good turn out of commission members would provide the Board of
Education with visible evidence of the commission.

Finally, it was important at this meeting for the writer, as the
executive secretary, to develop a clear time line for the completion of
the objectives defined under phase one of the planning document. There-
fore, suggested time spans were presented for the completion of the
three major objectives: orientation and organization, research back-
ground and development of the survey instrument, and the survey itself
with subsequent recommendations by the area committees for policy. The
suggested time schedules were amended as a result of staff input, and
it was agreed that orientation and organization were complete, and that
the time between March 6th and April 18th would be used to study the
research and to develop the research instrument. The time between
April 18th and June 1st would be spent on the survey, tabulating the
survey, and making recommendations for the work to be done by the com-
mission during phase two of the project.

Conclusion

One other in-service meeting was scheduled for March 20th. The
meetings were fruitful and input from the staff indicated that they were
meaningful meetings. The writer designed the meetings around the noon
hour; completed most of the business on the agenda during a one hour
period of time, and is happy to report that the staff was punctual for all meetings within a matter of a few minutes. It was agreed at the first pre-service meeting that any members arriving late for a meeting would be briefed by the writer at the end of the meeting. This eliminated the need of making redundant statements, and did not impose upon the time of any staff members.

Report to The Board of Education, March 11, 1974

The writer has made repeated reference to this meeting in this report. Briefly, Mr. Boozer was alerted on March 5th to attend the meeting, and to be prepared to report the commission's progress to the Board of Education. Mr. Boozer alerted the writer to the meeting, and it was agreed, as has been previously indicated, that the writer would make this report. The only question presented by the superintendent's directive was, at which meeting would this report be given, the 4 p.m. briefing session or the 7 p.m. regular meeting.

While the meeting time was never defined, this presented no real problem to the writer. However, since attendance had been solicited from commission members, it presented an awkward administrative situation to invite the staff to attend, and not to have some clearly defined time. Mr. Boozer and the writer made the only decision possible under the circumstances, we attended both meetings.

The 4 p.m. meeting began with a report and a discussion of a discipline study made by the Atlanta Association of Educators. While this seemed a rather logical place for the C.A.R.D. presentation, and although the superintendent had noddingly acknowledged our presence, the report
was not requested at this time. The 4 p.m. agenda did not include a report by the commission, and the matter did not come up at this session. At the conclusion of the session, Mr. Boozer went to the superintendent and was advised that we should come to the evening session. Upon arrival at the evening session we checked the agenda, but there was no mention of the report. A rather short evening meeting resulted in no mention of C.A.R.D. and with the superintendent making a rather hasty exit from the meeting to catch a plane to California. Two things happened at the conclusion of the meeting: Boozer followed the superintendent to the parking lot and was advised that the matter of the commission was resolved privately. The decision reached was that the office would be moved from the Chestnut Street address, no community people would be compensated, and the paid staff would be kept on. At the same time that Mr. Boozer was meeting with Dr. Crim in the parking lot, the writer was talking with Mr. Peter Scott of the Atlanta Constitution and some of the Board of Education members about the commission. Mr. Scott wanted to know whether the commission was to be funded, and he was advised that as far as the writer knew at this point in time, the commission was to be funded. The results of the conversations with two of the Board of Education members, Ms. Crowder and Ms. Griggs, indicated that at least these members knew nothing about the commission. Ms. Griggs had questions about supporting the honorarium for teaching personnel and community people. Ms. Crowder was primarily concerned that the Board of Education was not advised about the commission. Since the writer, upon completion of the planning document, had made available adequate numbers for the superintendent and his staff, it seemed reasonable that
a copy would be given to each board member. Can it be assumed that the
distribution of the planning document to the Board of Education was the
responsibility of the superintendent and not the writer in his role as executive secretary?

The writer senses that some serious breach of communication must
be shared by the superintendent and his staff. The planning document
should have been considered by either the total Board of Education or by
a committee designated by the Board of Education. Standing committees
usually exist on most boards of education which deal with a variety of
things that come to the attention of a board. The writer recognizes that
certain political pressures were now being applied to either the superin-
tendent, to the Board of Education, or to both. What were the political
issues? Was it the policy concerning payment for service on committees?
Was it the use of students and parents in this type of study? Was it
the superintendent's failure to keep his Board of Education advised?

Area Committee Meetings

This is a very important part of this report, and the final item
to be considered in this time span. Since the writer cannot possibly
deal with all reports in detail, it would be more objective to glean the
most pressing concerns from the areas, assess the morale of the area
committees, determine specific reactions to the planning document, and
to take a look at how the role of the facilitator evolves.

While a very important part of the total project, due to the March
14th action of the superintendent which discontinued the services of the
paid staff, this will be the only reference made in this project to the
work of the program facilitators.
All area meetings, except the one in area four, were well attended, and the area personnel were enthusiastic about the prospect of the job at hand. Area IV's attendance at their second meeting on March 11th was perfect, so attendance questions seemed to present no real problems to the work of the commission.

Most meetings ran no longer than two hours with some taking place in the morning, some taking place in the afternoon, and some meetings held at night. The selection of meeting dates, times and places presented no problems for the facilitators or the conveners. It should be mentioned that prior to the first meeting of the area committees, the facilitators met with the conveners to discuss the agenda and the organization of the meetings. Agendas were prepared by individual facilitators in some instances and by the C.A.R.D. office in other instances. Objectives for the meetings, in most instances were spelled out in writing, and in one instance an evaluative instrument was designed to evaluate the meeting. This instrument was shared by Norman Thomas with the other facilitators, and it was used in other area meetings.

Organization of the committees into working units proceeded without undue confusion. The planning document and the superintendent's charge were the basis of early discussions, while the Pittsburgh Survey on Corporal Punishment and the survey instrument for Atlanta, served as the basis for further discussion at subsequent meetings. While one of the facilitators indicated that non-directed general conversation on discipline consumed some time, keeping the group to the agenda objectives was not too difficult a task. Reports indicated that in early meetings the facilitators were looked to for direction, but subsequent meetings,
plus an explanation of the role of the facilitator, produced the desired leadership from the group. One group proceeded to elect a community person as the convener which exhibited an understanding of the real purpose of the survey, and the superintendent's desire to get input from the community and the parents.

The planning document seemed to be recognized as a general guide for the job at hand, and except for some suggestions about changing the time line for phase one (February 1 – May 31, 1974) seemed acceptable to the area committees. There seemed to be a general consensus that the job of the commission could be done, and there was a general support for the C.A.R.D. staff. It was felt that C.A.R.D. could be responsible for the research and organization, thereby relieving the area committees to conduct the survey.

Although concern arose over the superintendent's decision not to pay the honoraria, it presented no major problem, and some people indicated that money was not the issue. Some indicated that they would work without any compensation. The fact that so much preliminary work had been done by the C.A.R.D. staff in the area of planning, research and organization, seemed to result in high morale on the part of the area teams. Some concern was expressed about sharing meetings with other area teams, a fact that had been considered by Mr. Oscar Boozer, and would be implemented. At this time the indication was that very few of these meetings involving the total commission had been held. Also, some concern was expressed that the Board of Education and the superintendent should give more publicity to the work of the commission. As has been mentioned, few board members appeared to know about the work of
the commission.

In conclusion, this aspect of the project seemed to be most rewarding to committee members and to the facilitators. One facilitator advised that the time allotted for the role was inadequate, and presented documented evidence that the executive secretary should give consideration to an adjustment in the monthly salary of facilitators. The contingency fund, which has been mentioned before, could be of some use in this area.

It would be reasonable at this time to examine some of the administrative theory which could apply to this project, and certainly to the democratic work of the area committees. Weber's bureaucratic theory of organization, certainly in this instance, would give way to the more democratic and humanistic theories of Fayol and Barnard. The commission seemed to represent an integrated, inter-dependent theory of administration which contrary to Taylor, Weber and the like, provided each element of the team with leadership opportunities, and disseminated the scope and the purpose of the project to each member of the team.

The project also gave the writer an opportunity to examine the formal and informal communication structures which exist in all organizations. Although organized and structured, the plans, the area meetings, and the in-service staff meetings gave ample opportunity for informal lines of communication to be established, and they in turn contributed immensely to the success of the writer's administration. It was this informal line of communication that seemed to be missing between the executive secretary and the superintendent; between the superintendent and the chairman, Mr. Boozer. In these instances, it seemed as though
authority acted as a deterrent to the ultimate goal of the project. The
writer will go into this subject, communication, in some greater depth
in the final phase of this paper.

Miscellaneous Elements in the Report Period

During this period, a reporter from the national publication, News-
week, conducted an interview with Mr. Boozer and the writer and the work
of the commission. The reporter was covering the Southeastern region of
the United States and seemed to have as the underlying theme for the
article—a return to old-fashioned discipline. It is hoped that comments
made by the writer, refuting old-fashioned discipline, defined by too
large a segment of the population as a panacea for the problems in our
schools, will receive consideration when the article appears in the near
future. Here the writer acted in his dual role as executive secretary,
by providing information for the media on the commission, but he also
acted in his role as a student of educational administration. The writer
felt obliged to stress some new concepts of the role of discipline in
the schools, that of being the responsibility of a total school popula-
tion and not something that comes down on students. A more humane process
that recognizes that the problem is complex and the solution is also com-
plex. Discipline is not discussed in more detail since this report is
not designed to be a study of discipline, but rather on the organization
and administration of the commission.

It was an eventful period of time for the writer. A period that
went by quickly, and except for the practice of keeping an annotated log,
might have been impossible to recall.
REPORT V

March 14, 1974 — April 1, 1974

INTRODUCTION

On March 14, 1974, after a telephone conversation with Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, Mr. Oscar Boozer, Chairman of the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline, called the writer to advise that all consultant services to the Commission had been terminated by order of the superintendent. A subsequent letter, dated March 14, 1974, thanked the writer for his service and advised that he would, "no longer... be associated with us as staff..."

Subsequent action by the writer's doctoral committee, resulted in a new format for this project. Phase II of this study would be conducted from the viewpoint of the observer analyst, rather than a paid staff member. In this section the writer will make reference to the continued progress of the study under its new administration.

It is the purpose of Phase I of this report, to trace and analyze the dissolution of the Commission staff, with its political, financial and emotional challenges; to discuss the renegotiation of the writer's terminal project, with its emotional challenges; and finally, to suggest some of the implications for the reader of the study.

Although it is clear to the writer that there is a very necessary wedding between the theoretical and the practical in any phase of admin-
istration, it cannot be over emphasized that this project experience, in the field of educational administration, is a very valid and meaning-ful element in this training. It has a high correlation with the intern-ship experience, yet demands that the student record his experiences within some well defined parameters.

This final report presents an element in this project that is realistic—the writer and his entire staff have rather arbitrarily and capriciously been "fired". This experience, although not quite as traumatic, parallels the plight of Shaheen in San Francisco, and Scott in Washington, D. C. It is an experience that most superintendents understand, and probably are prepared or not prepared to confront.

Annotated Log

A rapid series of meetings and telephone conversations—the superintendent, assistant superintendents, the Commission staff, the Chairman of the Commission, the doctoral advisor, and folks—all interested in what was going to happen to the Commission, and some even wondering—what is going to happen to the writer.

3/14/74 Mr. Oscar Boozer advised the writer that the superintendent had discontinued the use of paid consultants on the Commission effective this date.

Attempted to contact Dr. Crim in reference to the decision.

All consultants advised of the superintendent's decision.

3/15/74 Dr. Barbara L. Jackson advised of the superintendent's decision.
Dr. Estes contacted to impress him with the importance of Dr. Crim contacting my office.

Dr. Crim returned my telephone call on the previous day.

3/18/74  Telephone conversation with Dr. Crim.
Telephone conversation with Mr. John Minor, Associate Superintendent; arranged for a meeting on March 22nd.

3/20/74  Final meeting of the staff with Mr. Oscar Boozer.
Lecture engagement at Atlanta University on the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline.

3/22/74  Meeting with doctoral committee on the status of the terminal project.
Meeting with Mr. John Minor on the superintendent's decision.

3/27/74  Revisions on the terminal project to the doctoral committee. Interview with Bill Cutler of the "Atlanta Voice."

3/29/74  The end of Phase I -- "The Organization and Administration of the Atlanta Public School's Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline".

**Dissolution of the C.A.R.D. Staff**

As has been previously indicated, the writer received notification of the superintendent's decision to discontinue the use of paid consultants from the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Oscar Boozer. Probably the first question of those affected was, why. The answers came from several sources—Oscar Boozer, John Minor, associate superintendent,
and Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, superintendent. Let us take a look at some of these explanations, and observe some of the actions of the writer in his role as the executive secretary.

Boozer's explanation indicated that the superintendent had not followed the policies of the Board of Education in the payment of Commission members, and on these grounds the paid members of the staff would have their services terminated. Mr. Boozer further indicated that political forces played a part in the decision—the Atlanta Association of Educators in particular, and finally that the superintendent had a history of not advising his Board about decisions, and they were not going to support him in this matter. The explanation raises some rather critical questions. Why had it taken the Board of Education two months to reach this decision? Since some Board members did not know about the Commission, who made the decision? What position could an organization like the Atlanta Association of Educators take on an indepth study of discipline by parents, students, community people and staff?

The first reaction by the writer, functioning as the executive secretary, was to advise all staff affected by the decision, and to indicate that he would be in touch with the superintendent as soon as possible to determine the reasons for the decision. Since a staff meeting was scheduled for March 20th, this seemed a logical time to hold the discussion, since it would give the executive secretary time to get as much input on the decision as possible. The reactions of the staff were quite consistent—disbelief.

While he was notifying the staff, the writer instructed his assistant, Ms. Somers, to put in a call to the superintendent. The first indication
from Dr. Crim's office was that he was in a conference, the second indication (a second call was made) was that he was dictating. The second conversation was between the writer and the superintendent's secretary, and the writer advised her that he was attempting to get input from the superintendent prior to making some public statement. The writer left his home telephone number for Dr. Crim's information; the call was not returned on this date.

The following day, since the superintendent had not responded to the previous day's telephone calls, the writer called Dr. Sidney Estes, assistant superintendent for instruction, and advised that communication was imperative if the writer was to make some statement to the press that was consistent with the wishes of the superintendent. On this same date, Dr. Jackson was advised of the situation, and counseled that the writer should be sure to contact Dr. Crim before issuing any statement, and that the writer should prepare for his doctoral committee (see Appendix H) a statement of the problem, and suggested alternatives to the proposal.

Dr. Crim did return the writer's call on this date, but since the writer left the office early, he was not aware of the communication.

It is important for the writer to pause at this point, and to reflect on the situation in his role as the executive secretary, as a doctoral student in educational administration, and certainly to examine the process in this rather difficult situation.

The executive secretary was faced with a most difficult situation. It was packed with emotion, and it was important that in this role the writer provide the affected personnel with as many facts as possible prior to any joint or individual action. The process seemed to demand
that the superintendent be given an opportunity to explain his action. The process seemed to warrant giving the superintendent every possible opportunity to head off bad publicity in this matter. Process and the role of the executive secretary were very closely allied.

The student of educational administration could take a more critical look at the situation, perhaps a less subjective look at the situation and determine the lessons to be learned. Communication skills seemed to be one of the fundamental lessons to be learned from this situation. It is imperative that lines of communication to the top man are developed, and if these do not seem to be working for the student to recognize that he must have some alternative avenues available to him. Also, the student must be able to recognize that even a superintendent may have some lessons to be learned.

Let us continue on with this situation, and pick the matter up on March the 18th, when the writer finally had an opportunity to talk with the superintendent about the discharge of his staff. The issue from the superintendent's perspective supported Oscar Boozer's statement that he had not followed the policies of the Board of Education in providing funds for community people and staff members for acting on commissions and task forces. However, and this is a very important however, from the point of view of the writer's reaction to the statement by the superintendent. The superintendent very candidly indicated that he had erred, further, that he had not even read the planning document. The writer now was armed with some facts, and was left with a decision—either support the superintendent or expose the superintendent.

The writer's decision was to support the superintendent. The
decision was not a unilateral decision, and here again the forces of communication came into effect. Community forces had been in touch with the writer; certainly staff members had communicated with the writer, and unofficial requests for support came from members of the superintendent's staff. Oscar Boozer, among others, continued throughout the project to function as a member of the superintendent's team, and to support the superintendent. The writer, as the executive secretary, as a student of administration, felt that this black school superintendent did not need adverse publicity at this rather critical stage in his administration. While the writer elected to be supportive, it was imperative that he communicate his concerns to the superintendent's office.

John Minor, a friend of the writer, and Dr. Crim's "right hand man" was chosen as the avenue to communicate some observations to the superintendent. Knowing that Mr. Minor played golf, the writer arranged for a golf date for the purpose of dealing unofficially with the situation. Several observations were made during the golf meeting: someone must read proposals forwarded to the superintendent; charges to task forces or commissions should be backed by a written statement; key personnel, such as Minor, would be better housed in the same building with the superintendent, and the superintendent's personal secretary should not be the personal secretary of the previous superintendent. The discussion was honest and candid giving the writer insight into high-level school administration, and the way at least one of them thinks. Mr. Minor disagreed with the writer in reference to the location of key personnel on the superintendent's staff, feeling that a top level administrator could function quite well housed some distance from the super-
intendent. Although the writer lacks Mr. Minor's experience, he contends that personnel key to the functioning of the superintendent's office should not only be housed in the same building with the superintendent, but even housed on the same floor of the same building.

The Final Staff In-Service Meeting

The final staff meeting was held on March 20th with Oscar Boozer. All members of the staff were present for the meeting except Mr. Norman Thomas who had a death in his family. All staff members were encouraged to express their concerns which included the universal feeling that the work of the Commission must go on, and within the context laid down by the superintendent—a multi-faceted approach to the solution of the problem. While there was disappointment in the official announcement of the superintendent, the basic need for the study was expressed by the total staff. Another concern hinged upon the indication from the superintendent that this type of study must be carried on by school staff; it raised a question as to how objective this type of study could be. Another concern revolved around Ms. Linda Somers who had been employed as an administrative assistant, and who depended entirely upon this job for her income. The sudden discharge had caused Ms. Somers some serious financial problems.

The final meeting was chaired by Oscar Boozer, and he expressed regret that the superintendent's decision had affected the progress of the Commission. It was emphasized that the decision did not in any way reflect upon the work that the commission staff had done. Mr. Boozer requested that final reports be filed by all staff members as soon as possible, and also, that all were welcome to remain with the commission in an
unofficial capacity. Finally, it was indicated that financial compensation for work already done would be expedited by direction of Dr. Crim.

It was concluded that Mr. Boozer would seek employment for Ms. Somers in his department immediately. Ms. Yabura, Ms. Belton, and the writer indicated that they would be interested in following the work of the commission. The writer, at this point, had some serious concern about the future of his doctoral project, and following the work of the commission presented more than an interest for him.

It was on this date, March 20th, that the writer, in his role as the executive secretary of the commission, delivered a lecture at Atlanta University on, "The Commission Its Objectives and Its Organization". Although the superintendent had discontinued the official work of the commission on March 14th, the writer fulfilled the lecture appointment. Dr. Robert Hatch hosted the lecture, and certainly the students of educational administration could learn some lessons from the experience of the writer.

It was at this point, almost two weeks after the superintendent's decision that the writer held an interview with Bill Cutler of the "Atlanta Voice" about the discontinuance of the commission staff. Bill and Peter Scott were invited to interview the writer, Scott declined the invitation, while Bill Cutler wrote another objective account of this news item. It is the opinion of the writer that much the better job of reporting this project was done by the "Atlanta Voice".

In conclusion, the firing of the staff has been explained, and the superintendent's honesty in the situation produced support from the writer.
The Affect of the Superintendents Decision on the Writers Project

It has been mentioned that Dr. Jackson had alerted the writer to prepare for a meeting with his doctoral committee on the effect of the superintendents decision on the project. The writer prepared a written statement for a meeting scheduled on March 22nd. The elements of the proposal included five suggestions: a continuance of the present project as an observer; the discontinuance of the project and the pursuit of a dissertation on the subject: "Curriculum Implications for the Training of Black School Superintendents", the development of a new project based upon the writers work with the Shaw University Without Walls project, or quite seriously, surrender possible graduation in 1974, and consider another year's study at the University.

Dr. Carnal was out of town on the date of the meeting with the doctoral committee. However, the committee met with the writer, discussed the alternatives and agreed that the writer should proceed with the current project as an observer analyst. The writer was directed to follow the work of the commission; attend whatever meetings he could; continue his relationship with the Chairman, Oscar Boozer, and to study some of the research in discipline to support his writing in Phase II. The writer was given one week to present to the committee in writing a short amendment to his original proposal.

A student of educational administration would do well to remember that alternative plans should be developed for any program. It is probably the rule rather than the exception when plans must be amended. The writer might suggest that alternatives are fundamental to the process of leadership.
Reflections on Part I of the Project

With the end of the part of the project, the writer would like to reflect upon several aspects of the study—certainly to express regret that the project was not completed according to the original proposal.

Perhaps some type of contract should be developed that could serve as an unofficial arrangement between the student and the agency with whom the project is attempted. To date, two doctoral students, using the project approach to the terminal paper, have had difficulty with the agency involved in the project. One student had to completely discontinue his project. Perhaps projects should be negotiated between the student's advisor and the agency, thus giving a degree of status to the project. The student's proposal, if signed by the agency, could at least indicate that the agency is aware of the project.

The writer feels that he should have taken a greater responsibility in explaining the implications of the planning document to the superintendent and to his staff. It was incorrect to assume that presenting documents in writing to a school district meant that the system understood the importance of the project to the student.

Money, as has been previously mentioned is always an object, and should certainly be dealt with accordingly. It is totally incorrect to assume that the dispensation of public funds can be dealt with arbitrarily, if not capriciously. The writer is not, at this point in time, justifying the budget for the project, but merely making some general statements about the use of public funds that may be helpful to other students who may find themselves in a similar situation.
Too much cannot be written about the role of the leader. It seems that some important models have been explored in this study—the superintendent, the Commission Chairman, the executive secretary, and the unofficial leadership as represented by the press, the disgruntled professional organization, the community and the Board of Education in "unofficial" session.

Implications of the Study

It would be quite presumptive of the writer to reach conclusions based upon this type of study. Perhaps more conclusive statements may be presented for consideration in part two of this report which will be more descriptive and analytical in content. However, at this juncture, the writer would like to offer implications which may be studied and weighed. Certainly these statements or implications should be studied to even a greater extent within the context of this project before they deserve credibility within the profession. However, it is possible that they may raise further questions of the reader and of others that could in the near future lead to further indepth study. With a pardon to the more astute student of the discipline of educational research, the writer would respectfully suggest the following as implications of this study, even perhaps, as questions needing more detailed consideration.

It is implied that administrative decisions are not made in a vacuum and that the role of a Board of Education need not be solely a role of the policy maker. While not presuming that decisions can be made, rather have been made capriciously, the writer suggests that in this project the superintendent of schools, newly appointed, might try-out new concepts with Board members on an unofficial basis, and prior to
committing resources such as staff, budget, and the prestige of his office. How difficult in this instance would it have been to place this planning document into the hands of three or four Board members with a note indicating that this was a possible approach to the study of discipline, and to ask what types of complications might be envisioned if "we" used this approach. Does this technique limit the role of the superintendent? Is it any more limiting than a direct reproach, after the fact? Could it be implied, even suggested, that new superintendents send up some trial balloons re: his "authority"?

Again a question. Again a question that could have greater implications for the "new" superintendent. Is it implied that slow and steady may win the race? Would it, in this situation, have been better for the administration to have studied the suggested plan prior to the commitment of funds? Would the outcome be any different? This is a question that remains to be answered. It would seem that one question has been partially answered through this study. A more complete study of the planning document by the staff may have resulted in greater support for the project; even a savings of thousands of dollars of budgeted funds. Perhaps implied here is a more studied approach to a problem which has been with all school districts and a careful analysis of the problem before district resources are committed. This situation dealt with discipline, an old problem, the administration moved with considerable speed to answer a cry from the community. Where was the community when the "rug" was pulled out from underneath the project?

This leads to the next implication in reference to how public support is generated. It has been implied certainly that this study, this concern was a top-priority with the public. What are the implications
for the study if there is no cry from the public when funds are not allocated according to need? Does the study imply that public information should have played a greater part in the project? Perhaps public information could have produced the support needed to finance the project. Does this have implications for any high level employee? Can it be implied from this study that the media could have been used to support the project? It has been implied by the public that the cry for a solution to the discipline problem did not come from the public, but from the teachers. Then where was teacher support when the project was in danger?

Since we are not taking any absolute positions, the examination of the roles of the superintendent's closest advisors might stand some scrutiny. Since by his own honest admission, the superintendent was not advised about the content of the planning document, does this imply that staff members have a greater responsibility in keeping the superintendent advised about decisions that might adversely affect his office. It is reasonable to explore the role of the deputy superintendent in this case; the role of the assistant superintendent for instruction; the role of the Commission Chairman, even the role of the writer. Does this situation imply that any one of them, if not all, had an obligation to the superintendent, and were perhaps negligent in their duties?

The writer could not imply that a progressive, modern, sophisticated school district like Atlanta was not ready for change; was not ready to innovate; was not ready to take a leadership role in community involvement. It would be unsophisticated of the writer to imply that such a limited look at Atlanta's system could constitute, better imply that Atlanta lacked a degree of sophistication. The writer could not imply,
based upon such limited data that Atlanta's superintendent was an administrator of the status quo rather than a leader seeking new direction. The study to date, however, might imply that cities might take a critical look at their superintendents, do they want an administrator or do they want a leader? This is certainly a question and cannot be construed as an implication of this study.

It might be implied, better suggested by this study, that all sessions of Boards of Education are not public, and that all sessions do not need a quorum to act. There seems to be some evidence in this study that board sessions that lead to some administrative action can be conducted in private session—even without a session. Data does not support the contention; does not even encourage the contention that board members acting unilaterally, even multi-laterally reached any decision about the composition of the commission staff. The evidence does point to the fact that the board members were not even knowledgeable about the commission. This could raise a question—was this all board members? The writer might suggest that some board decisions might be reached in non-public sessions, and that some board members might have more power than others.

While the writer has been careful not to reach conclusions, and to suggest only a very few implications from this study, there is one area that he might hazzard an implication. It seems rather clearly implied, that the spending of public funds, regardless of the amount is subject to public scrutiny, even public censure. It might be implied, based upon this limited study, that money and how it is spent does make a difference to people—all kinds of people. Would it then be reasonable
to imply from this study that public funds are public concern and their dispensation cannot be taken lightly?

A suggested implication of this study supports the value of skills in communicating with people. Perhaps too much has been said about informal lines of communication, yet the writer would hazzard another implication, that the informal forces of communication may have been infinitely more potent in this project than the more formal forces. If our data were more complete, would it even begin to tell the story that informal communication played in this project?

The writer has, at other points in this paper, discussed the value of this entire process. There seem to be some strong indications that the process of satisfying a terminal requirement through a project, can give a theoretic base a much broader perspective. Will the writer make some of these same mistakes when he is a superintendent? Will he make some of the same mistakes when he directs his next project? Is it possible to divorce theory and practice? What is theory without practice? If any one thing is concluded by this experience, and here the writer needs to admit his subjectivity, it is the fact that projects, internships, and practicums must be as fundamental to training as the academic aspect. What does fundamental mean in terms of units of credit? This is a question that the writer hopes to explore with black school superintendents during the next school year. This is a question for which we as educators must seek conclusive answers. The writer's only caution must be that time and the environment gravely affect conclusions; let us not be guilty of being stuck on our implications or on our conclusions.
PART I: PHASE II

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this part of the project is to report on the second phase of the work done by the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline during the period March 14th, 1974 (the date the writer's services were discontinued by the Superintendent Dr. Alonzo A. Crim) and May 31, 1974 (the date the study was to be terminated, according to the decision of the writer and his doctoral committee).

There are several elements that were considered in this phase of the project. The writer held several meetings with Mr. Oscar Boozer, chairman of the commission. The meetings were designed to explore the progress of the commission, the reorganization of the commission staff, and to offer whatever assistance the writer could to the commission. Further, the writer attended all meetings of the commission council (the administrative arm of the reorganized commission). The writer, during this phase of the report, served in the role of a participant observer—a role that had no official function, but assisted as a consultant, and as a historian who knew the work of the commission prior to March 14th, 1974. The writer considered attending the area committee meetings during this report period, but this was not convenient. Input from these sessions was gathered by holding individual conferences with some of the area committee members. Finally, the writer raised questions through this period
on the progress of the commission. These questions, if they have answers, will be considered in the final part of this report.

The writer would like to cite the cooperation of Mr. Oscar Boozer and Ms. Jill Slavin for the work done in this phase of the project. Without their willingness to share information, and their encouraging the writer to become an unofficial member of the administrative arm of the commission, the completion of this project would not have been possible.

In conclusion, the writer made a concerted effort to observe and to report. With a very few exceptions, the writer refrained from a comparative analysis of the work done by the commission during phase one and the work done during this phase. Any comparative evaluation or analysis will be more appropriately done in the final section of this report, where the fundamental questions raised in this project will be discussed in some detail. The writer further contends that a project differs from a dissertation in content and process. Therefore, such subjective data as suggestions, implications, and recommendations are of value not only to the project itself, but to future students or professionals who might face the challenge of organizing and administering a commission on discipline. Certainly, discipline concerns have magnified in public schools, urban and suburban, throughout the past two decades. Certainly, other districts will organize commissions to deal with the concerns of the total community. It is in this context that the experience of this project may provide data, recommendations, implications and suggestions that may facilitate the organization and the administration of commissions in other cities. The data in this type of study has to do with the interaction of people in their jobs; it is not the type
of data that is fed into a computer for analysis; the writer is the computer, and he analyzes the observed actions of people in very real situations.

REORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Reorganization of the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline began the week of March 20th, and culminated with a planning session held by Oscar Boozer on April 11, 1974.

At the final meeting of the writer's staff, held on March 20th, Boozer announced that he had taken the first step in the reorganization of the commission. A letter had been forwarded to Dr. Sidney H. Estes, Boozer's immediate superior, advising that he awaited instructions as to how the commission should be organized in the future and requested staff to carry out the work of the commission. A discussion between Boozer and the writer indicated that Boozer in future dealings with the commission would be more deliberate in his administration. Boozer also implied that Dr. Crim and Dr. Estes would be expected to take more of the decision making responsibility in the next phase of the study.

The writer, in a meeting held with Boozer on April 4th, concluded that reorganization had not been completed on that date. However, a Ms. Jill Slavin of the research department of the Atlanta Public Schools had been identified to work on the development of a survey instrument for the study. It was at this meeting that the writer was successful in getting permission from Boozer to observe the functioning of the commission, and to sit in on any meetings held by the commission. This privilege was extended to meetings held at the central office or in the
local office of the commission. The permission to attend these meetings was enthusiastically extended by Boozer, who saw the writer continuing to serve on the commission as a valuable resource. Boozer did make it clear at this meeting that the writer could have no official status on the commission. This meeting laid the ground work for the writer's continued involvement, and help to establish his role as an analytical observer.

Ms. Jill Slavin, a researcher for the Atlanta Public Schools, in an informal meeting with the writer on April 11th, made it quite clear that she would not serve in an administrative role on the commission, and that she would not assume the commission responsibility as an addendum to her other job responsibilities. This began to raise the first of some interesting questions on staff personnel assuming add-on responsibilities. It may be remembered by the reader that the Superintendent, Dr. Crim, had listed the Board of Education policy of staffing commissions with school system personnel as one of the reasons for dissolving the writer's staff. It seems that there is some slight difference of opinion between the board policy and the attitude of some of the school personnel who are assigned these add-on type of responsibilities. This question of professional involvement on relevant commissions, such as the discipline commission, will be discussed by the writer in the final part of this report.

Reorganization during the week of April 4th—April 11th, resulted in representatives being chosen by the area committees to serve on the new administrative council, or being appointed as was the case with Ms. Slavin. These representatives were professionals and lay personnel from
each area. There were representatives from each area office, one senior
high principal, one junior high principal, one assistant principal, a
community person or parent from each area, a counselor, and a teacher
that comprised the committee. They were to act as a steering committee
for the work of the commission and as a liaison between Mr. Boozer's
office and the five district areas. At the first meeting of this coun-
cil, held on April 11th at the Instructional Services Center, the fol-
lowing issues were raised: the role of the council in the future of the
disciplinary study, the survey developed by Ms. Slavin, and the time
line that would be followed in the completion of the study. Time and
the additional responsibility of the council seemed to be of primary
concern to those in attendance. Principals, assistant principals and
area personnel expressed concern about being involved in too many things
for this time of the year. They were also concerned about the loss of
the writer's staff, and the type of expertise they had given to the com-
mission. The value of the project was not questioned by those in
attendance, only the priorities of the project as it related to the
ending of the school year. This concern was expressed in open council
conversation, and also to the writer in two personal conversations with
area staff representatives.

Secondly, reaction to the survey instrument developed by Ms. Slavin
was very positive. There was unanimous agreement that without this type
of support, data could not be gathered before the end of the school
year. Ms. Slavin made it quite clear that the survey instrument which
she presented at this meeting was not in its complete form. She listed
as one of the objectives of the first meeting the refinement of the survey
instrument. The instrument was then to be shared with the area committees for their further refinement of the document and their suggestions. Although, at this first meeting, there was considerable discussion of the instrument, and many good suggestions for modification were forthcoming, two questions continued to come up: how reliable was any sample of popular opinion, and how was the instrument to be disseminated? There did seem to be a consensus that the instrument would be accepted by the area committees, yet the methodology for dissemination seemed like a real issue. Suggestions were made which included a personal interview so that all parents would understand the survey form; the inclusion of non-professionals in the survey population; surveys should be mailed to parents; interviews should be taped at the elementary school level, etc. Questions were also raised as to who would do the tabulation of the survey responses, and who would conduct the survey.

The first organizational meeting concluded with council members being asked to share the survey form with their area committees, and to return on April 26th with specific modifications or suggestions concerning the survey form.

In conclusion, the reorganization of the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline had been conducted around the leadership of Oscar Boozer and Jill Slavin; and the development of a leadership council or administrative committee. The period of time necessary for the reorganization was approximately four weeks. The most critical question that came out of the reorganization was the allocation and prioritizing of responsibilities by the professional staff.
The Press

The Atlanta Constitution on April 24th published an article entitled—"Discipline—Is It The Biggest Roadblock To Learning?" This was the first article in reference to the commission since the Peter Scott article in a March 3, 1974 edition of the Atlanta Constitution. Although mention was made of the "discipline commission" and comments were included in the article by Oscar Boozer and Jill Slavin, little was said about either the previous work of the commission or the fact that the commission had been reorganized.

Paul West, the reporter who wrote the article, gave particular attention to the recently conducted study by the Atlanta Association of Education. He also wrote about some of the underlying causes of discipline problems in our nation's schools, and concluded with some observations on innovative programs being tried in both the nation's schools and the Atlanta Public Schools. Included was a reference to behavior modification models being developed under the auspices of a Georgia State doctoral student, Steve Garber, in the Atlanta system.

It was a well written, informative article on the general problem of discipline in public schools. Objectively speaking, it did not consider either the goals and objectives of the commission or any of the concerns that led to the reorganization of the commission. The article could be defined as supportive of the complexity of the problem faced by the commission. It was of particular interest to the writer that the tone of the article was in the form of a short scholastic paper, but devoid of any criticism. Where were the hard questions—better still, where were any questions?
Budget

It is worth mentioning that during the reorganization meeting there had been no mention of budget for the study. Jill Slavin had mentioned certain cost factors in the council meeting, but no conversation was held on the financing of the dissemination of the survey forms, or of the tabulation work that would have to be done after the survey form was returned.

Although costs had been alluded to by both Boozer and Slavin, nothing was ever spelled out in detail. It did seem reasonable, that as a result of his previous experience with finances, Boozer would exhibit considerable care in the disclosure of the expenditure of funds. While the disclosure of the expenditure of public funds is desirable, and correct in theory, the politics of that disclosure can often result in a public debate that can slow down the work of a public task force.

It will be interesting to determine whether the Board of Education will raise any questions on this subject. To date, no questions have been raised. There has been no questioning of the time being spent by professionals at council meetings. It would seem to the writer that this should be of concern to someone—parents, students, Board of Education?

Is it reasonable to assume that add-on responsibilities do not have a cost? Would it be even more reasonable to assume that the philosophy of add-on responsibilities may be a part of the discipline problem? The answers to these questions may be a part of a very complex problem in discipline.

The Superintendent

Dr. Alonzo Crim's influence was not evident during this stage of
the study except his support for the continuance of the study. Budgetary concerns seem to have taken precedence over all other district concerns. If Jill Slavin has been relieved of her other research duties, some high level decision has probably been made. No information was available to the writer as to who made this decision.

Based upon previous involvement with the commission, the writer sees little direct involvement of the superintendent in this study. The writer sees this as a proper position for a superintendent and pauses only to raise one rather critical question. If the Board of Education was disturbed by the lack of communication during phase one of this study, what provisions did the superintendent build into phase two of the study to see that this same mistake would not be repeated?

The Board of Education

The writer, in a lengthy conversation with board member, Carolyn Crowder, on April 6th at the occasion of the National School Boards Conference in Houston, Texas, determined that some board members were concerned about their lines of communication with the superintendent of schools. It was felt that they could be more supportive of his programs, if he would keep the board members better advised.

The current administrative vehicle, the council, made little mention of keeping the Board of Education advised of their work. It is in this context that the writer gave some informal input to the council, so that board support for the study would continue. It is the writer's opinion that any information to the Board of Education should be transmitted through the superintendent. This would serve the purpose of keeping the superintendent up-to-date on commission progress, and at the same time
keep the Board of Education advised. This communication emphasis was one of the objectives in the original planning proposal.

In retrospect, some of the same mistakes were made in phase two of this study as were made by the writer in phase one. The mistake that looms the most ominous is that of good communication.

The Student

It is quite evident that the role of the student in the discipline study has not been perfected. Although the commission in both phases of the study moved past the point of blaming the student for disciplinary problems, in neither phase was a vehicle developed for the meaningful involvement of the student in the process of seeking solutions.

There is no student representation on the administrative council of the reorganized commission. The first two council meetings, held April 11th and April 26th were held at 9:30 a.m. Since principals were present, it did not seem unreasonable for students to have been invited to share the responsibilities of the council. It seemed a major weakness of the council that no consideration had been given to student representation from the five areas. In council conversations about any issues raised, the student was not forgotten. It would be fair to say that the student's interests were given top priority. The writer would only question that no council member "noticed" that students were absent from the meeting table. Were decisions made about the extent of student involvement which were not shared with the council? How important would it be to resolve this issue at this late date? Will the issue lay dormant until the commission recommendations are presented to the public or to the Board of Education? Precedent has been established in Atlanta for this possi-
bility. A board appointed commission made a study in the 1960's. Before the board could consider the report, powerful American Civil Liberties Union forces blasted a hole in the report because it did not consider the civil rights of the students.

**The Survey Form**

The form that was presented for consideration on April 11th was developed by Ms. Jill Slavin of the Atlanta Public Schools. In Ms. Slavin's opening remarks she indicated that her work on the rough form had been rather hurriedly done, and that this first session was to be a work session to be followed by other sessions with the area committees.

Recognizing that this open type of survey form would be much more difficult to categorize and to tabulate, Ms. Slavin felt, that since the form did not limit respondants' replies it was more suitable for this type of study. She received general support from those present at the initial council meeting, as has been indicated, many council members expressed appreciation that someone had taken the time to both gather data from the area committees to be used in constructing the survey form, and then to present the form for consideration at the first meeting.

The review of the survey form was conducted in a two hour session. It should be mentioned that the original form was divided into five parts: one for principals, one for teachers, one for students, one for parents and one for the community. Some of the basic questions pertaining to the survey had to do with the identity of the respondants (race, age, sex, etc.), the distribution of the survey, the language of the survey, the type of interview to be used at the elementary level, and the privacy to be afforded students where the survey was being
conducted at the school site, and who represents the community. Some of these questions would surface regardless of the topic being discussed. The writer is not sure whether the question of "who" represents the community has ever been resolved, or ever will be.

Probably the two most important elements that were not evident in the form, which came up in the discussion was the absence of a non-professional employee form, and the status of such professions like counselors, nurses, and social workers who are neither teachers nor principals. It was decided, for the purpose of this study, to prepare forms for these categories.

It should be stated that problems relating to the identity of respondents so as to have a good cross-section of responses, were to be resolved by the research department which had this type of information on file. Ms. Slavin took this responsibility in addition to indicating that she would set up the system for categorizing the responses. More shall be said about this when we review the four administrative council meetings that were held.

Due to the time limitations on the study, it was planned to consider a first class mailing. The rate of return usually for this type of study was 60 per cent, but the hope for this study was to be 80 per cent. Of these returns, 25 per cent were to be personally surveyed. This presents the writer with several concerns: 60 per cent seemed totally unrealistic for a mail-out, and where would the money come from for the mailing? As we shall see, the mail-out method of surveying was not used for the majority of the discipline surveys.

Armed with a provisional survey document, the council members
returned to their respective areas to test the form with their full committees, and to bring back additional data to improve the form. The process seemed good—only two basic elements seemed to be missing; there did not seem to be enough student involvement, and budget considerations were not clear. With some of the area committees scheduled to meet before April 15th, Ms. Slavin made revisions after the first meeting of the discipline commission and had the first revised form available to all committee members on the afternoon of April 11th. This seemed like an excellent administrative and technical accomplishment.

**Orientation Session with Jill Slavin**

Since Ms. Slavin did not know the writer, the first meeting of the administrative council progressed with several references made to the writer before Ms. Slavin asked for some clarification of the writer's status on the commission. Mr. Boozer made the belated introductions. As the meeting progressed, it became evident that Ms. Slavin had little or no orientation to the history of the commission. At the conclusion of the April 11th meeting, Ms. Slavin and Mr. Boozer met with the writer in Boozer's office. The writer introduced Ms. Slavin to the commission files, and particularly to the planning document which had formed the basis for phase one of the study. Since Ms. Slavin had another appointment, the meeting was rather hurried, but the writer and Mr. Boozer were able to bring her up-to-date on the commission. The writer shared telephone numbers with Ms. Slavin, and offered whatever assistance he could provide. It was at this point that Ms. Slavin shared her conviction that she would have to be relieved of her duties with the research department before taking on any responsibilities beyond the preparation
of the survey document.

COMMISSION MEETINGS

Introduction

The foregoing information and discussion has been designed to bring the reader up-to-date on the reorganization of the commission and to discuss in some detail what were considered some of the fundamental aspects of reorganization: the press, the superintendent, the budget, the student, and the survey form.

Without being too redundant, this section of this report will deal with four administrative meetings held between April 11th and May 23, 1974. The writer will review the major items on the agenda of each meeting, and as objectively as possible, trace the progress of the commission. For want of a better title, since none was defined, these meetings shall be labeled—administrative council meetings.

April 11, 1974—Administrative Council Meeting

A great deal of reference has been made to this meeting in the previous section of this report. It was basically designed to introduce Ms. Jill Slavin, and to discuss the survey document prepared for consideration of the administrative council and then the area committees.

Clearly, the role of Mr. Oscar Boozer had been established as the chairman of the commission. This was no longer an inactive role. He chaired these meetings and assumed a position of authority. The "honorary chairman" status which he had assumed during phase one was clearly discarded for this more active and responsible role. This may have been a decision reached by the superintendent.
Three people from the district office, Dr. Marion Boyle, the Director of the Vision and Computer Braille Center, Ms. Jill Slavin, and Mr. Lee May, from the Office of Community Services, had been defined as key support personnel. Dr. Boyle continued her work on a series of pamphlets on discipline, a stop-gap measure which had been devised to answer any criticism that nothing was being done during the time of the discipline study. Ms. Slavin continued in her role as researcher, and Mr. May serving as a combination researcher and the person in charge of publicity for the commission.

The agenda of this first meeting included orientation, the introduction of the third in a series of pamphlets that Dr. Boyle had developed, and a discussion of the survey instrument. Some time between the formation of the commission and the first involvement of the writer in this study, it was agreed that Dr. Boyle would develop a series of pamphlets on discipline. The first pamphlet ready for publication was completed on or about 30 January 1974, when the writer joined the commission team. Another pamphlet was completed in mid-February, and the third in early April. The pamphlets gave advice on the handling of disciplinary problems from the perspective of the administrator, the teacher, and the student.

The survey instrument received the major consideration of the committee. Only one element of this discussion will be considered here; the element that has not been mentioned before: the definition of discipline. Despite extended discussion on the subject, no definition was forthcoming from the council. It was decided that this must be discussed by the total commission. The writer can indicate that even
though this discussion did take place in the area meetings, discipline was not defined, so that each respondent would have to answer the survey form with his own definition of discipline in mind.

Finally, as has been mentioned, short personal interviews by the writer with committee members present stressed the feeling that time was running out. Nevertheless, the general morale of the group at the meeting was good.

April 26, 1974—Administrative Council Meeting

This meeting was held after the two weeks of study by the area committees of the survey instrument. The purpose of the meeting was to firm up the survey form and to consider its dissemination. Again, Oscar Boozer chaired the meeting, and Ms. Slavin assumed the leadership in the survey discussion.

It was decided that each area would report on reactions to the survey. As has been indicated, the survey had originally been designed to include responses from parents, principals, teachers, students and community people. Two other areas were added to the form: non-professional people and supportive administrative personnel. These categories were added as a result of input from the area meetings and as a result of the discussion held in the previous council meeting. The reporting at this meeting asked for the reaction of each group to the survey. Since no supportive personnel were present, or students, or non-professionals, the reporting was done by principals, teachers, area office representatives and parents. The following is a brief review of the reactions of these persons to the categories of the survey form.
General Comments

The general reaction from the area committees was very good. Some general suggestions included allowing more space for the responses, a space to indicate the type of school surveyed, and an indication that at the end of the survey there should be a space for general comments by the respondents.

Principals' Survey

The principals were concerned with the word "mis-conduct" being used on the form and suggested the word "misbehavior" in its place. The feeling was that the latter was a less offensive word with fewer negative connotations.

Other concerns had to do with the change of a few words so that the form could be more easily read. It was the feeling that every effort should be made to encourage responses, and that "educationalese" could discourage respondents.

Some of the questions were too complex, and the suggestion was that these questions should be divided. The survey itself was not changed to any great degree, (see Appendix I). They did support the proposal that administrative and supportive personnel, other than principals, should be dealt with in a separate survey form rather than being included with the principals.

Teachers' Survey

Some of the questions on the original survey form asked what were defined by teachers as personal questions. It was concluded that such questions as "what do you do in your classroom" should be deleted, and
teachers should be asked, "what is being done in your school?"

As with the principals' survey, words were changed to simplify the form. It seemed a general consensus that all categories of the survey would be written in "everyday" language regardless of the respondent. Teachers also wanted their questions to be similar to those asked of the principals, so that differences or supportive data could be defined.

There seemed to be a trend of thinking developing from both areas—i.e., simplicity of wording, and less complex statements.

Parents' Survey

Probably the most interesting observation came in this category of the survey. It was felt by the majority of those present that parents should be asked how they handled their child's misbehavior at home. It should be noted that the percentage of parents present at this meeting was less than 15 per cent. It is interesting to note that those parents present entered into the discussion of this item, and were in agreement. It will be interesting to determine how this data is related to the recommendations made to the Board of Education. The writer contends that these responses will vary to a great degree, from no discipline at one end of the spectrum to corporal punishment at the other end. Would it be feasible to set up schools according to philosophies on discipline, and to assign students according to their parents' philosophy; to assign staff according to their philosophy? Could we have the John F. Kennedy Corporal Punishment Middle School and the Brown Permissive High School? This might present students of education with some interesting studies. Some very interesting conclusions might be reached. Does a philosophy of discipline in a school have any effect upon academic achievement?
These questions, although they are thought provoking, will remain academic for the purpose of this study.

Students' Survey

In the area meetings, there were students involved in the discussion of the survey. They were concerned that some of the wording in the survey might not be acceptable. "Behave badly" and "misbehavior" were among the words that were suggested as needing to be changed. The students were also concerned about the threat of the survey to some students. They felt that students would resent the survey unless it was explained by a peer. The writer feels that the decision made by the council, not to interpret survey forms, was a good decision. The students who responded to the survey form had suggested that perhaps students should interpret forms for students.

Student reaction to the survey form, in general, was good.

Community Survey

The responses in this category were very few in number, and the discussion on the survey form was limited. This may indicate that there was very little community involvement during the two week review period, or it could indicate that parents and community had collaborated on their responses.

The one area that does deserve consideration is a question to the community re: the serious disciplinary problems that students present to the merchants in the community. It was a searching question to help determine what affect the parents, school and students could have upon improving the relations between the school community and the total community.
It should be noted that the discussion of the survey form dealt only with four primary areas. There was no discussion on the category of non-professional workers or supportive administrative personnel because this category of the survey had not yet been developed.

**Dissemination of Survey Form**

This very important issue came up at the end of the meeting, after the committee had been in session for two hours. Some discussion was held on the subject, but no conclusions were reached. It seemed agreeable that this would be the primary discussion for the next council meeting. It did not seem to the writer that this would be an easy issue to resolve.

**May 8, 1974—Administrative Council Meeting**

This meeting redefined the number of survey groups from the original five groups to seven groups. The number of people to be surveyed from each area, and the method of dissemination of the survey form were identified. Time was becoming an increasingly important factor with the completion of the survey scheduled before the May 24th holiday weekend. Appendix J contains a summary of this information for the reader's clarification.

The original thinking of the committee had defined, as of the April 26th meeting, five survey groups: students, principals, teachers, parents, and community. Modification of the principals' survey did not meet the needs of the supportive personnel, so another form was added to the survey for this group and for the non-professional group. In its final stage, the survey form had seven categories to be completed.
Survey Numbers

Earlier thinking had projected the survey to be sent to perhaps 50 per cent of the school population and their parents. This was scaled down to nearly 3,000 respondents: 1,000 students (200 from each area); 143 principals, 500 teachers, 250 non-professionals, 143 administrative and supportive staff, 750 parents, and 100 community people (to include the Board of Education members).

Students were to be surveyed in grades 6-12, while principals and supportive personnel from all schools were invited to participate in the survey. Teachers were to be surveyed on three levels: elementary, middle and high school, with 50 per cent of the respondents coming from the elementary and middle schools, and 50 per cent from the high schools. Parents were to come from the three levels: 50 per cent with children in the elementary and middle schools, and 50 per cent with children in the high schools.

It is important to note that variables such as race, socio-economic background, geographic location of respondents, were not clearly defined. Earlier reference to this consideration was "resolved" by Ms. Slavin who had made reference to data which the district had in its files.

Dissemination of Survey Forms

Dissemination of the survey forms was left up to each area committee. A conversation with Oscar Boozer indicated that some areas worked with their parents in getting out the survey; some areas disseminated the material through the student body; one area mailed their surveys
and in some areas the committee members assumed the responsibility of dissemination. Ms. Gaynel Wallace, and area two parents, indicated that each one of their committee members assumed the responsibility for five survey forms.

In discussing responses with Mr. Boozer, it was determined that responses varied from area to area. One area, which mailed out its survey form, received a 30 per cent response which seemed good for this type of communication. Another area, which used the services of the committee members, got a 100 per cent response. A final tally of responses is not available at this date, May 30, 1974.

In the opinion of the writer, the lack of any consistent method of dissemination may have an effect upon the data collected. It raises some serious questions about the use of surveys, and the importance of getting a representative sample if the data is to be reliable.

May 23, 1974—Administrative Council Meeting

This was the final administrative council meeting included in this phase of the project. This was a short meeting designed to provide committee members and high-level school administrators with a progress report from the commission staff. Oscar Boozer chaired the meeting, with Jill Slavin, Marion Boyle, and Lee May on the agenda.

Slavin and Boozer thanked the committee members for their cooperation in the survey, which, according to Ms. Gaynel Wallace, took approximately five days to complete. Both Boozer and Slavin indicated that the job could not have been done without the cooperation of the committee members in the areas, and the council members in attendance. At this date, May 30, 1974, no specific tally has been made of the responses.
However, the response was indicated as "very good".

All area committee members were encouraged to carry the survey a step further by interviewing personally a "behavioral specialist" to determine their view of how disciplinary problems should be handled in schools. These specialists were further defined as mental health professionals, medical professionals, educational professionals, and community agency professionals. Ms. Slavin indicated in a memorandum that this information might be valuable in making knowledgeable recommendations to the Board of Education.

Dr. Marion Boyles spoke of the progress being made on the fourth in a series of district publications on discipline. This latest publication was to have as its theme—the students' concept of discipline. Audience responses as to value of these publications ranged from "of little value" to "a basis for faculty seminars".

Lee May indicated that one hundred large school systems were being surveyed for material on discipline. The material was to be used as resource material to the commission members who would be making the policy recommendations to the Board of Education. To date twenty-five districts have responded. The material will be kept on file in Oscar Boozer's office.

Perhaps the major item for consideration at this meeting was that Jill Slavin would spend the next 3-4 weeks defining categories for the survey responses. After the completion of this major task, commission members would be asked to read the survey responses and to place them in an appropriate category. There was no mention of returning to the community with the implications the data presented prior to preparing
recommendations to the Board of Education. The reader may recall that a public forum on commission recommendations was to be scheduled during the summer as an objective of the original planning document.

Some time between this date, May 23rd, and the final report to the Board of Education, Ms. Slavin was to make a review of the literature on the subject of discipline. Abstracts of these reviews were to be presented to the commission members. It was not clear as to what value this information would be to the commission or how it might affect the recommendations to the Board of Education.

This meeting was concluded with a twenty-five minute film—"What is Discipline Anyway?" The film was offered to motivate discussion, and it certainly did just that. The following observations would preclude the use of the film in any further educational situation, in the opinion of the writer. The film presented a series of observations by seven or eight well known white authors on the subject of discipline. The only minority reference was a young high school student who had done something wrong, and a concluding scene with a very young elementary student who was walking across the school yard with his head down. The film strongly implied that the authorities on the subject were white, and the problem was black. This may be too simple an explanation, but the writer was joined in his thinking by three other minority members of the commission who made similar comments on the film.

**IMPLICATIONS**

This part of the project has dealt with the mechanics of reorganization and the conduct of a survey in an urban school system. There are several questions that have been raised, to which the writer will respond in the final part of this paper. Issues that deal with the
the subject of discipline, and then to discuss some of the suggestions, implications and/or recommendations of these issues. It is the hope of the writer that this discussion might assist others who may be faced with a similar organizational and administrative responsibility. A project is intended as a practical exercise designed as a workshop for a student in educational administration.

Some of the questions raised in this part of the paper have to do with the extent that school districts can add-on responsibilities to staff personnel and continue to expect personnel to operate efficiently. Certainly the effect of these add-on responsibilities can be considered in the light of their effect on discipline in a school. Paul West's article in the Atlanta Constitution should be analyzed. Finally, but probably most important, what happened to the student participation in the project?

Conclusion

In this phase of the project, the writer had the role of an analytical observer. It was a difficult role for an administrator. It was difficult to remain "out" of the administrative leadership role. The process of being objective about the reorganization of the commission was also a very difficult position to maintain. Certainly, the writer recognizes the validity of the process of being in the position of an observer, but it is a role that just does not come easily to one who has had a more active role in education for the past seventeen years. The transition from a position of executive secretary to a position of observer was difficult to resolve.

Although privileged to attend area committee meetings, the logistics
of attending meetings in five different areas presented the writer with a problem which was best resolved through a process of personal interviews with area committee members: Ms. Gaynel Wallace, Mr. Gene Jones, Ms. Ruby Clay and others. The writer is indebted to these people for their cooperation.
PART II

INTRODUCTION

Questions have been raised in part one of this report. Some, like the identification of the community, have remained unanswered for the past decade, and for the purpose of this paper shall remain unanswered. Others, like who makes behind-the-scenes decisions for the superintendent of schools, can only be alluded to by the writer for the subject itself could be a complete study. However, the writer during the course of this project has raised some interesting questions which, until this part of this report, have not been discussed in depth. It will not, of course, be possible to answer all the questions that have been raised. Time does not permit this; some questions are far beyond the perception or conception of the writer, and some may always remain questions for some of the reasons listed above. Therefore, a definition of the purpose of this concluding section of this report is in order.

This terminal project is the first attempt by a doctoral student at Atlanta University. The writer, during the course of the project, has recognized several interesting aspects of a terminal project which he would like to share with those who may choose to pursue this type of terminal study in the future. Certainly, these recommendations are intended for the consideration of future students and other interested persons. All recommendations will not apply to all projects. However,
it will be the intent of the writer to deal with general recommendations that could apply to any terminal project. The recommendations may be the beginning of guidelines that will evolve for future use. As they are tested, perhaps even reiterated by others, the evolutionary process may lead to a set of principles. This is an innovative method of satisfying the requirements for a doctoral degree, probably peculiar to the field of education, and principles need to be forged by trial, error and time. Therefore, this conclusion will in part deal with recommendations for students writing or doing terminal projects.

Secondly, there are the questions of this study. Some have been explored, and some are to be explored in the following pages. These are specific questions that relate to the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline. Specific in that they relate to Atlanta's attempt to study discipline in its school system. This study by the writer may contribute to the general knowledge in the field of discipline, and hopefully will be of some assistance to school districts in other cities who are considering this type of study. As has been indicated, and for the reasons listed in the introductory paragraph, only some of these questions will be considered in this concluding segment of this paper. The writer will therefore list most of the questions that have surfaced, yet will identify only a few for some in depth study.

The writer will continue to steer away from conclusions in this part of the paper, as he has in part one. This has been a study on the organization and the administration of a commission to deal with what a Gallup poll defined as "the greatest complaint against the schools of the
country . . . (the) lack of discipline." It is not now clear to the writer that a public school commission or a public school district will find the answers to this public dilemma. It is suspected that the answer lies in more than this one public institution or any public institution.

PROJECT QUESTIONS DISCUSSED

Communication

"Another reason a pupil may become a discipline problem is that the lines of communication are functioning badly. . . ." Another reason, the writer has been able to deduce that schools may have discipline problems is the lines of communication are down. Since a comparative few of the questions raised in this paper can be discussed, it would be negligent not to discuss the lines of communication in the Atlanta Public School System. It is expedient that we deal with communication, if the reader is to understand the frustrations experienced by the writer, and even more important if future students are to escape the frustration and to understand lines of communication. It is not enough for the writer to infer that the lines were down, this is a misstatement. It is important to know that this project was a study in communication, but of the less formal type.

It is the writer's opinion that in retrospect the questions raised

---


about the superintendent's lack of communication with the Board of Education, was a case of inexperience on the part of the writer. The writer assumed since two new board members did not know about the commission that no communication had gone on between Dr. Crim and the board members about the commission. Although no formal communication had been sent to the board members, decisions were made by the board: first to change the commission site from 87 Chestnut Street, S.W. to Pryor Street, second, not to pay school personnel and citizens for work on the commission, and finally to totally dissolve the paid staff of the commission. Some kind of communication did exist between the superintendent and some of the members of the Board of Education. Dr. Crim did not reach these decisions on his own accord. One, he did not know of the "bad blood" between 87 Chestnut Street (The Institute of The Black World) and the Board of Education; two, he had approved payment of school personnel and the hiring of a paid staff to conduct the survey, and it made no sense in this context to contradict himself. Who then has authority over the superintendent—certainly the board members. Since all three decisions were reached; since no decision was a matter of the public record; the decisions were reached by some Board of Education members (not Griggs and Crowder) and communication did exist between some of the board members and the superintendent. It was a good communication of an informal nature. This then corrects a false assumption that the writer may have built into part one of this written paper; the assumption that communication between the superintendent and some members of the board may not have existed.

Another question raised that could be answered was the communication between the superintendent and the commission. Dr. Alonzo Crim
had an idea that he expressed in his November 30th letter to Oscar Boozer which indicated that, "you should invite to serve with you (on the commission) staff members . . . students and community members . . . (and) after you have initiated your meeting, I would personally appreciate regular reports." The beginning of the commission, from the writer's concept, was like the ending---written and to the point. It was what transpired between the November 30th date and the end, the March 14th date which the writer would like to discuss in some detail.

The writer, on January 30th forwarded a planning document (See Appendix A) to Dr. Crim for his review and consideration. It outlined the objectives of the commission. The receipt of this document was acknowledged by Dr. Crim on February 5th. On February 7th, at a meeting with Dr. Crim, the writer and Mr. Boozer, presented Dr. Crim with a tentative calendar of events for the commission (see Appendix C). On February 18th a meeting was planned by the writer and Mr. Boozer at which Dr. Crim was to charge the commission. On February 21st the writer prepared a written charge for the superintendent which was published on February 26th, and on March 11th the writer and Mr. Boozer, just three days prior to the firing of the C.A.R.D. paid staff, responded to Dr. Crim's request to be prepared to address the Board of Education regarding the commission. This constitutes, in the opinion of the writer, documented formal communication with the superintendent. The communication, except for the March 11th board meeting alert, and the March 14th dismissal of the C.A.R.D. staff seemed to be one-way. Here the writer

---

would like to state that, in his opinion a superintendent if there are no problems need have no further formal communication with a commission of this type. However, there were problems and some informal communication from the superintendent to the commission of the subject was in order. The superintendent did not meet his responsibility to the writer; he did not meet his responsibility to the writer's staff.

Finally, this would have implications for future students pursuing a project. Do not assume that with a superintendent of schools that communication can be a one-way street. The writer made a mistake that his experience should have prevented.

Commitment

It is questionable that the Atlanta Board of Education was committed to Dr. Crim's broad based study of discipline. It seems evident that a superintendent must have the support of his board members before he commits himself to a project or be willing to face some public embarrassment. Dr. Crim reacted to input from parents and from teachers as a result of five "town hall" meetings which he held upon his arrival in the city of Atlanta. He reacted to concerns without consulting his Board of Education, and he moved on these concerns without testing the situation with his board members.

First, the superintendent should have discussed his plans to move on this public concern with the members of the board. He should have announced his intention to set up a commission to study this problem and to make policy recommendations to the board in some other format than the district newspaper. It seemed unlikely that a commission set up to make policy recommendations to the Board of Education should be activated
without some thorough board consideration. It is one thing to move quickly on a public concern, and it is quite another thing to move on the Board of Education, through a public commission, without consulting the board. Commitment could have been clearly defined at an informal board discussion on the subject, and the work of any commission might have then been subject to Board of Education approval. It is the opinion of the writer that the Board of Education is not merely a policy making agency, and Grieder, Pierce and Jordan support this opinion by stating that, "the oversimplification of functions which assigns policy making to school boards and execution of policies to administrators is not adequate." It is also the opinion of the writer that in this particular situation the superintendent of schools exceeded his authority; even exceeded good judgment. The process seemed to be to share his thinking with the board, get their approval, to proceed, and then to develop a plan for implementation that could be approved by the board. This did not seem like a subject for a unilateral decision. This process could have defined commitment, and could have saved time, money and some embarrassment.

The commission study as it was now constituted may speak seriously to the commitment of the board to a study; it does not speak to the board based study originally outlined by the superintendent. The Board of Education is committed to a study of discipline. The board is not committed to a broad base study. The superintendent of schools is not committed to a broad based study of discipline for the city of Atlanta.

---

and the current study is indicative of this attitude. What currently exists in the City of Atlanta, is a study of discipline being conducted by in-house people without any meaningful student involvement; without any meaningful plan for community involvement.

Total involvement may be a myth. A myth that the realistic politics of this school board or any school board will not permit. It is a threat to the status quo. Total involvement seems like an academic model that has not been perfected; not in our schools, not in our government, not even in religion. It is critical to have a sound political base in dealing with community involvement. Commitment changes—commitment is political.

Questions in the Planning Document

Two questions incorporated in the planning document need a closer examination. One, the question that community consultants should receive some minimal compensation for public service, and two, that paid personnel like teachers should receive some compensation for public service beyond their teaching duties.

Recent federal programs have leaned heavily upon the use of community people in the planning, implementation and the evaluation of federally funded programs in the public schools. Since 1965 the use of community consultants has been the rule rather than the exception. These consultants have been compensated for their time. Certainly, all school budgets have an allocated sum of money for consultant services. However, the interpretation here has usually been that these services would be provided by professional experts. It is the contention of the writer that the services of non-degreed people is expert, and should be
compensated. Perhaps the scale of compensation should not be the same as for the professional, and this would be subject for some extended debate.

As has been discussed in this paper, the writer defined community people as necessary experts in this study, and offered an honorarium of one hundred dollars for approximately four to five months service. The writer's defense of this allocation of funds rests clearly with the precedent established by federally funded projects, and by the local policy of paying Board of Education members for public service.

The question, the payment of professional staff for the performance of services which are beyond their normal scope raises the last issue which the writer would like to discuss in this paper. The issue of add-on responsibilities to professionals and the effect that these responsibilities may have upon the disciplinary problems in the school system. Without sounding like a union organizer, the writer supports the union position that there should be extra pay for extra work. Supervision of athletic events, after school activities, and discipline commissions represent extra work for administrators and for teachers. It seems reasonable that something must suffer when supervisory personnel are at district meetings; it seems reasonable that something must suffer when teaching personnel are performing non-teaching duties. Does this mean that the writer does not advocate the use of supervisory and teaching personnel on a commission of this type? The answer is obvious; he does not! There is a fundamental role for this type of involvement on task forces and commissions; even for this type of involvement at the athletic event. The writer feels that supervisors meeting this type of responsibility
during school hours should be replaced by other competent personnel, that teachers should also be replaced by other competent personnel. This does not mean that other teachers should give up their conference periods; it does mean that substitute personnel should be assigned. With this type of support, it is reasonable to hold schools more accountable for performance and for discipline in their schools.

Conclusion

The writer, in this concluding section of this paper, has attempted to touch upon some of the elements that are fundamental to the project; some of the elements that will be fundamental to most projects; communication, commitment, some of the ideas of the writer which have been incorporated into the study, and one that perhaps has been alluded to but not clearly spelled out, one that has not been discussed, but must be mentioned... integrity. It is a fundamental ingredient about which nothing has been written in this paper, but which touches upon the interrelationships between people.

Can the schools do any job alone? Can there be a cooperative effort between the schools and the community? Are we so bound by tradition that failure is more acceptable than change? Do we recognize that we are failing, and does it really matter? Is there no leadership in our ranks? Where do we go from here?

These questions do not apply to the subject of discipline. They are valid questions for the process of education.
OBSERVATIONS FOR STUDENTS CONSIDERING TERMINAL PROJECTS

The introduction has indicated what the writer will attempt in this segment of the conclusion of this report. The format will include a listing of the recommendations, and then the writer will explore some of the most pertinent suggestions.

Recommendations

1. There will be a clear definition of the purpose of the project by the student's doctoral committee, the school or agency cooperating in the study, and the student.

2. Any premature termination of the project shall be processed through the above name participants.

3. In instances where students are receiving financial compensation for their work with the agency or public school, regularly scheduled "holidays" should be provided for the student to meet and to confer with his doctoral committee.

4. Included in the project proposal should be several alternative mini-proposals that could be implemented should the original proposal be terminated or have to be amended.

5. A contractual arrangement should be developed between the student, the student's doctoral committee, and the agency or school cooperating in the project.

6. Care should be exercised that a student does not define too many objectives in his proposal.

7. Some type of daily log should be kept by the student and be available for the doctoral committee's perusal.

8. The number of students satisfying requirements through a project should be limited by the number of faculty advisors available who have had some type of experience in this area.

9. A project should cover a minimum of six months, and a maximum of a school year. Regular reports should be made to the doctoral committee on the student's progress.
by the student and the cooperating agency. These reports will form the nucleus for the terminal written report, and for the "holiday" sessions with the student's advisor. At the conclusion of these "holiday" sessions, the reader should make both verbal and written recommendations to the student.

10. One reader, probably the student's advisor, should be assigned. Other members of the doctoral committee may read all reports, and of course will be required to read the final paper.

11. "Holiday" sessions should be open to any member of the faculty, and other students at the university who may be interested in either the subject of the proposal or in pursuing a project at some later date.

12. Where possible, the student should remain in commuting radius of the university.

13. A student should not consider a project as an alternative to a dissertation for the purpose of eliminating written requirements.

14. A project is a valuable experience for a student to expand his practical work experiences. It could be incorporated with an internship with the final written work coming after the work experience.

**Writer's Comments**

A clear definition of the purpose of a project is vital to the success of the project, and probably to the mental health of the student. It is critical that the participants spend considerable time on the student's proposal; identifying areas that may cause future problems, and dealing with the issues. School districts may have problems dealing with proposal objectives that do not support the philosophy or the objectives of that system. It would be an error to fund a student's services if his attitudes on community involvement, for example, do not support or are in conflict with those of the district. It would be an error for the student to negotiate an understanding with a school system without
the involvement of his doctoral committee.

A clear definition of purpose, and a wedding of minds on the project objectives is almost as fundamental to the success of the project as the capabilities of the student. Perhaps this comment speaks to efficient organization or as Barnard has put it, "an interpersonal system of coordinated human efforts. . . ." It will take this "system" to complete a project successfully.

Termination of a project, based upon the writer's experience is not an abstract theory, but a very possible element to be considered by a student who contemplates the project approach as a terminal requirement towards his degree. There are two things that the writer would like to see considered at this juncture; one, that the decision is reached through the same avenues that originally approved the project, namely: the student, the student's doctoral committee and the school or agency represented in the project. This may be a learning situation for any and all involved, and could prevent a repetition of the problem for all concerned. The other area that the writer would like to see considered, if a project is terminated, is the opportunity for a review of the student's performance before any alternative plans are considered. It is conceivable that a student should not consider another project in the light of his previous performance. It is in this context that the project is so much more practical when compared with a dissertation. One deals with little that is practical. The results may be a highly qualified academician with little or no practical ability or skills.

---

Regular Scheduled "Holidays"

A project cannot be effective without some regular communication between the student and his advisor. It is the writer's opinion that these periods, probably inaccurately described as "holidays", should be built into any project proposal. Fundamental to these regular sessions between student and advisor is the regular written report of the student and the school or agency cooperating in the study. It is an opportunity for review; even an opportunity for critical areas that could lead to the termination of a project to be considered and resolved. The writer has found it most helpful, during the course of this project to have regular meetings with his advisor around issues and the progress of the project. A student, particularly one who is not within commuting radius of the university should not lose contact with his doctoral committee nor with his advisor. Again, contact just for the sake of visibility is not what the writer has in mind, but contact around regular written reports by both the student and his immediate supervisor. These "holidays" could cover a period of three days, with the student having an opportunity to do some research during the time that he is not meeting with his doctoral committee and/or advisor.

Daily Log

This suggestion made by the writer's doctoral committee was of invaluable assistance to the writer in keeping track of events, and in making more formal written reports on the progress of the project. It is a rather simple annotated device, but should be given strong consideration by any student who pursues a project. Certainly for the student who wishes to or begin writing on his terminal paper while
pursuing his project.

The Terminal Paper

The writer does not recommend that a student attempt to complete a final written report at the same time as he is involved in a meaningful project. However, this is not to say that the data necessary for the report should not be gathered during this time. There are of course, some students who will be able to accomplish this exercise, but it should not be encouraged. Most projects, especially those on which a student is employed full-time, are full-time jobs. A student cannot do two full-time jobs well; one will suffer. The writer must emphasize that a student cannot wait until the project is complete to gather data, and to do research. This must be a continuous process, supported as has been indicated by the "holiday" periods away from the project. A careful utilization of time and gathering of data can afford a student, in the opinion of the writer, to complete a terminal report in one semester.

Finally, the final report in a project is not a watered down dissertation, but an academic document that is based more upon the practical aspect of administration, and less upon abstract research. The writer has been careful not to indicate that this is a document that does not include research.

The Value of the Terminal Project

Continuously in this document the writer has referred to the terminal project. The above paragraph or two has dealt with some of the mechanics; this will deal with the value of the process. Dethy and Ostrander suggest that values are, "the concept of comparative worth
or importance. . . ." It is exactly in this context that the writer would like to conclude this set of recommendations—the concept of comparative worth.

Abbreviary comparison is in order for the reader to understand that a project represents a conflict with reality; a sure confrontation with what is about to come; a sure struggle with self and with people. The comparison is with the traditional dissertation, and will be necessarily brief. Frank Damron, a native American psychologist, speaking at a meeting attended by the writer, in Berkeley, California on May 3, 1974, heard these words, conflict, confrontation, and struggle, described as words "without meaning to the native American, words of the invader." Yet, they are the words the writer will select to compare the reality of the project with the philosophy of a dissertation. It has been the writer's continued experience that the world of the educational leader is harsh and brutal, often lacking in the humaneness of which we speak in this academic atmosphere. What better preparation, a paper or an experience? In the words of Dethy and Ostrander, which has the greater worth? The writer opts for the project as a vital element in the training of an educational administrator where the world is full of harsh words and harsh acts. It is better to have the experience than to research the experience. There is no comparison between the two, yet, one without the other is nothing.

---
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INTRODUCTION

As a result of a telephone conversation with Mr. Oscar Boozer on Monday, January 14, 1974 and a luncheon meeting with Dr. Hosford of Mr. Boozer’s staff, and Mr. Boozer on January 18, 1974, the writer has been requested to represent the superintendent’s office on a commission charged with the responsibility of submitting, a "... a recommendation for adoption by the Board of Education that will establish a policy for accountability of school staff, parents, and students in school discipline."

Mr. Boozer charged the writer with the responsibility to preparing a preliminary planning report prior to February 1, 1974 — the effective date of the commission.

The following report has been prepared with the cooperation of Ms. Brenda Belton, Ms. Aljosie Yabura, Mr. Arthur Barham, Dr. Mack Jones, Dr. Carl Spight, and Mr. Norman Thomas. Their thinking represents a cross-section of the Atlanta community, parents of students in the Atlanta Public Schools, a former teacher in the Atlanta Public School System, professors in higher education, and a cross-section of educators in cities other than Atlanta.

The report will include references to the organization and composition of the commission, a calendar for the completion of the task; job descriptions for consultants to the commission; goals, objectives and

---

1Alonzo A. Crim, "Memorandum to Area Superintendents" Atlanta Public Schools, January 14, 1974.
guidelines for the commission; recommendations for the superintendent regarding: budget, his charge to the commission; and, future planning, implementation and evaluation of the project.

It is the purpose of the report to give direction for the completion of the task, to share some preliminary thinking with the superintendent's office and the members of the commission staff, and to encourage the recipients of this rough draft to share their reactions, criticisms, suggestions and expertise with the writer. It is the further suggestion of the writer that these preliminary plans will serve as a stimulus for a more comprehensive document that could become a matter of public record.
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TITLE OF THE STUDY

In his memorandum to area superintendents, Dr. Crim referred to the commission as "... a 50 member Commission on School Discipline..."\(^2\)

RECOMMENDATION

The title suggests a negative image for the commission. It is recommended that at the first meeting of the area committees that the title be discussed, and if a change is in order, that titles be recommended for consideration of the executive secretary, the facilitators and Mr. Boozer.

GOAL OF THE STUDY

Dr. Crim has defined the goal of the study as the "... establish (ment) policy for accountability of school staff, parents and students in school discipline."\(^3\)

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Suggested objectives of the study are:

1. to survey school staff, students, parents, and community regarding their perception of policy needs in the area of school discipline;

2. to research studies made by other large cities in the area of discipline;

3. to recommend to the Atlanta Board of Education policy statements based upon research and survey;

4. to provide public hearings on policy recommendations prior to the submission of final policy recommendations to the Board of Education;

\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)Ibid.
5. to give parity to the input from professional and non-professional sources;

6. to develop operational objectives within the context of these objectives and the goal of the study;

7. to develop the study in three phases: (1) planning, research and survey; (2) writing, public hearings, and final recommendations; (3) evaluation;

8. to evaluate the study after it has been operational;

9. to keep the public, superintendent, and Board advised of commission progress.

**PHASES OF THE STUDY**

As indicated in the objectives, the study is recommended to be conducted in three phases: (1) planning, research and survey; (2) writing and public hearings with final recommendations; (3) evaluation.

**Phase I - February 1, 1974 - May 31, 1974**

1. Superintendent's charge to the commission with guidelines for the study.

2. Organize the staff and define their duties.

3. Organize the Area Committees and define their duties.

4. Devise a calendar for area meetings and staff meetings.

5. Define operational objectives.

6. Formalize the budget.

7. Set up the commission office.

8. Research and survey.

9. Regular reports to the public, superintendent and Board.


**Phase II - July 1, 1974 - September 30, 1974**

1. Write policy recommendations based upon data from Phase I.

2. Write rationale for each recommendation.
3. Regular report to public, superintendent, and Board.

4. Public hearings on recommendations possibly organized around Dr. Crim's Town Hall model.

5. Final Report to the Board of Education.

Phase III - February 1, 1975 - March 31, 1975

1. After the policies have been operational for a semester, evaluate for possible changes.

GENERAL

The urgency of a standard policy is recognized by the writer. Support for Board policies in this area comes from staff, students and community. Phases one and two present to the public, within a reasonable time span, a study of sufficient depth to reflect the size and complexity of an urban school district. Any less time could reflect in policy recommendations that lack a reasonable sample size, limit public hearings on suggested recommendations, and result in a policy that might create more problems than it alleviates.

ORGANIZATION AND DUTIES OF THE STAFF

Dr. Crim, in his letter to Mr. Oscar L. Boozer, dated November 30, 1973, listed Mr. Boozer as the chairman of the commission with the authority to organize a staff to carry out the commission task. The following chart describes the organization of the staff; duties are listed separately:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Responsible To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Oscar L. Boozer</td>
<td>Chairman of Commission</td>
<td>Dr. Alonzo Crim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Harold Treadwell</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>Mr. Oscar Boozer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Brenda Belton</td>
<td>Program Facilitator</td>
<td>Mr. H. Treadwell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duties of the Chairman and Executive Secretary include coordinating the study; planning the budget; hiring support personnel; assisting in defining objectives and operational objectives for the study; advising the public; superintendent and Board of Education on the progress of the study; writing the final reports for each phase; managing the commission office; attending meetings called by the Board and the superintendent; and, such other duties as defined by the superintendent.

Duties of the Program Facilitators include: assisting in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the study; recording the activities and recommendations of the area committees; serving as a resource to the area committees; conducting research; assisting in the survey; attending all meetings of the area committees, and meeting of the executive secretary; assisting in the second phase of the study (writing and public hearings), and such other duties as are mutually agreeable.

**ORGANIZATION OF THE AREA COMMITTEES AND THEIR DUTIES**

Dr. Crim has set into motion the organization of five area committees consisting of "... one person from the area office...", and elementary or middle school principal, a secondary school principal, a secondary school student, a parent from the elementary school, a parent from the
secondary school, a counselor and a community leader representing the community-at-large.\textsuperscript{4} One person will act as a "convener" from this group. Clerical support will come from the commission office, and each of the five area committees will be assigned a program facilitator (see "Organization and Duties of Staff").

Duties

These committees are performance oriented. They will schedule meetings to define performance objectives relating to the general objectives of the study, conduct research and survey responsibilities of the commission in their respective areas. The research and survey data are communicated through the program facilitator to the commission office. One committee member in each area will work in Phase II (writing and public hearings).

BUDGET (PHASE I)

DIRECT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Treadwell, Executive Secretary</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$4000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Facilitators - 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Belton\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{*} 6 hours per wk. x 16 wks. @ $6.00

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aljosie Yabura*</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Barham*</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack Jones*</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Spight*</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Thomas*</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*6 hours per wk. x 16 wks. @ $6.00

**Area Committee (Professional)** - 25
To be Named 2500.00

**Area Committee (Non-Professional)** - 25
To be Named 2500.00

**Consultants to Project** -
50 hours 500.00

Subtotal for Direct Costs $13,800.00

**OTHER DIRECT COSTS**

- **Office Space and Equipment** - 87 Chestnut St., SW 200.00
- Telephone 400.00
- **Travel for Program Activities** 500.00
- **Office Supplies and Reproduction** 500.00

Subtotal for Direct Costs 13,800.00

Subtotal For Other Direct Costs 1,600.00

**Contingency Fund (10%)** 1,500.00

Total Budget Expenditure $16,900.00
### BUDGET (PHASE II)

#### DIRECT COSTS

**Administrative - 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harold Treadwell</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Facilitators - 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Belton*</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aljosie Yabura*</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Barham*</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack Jones*</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Spight*</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Thomas*</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*16 hours per wk x 6 wks @ $8.00

**Area Committees - 5**

To select, one from each area

Subtotal for Direct Costs $7,600.00

#### OTHER DIRECT COSTS

**Office Supplies and Reproduction**

500.00

Subtotal for Other Direct Costs 500.00

#### INDIRECT COSTS

**Office Space and Equipment - Pryor Street**

NC

**Telephone**

NC

Subtotal for Indirect Costs NC

Subtotal for Direct Costs $7,600.00

Subtotal for Other Direct Costs 500.00

Contingency (10%) 800.00

Total Budget Expenditure $8,900.00
BUDGET (PHASE III)

DIRECT COSTS

Administrative - 2
Harold Treadwell, Executive Secretary 20% 800.00
Secretary 50% 600.00

Program Facilitators - 3
Arthur Barham* 20% 500.00
Aljosie Yabura* 20% 500.00
Norman Thomas* 20% 500.00
Student 5% 100.00

* 8 hours per wk x 8 wks @ $8.00

Subtotal for Direct Costs $3,000.00

OTHER DIRECT COSTS

Office Supplies and Reproduction 500.00

Subtotal for Other Direct Costs $500.00

INDIRECT COSTS

Office Space and Equipment - Pryor Street NC
Telephone NC

Subtotal for Indirect Costs NC
Subtotal for Direct Costs 3,000.00
Subtotal for Other Direct Costs 500.00

Contingency (10%) 350.00

Total Budget Expenditure $4,000.00
The following general statements will assist in the total project:

1. The superintendent to prepare a charge to the commission to be delivered at the first general meeting.

2. The superintendent to direct a memorandum to area superintendents and site administrators requesting their cooperation in the study, and identifying the commission staff.

3. Payroll to consider the payment of area personnel in either two equal payments (April 1 and June 1, 1974) or one payment on June 1, 1974.

4. Identify salaried personnel as consultants rather than part-time employees to eliminate paper work.

5. Install a telephone at 83 Chestnut St., S.W. effective February 4, 1974.

6. Forward a letter to The Institute of the Black World re: use of office facilities at 83 Chestnut St., S.W. effective February 1, - May 31, 1974. See budget (Phase I) for rate.

7. The superintendent's office to prepare public announcements via the media identifying the task force, its goal and objectives, location of the task force office, telephone number, etc.
APPENDIX B

STAFF MEETING AGENDAS
AGENDA
SUPERINTENDENT'S COMMISSION ON DISCIPLINE
ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

January 30, 1974

1. Meeting Dates of Staff for February (3)
   a. Purpose: Orientation and planning

2. Organization of Commission by Area Committees
   a. Role of program facilitators
   b. Area preferences (see map)
      (1)
      (2)
      (3)
      (4)
      (5)

3. Suggested Meeting dates and times for Area Committees

4. Alternates for facilitators

5. Organization of Committees
   a. independent study
   b. interdependent study

6. Status of the Commission

7. Pre-planning Report
   a. Purpose
   b. Budget and Phasing
   c. Read, annotate, finalize at next meeting
AGENDA
PROGRAM FACILITATORS
February 5, 1974

1. Review of the Preliminary Planning Document
2. Status of Commission
3. Survey Research Plans
4. 1964 Board Policies on Discipline
5. Meeting with Dr. Crim - 2/7/74
6. Vitas for Atlanta Public Schools
AGENDA
DISCIPLINE COMMISSION
February 12, 1974

1. Payroll Consideration
   a. forms
   b. frequency

2. Results of February 7, 1974 Meeting with Dr. Crim
   a. letter from Dr. Crim
   b. Policy Statement Concept for Commission
   c. February 15, 1974 Meeting at Garnett Street

3. Meeting with Discipline Commission of Christians and Jews

4. Plans for first Committee Meetings
   a. February 20th – March 20th

5. March, 1974 Schedule of Team Meetings

6. Consultant Pay Schedule
   a. local
   b. out-of-town

7. Title of Commission
AGENDA

ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
COMMISSION ON ACCOUNTABILITY AND RIGHTS IN DISCIPLINE
83 Chestnut St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

February 19, 1974

1. Preliminary report on research by J. Davis
   re: surveys on discipline

2. Introduction of Mr. Oscar Boozer, Chairman of Commission

3. Pre-Planning for committee meetings
APPENDIX C

CALENDAR OF COMMISSION EVENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/30/73</td>
<td>Appointment of Commission Chairman Mr. Oscar Boozer to head Discipline Commission by Dr. Crim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/73</td>
<td>Preliminary organizational work in which Commission would function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/74</td>
<td>Researched funding for the operation of the Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/74</td>
<td>Briefed Dr. Sidney Estes on establishing a 50 member Commission with representation from each Area office: elementary principals, high school principals, students, parents, counselors, teachers and community leaders. A program facilitator will be assigned to each area task force, and an executive secretary will be selected. Mr. Harold Treadwell was recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/74</td>
<td>Contacted H. Treadwell re: working as the Executive Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent notified area superintendents via memorandum this date re: composition of Commission and that the area superintendents would select area representation before 2/1/74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18/74</td>
<td>A luncheon meeting was held to discuss plans in accomplishing the task as requested by the superintendent. Mr. Treadwell was requested to formulate a rough draft re: procedures and plans. Also he was given the go-ahead in naming the program facilitators to be assigned to each area team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/74</td>
<td>Pre-Planning as directed above began. Three area program facilitators were interviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/74</td>
<td>Interviewed three area facilitators. Two of the facilitators would serve as co-facilitators for one area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/74</td>
<td>Presented the rough draft of the pre-planning proposal to Mr. Boozer with copies for distribution to: Dr. Crim, Mr. Minor and Dr. Estes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Boozer dealt with the Assistant Comptroller in establishing sufficient funds for phase one of the Commission's study. The amount is $16,341.82.

1/30/74
Staff training began with program facilitators to be headquartered. 83 Chestnut St., S.W. Four training sessions were scheduled — 1/30/74, 2/5/74, 2/12/74 and 2/19/74.

1/31/74
*Publication #1 - Teachers

2/1/74
Contacted Ms. Janet Davis to research studies that have been made in other large cities and to recommend research tools for our survey in Atlanta. A report is to be made at the February 19, 1974 Staff Training Session.

2/4/74
Names of representatives from Areas I, II, III, and V received.

2/5/74
Roster of committee membership given to Mr. Treadwell for his files and distribution to program facilitators.

Second Staff Training Session held with program facilitators.

2/6/74
Current plans discussed and projection of events finalized.

2/7/74
Briefing session with the superintendent at 10:30 a.m.

2/11/74
The Superintendent to mail a letter to each member expressing appreciation for their service to the Commission and informing the members of the first meeting.

2/15/74
The first meeting of the Commission — a charge by the Superintendent.

2/21/74
Beginning of area meetings.

2/29/74
*Publication #2 - Administrators and Discipline.

3/15/74
Progress report to the Superintendent.

3/31/74
*Publication #3 - Success Stories by Teachers.

4/1/74
Progress report to the Board of Education at the briefing session.

*Tentative Titles
4/30/74  *Publication #4 - How Students Look at Discipline.
Completion of Phase I with report.

7/1/74 - 9/30/74 Completion of Phase II

1. Write policy recommendations based upon data from Phase I.

2. Write rationale for each recommendation.

3. Regular report to public, superintendent, and Board.

4. Public hearings on recommendations possibly organized around Dr. Crim's Town Hall Model.

5. Final Report to the Board of Education.

*Tentative Title
APPENDIX D

MEMORANDUM FROM RESEARCH CONSULTANT
MEMORANDUM

TO: Harold Treadwell and the Members of the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline

FROM: Janet G. Davis, Research Consultant

RE: Progress Report

DATE: February 19, 1974

The following was used as an outline indicating objectives for the Review of Literature component:

I. Journal references used for periodical search

   A. Education Index
   B. Current Index to Journal in Education
   C. Research in Education – ERIC

II. Requirements

   A. 10 documents
      (1) 1964 and above
   B. Actual breakdown of 3–5 surveys
      (1) Urban setting

III. Questions concerning each survey were:

   1. Purpose of study
   2. Who conducted study
   3. Population of study
   4. Method of distribution
   5. Percentage of parents, faculty, students participating
   6. Methodology of survey
   7. Racial composition of school system, those surveyed
   8. Time element
   9. Results
   10. Limitations
   11. Recommendations
   12. Follow-up
   13. Categories resulting from survey
   14. Copy of questionnaire used

IV. Recommendations/Justifications to Commission

Results of this search produced only one (1) research tool—Discipline Survey by the Pittsburgh Public Schools, July 1971. It is concluded that although school districts do in as much conduct discipline surveys—they are not available for public consumption except upon request. It is therefore recommended that additional time be given for written requisition of said document.
APPENDIX E

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON SCHOOL DISCIPLINE
MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON SCHOOL DISCIPLINE
Oscar L. Boozer, Chairman
Harold Treadwell, Executive Secretary

Area I

Mrs. Marjorie Bolen, Teacher at Brown High School, 3970 Thaxton Rd.,
S.W., 30331 - Telephone: 344-5380

Mrs. Opal Chamblee, Counselor, Brown High School, 1689 Detroit, Ave.,
N.W.  30314 - Telephone: 794-0987

Mr. Algee Long, Secondary Student at Washington, 629 Griffin St., N.W.
30314

Rev. J. E. Lowery, Community at Large, Minister, 503 Mitchell St.,
S.W.  30314 - Telephone: 524-4236

Mr. Charles Mason, Secondary Principal at Southwest High, 391
Fielding Ln., S.W., Telephone: 691-5671

Mr. J. E. Morris, Elementary School Principal at J.C. Harris,
2138 Jones Rd., N.W., Atlanta, 30318, Telephone: 696-6716 (Home)

Mr. Herman Reese, Secondary School Parent, Therrell, 3845 King Edward
Trail, S.W.  30331 - Telephone: 349-3228

Mrs. Gaurnell Wallace, Elementary School Parent, Continental Colony,
2681 Laurens Cir., S.W.  30311 - Telephone: 344-4566

Mrs. Virginia Whatley, Elementary Teacher at Oglethorpe, 1304 Calhoun
Terr., S.W.  30314 - Telephone: 753-2361

Mrs. M. S. Whelchel, Resource Social Worker, Area I Office, 3257
Amhurst Dr., N.W.  30318 - Telephone: 696-6618

Program Facilitators

Dr. Mack Jones
Dr. Carl Spight
Area II

Mrs. Agnes Batey, Teacher, Long Middle, 635 Fair St., S.W. Apt. C-5 
Telephone: 766-0251 (office) 523-3170 (home)

Rev. O. L. Blackshear, Community At-Large, Mt. Pleasant Baptist, 
17 Meldon Ave., S.E., 30315 - Telephone: 522-4278 (office)

Mrs. Arthur Cooke, Counselor at George High, 345 Larchmont Dr., N.W., 
30315 - Telephone: 794-1669

Mrs. Shirley Frady, Parent, Cleveland Elementary, 240 Tonnawanda Dr. 
S.E., 30315 - Telephone: 622-0987 (office)

Mr. Bert Johnston, Principal, Sylvan High, 3047 Henderson Rd., 
Tucker 30084 - Telephone: 939-1797

Mrs. Ann Popwell, Parent, George High School, 935 Forrest Dr., S.E. 
30354 - Telephone: 361-3254 (office)

Mr. P. L. McCullough, Principal, Brewer Elementary, 25 Exeter, Avondale 
Estates 30022 - Telephone: 377-4900

Mr. Glenn Randall, Teacher at George High School, 311 Scott St., S.W. 
Apt. 166, 30311 - Telephone: 792-0680

Mrs. Evelyn Turner, Resource Teacher, Area II Office, 1222 Lynway 
Ln., S.W., 30311 - Telephone: 753-3549

Mr. Larry Daniely, Student, Price High School, 2310 Alston Dr., S.W., 
Apt. #1500, 30317 - Telephone: 373-3409 (office)

Program Facilitator

Ms. Aljosie Yabura
Area III

Dr. Curtis Dixon, Principal, Northside High School, 2745 Old Spanish Tr., College Park, Ga. - Telephone: 355-6886 (office)

Mr. Willie Gaither, Student, 1227 Grant St., S.E. - Telephone: 622-1867 (office)

Mrs. Luenelle Gardner, Parent, Smith School, 445 Pryor St., S.W.
Telephone: 522-6863 (office)

Mrs. Nancy Goldberg, Parent, North Fulton School, 2537 Parksale Pl., N.E. - Telephone: 237-9826 (office)

Mrs. Edith Hammond, Community Leader, 2655 Ellwood Dr., 30305,
Telephone: 233-9826 (office)

Mr. Angelo Hunter, Student at Howard High School, 366 Ashburton Ave., S.W. - Telephone: 373-4272

Mrs. Ercell McIver, Teacher, Spring Street Elementary, 3252 Spreading Oak Dr., S.W. - Telephone: 344-5286

Ms. Marian Morgan, Counselor, Grady High School, 179 Chicamauga Ave., S.E. - Telephone: 872-1887 (office)

Mr. John Phillips, Teacher, Archer High School, 1186 Citadel N.E., Telephone: 633-1535

Mr. Vanester Pugh, Assistant Principal, Sutton Middle School, 507 Lynn Valley Rd., S.W. - Telephone: 255-5236

Mrs. Lucy Smith, Area III Staff, 37 LaRue Pl., Cross Creek, N.W. Telephone: 351-9212 (office)

Program Facilitator

Mr. Arthur Barham
Area IV

Ms. Katherine Antoniades, Teacher, Blalock Elementary School, 500 Northside Circle GG 15, 30309, Telephone: 432-3645

Mr. Marshall Arnold, Principal, Harper High School, 4425 Bakers' Ferry Rd., S.W., 30331, Telephone: 696-1888

Mr. Sidney Blackstone, Principal, Fowler Street School, 6737 Arabian Ter. Lithonia, 30058, Telephone: 482-2572

Mrs. Rubye Clay, Parent, 2838 Eleanor Ter., N.W. 30318, Telephone: 792-1205

Mr. Ernest Pharr, Area IV Office, 3415 Pamlico Dr., S.W. 30311, Telephone: 696-6071

Mr. Lucus Sanford, Student, West Fulton High School, 3415 Maynard Court, N.W. 30318, Telephone: 753-7481

Mrs. Betty Smith, Counselor, Douglass High School, 4383 Rollings Hill Rd., S.W. 30331, Telephone: 344-7587

Mr. Lloyd Smith, Parent, 1800 Detroit Ave., N.W. 30314, Telephone: 794-1758


Rev. J. A. Wilborn, Pastor, Union Baptist Church, 2726 Collier Drive, N.W. 30318, Telephone: 799-7368

Program Facilitator

Ms. Brenda Belton
Area V

Mrs. Jacquelyn D. Baldwin, Community at Large, King Middle School, 380 Martin Street, S.E., Apt F-1, Telephone: 659-5193

Mr. Robert Dixon, Principal, King Middle, 890 King Grant Dr., N.W. 577-3972 (office), 794-7416 (home)

Mrs. Betty Dunnaway, Teacher, Whitefoord Elementary, 618 Brennan Ave., S.W., Telephone: 758-4238

Mrs. Viola Elder, Parent, Bass High School, 184 Whitefoord Ave., N.E., 30307, Telephone: 522-5590

Mrs. Marva Fears, Teacher, East Atlanta High School, 1980 Delphine Dr., 30032, Telephone: 377-8855 (office) 627-0291

Mrs. Joyce Goodman, Peterson Elementary, 617 Blake Ave, 30316, Telephone: 627-5401

Mr. Mell Hines, East Atlanta High School, 2641 Pharr Rd., N.E. Telephone: 241-7433

Mr. Eugene Jones, Social Services Coordinator, Area V, 2771 Collier Dr., N.W. 30318, Telephone: 873-5252 (office) 799-8084 (home)

Mr. William Russell, Murphy High School, 4148 Windsor Castle Wy., Decatur 30034, Telephone: 289-1740 (home) 373-4466 (office)

Mr. Sam Wells, Roosevelt High School, 2416 Timber Ridge Ct Decatur, 30032, Telephone: 627-2449 (office) 758-9792 (home)

Program Facilitator

Mr. Norman Thomas
February 26, 1974

Mr. Oscar Boozer, Chairman  
Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline
Instructional Services Center
2930 Forrest Hill Dr., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30315

Dear Mr. Boozer:

The purpose of this communication is to support my statement made in our meeting on Monday, February 18, 1974, and to share with you a more formal written charge on the very important task the Commission is to perform for the school system.

I. It is important for me to emphasize my philosophy that any policy recommendations should reflect both accountability of staff, parents, and students in discipline, and the rights that are inherent for each of these groups. Policy recommendations should therefore protect the rights of members of our school community (staff, parents, and students) and reflect a humane philosophy designed to further the educational achievement of the young people in our schools.

II. In order that the study will reflect the consideration that we must give to the size and complexity of this large urban school district, I support the three-phase approach recommended in the attached planning document. Phase One should conclude on or about June 1, 1974, with a preliminary report of your planning, your research into this subject, and a survey of community recommendations. Phase Two, July 1, 1974 - September 30, 1974, should include written policy recommendations based upon data from Phase One; your rationale for these recommendations; and then a series of public hearings on tentative recommendations to the Board of Education. Your final phase, Phase Three, Spring of 1975 (date to be later identified), should be an evaluation of the policies which will have been in effect for approximately one semester.
APPENDIX F

DR. CRIM'S CHARGE TO COMMISSION
III. I charge the Commission with the responsibility of sharing regular progress reports with the public, superintendent, and the Board of Education.

IV. Further, it is the charge of the Commission to develop policy statements, not implementation procedures for policy.

V. Finally, I recognize the expertise of the Commission members, the individuality of each area committee, and within the flexible parameters of this document, charge them with the exercise of their duties in the interest of the students, teachers, administrators, and parents of our school system.

Sincerely,

Alonzo A. Crim
Superintendent

AAC:tf
Attachment
GUIDELINES FOR AREA FACILITATORS FOR GATHERING INFORMATION REGARDING SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Elicit input from each area group (team) on the following components of the research tool. Once this information is received, results will be categorized and formulated into actual questionnaire.

1. Define purpose—What is the aim of the questionnaire; to solicit what kinds of information (opinions)

2. What areas should be covered/or included? Past, present, future aspects of discipline.

3. Define population—Who shall be surveyed? Faculty, parents, students, administrators? On what levels—Elementary, Secondary. What about supportive staff—para-professionals and Business Community? What geographic areas should be served?

4. How shall surveys be distributed? Interview or mail? Discuss implications of both (i.e. time factor for oral, pros-cons; low return for mailed questionnaire)

5. What possible follow-up can result from survey? Implications for reform.

6. Who shall receive the results? School personnel, community, mass media, etc.

7. Will the Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline devise a position paper based on the results of the survey? Can the survey expose real attitudes; can it reflect the needs of the schools, the communities?

8. Can the survey and/or C.A.R.D. gain public support to affect some change in the Atlanta Public Schools.
APPENDIX H

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS FOR COMPLETION OF DOCTORAL PROPOSAL
March 21, 1974

TO: Members of Doctoral Committee
FROM: Harold M. Treadwell
RE: Alternative Proposals for Completion of Doctoral Project

Attached herewith is a copy of the letter received by the writer terminating his services of the Superintendent of Schools' Commission on Accountability and Rights in Discipline.

As a result of this action, the writer has requested this meeting of his doctoral committee to determine the status of the candidate's project.

As suggested by committee members, alternatives to the project should be suggested by the writer for this meeting. The writer's suggestions are as follows:

1. Continue the project as an observer. Define the problems of reorganization; determine the extent of the utilization of the writer's planning document; and to analyze the results of the study to a date which would still allow the writer to graduate in August, 1974.

2. Pursue a dissertation on the subject: Curriculum Implications for the Training of Black School Superintendents. This was an original proposal of the writer which had received advisor approval in the spring of 1973. The proposal, and its defense is familiar to Dr. Ronald Kilpatrick, Dr. Clark Carnal, and Dr. Sidney Estes (former advisor). A copy of the proposal is available, and copies of the survey instrument could be completed within the month.

3. Develop a new project proposal around the writer's work with the Institute of the Black World and the University Without Walls project. Two advisors: Dr. Ronald Kilpatrick and Dr. Clark Carnal are familiar with the writer's efforts in this area.

4. Finally, as a last resort, surrender graduation for 1974; complete course work, comprehensive examination and remain in the program for the 1974–1975 school year.
The writer has been advised of research money available to Atlanta University staff under the Spencer Foundation Grants for Research. It is suggested that one of the committee members give serious consideration to the second alternative above: "Curriculum Implications for the Training of Black School Superintendents," apply for the grant, and hire the writer as a research associate. This suggestion has implications for the doctoral program in educational administration at Atlanta University.

Thank you for your consideration.
DISCIPLINE SURVEY FORM (PARENTS)

Age: Under 20 _______ 41-50 _______
    21-30 _______ 51-60 _______
    31-40 _______ Over 60 _______

Sex _______ Race _______

Number of Children in Atlanta Public Schools:
   Elementary _______ Middle _______ High _______

Total Family Income Per Year:
   $ 0 - $ 5,000 _______
   5,000- 10,000 _______
   10,000- 15,000 _______
   15,000- 20,000 _______
   20,000- 25,000 _______
   Over 25,000 _______

1. Please list the major discipline problems in your child's school in order of their importance:

   1. __________________________________________
   2. __________________________________________
   3. __________________________________________
   4. __________________________________________
   5. __________________________________________

2. What kinds of things do you feel have caused these problems?

3. What do you think would be the best way to prevent discipline problems?

4. How do you think your school should handle students who misbehave?

5. If your child were involved in a SERIOUS incident of misbehavior, how would you wish the school to handle it?
6. If your child were involved in a MINOR incident of misbehavior, how would you wish the school to handle it?

7. How do you think the school should handle children who frequently misbehave and disrupt the school program?

8. If not limitations were set, what changes would you make in your school to prevent and/or handle discipline problems?

9. How do you think the school system, as a whole, can help in solving discipline problems?

10. What kinds of things do you do at home to help your child to behave at school?

11. How do you think parents can help in solving discipline problems?

Comments:
DISCIPLINE SURVEY (STUDENTS)

Age:_______  Sex:_________  Race:_________  Grade:_________

Name of School______________________________________________

Father's Occupation________________________________________

Mother's Occupation________________________________________

1. Please list what you feel are the most serious behavior problems in your school in order of their importance:

1.________________________________________________________
2.________________________________________________________
3.________________________________________________________
4.________________________________________________________
5.________________________________________________________

2. What kinds of things in your school help students to behave well?

3. What kinds of things in your school cause students to misbehave?

4. If you were involved in a SERIOUS incident of misbehavior, how do you think the staff at your school should handle it?

5. If you were involved in a MINOR incident of misbehavior, how do you think your school should handle it?

6. How do you think your school should handle students who are frequently misbehaving and disrupting the school program?

7. What changes would you make in your school to improve student behavior?

8. What do you think students can do to help with discipline problems at your school?

Comments:
DISCIPLINE SURVEY (COMMUNITY)

Age:  
- Under 20  
- 21-30  
- 31-40  
- 41-50  
- 51-60  
- Over 60

Sex:  
Race:  
Affiliation:  

1. What do you feel are the most serious discipline problems in the schools in your community? List in order of importance:

1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
5.  

2. What kinds of things in these schools appear to contribute to student misbehavior?

3. What kinds of things in the community appear to contribute to student discipline problems?

4. What changes do you feel should be made in the schools to prevent discipline problems?

5. What changes do you feel should be made in the schools to deal with discipline problems?
6. What resources should be made available to the schools to deal with discipline problems?

7. What do you feel you can do as a member of the community to help solve discipline problems in the schools?

Comments:
DISCIPLINE SURVEY (NON-CERTIFIED STAFF)

Type of School:  ____Elementary  ____Middle  ____High

Your Position__________________________  Your Sex________

Your Age:  Under 20____  41-50____  21-30____  51-60____  31-40____  Over 60____

Your Race________

How long have you been with this school?________

How long have you been with the school system?________

1. What do you feel are the most serious behavior problems in your school? List in order of importance:
   
   1. ___________________________________________
   2. ___________________________________________
   3. ___________________________________________
   4. ___________________________________________
   5. ___________________________________________

2. What kinds of things seem to cause student misbehavior?

3. What changes do you feel should be made in the school to prevent discipline problems?

4. What changes do you feel should be made in the school to deal with the discipline problems?
DISCIPLINE SURVEY (NON-CERTIFIED STAFF) (Cont'd)

5. How should the school system, as a whole, assist your school with discipline problems?

6. What do you feel you can do to prevent discipline problems in your school?

7. What do you feel you can do to help solve discipline problems in your school?

Comments:
DISCIPLINE SURVEY (TEACHERS)

School Level (Check one) _____ Elementary _____ Middle _____ High
No. of Students _______ Racial Composition _____% Black _____% White

Your race _______ Age Group: 20-30 _____ 51-60 _____
31-40 _____ Over 60 _____
41-50 _____

No. Years Teaching _______
No. Years at this School _______

1. List the major behavioral problems in your classes which interfere with the learning process. Rank them first in order of severity and then rank the same problems again in order of frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What have you found to be the most effective means of handling the problems listed in Question #1?

3. What have you found to be the least effective means of handling the problems listed in Question #1?

4. What kinds of things in your classroom seem to encourage appropriate student behavior?
5. What kinds of things in your school seem to encourage appropriate student behavior?

6. What kinds of things in your classroom seem to contribute to poor student behavior?

7. What kinds of things in your school seem to contribute to poor student behavior?

8. What things are currently being done in your classroom to encourage appropriate student behavior?

9. What things are currently being done in your classroom to deal with student misbehavior?

10. What do you feel is the most common cause of student misbehavior?

11. If no limitations were set, what changes would you make in your classroom to prevent discipline problems?
12. If no limitations were set, what changes would you make to *deal with* discipline problems?

13. If no limitations were set, what resources would you request to *deal with* discipline in your classroom?

**Comments:**
1. List the major behavioral problems in your school which interfere with the learning process. Rank them first in order of severity and then rank the same problems in order of frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What have you found to be the most effective means of handling the problems listed in Question #1?

3. What have you found to be the least effective means of handling the problems listed in Question #1?

4. What kinds of things in your school seem to encourage appropriate student behavior?
5. What kinds of things in your school seem to contribute to poor student behavior?

6. What methods are currently being used in your school to encourage appropriate student behavior?

7. What methods are currently being used in your school to deal with student misbehavior?

8. What do you feel is the most common cause of student misbehavior?

9. If no limitations were set, what changes would you make in your school to prevent discipline problems?

10. If no limitations were set, what changes would you make to deal with discipline problems?

11. If no limitations were set, what resources would you request to deal with discipline in your school?

Comments:
DISCIPLINE SURVEY
(PRINCIPALS)

School Level (Check one) ___Elementary ___Middle ___High
Number of Students_____ Racial Composition____% Black ____% White
Your Race_____________ Your Sex_____________
Total Years as Principal_____ Number of Years as Principal at this school_____
Age Group: 25-35____ 46-55____
36-45____ 56-65____

1. List the major behavioral problems in your school which interfere with the learning process. Rank them first in order of severity and then rank the same problems in order of frequency.

   **Severity**
   1. ____________________________
   2. ____________________________
   3. ____________________________
   4. ____________________________
   5. ____________________________

   **Frequency**
   1. ____________________________
   2. ____________________________
   3. ____________________________
   4. ____________________________
   5. ____________________________

2. What have you found to be the most effective means of handling the problems listed in Question #1?

3. What have you found to be the least effective means of handling the problems listed in Question #1?

4. What kinds of things in your school seem to encourage appropriate student behavior?
5. What kinds of things in your school seem to contribute to poor student behavior?

6. What methods are currently being used in your school to encourage appropriate student behavior?

7. What methods are currently being used in your school to deal with student misbehavior?

8. What do you feel is the most common cause of student misbehavior?

9. If no limitations were set, what changes would you make in your school to prevent discipline problems?

10. If no limitations were set, what changes would you make to deal with discipline problems?

11. If no limitations were set, what resources would you request to deal with discipline in your school?

Comments:
APPENDIX J

SURVEY GROUPS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Total/Area</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Total/ System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Grades 6 - 12</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Principals</td>
<td>@ 25</td>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25/Elementary</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25/Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50/High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Non-Certified Personnel</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Janitors, Maids</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofessionals, Secretaries, Bus Drivers, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Administrative and Supportive Staff</td>
<td>@ 25</td>
<td>1 per School: Counselors, Social Workers, Psychologists, Asst. Principals, Lead Teachers Resource Teachers, etc.</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parents</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50/Elementary</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50/Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50/High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community Members (Board Members Will be Surveyed by Steering Committee)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Merchants, Social Agencies, Neighborhood Residents, etc. (Fill in Affiliation before Distribution)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Alvin Dawson

FROM: Dr. Alonzo A. Crim, Superintendent

As you know, discipline has loomed forth as a serious concern of students, staff, parents, and other community members. In response to this, I have asked that a Commission be formed to look at discipline in the Atlanta Public Schools and develop an appropriate policy. I have requested Mr. Oscar Boozer to serve as chairman of this Commission on Discipline. By the end of the school year, the Commission will prepare and submit a recommendation for adoption by the Board of Education that would establish a policy for accountability of school staff, parents, and students in school discipline.

Mr. Boozer has discussed with me his plans to establish a 50-member Commission on School Discipline with system-wide representation of parents, community leaders, students, teachers, school administrators, and support personnel, with equal area representation. I am, therefore, asking that you designate 10 persons from Area V to serve on the Commission. Please select one person from the area office to represent you, an elementary or middle school principal, a secondary school principal, an elementary or middle school teacher, a secondary school teacher, a secondary school student, a parent from the elementary school, a parent from the secondary school, a counselor, and a community leader representing the community-at-large. I should emphasize that in view of the assignment facing this Commission, serious thought should be given to select individuals who possess very high leadership qualities and the ability to communicate and relate to other members of the task force team, and with the group he or she is representing.

Please appoint your area committee before February 1, 1974, and name one person to be the convener to call your area group together when requested to do so by Mr. Boozer.

AAC:tf

cc: John A. Minor, Jr.  Barbara Whitaker
    Sidney Estes    Oscar Boozer
November 30, 1973

Mr. O. L. Boozer, Director
Health and School Social Services
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Mr. Boozer:

Discipline has loomed forth as a serious concern by students, staff, and community members. In response to this concern, I should like to form a commission which will look at discipline in the Atlanta Public Schools and develop an appropriate policy. I should like for you to serve as Chairman of this commission. You should invite, to serve with you, staff members, such as: Area Superintendent, principal, teachers, students, and community members from the five areas.

I would hope that the commission, by the end of the school year, would come forth with a recommendation for policy adoption by the Board of Education that would establish the accountability for school staff, parents, and students in school discipline. The policy, in my opinion, should be one that would reflect the humanism that we, as educators, perceive of students. It should highlight the counseling aspect of the educational process. I know that this is a heavy responsibility in tandem with the many activities for which you are responsible, but it is a necessary one. I wish to thank you in advance for giving leadership to this most important task. Will you inform me of how I can be of assistance to you in organizing the commission. After you have initiated your meetings, I would personally appreciate regular reports.

Sincerely,

Alonzo A. Crim
Superintendent

AAC:rr

cc: John A. Minor, Jr.
    Sidney Estes